

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

LR No.: 0203-06
Bill No.: SCS for HCS for HB 58
Subject: Political Subdivisions
Type: Original
Date: April 22, 2005

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
General Revenue	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Downtown Revitalization Preservation	\$0	\$0	\$0
Mo. Veterans Commission Capital Improvement Trust	Unknown	\$0	\$0
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds	Unknown	\$0	\$0

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 38 pages.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Local Government	Unknown to (Unknown)	Unknown to (Unknown)	Unknown to (Unknown)

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

Officials of the **Office of State Courts Administrator** assume no fiscal impact on the Courts.

Officials of the **Department of Revenue** assume no fiscal impact.

Officials of the **Department of Natural Resources** assume no fiscal impact.

Officials of the **Missouri Department of Conservation** assume no fiscal impact.

Officials of the **Boone County Sheriff's Office** assume no fiscal impact.

Little Blue Valley Sewer District and **Callaway County Water District #1** assume no fiscal impact.

Timing did not allow for more local governments to respond.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Section 50.530: Defining an Accounting Officer:

In response to fiscal note 1088-01 of this session, the following responses were issued:

Officials of the **Cass County Commission** assume no fiscal impact.

Oversight assumes no state or local fiscal impact.

Sections 50.1030 and 50.1031 County Employees Retirement System - Benefits:

The **Joint Committee on Public Employee Retirement (JCPER)** has reviewed this proposal and has determined an actuarial study is not needed under the provisions of section 105.660, subdivision (5).

Officials from the **Local Government Employees Retirement System and County Employees Retirement System** assume no fiscal impact to their agency.

Sections 54.010, 54.280 etal. - Consolidates Tax Collections in Township Counties:

Officials of the **Office of Henry County Treasurer-Collector** assumes this proposal would have annual savings of approximately \$33,280.

Officials of the **Nodaway County Clerk's Office** assume this proposal would promote greater efficiency by centralizing tax collections. Officials assume there would be administrative savings in staff time, and paperwork and errors. Currently the county has 15 individual Collectors. Officials believe that tax dollars could be distributed in a more timely fashion, thereby aiding the taxing authorities. Officials estimated that the fees retained for collecting taxes would now be retained by the County, and would be sufficient to pay for any additional expenses of the new office of Collector-Treasurer.

Officials of the **Livingston County Clerk's Office** estimates the 3% collection fee would generate approximately \$136,000 annually. Officials assume the cost of operations would be reduced because instead of processing 13 individual tax books now only one would be required at a central location. Officials assume savings in administration and supplies. Officials concluded there would be no losses incurred.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Officials of the **Carroll County Clerk's Office** assumes the county would realize approximately \$68,000 annually from the 3% collection fee. Officials assume there would be savings from purchasing supplies, and in administration. Officials stated they have 20 individual Collectors, and assume they would save office costs and staff time in having collections made at a centralized location. Officials concluded they would expect no losses to their county if this proposal were to be adopted.

Oversight assumes the loss of tax monies generated by the withholding of ½ of 1% by the various Township County Collector-Treasurers, for mailing tax statements, would be offset by the individual Township Collector no longer retaining a fee for salary.

Oversight assumes there would be no fiscal impact to the State's Blind Pension Trust Fund, or to local taxing authorities, such as school districts, road districts, library districts, etc.

Oversight notes that under the current method of collection of tax revenues in township counties, the Ex-Officio Collector retains for salary a collection fee of 2% for collecting delinquent taxes, and retains a 3% collection fee on all licenses, current taxes, etc. This proposal would transfer the monies generated from retaining these fees to the individual township counties' General Revenue Fund.

Section 67.1003 City of Maryville, Transient Guest Tax:

Oversight assumes that this section would allow the City of Maryville to charge a guest tax on all sleeping rooms paid by guest of hotels and motels within their city. Oversight assumes this proposal is permissive and would require voter approval. **Oversight** assumes no fiscal impact.

Section 67.1305 City/County Local Economic Development Empowerment Act:

This section would allow any city/county, with voter approval, to impose a sale tax that could not exceed one-half of one percent on all retail sales. The tax could only be used for promoting economic development.

Officials of the **Department of Revenue** assume they would retain a 1% collection fee.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Section 67.1350 Annexation - City of Warrensburg:

Officials of the **Department of Transportation** assume that if the City of Warrensburg were to annex an area along a road or highway, the department would be required to relocate city boundary signs located along state routes around the City of Warrensburg.

Officials assume they would remove and install the new city limit/speed limit assembly in the new location. Officials assume only one new assembly would be required at a cost of \$340 per assembly. Therefore officials estimate a one-time cost of \$340. Officials stated that if a speed study were conducted, the cost would be absorbed with existing resources. Cost would be to the Road Fund.

Officials of the City of Warrensburg did not respond.

Oversight assumes that the decision to annex would be discretionary, and any cost of annexation would be absorbed by the City of Warrensburg **Oversight assumes that the Department of Transportation would be able to absorb cost. Therefore, cost to Department of Transportation will be shown as \$0.**

Section 67.1754 St. Louis County Parks:

Officials of **St. Louis County** assume no fiscal impact.

Oversight assumes this proposal grants authority for additional uses of Municipal Grant Funds for parks, and does not require any additional duties or expenditures by local government. Therefore, Oversight assumes no state or local fiscal impact.

Section 67.1775: Community Services for Children Sales Tax:

In response to identical legislation of this session, fiscal note 1197-02 SB 238, the following fiscal impact estimates were issued.

Officials with the **Department of Revenue (DOR), Department of Social Services, State Treasurer's Office, and Jasper County** assume this proposal would have no fiscal impact on their agencies.

Officials with **Jefferson County** assume this proposal could result in positive fiscal impact as a

ASSUMPTION (continued)

result of the elimination of cots related to their community children's service fund sales tax collections. Oversight assumes the 1% collection fee imposed by DOR to collect the tax would offset such savings.

Oversight assumes this proposal stipulates that the Director of Revenue shall administer, collect, and disburse funds collected for the community children's services sales tax that counties are enabled to enact. Oversight further assumes that Jefferson County and St. Charles County have enacted such sales taxes, and that other counties are eligible to do so, pending approval of their voters.

Oversight assumes that the DOR would charge a 1% collection fee on the sales taxes relating to this proposal. However, such revenues would be offset by increased personnel, systems modification and programming, and other collection costs. Oversight cannot speculate as to how many counties will seek and attain voter approvals for imposing this tax, thus, it cannot estimate the amount of sales tax collections generated.

Section 71.794 Special Business District:

Oversight assumes that the changes in the requirements that notice of hearings for a proposed special business district be sent by registered mail with a return receipt, to one of notice by regular mail would have some savings in postage cost. Oversight assume any savings would be insignificant.

Section 94.270 License Fee on Hotels and Motels in the Cities of St. Peters and Berkeley:

Officials of the **City of St. Peters** stated that the city currently receives an estimated \$400,000 annually from the license fee on hotels and motels. Officials stated this proposal would cause a decrease in revenue of approximately \$396,000 annually.

Officials of the **City of Berkeley** stated that currently the city does not assess a license fee on hotels and motels, therefore, officials assume no fiscal impact.

