

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 4664-04
Bill No.: HCS for HB 1623
Subject: Economic Development; Taxation and Revenue - Sales and Use
Type: Original
Date: March 7, 2012

Bill Summary: This proposal changes the laws regarding the membership of a city economic development tax board.

FISCAL SUMMARY

| ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND | | | |
|---|------------|------------|------------|
| FUND AFFECTED | FY 2013 | FY 2014 | FY 2015 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |

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

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

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

| ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) | | | |
|--|----------|----------|----------|
| FUND AFFECTED | FY 2013 | FY 2014 | FY 2015 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE | 0 | 0 | 0 |

☐ 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).

| ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS | | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| FUND AFFECTED | FY 2013 | FY 2014 | FY 2015 |
| Local Government | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

Officials from the **Department of Economic Development** assume the current proposal would not fiscally impact their agency.

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

In response to a previous version of this legislation, officials from the **Department of Revenue** each assumed the proposal would not fiscally impact their agency.

In response to a previous version of this legislation, officials from the **City of Raytown** assumed the proposal would not fiscally impact their city.

In response to a previous version of this legislation, officials from the **County of St Louis** assumed the proposal would not fiscally impact their county.

In response to a previous version of this legislation, officials from the **School Districts of Mexico** and **Parkway** each assumed the proposal would not fiscally impact their respective school districts.

In response to a previous version of this legislation, officials from the **City of Liberty** stated that the proposal would place an unfunded mandate on the City if a municipal election were required for each economic development project. The City also stated 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.

In response to a previous version of this legislation, 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

ASSUMPTIONS (continued)

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.

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> |

FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government

FY 2013
(10 Mo.)

FY 2014

FY 2015

\$0

\$0

\$0

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
Office of the Secretary of State
City of Kansas City
City of Columbia
City of Raytown
City of Liberty
County of St. Louis
Mexico School District No. 59
Parkway School District

NOT RESPONDING

Numerous Counties

Numerous Cities

Numerous School Districts



L.R. No. 4664-04
Bill No. HCS for HB 1623
Page 6 of 6
March 7, 2012

Mickey Wilson, CPA
Director
March 7, 2012

LR:LR:OD