

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH  
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

**FISCAL NOTE**

L.R. No.: 4664-03  
Bill No.: HB 1623  
Subject: Cities, Towns and Villages; Economic Development; Taxation and Revenue -  
General; Boards, Commissions, Committees, Councils  
Type: Original  
Date: February 23, 2012

---

Bill Summary: This proposal provides the option to choose five or nine members on a city economic development tax board.

**FISCAL SUMMARY**

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND</b>			
<b>FUND AFFECTED</b>	<b>FY 2013</b>	<b>FY 2014</b>	<b>FY 2015</b>
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS</b>			
<b>FUND AFFECTED</b>	<b>FY 2013</b>	<b>FY 2014</b>	<b>FY 2015</b>
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

Numbers within parentheses: ( ) indicate costs or losses.  
This fiscal note contains 6 pages.

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS</b>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)</b>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

☐ Estimated Total Net Effect on All funds expected to exceed \$100,000 savings or (cost).

☐ Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund expected to exceed \$100,000 (cost).

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS</b>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015
<b>Local Government</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

## FISCAL ANALYSIS

### ASSUMPTION

Officials from the **Department of Economic Development** and **Department of Revenue** each assume the current proposal would not fiscally impact their respective agencies.

Officials from the **Cities of Kansas City, Columbia and Raytown** each assume the current proposal would not fiscally impact their respective cities.

Officials from the **County of St Louis** assume the current proposal would not fiscally impact their county.

Officials from the **School Districts of Mexico and Parkway** each assume the current proposal would not fiscally impact their respective school districts.

Officials from the **City of Liberty** state that this proposal would place an unfunded mandate on the City if a municipal election were required for each economic development project. The City also states that municipal elections cost an average of \$25,000 not including the costs for election education materials.

**Oversight** assumes this proposal changes the number of members allowed on the economic development tax board, rather than requiring municipal elections for economic development projects.

Officials from the **Office of the Secretary of State (SOS)** state many bills considered by the General Assembly include provisions allowing or requiring agencies to submit rules and regulations to implement the act. The SOS is provided with core funding to handle a certain amount of normal activity resulting from each year's legislative session. The fiscal impact for this fiscal note to the SOS for Administrative Rules is less than \$2,500. The SOS recognizes that this is a small amount and does not expect that additional funding would be required to meet these costs. However, the SOS also recognizes that many such bills may be passed by the General Assembly in a given year and that collectively the costs may be in excess of what the office can sustain with the core budget. Therefore, the SOS reserves the right to request funding for the cost of supporting administrative rules requirements should the need arise based on a review of the finally approved bills signed by the governor.

**Oversight** 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.

ASSUMPTIONS (continued)

Officials from the **Counties of Andrew, Barry, Bates, Boone, Buchanan, Butler, Callaway, Camden, Cape Girardeau, Carroll, Cass, Clay, Cole, Cooper, DeKalb, Franklin, Greene, Hickory, Holt, Jackson, Jasper, Jefferson, Johnson, Knox, Laclede, Lafayette, Lawrence, Lincoln, Marion, Miller, Moniteau, Monroe, Montgomery, New Madrid, Nodaway, Ozark, Pemiscot, Perry, Phelps, Platte, Pulaski, Scott, St. Charles, St. Francois, Taney, Texas, Warren, and Webster** did not respond to Oversight's request for fiscal impact.

Officials at the following cities: **Ashland, Belton, Bernie, Bonne Terre, Boonville, California, Cape Girardeau, Clayton, Dardenne Prairie, Excelsior Springs, Florissant, Frontenac, Fulton, Gladstone, Grandview, Harrisonville, Independence, Jefferson City, Joplin, Kearney, Kennett, Knob Noster, Ladue, Lake Ozark, Lebanon, Lee Summit, Linn, Louisiana, Maryland Heights, Maryville, Mexico, Monett, Neosho, O'Fallon, Pacific, Peculiar, Popular Bluff, Republic, Richmond, Rolla, Sedalia, Springfield, St. Charles, St. Joseph, St. Louis, St. Robert, Sugar Creek, Sullivan, Warrensburg, Warrenton, Webb City, Weldon Spring and West Plains** did not respond to Oversight's request for fiscal impact.

Officials from the **Blue Springs Public Schools, Branson Public Schools, Columbia Public Schools, Fair Grove Schools, Francis Howell Public Schools, Independence Public Schools, Jefferson City Public Schools, Kansas City Public School Board, Kirksville Public Schools, Lee Summit Public Schools, Mehlville Public Schools, Nixa Public Schools, Sedalia School District, Sikeston Public Schools, Silex Public Schools, Special School District of St. Louis County, St Joseph School District, St Louis Public Schools, St. Charles Public Schools, and Sullivan Public Schools** did not respond to Oversight's request for fiscal impact.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2013 (10 Mo.)	FY 2014	FY 2015
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2013 (10 Mo.)	FY 2014	FY 2015
	<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.

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

The proposed legislation appears to have no fiscal impact.

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 Economic Development  
Department of Revenue  
Office of the Secretary of State  
County of St. Louis  
Cities

Liberty  
Kansas City  
Raytown  
Columbia

Schools  
Mexico School District No. 59  
Parkway School District

NOT RESPONDING

**Numerous Counties**  
**Numerous Cities**  
**Numerous School Districts**



Mickey Wilson, CPA

L.R. No. 4664-03  
Bill No. HB 1623  
Page 6 of 6  
February 23, 2012

Director  
February 23, 2012

LR:LR:OD