Oversight assumes that other cities affected by this proposal could have negative fiscal impact if they currently assess a license fee on hotels/motels which would be greater than 1/8% of the hotel's gross revenue. Oversight assumes the City of Woodson Terrace would be one of the other cities that could have negative fiscal impact from this proposal.

Oversight will show fiscal impact as either \$0 to a negative Unknown.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Section 94.837 Transient Guest Tax - Cities of Canton, La Grange, and Edina:

Oversight assumes these cities with voter approval could impose a transient guest tax that could not exceed 5% per occupied room per night. Oversight assumes no state fiscal impact because the Department of Revenue does not collect guest taxes. Oversight assumes the cities, with voter approval would collect an undetermined amount and would spend an undetermined amount on the promotion of tourism. Oversight assumes that the city would not spend more revenue than the amount received which would result in an annual fund balance of either \$0 or a positive unknown. For purposes of this fiscal note annual fiscal impact will be shown as \$0.

Section 94.838 - Sales Tax for Capital Improvements - City of Lamar Heights

Oversight assumes if the voters of the City of Lamar Heights would approve the imposition of a sales tax on food that the Department of Revenue would withhold a 1% collection fee for collecting the sales tax on food. Therefore, Oversight will show income to the State's General Revenue Fund as a positive unknown.

Section 94.860 Municipalities in St. Louis County Sales Tax for Public Safety:

Officials of the **Department of Revenue** assumes they could handle any additional workload created by this proposal with existing resources.

Oversight assumes if the Department of Revenue collects the sales tax, the DOR would retain a 1% fee for collecting the tax. The amount of money generated by the 1% fee is indeterminable and is unknown. Since any potential collection fees would be contingent upon local voter approval, Oversight will show fiscal impact to the State's General Revenue Fund as \$0 to Unknown.

Oversight assumes this is enabling legislation and would have no fiscal impact, unless the governing body of any municipality located in St. Louis County would seek voter approval to levy an additional sales tax of up to one-half cent.

Oversight assumes that this proposal as written does not mandate such governing bodies to place before the voters the question of levying the additional sales tax; such an act is discretionary. Nor does this proposal mandate an increase in the tax rate. Therefore, Oversight assumes this proposal would have no fiscal impact.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Oversight will show fiscal impact as \$0 if the tax increase were placed on the ballot and were defeated, or if it were never placed on the ballot, to Unknown revenue if the question were placed on the ballot and passed by the voters of the district. Oversight assumes if the tax increase were passed there is no way to determine the amount of revenue that would be generated by the tax.

Sections 99.1080 thru 99.1092 - Downtown Revitalization Preservation Program:

In response to identical legislation, state agencies submitted the following fiscal impact statements:

Officials from the **Department of Revenue** and the **Office of the State Treasurer** each assume the proposal would not fiscally impact their respective agencies.

In response to a previous version of this proposal, officials from the **Office of Secretary of State (SOS)** assumed there would be costs due to additional publishing duties related to the Department of Economic Development's authority to promulgate rules, regulations, and forms. SOS estimated the division could require approximately 4 new pages of regulations in the Code of State Regulations at a cost of \$27.00 per page, and 6 new pages in the Missouri Register at a cost of \$23.00 per page. Costs due to this proposal are estimated to be \$246, however, the actual fiscal impact would be dependent upon the actual rule-making authority and may be more or less. Financial impact in subsequent fiscal years would depend entirely on the number, length, and frequency of the rules filed, amended, rescinded, or withdrawn. SOS does not anticipate the need for additional staff as a result of this proposal, however, the enactment of more than one similar proposal may, in the aggregate, necessitate additional staff.

Oversight assumes the SOS could absorb the costs of printing and distributing regulations related to this proposal. If multiple bills pass which require the printing and distribution of regulations at substantial costs, the SOS could request funding through the appropriation process.

Any decisions to raise fees to defray costs would likely be made in subsequent fiscal years.

Officials from the **Office of Administration - Budget and Planning** deferred to the Department of Economic Development.

Officials from the **Department of Economic Development (DED)** stated the bill creates \$15 million annually in TIF funding that comes from new revenue. DED is allowed to recover costs of reviewing projects. DED does not project initial costs but anticipates asking for a budgeted

ASSUMPTION (continued)

position and expenditure authority through the normal budget cycle as the program grows.

DED makes no assumption with regard to fiscal and has no administrative impact at this time.

DED officials assume they would need one Economic Development Incentive Coordinator plus expenses to administer the Downtown Revitalization Preservation Program. DED assumes that any revenue from the sale of the Workforce Development property would be required to be reinvested in other Workforce Development facilities or the funds would revert back to the Federal government. DED officials estimate the costs of (1) FTE Coordinator, plus equipment and expense at \$71,760 in FY 2006; \$79,121 in FY 2007; and \$81,161 in FY 2008.

Oversight would point out that in fiscal note 2076-03 of this session, which is identical, DED officials did not request additional FTE, however, they did say that as the program developed they would request additional FTE through the normal budget cycle. Therefore, Oversight assumes no fiscal impact from additional FTE.

Oversight assumes this program will annually transfer up to \$15 million of the new state revenues received as a result of the projects back to the local political subdivisions, much like the current tax increment financing programs and the Missouri Downtown Economic Stimulus Act. It is indeterminable whether the developments within the projects would have occurred elsewhere in the state, if not but for the implementation of this program. If the development would have occurred elsewhere in the state if not for this proposal, then this program will result in a loss of up to \$15 million in state revenues annually that the state would have been able to keep if not for this proposal. If the developments would not have occurred in the state if not for this program, then the state's loss of up to \$15 million in new revenues that goes back to the local projects will be offset by the up to \$15 million in new revenues the state may receive because of this proposal.

Oversight assumes that since the proposal requires the Department of Revenue to annually submit the first \$15 million of other net new revenues generated by developments from the plan into the state downtown revitalization preservation fund, that these monies would not be initially deposited into General Revenue, but rather go directly into their respective funds.

Oversight assumes revenue that is received by the local political subdivisions from the new fund may fall short of the project development costs. Oversight will range the fiscal impact to local political subdivisions from \$0 (economic activity taxes meet project development costs) to a negative Unknown (project development costs exceed economic activity taxes).

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Oversight acknowledges that the proposal is designed to stimulate economic development within the state with the purpose of generating additional future state revenues. However, Oversight cannot determine or estimate the magnitude of the future benefit the state may realize because of these programs.

Section 115.019 - Cass County: Formation of Board of Election Commission:

In response to fiscal note 1091, SB 257, the following fiscal impact statements were issued.

Officials of the **Cass County Commission** assume no fiscal impact.

Oversight assumes this provision is discretionary, and would require voter approval before fiscal impact would be realized. Oversight assumes no state fiscal impact.

Section 198.345 Assisted Living Facilities, Marion and Ralls Counties:

Officials of the **Department of Social Services** assume there would be no fiscal impact related to the licensing of new assisted living facilities.

Section 205.010 - Cass County and Cooper County - Public Health Center:

In response to identical legislation fiscal note 1089-01, SB 258 the following fiscal impact statements were issued:

Officials of the **Cass County Commission** assume no fiscal impact.

Oversight assumes current law would allow Cass County to place the ballot the question of establishing a health center in Cass County, but only by petition. This proposal would allow a majority of the Cass County Commission to place the question on the ballot. **Oversight** assumes this is enabling legislation and would have no fiscal impact without action by the governing body. Oversight assumes no State or Local fiscal impact.

Section 231.444 Worth County Road Rock Fund - Property Tax:

Oversight assumes this section is permissive and does not mandate the Worth County Commission to levy a tax for the purchase of road rock. **Oversight** assumes there would be no fiscal impact without action of the governing body and with voter approval. **Oversight** assumes

ASSUMPTION (continued)

no state or local fiscal impact.

Section 250.140 - Water Supply Districts, Sewer Districts, Collections:

Officials of the **Department of Natural Resources** assumes no fiscal impact.

Officials of the **Little Blue Valley Sewer District** assumes no fiscal impact.

Officials of the **Callaway County Water District 1** assume no fiscal impact.

Section 263.245 Schuyler and Worth Counties - Right-of-Way Brush Control:

Oversight assumes this section provides procedure for the counties of Schuyler and Worth to control brush along their county roadways, and not have cost to the county. **Oversight** assumes no state or local fiscal impact. Landowners of property along county roads would be billed for the clean-up expense if they did not keep the Right-of-Way clear of brush.

Sections 321.552 and 321.554 Ambulance/Fire Protection Districts - St. Louis, St. Charles Counties:

Oversight assumes Ambulance and Fire Protections Districts located in St. Louis County and St. Charles County would be allowed to seek voter approval to impose a sales tax in an amount of up to one-half of one percent on all retail sales. Monies generated by the sales tax could only be used for operation of the district.

Oversight assumes the Department of Revenue would collect the sales tax, if one were approved, and would retain a 1% collection fee that would be deposited in the State's General Revenue Fund. **Oversight** will show fiscal impact as either \$0 or unknown amount of revenue.

Section 488.2220 City of Springfield - Municipal Court Cost:

Oversight assumes the City of Springfield would be allowed to assess an additional court cost of \$5 per case for each municipal ordinance violation case filed. **Oversight** assumes the City would use monies generated by the fee to provide for court services, and records management system.

Oversight assumes the City would not spend more than received resulting in either an annual fund balance of \$0 or a positive unknown.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Section 559.607 Municipal Courts - Probation Services:

In response to identical legislation, (567-01), the following fiscal impact statements were issued:

Officials from the **Department of Corrections, City of Lees Summit, and the City of Maryland Heights** assume the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their agencies.

Officials from the **Office of State Courts Administrator** assume the proposed legislation would have no fiscal impact on the courts.

Oversight assumed no fiscal impact. The court could assess the person found guilty a service fee in an amount that would pay for the costs of probation services.

Sections 1, 2, and 7: Conveyance of Property in Buchan, St. Francois, and Iron Counties:

Based on responses of other land conveyances, **Oversight** assumes the **Office of Attorney General**, who would approve the form of the instrument of conveyance, and the **Commissioner of Administration** who would set the terms and conditions for the sale, would have no fiscal impact to their offices. **Oversight** assumes that the State would receive the full value of the property being conveyed, therefore, there would be no fiscal impact.

Section 4: Madison County Sales Tax for Recreational Purposes:

Oversight assumes this proposal is permissive and would require action by the County's governing body, and with voter approval.

Oversight assumes if the voters were to approve by vote, a sales tax that could not exceed 1%, the State Department of Revenue would collect the tax and would retain a 1% collection fee, which would be deposited in the State's General Revenue Fund. The amount of revenue generated from the collection fee is indeterminable and unknown.

The county would receive an unknown amount of revenue from the sales tax, and would have unknown costs of providing recreational projects. **Oversight** assumes the county would not spend more than it receives annually, which would result in a recreational fund balance of either \$0 or a positive unknown.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Section 6 Conveyance of State Property in Lafayette County:

This section provides for the sale of state property in Lafayette County. Proceeds of the sale are to be deposited in the Veterans Commission Capital Improvement Trust Fund. **Oversight** is not able to determine the amount of money the state will receive for the property. Therefore, income to the Veterans Commission Fund will be shown as unknown. **Oversight** assumes there would be no fiscal impact to the Office of Attorney General and the Commissioner of Administration.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2006 (10 Mo.)	FY 2007	FY 2008
---	---------------------	---------	---------

GENERAL REVENUE FUND

Income – DOR

1% Collection Fees (67.1775)	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown
------------------------------	----------------	----------------	----------------

Income - DOR

1% Collection Fee (67.1305)	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown
-----------------------------	----------------	----------------	----------------

Income - DOR

1% Collection Fee (Section 4)	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown
-------------------------------	----------------	----------------	----------------

Income - DOR

1% Collection Fee (Section 94.860)	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown
------------------------------------	----------------	----------------	----------------

Income - DOR

1% Collection Fees (section 321.552, and 321.554)	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown
---	----------------	----------------	----------------

Transfer In - from the Downtown Revitalization Preservation fund for recoupment of expenses incurred by state agencies (Sections 99.1080 to 99.1092)

\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown
----------------	----------------	----------------

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2006 (10 Mo.)	FY 2007	FY 2008
Costs - DED, DOR			
- to administer the Downtown Revitalization Preservation Program (Sections 99.1080 to 99.1092)	\$0 to <u>(Unknown)</u>	\$0 to <u>(Unknown)</u>	\$0 to <u>(Unknown)</u>
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT TO STATE GENERAL REVENUE FUND	<u>\$0 or Unknown</u>	<u>\$0 or Unknown</u>	<u>\$0 or Unknown</u>
DOWNTOWN REVITALIZATION PRESERVATION FUND			
<u>Income</u> - net new revenue from approved projects	\$0 to \$15,000,000	\$0 to \$15,000,000	\$0 to \$15,000,000
<u>Transfer Out</u> - to General Revenue Fund for recoupment of expenses from DOR and/or DED	\$0 to <u>(Unknown)</u>	\$0 to <u>(Unknown)</u>	\$0 to <u>(Unknown)</u>
<u>Costs</u> - to Municipalities for development projects	\$0 to <u>(\$15,000,000)</u>	\$0 to <u>(\$15,000,000)</u>	\$0 to <u>(\$15,000,000)</u>
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT TO THE DOWNTOWN REVITALIZATION PRESERVATION FUND	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
MISSOURI VETERANS COMMISSION CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT TRUST FUND			
<u>Income</u> to Veterans Commission Capital Improvement Trust Fund From sale of state property in Lafayette County (section 6)	<u>Unknown</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2006 (10 Mo.)	FY 2007	FY 2008
TOWNSHIP COUNTIES - GENERAL REVENUE FUND			
<u>Income</u> to General Revenue Fund			
From 2% fee on delinquent tax collections. *	\$0	Unknown	Unknown
<u>Income</u> to General Revenue Fund			
From 3% collecton fee retained *	\$0	Unknown	Unknown
<u>Income</u> to General Revenue Fund			
From ½ of 1% fee for mailing	\$0	Unknown	Unknown
<u>Cost</u> to General Revenue Fund			
From additional costs of office expense, personnel costs, etc.	<u>\$0</u>	<u>(\$Unknown)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT TO TOWNSHIP COUNTIES GENERAL REVENUE FUND * (section 54.010 etal.)	\$0	Unknown	Unknown
TOWNSHIP COUNTIES POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS -(TAXING AUTHORITIES)			
<u>Savings</u> to Political Subdivisions			
from fees retained by Township Collector for salary. (section 54.010 etal.)	\$0	Unknown	Unknown
<u>Cost</u> to Political Subdivisions			
½ of 1% fee retained by County Collector-Treasurer for mailing of taxes.	<u>\$0</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2006 (10 Mo.)	FY 2007	FY 2008
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT TO POLITICAL SUBDIVISION - TAXING AUTHORITIES ** (section 54.010 etal.)	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0 or Unknown</u>	<u>\$0 or Unknown</u>
CITY OF ST. PETERS / OTHER CITIES (Section 94.270)			
<u>Loss of Revenue</u> to City of St. Peters From reduction is license fee. (section 94.270)	<u>(\$396,000)</u>	<u>(\$396,000)</u>	<u>(\$396,000)</u>
<u>Loss of Revenue</u> to City of Berkeley From change in license fee calculation	\$0	\$0	\$0
<u>Loss of Revenue</u> to Cities From change is calculation of license fee on hotels/motels	<u>\$0 or (Unknown)</u>	<u>\$0 or (Unknown)</u>	<u>\$0 or (Unknown)</u>
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT TO CITY OF ST. PETERS and OTHER CITIES. (Section 94.270)	<u>\$0 or (Unknown)</u>	<u>\$0 or (Unknown)</u>	<u>\$0 or (Unknown)</u>
ST. LOUIS COUNTY MUNICIPALITIES SAFETY SALES TAX FUND			
<u>Income</u> to Certain Cities Safety Sales Tax Fund (Section 94.860) From voter approved sales tax	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown
<u>Cost</u> to Certain Cities Safety Sales Tax Fund (Section 94.860) From improving public safety	<u>\$0 or (Unknown)</u>	<u>\$0 or (Unknown)</u>	<u>\$0 or (Unknown)</u>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2006 (10 Mo.)	FY 2007	FY 2008
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT TO CERTAIN CITIES PUBLIC SAFETY SALES TAX FUND (Section 94.860)	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
CITY OF LAMAR HEIGHTS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS TRUST FUND (Section 94.838)			
<u>Income</u> to Capital Improvements Trust Fund			
from voter approved sales tax on food, and transient guest tax on lodging.	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown
<u>Cost</u> to Capital Improvements Trust Fund			
from funding capital improvement projects	<u>\$0 or (Unknown)</u>	<u>\$0 or (Unknown)</u>	<u>\$0 or (Unknown)</u>
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT TO LAMAR HEIGHTS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS TRUST FUND	<u>\$0 or Unknown</u>	<u>\$0 or Unknown</u>	<u>\$0 or Unknown</u>
CITY/COUNTIES ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT TRUST FUND (Section 67.1305)			
<u>Income</u> to City or County Economic Development Fund			
From one-half of one percent sales tax	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
<u>Cost</u> to City or County Economic Development Fund	<u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT TO CITY/COUNTY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT TRUST FUND	<u>\$0 or Unknown</u>	<u>\$0 or Unknown</u>	<u>\$0 or Unknown</u>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2006 (10 Mo.)	FY 2007	FY 2008
Cost to Children's Services Fund providing children services (67.1775)	<u>\$0 or</u> (Unknown)	<u>\$0 or</u> (Unknown)	<u>\$0 or</u> (Unknown)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT TO CITY/COUNTY CHILDREN'S SERVICES FUND (Section 67.1775)	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
CITIES OF CANTON, LA GRANGE, AND EDINA TOURISM FUND			
Income to City Tourism Fund (Section 94.837) From transient guest tax	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown
Cost to City Tourism Fund From promotion of tourism (Section 94.837)	<u>\$0 or</u> (Unknown)	<u>\$0 or</u> (Unknown)	<u>\$0 or</u> (Unknown)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT TO CERTAIN CITIES TOURISM FUND	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS REVITALIZATION PRESERVATION FUND (Sections 99.1080 to 99.1092)			
<u>Transfer In</u> - from State Revitalization Preservation Fund - to reimburse project development costs	\$0	\$0 to \$15,000,000	\$0 to \$15,000,000
<u>Costs</u> - project development costs for Downtown Revitalization Preservation Program	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT TO THE LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS	<u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>\$0 to</u> (Unknown)	<u>\$0 to</u> (Unknown)

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2006 (10 Mo.)	FY 2007	FY 2008
CITY OF SPRINGFIELD GENERAL REVENUE FUND (Section 488.2220)			
<u>Income</u> to City of Springfield			
From new \$5 municipal court fee.	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
<u>Cost</u> to City of Springfield			
From providing court services etc.	<u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT TO CITY OF SPRINGFIELD GR FUND	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
MADISON COUNTY RECREATION TRUST FUND			
<u>Income</u> to Recreation Trust Fund			
From voter approved sales tax (section 4)	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown
Cost to Recreation Trust Fund			
From providing recreation projects and programs. (section 4)	<u>\$0 or (Unknown)</u>	<u>\$0 or (Unknown)</u>	<u>\$0 or (Unknown)</u>
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT TO MADISON COUNTY RECREATION TRUST FUND (section 4)	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT ***	<u>Unknown to (Unknown)</u>	<u>Unknown to (Unknown)</u>	<u>Unknown to (Unknown)</u>

* Income from commissions withheld prior to this proposal was retained by the Ex-Officio Collector for salary. These withholdings would now go to the county treasury. Oversight assumes fees withheld would be adequate to defray the costs of administration of the office of Collector-Treasurer. Oversight assumes the transfer of tax revenue collection authority would begin on March 1, 2007.

****Oversight assumes the fees retained by the Township County Collector for salary would be greater than the fee of ½ of 1% retained by the Collector - Treasurer for mailing tax statements resulting in either an annual \$0 or positive savings for local taxing jurisdictions.**

***** Oversight assumes annual cost would not exceed income, which would result in a positive fund balance. For purposes of this fiscal note Oversight will show annual fiscal impact as \$0 or Unknown.**

FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

Small businesses located within the City of Lamar Heights that are in the food business or lodging business would be expected to collect an additional tax on food items and hotel/motel rooms as defined by this proposal.(94.838)

Small businesses located within any City or County that would receive voter approval to impose a sales tax for Economic Development Improvements would be expected to collect and administer additional tax on retail sales. (67.1305)

DESCRIPTION

This proposed legislation relates to political subdivisions.

Section 44.090 - Allows the executive officer of any political subdivision to enter into mutual-aid agreements or agreements for reciprocal emergency aid. In time of emergency it shall be the duty of each local organization to render assistance in accordance with the mutual-aid arrangements or agreements.

The contracts agreed upon may provide for compensation and other terms. They may be for an indefinite period of time as long as a 60 day cancellation notice by either party. The contracts cannot be entered into for the purpose of reduction of staffing.

At the time of a significant emergency anywhere in the state or bordering states, the highest ranking official of a political subdivision available may render aid to any requesting political subdivision as long as he or she is in compliance with the policies of that jurisdiction. When responding to requests, political subdivisions will be subject to all provisions as if it were providing service in its own jurisdiction.

DESCRIPTION (continued)

All political subdivisions, upon enactment of these provisions or an execution of an agreement, are automatically part of the Missouri statewide mutual aid system. A political subdivision can elect to not participate. It must provide a copy of the resolution doing so to the State Fire Marshal & State Emergency Management Agency.

This proposal specifies what organizations, people, and other entities shall be considered an emergency response agency.

It shall be the responsibility of each political subdivision to adopt the National Incident Management System promulgated by the U.S. Dept. Of Homeland Security. In the event of a disaster beyond the capabilities of a political subdivision, the governing body may request assistance and shall be done within the guidelines of the statewide mutual aid plan.

Any entity or individual that holds license, certificate, or other permit issued by a participating political subdivision or state, shall be deemed to hold such a position in the subdivision requesting assistance. Any political subdivision providing assistance shall receive appropriate reimbursement and such reimbursement must be in accordance with state and federal guidelines.

Applicable benefits normally available to personnel are also available to such persons when an injury or death occurs when rendering assistance to another political subdivision under this section. Responders shall be eligible for the same benefits that may be available to them for line of duty deaths.

All activities performed under these agreements are deemed to be governmental functions. For the purposes of liability, all participating political subdivisions responding are deemed employees of such participating political subdivision.

Sections 49.093 & 55.160 - Raises from \$250 to \$1,000 the value of property for which the county auditor in counties of the first and second classification and the county department officer in counties of the third and fourth classification is required to inventory.

Section 49.272 - Authorizes the Jasper and Jefferson county commissions to impose by rule, regulation, or ordinance a civil fine of up to \$1,000 for each violation of any rule, regulation, or ordinance adopted by the commission.

DESCRIPTION (continued)

Section 50.343 - Allows county officials' salaries to be computed on an assessed valuation basis without regard to modifications because of the existence of enterprise zones.

Section 50.530 - Under this act proposal, the budget officer:

- In counties of the first classification with more than 100,000 people according to the 1970 census, is appointed by the county commission;
- In counties of the first classification with less than 100,000 people according to the 1970 census, is the county auditor;
- In Cass County and counties of the second classification, is the presiding commissioner unless the commission designates the county clerk; and,
- In counties of the third and fourth classification, is the county clerk.

Section 50.540 - Salaries and benefits shall be paid only to the extent authorized in the annual budget document and appropriation order for each county office. The county commission shall set the minimum number of hours a person must work for each salary level.

Section 50.760 - Requires county commissions without a purchasing agent to estimate county expenditures for supplies for the following year. The commission may authorize the purchase of supplies at a public action. No contract for a purchase is valid until the commission has approved a purchase order for the supplies for which bids were advertised and submitted.

Section 50.770 - Specifies that "supplies" include materials, equipment, and contractual services but excludes regulated utility services.

Section 50.780 - Allows County Commission, to waive the requirement of competitive bids in times of emergency. Officials must note in the minutes the nature of the emergency and the vote approving the purchase.

Section 50.783 - Allows the County Commission to waive the requirement of competitive bids for supplies whenever they have determined there is only one source for the supplies.

DESCRIPTION (continued)

Officials must record all transactions and discussion in their minutes. One purchases that have been determined there is only a single source which exceed \$3,000 the Commission is required to post notice of the proposed purchase, and where the purchase exceeds \$5,000 the Commission is required to publish the purchase in at least one daily and one weekly newspaper of general circulation. County officials would be allowed to use an electronic medium

Section 50.784 - Authorizes the county commission to delegate its procurement authority to county departments provided that the department follows all the laws for purchasing, entering contracts, and keeping records. The delegation may allow the county departments to negotiate the purchase of services. No claim for payment will be certified by the commission unless accompanied by documentation. Any department given procurement authority must keep full and detailed records. Each instance of single feasible source purchasing authority over \$5,000 must be specifically delegated by the commission.

Section 50.1030 & 50.1031 - As part of the annual review by the Board of Directors of the County Employees Retirement Fund, the board will determine if having an additional benefit or enhancement which will improve the quality of life for future retirees is feasible.

After the annual review, the Board may vote to make any of the feasible adjustments outlined in Section 50.1030, RSMo, subject to the following guidelines:

- No adjustment can be made until the fund has achieved a funded ratio of assets to the actuarial accrued liability equaling at least 75%;
- Adjustment can be made no more than once every 12 months;
- Any adjustment within a 12 month period may increase the actuarially determined and required annual contribution as a percentage of payroll no more than 1%; and,
- Adjustments, except for COLA, will apply only with respect to active employees on the effective date of an adjustment.

Section 52.317 - Currently, Section 52.317, RSMo, states that any county which must establish a "Tax Maintenance Fund" must also provide as much money as was designated in the approved budget in the previous year and must include the same percentage adjustments in compensation. This proposal excludes capital improvements and equipment purchases from the amount of money required. It also requires that the same percentage adjustments for individual employees compensation be provided.

DESCRIPTION (continued)

Sections 54.010, 54.280, 54.320, 54.330, 65.110, 65.160, 65.460, 65.490, 65.600, 136.010, 136.160, 137.465, 137.585, 139.120, 139.350, 139.400, 139.420, 139.430, 139.440, 139.450, 139.460, 165.071, 242.560, 245.205, & 301.025 - Under this proposed legislation, laws generally applicable to county collectors shall apply and govern county collector-treasurers except when they conflict with law specifically applicable to county collector-treasurer, in which case, such laws shall govern.

This proposal provides that the treasurer ex officio collector of a county with township organization shall no longer retain such title, and shall instead, assume the office of collector-treasurer on March 1, 2007. Until such date the township collector shall continue to perform the same duties and be subject to the same requirements and liabilities until his or her term expires. On such date though, the township collector shall cease to perform his or her duties and shall promptly deliver to the collector-treasurer, all books, papers, records, and property pertaining to the office. Notwithstanding other provisions of law to the contrary, the collector-treasurer shall obtain and hold the same duties, powers, and obligations previously granted to, and held by, the township collector. The collector-treasurer will also continue to perform the duties of the current "treasurer ex officio collector". Provisions have been made so that the consolidation of the duties of these two positions does not result in conflict.

The county treasurer-collector will continue to be compensated in the same manner as when he or she was the treasurer ex officio collector and will post the same bond. The number deputies and assistants that are needed by a collector-treasurer shall be determined by the collector-treasurer, but he or she shall have no less than one full-time deputy.

This proposal requires the treasurer-collector to collect a fee of one-half of one percent on all licenses, taxes, and all interest collected in order to be deposited in the county treasury. This money can only be used to complete the mailing of personal property tax statements and receipts.

This proposal eliminates provisions directed specifically at township collectors such as their election and requirement to take an oath. It also transfers the powers given to them with regard to collecting taxes to the treasurer-collector. Powers currently given to the treasurer ex officio collector that require interaction with the township collector have been transferred to other county officials such as the county clerk.

Section 59.044 - Provides that a recorder of deeds separate from circuit clerks in counties of the second, third, and fourth classification shall be paid statutory compensation as provided for in Section 50.334.

DESCRIPTION (continued)

Section 64.215 - Requires that the county commissioner and county highway engineer, as members of the county planning board, be nonvoting members in Cass County.

Currently, these individuals are members on the board with voting power in Cass County.

Section 67.055 - Provides that any moneys received or collected to fund additional costs incurred by any county office, excluding moneys collected before September 1, 2005, shall be subject to "The County Budget Law" (Sections 50.525 to 50.745).

Sections 67.469 & 140.150 - Adds special assessments for neighborhood improvement districts to the laws regarding the collection of property taxes and other local taxes. These assessments are allowed to be collected and assessed in the same manner as other local taxes.

Section 67.1003 - Authorizes the City of Maryville to impose, upon voter approval, a transient guest tax of up to 5% on hotel and motel rooms.

Section 67.1159 - When any tax, interest, or penalty imposed in relation to the St. Charles County Convention and Sports Facilities Authority is not paid when due, the authority may file for record a notice of lien in the recorder's office. The notice will specify the amount due and the name of the liable person. From the time of filing such notice, the amount of tax shall have the force and effect of a lien against the real and personal property of the business of such person or the facility giving rise to the tax.

Under this proposal, a lien may be released by filing a release of the lien executed by a duly authorized agent of the authority upon payment or upon receipt of sufficient security, or by final judgment holding such lien to have been erroneously imposed.

Each recorder shall receive statutory fee for the filing of each notice of lien and for each release of lien filed for record. The authority is authorized to collect an additional penalty from each taxpayer equal to the cost of filing a notice of lien or release with respect to such taxpayer.

Any person operating or managing a business or facility who owes taxes, penalty, or interest, or is required to file any report with the authority, must notify, in writing, the authority at least 10 days prior to any sale of the entire business or a major part thereof. The notice includes the name of the business or facility and the owner, the intended date of purchase, and the name of the person purchaser and person collecting the tax. Any person who takes with notice of delinquent tax or noncompliance is considered to be taking subject to any tax, penalty, or interest owed by the seller.

DESCRIPTION (continued)

The authority shall have the power to bring a civil action to enjoin the operation of a business or facility, if the business or facility has a tax, penalty, or interest which is unpaid or is violation of the statutes relating to the authority.

Section 67.1305 - Allows the governing body of any city or county to impose, by order or ordinance after voter approval, a sales tax for economic development purposes. The tax shall not be more than $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1%. Any city or county that imposes a tax under sections 67.1300 or 67.1303 shall not impose this tax.

All sales tax collected pursuant to this section will be collected by the Director of Revenue, less 1% for the cost of collection. The money will be deposited into the "Local Option Economic Development Sales Tax Trust Fund". The director must keep records of the money in the trust fund and the records shall be open to the officers of the city, county, or the public. No later than the 10th day of each month, the director will distribute the money deposited in the trust fund during the previous month to the city or county which levied the tax.

If a city or county abolishes the tax, it must notify the director at least 90 days before the repeal. The director may order retention in the trust fund for a period of one year, of 2% of the amount collected after receipt of such notice of the repeal in order to cover possible refunds or overpayment and redeem dishonored checks. After a year, the director will return the balance to the city or county and close the account.

Revenue generated by this tax cannot be used for retail development projects unless they are for redevelopment of downtown areas or historic projects. At least 20% of the revenue generated by this tax must be used for long-term economic development preparation. No more than 25% of the revenue generated may be used for administrative purposes.

Each city or county imposing this tax must establish an Economic Development Tax Board. The board is for volunteers and shall consist of five members for a city and seven members for a county, appointed by various local entities or officials.

The board, subject to approval of the governing body, shall consider economic development plans, economic development projects, or designations of an economic development area. It shall provide notice and hold hearings. The board will make recommendations to the governing body within 90 days of a hearing and the governing body will then have the final determination on use and expenditure of money from the trust fund. There are specific requirements that projects and plans outside of the city or county must meet in order for the board to make a recommendation to use such trust fund money.

DESCRIPTION (continued)

When this tax is imposed within a special taxing district, it shall be excluded from the calculation of revenues available to such districts and no revenues from the tax will be used for the purposes of such district unless recommended by the board and approved by the governing body.

The board must report at least annually to the governing body on the use of the money in the trust fund and on progress of any plan, project, or designation adopted. It must also submit a report each year by March 1 to the Joint Committee on Economic Development.

Any city or county which adopts this sales tax may submit the question of repeal to the voter on any date.

Section 67.1350 - This act allows Warrensburg to annex areas along a road or highway up to 2.5 miles from the existing city boundaries.

Sections 67.1401 & 67.1451 - Redefines the term "owner" in the "Community Improvement District Act". It also allows for each director of a Community Improvement District Board in Springfield to be either: 1) an owner of real property within the district; 2) a legally authorized representative of a property owner; or 3) a registered voter within the district.

In Springfield, if there are less than 5 owners of real property located within a district, the board may be comprised of up to 5 legally authorized representatives of such property owners.

Section 67.1754 - Allows grant proceeds to be used to fund any recreation program or park improvement in St. Louis County.

Sections 67.1775; 210.860; 210.861 -Modifies some of the ballot language to allow for lawful collection of the revenues derived from the local sales tax. The "Community Children's Services Fund" is created. All revenues collected under the local sales tax, less one percent for the cost of collection, will first be deposited in the state's general revenue fund and then transferred to the Community Children's Services Fund.

The proposal modifies language in Section 210.860, RSMo, to allow the City of St. Louis to impose a property tax of a twenty-five cents on each one hundred dollars of assessed valuation on taxable property for services for the purpose of providing counseling, family support, and temporary residential services to persons eighteen years of age or less and those services described in Section 210.861. Under current law, this section provided for the same twenty-five cent property tax to be levied for the purpose of providing counseling, family support, and temporary residential services to persons eighteen years of age or less. Revenues derived from

DESCRIPTION (continued)

this tax shall be deposited in the county treasury to the credit of the Community Children's Services Fund to provide funds for counseling and related services to children and youth in the county which will promote healthy lifestyles among children and youth and strengthen families.

Section 67.1809 - Specifies the jurisdiction of the regional taxicab commission. Under this act, the regional taxicab commission may exercise jurisdiction over any person who engages in the business of transporting passengers in commerce, wholly within the regional taxicab district, in any motor vehicle designed or used to transport not more than eight passengers including the driver.

The jurisdiction of the regional taxicab commission shall not apply to:

- * Operators who are required to be licensed, supervised and regulated by the state highways and transportation commission. The regional taxicab commission's jurisdiction shall not extend to motor vehicles transporting passengers within the district in interstate commerce, and those interstate operations are subject to the powers of the state highways and transportation commission;
- * Motor vehicles that are operated exclusively by not-for-profit corporations or governmental entities, whose operations within the regional taxicab district are subsidized, wholly or in part, with public transit funding (federal or state);
- * Vehicles that transport one or more passengers upon the public highways in a continuous journey from a place of origin within the regional taxicab district to a destination outside the district, or from a place of origin outside the district to a destination within the district, either with or without a return trip to the point of origin.

Every person, partnership or corporation who becomes subject to the jurisdiction of the regional taxicab commission which was previously under the jurisdiction (through permit or certificate) of the state highways and transportation commission is deemed to be licensed, permitted and authorized by the regional taxicab commission, and the vehicles and drivers used by such motor carriers are hereby deemed to be licensed, permitted and authorized by the regional taxicab commission to operate and engage in the transportation of passengers within the regional taxicab district, to the same extent as they were formerly licensed, permitted and authorized by the highways and transportation commission on August 27, 2005. Such motor carriers, drivers and vehicles are exempt from applying for any license, certificate, permit or other credential issued or required by the regional taxicab commission, except that the regional taxicab commission may, after December 31, 2005, require such motor carriers and drivers to apply and pay the regular

DESCRIPTION (continued)

fees for annual renewals of such licenses, permits, certificates or other credentials, pursuant to uniform requirements applicable to all motor carriers, vehicles and drivers operating within the regional taxicab district.

Section 67.1850 - Changes the definition of county to include any county within the state, and changes the definition of city to allow any city within the state to develop a Geographical Information System. Currently only first class counties without a charter are allowed to create a system, and only cities with a population in excess of sixty thousand and located in any first class non-chartered county are allowed to create a system.

Section 71.794 - Current law requires cities that are holding hearings on whether to establish a "Special Business District" to mail notices of the hearing to all recorded owners of property by certified mail, with a return receipt. This proposal would allow the notice to be mailed by regular mail.

Section 82.291 - Extends the expiration date of Section 82.291 to August 28, 2008, which makes property owners in Hazelwood liable for removal of all derelict vehicles that are not properly stored if they are deemed to be a public nuisance.

Sections 82.301 to 82.305 - Provides that a neighborhood organization representing persons aggrieved by a code violation may seek injunctive and other equitable relief in the circuit court for abatement of the nuisance upon showing: 1) The notice requirements have been satisfied and 2) The nuisance still exists and has not been abated.

This proposal limits when such an action may be brought. It must be at least 60 days after the organization sends notice to the appropriate municipal agency. The action may not be brought if the municipal code enforcement agency has filed an action for equitable relief from the nuisance. Also, it must be at least 60 days after the organization sends notice to the tenant and property owner. If notice by mail is not returned, is refused, or signed for by a person other than the addressee, notice can be given by sending a copy by mail and posting a copy on the property.

This proposal requires notice to include the nature of the alleged nuisance, the date and time it was first discovered, the location of the nuisance, and the relief sought.

In filing a suit, an officer of the neighborhood organization shall certify to the court that the organization has taken steps to satisfy the notice requirements and that each condition needed for filing has been met.

DESCRIPTION (continued)

Under this proposal, an action may not be brought against an owner of residential rental property unless a notice of violation has first been issued by an appropriate municipal code enforcement agency and remains outstanding after 45 days.

If a violation notice is an essential element of the municipal enforcement action, a copy of the notice signed by an official from the agency shall be prima facie evidence of the facts within the notice. A notice of abatement issued by the agency is evidence that the plaintiff is not entitled to the requested relief.

A proceeding must be heard at the earliest date practicable and be expedited.

Nothing in this proposal may be construed as to abrogate any equitable or legal right or remedy otherwise available under the law. This proposal may not be construed to grant standing for actions challenging zoning applications, involving the interior physical defect of property, or involving a municipal alcohol law.

Section 82.1025 - Grants neighborhoods organizations in the cities of St. Louis, Kansas City, and Springfield and the counties of Platte, Jefferson, Franklin, and St. Louis standing to file nuisance actions against a nearby property owners when the owner fails to maintain his or her property.

Section 94.270 - Prohibits the city of Berkeley from levying or collecting such a fee over \$12,000 per year. Certain cities under this section may increase a hotel license tax by 5% per year but the total tax levied shall not exceed 1/8% of such hotel gross revenue. This proposal also places an expiration date of January 1, 2006 on any taxes levied under this section in St. Peters that are effective on August 28, 2005.

Section 94.700 - Authorizes a city with a population of 100 or more to levy a transportation sales tax, upon voter approval. Currently, only cities with a population of 200 or more are authorized to levy this tax.

Section 94.837 - Authorizes the cities of Canton, La Grange, and Edina to impose a transient guest tax, upon voter approval, on all hotels and motels within their city limits, which cannot exceed 5% per occupied room per night.

Section 94.838 - Authorizes the City of Lamar Heights to impose, upon voter approval, a room tax of not more than 6% per night and a local sales tax on food of not more than 2%. These taxes will be in addition to any other taxes authorized by law and used solely for capital

DESCRIPTION (continued)

improvements. The proposal provides a procedure to repeal the tax.

Section 94.860 - Authorizes municipalities in St. Louis County, upon voter approval, to impose a public safety local sales tax of up to one-half of one percent on all retail sales. The revenue from this tax would be used for expenditures on equipment, municipal employee salaries and benefits, and facilities for emergency services providers.

Sections 99.1080 to 99.1092 - Creates the "Downtown Revitalization Preservation Program".

A redevelopment plan will include a general description of the program undertaken to accomplish the redevelopment projects and related objectives.

A redevelopment plan may be adopted by a municipality in reliance on findings that a reasonable person would believe: 1) the redevelopment area is a blighted or conservation area and has not been subject to growth through investment by private enterprise, 2) the plan conforms to the comprehensive plan for the redevelopment of the municipality as a whole, 3) generally the estimated dates of completion have been stated, 4) a relocation plan is developed if a business or residence must be moved, and 5) the plan does not include the redevelopment of a gambling establishment.

Before adopting a redevelopment plan, a municipality must provide notice and hold a public hearing. The proposal provides the procedure that must be followed by a municipality prior to adoption, including when changes are allowed to be made, and how notification must be given. After adoption of an ordinance designating a redevelopment area, no ordinance can be adopted altering the exterior boundaries of the area affecting the general land uses established under the plan or project without a public hearing.

A municipality must submit an application to the Department of Economic Development for review and determination as to approval of the disbursement of project costs from the Downtown Revitalization Preservation Fund, which is created in this proposal. The application must be forwarded and approved by the Commissioner of Administration. This proposal sets limits on disbursements from the fund and lays out requirements for the information which must be included in the application.

Redevelopment projects can only receive disbursements from the fund for 25 years. A municipality that receives money from the fund must place it in a separate account from other net new revenues within the special allocation fund.

DESCRIPTION (continued)

A redevelopment project approved for financing cannot thereafter elect to receive tax increment financing under the Real Property Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment Act and continue to receive the downtown revitalization financing.

Section 100.050 & 100.059 - Under this proposal, all amounts paid in excess of actual costs for an industrial development project in Franklin County shall be disbursed to each taxing entity in proportion to the current ad valorem tax levy of each taxing entity. Also, notice of proposed projects must be provided to all the taxing entities in Franklin County.

Section 115.019 - Authorizes the Cass County Commission to seek the formation of a board of election commissioners in Cass County. Upon majority vote of the Commission, the question of whether to form a board of election commissioners in Cass County shall be placed on the ballot.

Section 137.115, 139.040, 139.055 & 301.025 - Allows local government officials to accept cash, personal checks, business checks, money orders, credit cards, or electronic transfers of funds for the payment of any city or county tax or license. The local government can charge the person a fee equal to the amount charged to the county or city by the bank, processor, or issuer of the electronic payment.

Section 137.720 - Currently, in order to be eligible for state cost-share funds a county must provide from the county GR fund, an amount equal to an average of the 3 most recent years of the amount provided from GR to the assessment fund, except that a lesser amount is acceptable if the county assessor, county governing body, and the state tax commission unanimously agree.

Under this proposal, a lesser amount is acceptable if two of the three (assessor, governing body, or tax commission) agree.

Section 138.100 - Allows a county board of equalization to meet at least once a month for the purpose of hearing allegations or erroneous assessments and other errors. Currently, such a board is required to meet monthly.

Sections 190.010, 190.015 & 190.090 - Allows fire protection districts in St. Louis County to form ambulance districts according to the statutory procedure laid out in Sections 190.001 to 190.090, RSMo, if the boards of the participating fire protection districts approve the formation of an ambulance district by a majority vote and the fire protection districts are contiguous.

DESCRIPTION (continued)

This proposal also allows the territory in an ambulance district to not be contiguous, but instead, within a 5 mile radius of the other territory contained within the district limits.

Section 190.292 - Specifies that the election of the Warren County Emergency Services Board members is to take place during the first municipal election in a calendar year.

Section 190.335 - In Greene County any emergency telephone service 911 board appointed by a county which is in existence on the date the voters approve a sales tax shall continue to exist and shall have the same powers.

Section 198.345 - Authorizes nursing home districts in Marion and Ralls counties to maintain assisted living facilities.

Section 205.010 - Currently, any county may operate a public health center. Whenever the county commission is presented with a petition signed by at least 10% of the voters asking that an annual tax be levied the county shall submit the question to the voters at an election.

In addition to the current method, this proposal would require the Cass County Commission and the Cooper County Commission to submit the question of establishing a public health center to the voters if the commission, by a majority vote, chooses to do so.

Section 231.444 -Allows Worth County, upon voter approval, to levy and impose a tax not to exceed 25 cents per acre on agricultural and horticultural property. The proceeds will be deposited into the "Special Road Rock Fund", which is used to purchase road rock on county roads.

Currently, this statute only applies to Carter, Scotland, Knox, and Schuyler counties.

Sections 247.060 & 247.180 - Requires water supply district board election to be held in April.

Section 250.140 - Adds water supply districts to those entities that may sue landlords or tenants for past due bills, minus any security deposits. It requires supplier entities to make a good faith effort to notify the property owner when the tenant's sewer or water bill is more than 30 days late. The owner cannot be held liable for sums due from the tenant for more than 90 days of service, and the water provider cannot be held civilly or criminally liable for terminating service due to the delinquency of the payment. This section only applies to residences with their own private water and sewer lines and becomes effective on February 1, 2006.

DESCRIPTION (continued)

The provisions of this section do not apply to sewerage services, water services, or combined services in St. Louis City.

Section 263.245 - Includes Schuyler and Worth counties in Section 263.245, RSMo, which provides that owners of land in certain counties shall control all brush growing on their property that is designated as the county right-of-way or county maintenance easement part of such property and which is adjacent to any county road.

Section 278.240 - Eliminates the requirement that candidates for trustee of a watershed district live within the district.

Section 320.121 - Allows towns and villages, in addition to cities and counties, prohibit fireworks.

Section 321.120 - Modifies the terms served by fire protection district board members in St. Charles County.

Sections 321.190 & 321.603 - Prohibits fire district board members from being paid more than one attendance fee if such member attends more than one board meeting in a calendar week.

Section 321.322 - Provides that Harrisonville will be governed by Section 72.418 relating to city reimbursement to the fire protection district.

Sections 321.552 & 321.554 - Exempts St. Louis County and St. Charles County from provisions allowing the governing body of an ambulance or fire protection district to impose, upon voter approval, a sales tax of up to ½ of one percent on retail sales in the district.

Section 349.045 - Designates the requirements that the board of an industrial development corporation in Lewis County must meet.

Sections 447.620; 447.622; 447.625; 447.640 - Lengthens the time from one month to six months that a property must be unoccupied before a person can petition to have it declared abandoned.

Sections 473.770 & 473.771 - Allows public administrators to delegate certain duties to a deputy. Specifically, a deputy who is a licensed attorney can execute inventories, settlements, surety bonds, pleadings, and other court documents filed in the name of the public administrator.

DESCRIPTION (continued)

Section 488.2220 - Adds Springfield to Section 488.2220, RSMo, which allows certain cities to provide for additional court costs of up to \$5 for municipal ordinance violations.

Section 559.607 - Authorizes municipal courts to contract with a public entity or employ a person to serve as the city's probation officer. Currently, such courts may only contract with a private entity to provide probation services. Persons found guilty of municipal ordinances and placed on probation will be required to pay a service fee to the court to pay for the probation services.

Currently, only cities which do not have probation services for persons convicted of ordinance violations may contract with private entities to provide probation services. This proposal authorizes any city to contract with a private or public entity or employ a probation officer to provide probation services.

Section 1 - Authorizes the Governor to sell state property in Buchanan County.

Section 2 - Authorizes the Governor to sell state property in St. Francois County.

Section 3 - Requires the county commission in all counties except charter counties shall be responsible for the computation of salaries of all county officials provided that any percentage salary adjustments in a county shall be equal for all such officials in that county.

Section 4 - Madison County may impose a sales tax for public recreational projects and programs upon voter approval.

Section 5 - Authorizes the Governor to remise, release, and forever quitclaim all interest in the State Health Lab and the EDP Building in Cole County, if the Office of Administration determines that there is no longer any beneficial use for the buildings.

Section 6 - Authorizes the Governor to remise, release, and quit claim interest in state property in Lafayette County. The proceeds from the sale will be deposited into the Veterans Commission Capitol Improvement Trust Fund.

Section 7 - Authorizes the Governor to convey state property at the Fort Davidson Historic Site to the City of Pilot Knob in Iron County.

Sections 249.1152 & 249.1154 - REPEALED

DESCRIPTION (continued)

This proposal contains an emergency clause for Section 94.838 regarding the room and food tax for capitol improvements for the City of Lamar Heights.

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

Office of Attorney General
Office of Secretary of State
Office of State Treasurer
Office of Administration - Budget and Planning
Department of Economic Development
Office of State Courts Administrator
Department of Natural Resources
Department of Conservation
Department of Revenue
Joint Committee on Public Employee Retirement
County Employees Retirement System
Local Government Employees Retirement System
Department of Transportation
Department of Social Services
Department of Corrections
St. Louis County - Director of Administration
Henry County Treasurer-Collector
Boone County Sheriff
Little Blue Valley Sewer District
Callaway County Water Dist. #1
Cass County Commission
Nodaway County Clerk
Livingston County Clerk
Carroll County Clerk
Jasper County Commission

LR No. 0203-06
Bill No. SCS for HCS for HB 58
Page 38 of 38
April 22, 2005

SOURCE OF INFORMATION (continued)

Jefferson County Commission
City of St. Peters
City of Berkeley
City of Lees Summit
City of Maryland Heights



Mickey Wilson, CPA
Director
April 22, 2005