# COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH OVERSIGHT DIVISION

#### **FISCAL NOTE**

<u>L.R. No.:</u> 5749-01 <u>Bill No.:</u> HB 2251

Subject: General Obligation and Revenue; Treasurer, State

Type: Original

Date: February 12, 2016

Bill Summary: This proposal changes the laws regarding the sale of general obligation

bonds.

## **FISCAL SUMMARY**

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue	\$0	\$0	\$0	

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	
Total Estimated Net Effect on Other State Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	

Numbers within parentheses: ( ) indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 6 pages.

L.R. No. 5749-01 Bill No. HB 2251 Page 2 of 6 February 12, 2016

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	
Total Estimated Net Effect on All				
Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	
Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE	0	0	0	

☐ Estimated Net Effect (expenditures or reduced revenues) expected to exceed \$100,000 in any of the three fiscal years after implementation of the act.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	
<b>Local Government</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	

L.R. No. 5749-01 Bill No. HB 2251 Page 3 of 6 February 12, 2016

#### FISCAL ANALYSIS

#### **ASSUMPTION**

**Oversight** was unable to receive some of the agency responses in a timely manner due to the short fiscal note request time. Oversight has presented this fiscal note on the best current information that we have or on prior year information regarding a similar bill. Upon the receipt of agency responses, Oversight will review to determine if an updated fiscal note should be prepared and seek the necessary approval of the chairperson of the Joint Committee on Legislative Research to publish a new fiscal note.

Officials at the **Office of the State Treasurer** and the **Joint Committee on Administrative Rules** each assume no fiscal impact to their respective agencies from this proposal.

In response to similar legislation from 2015, HB 204, officials from the **Department of Economic Development - Division of Business and Community Services**, **Missouri Housing Development Commission**, **Division of Energy**, and **Missouri Development Finance Board**, the **Department of Insurance**, **Finance and Professional Registration**, the **Department of Revenue - Division of Taxation**, the **Office of Administration** and the **Office of Missouri State Auditor** each assumed this proposed legislation will have no fiscal impact on their respective agencies.

In response to similar legislation from 2015, HB 204, officials from the **Office of Secretary of State (SOS)**, stated many bills considered by the General Assembly include provisions allowing or requiring agencies to submit rules and regulations to implement the act. The SOS's office 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 Secretary of State's office for Administrative Rules is less than \$2,500. SOS recognizes that this is a small amount and does not expect that additional funding would be required to meet these costs. However, 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 their office can sustain with their core budget. Therefore, 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 with core funding. If multiple bills pass which require the printing and distribution of regulations at substantial costs, the SOS could request funding through the appropriation process.

L.R. No. 5749-01 Bill No. HB 2251 Page 4 of 6 February 12, 2016

#### ASSUMPTION (continued)

**Oversight** assumes the legislation is permissive in that the Office of Administration may provide technical and advisory assistance. Oversight assumes the OA would not offer these services unless funding for the needed positions was obtained through the appropriations process. For fiscal note purposes only, Oversight will assume no impact.

Officials at St. Louis County, the City of Kansas City, the West Plains Schools, the Pettis County R-XII School District, the Middle Grove C-I, the St. Elizabeth R-4 School District and the Malta Bend School District each assume no fiscal impact to their respective entities from this proposal.

In response to similar legislation from 2015, HB 204, officials from the **City of Columbia** assumed no fiscal impact to their local political subdivision.

Officials at the following counties: Andrew, Atchison, Audrain, Barry, Bollinger, Boone, Buchanan, Callaway, Camden, Cape Girardeau, Carroll, Cass, Christian, Clay, Cole, Cooper, DeKalb, Dent, Franklin, Greene, Holt, Jackson, Jasper, Jefferson, Johnson, Knox, Laclede, Lawrence, Lincoln, Maries, Marion, McDonald, Miller, Mississippi, Moniteau, Monroe, Montgomery, New Madrid, Nodaway, Ozark, Perry, Pettis, Phelps, Platte, Pulaski, Scott, Shelby, St. Charles, St. Francois, Taney, Warren, Wayne and Worth 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, Des Peres, Excelsior Springs, Florissant, Frontenac, Fulton, Gladstone, Grandview, Harrisonville, Independence, Jefferson City, Joplin, Kearney, Knob Noster, Ladue, Lake Ozark, Lee Summit, Liberty, Louisiana, Maryland Heights, Maryville, Mexico, Monett, Neosho, O'Fallon, Pacific, Peculiar, Pineville, Popular Bluff, Raytown, 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 at the following school districts: Arcadia Valley R-2, Avilla R-13, Bakersfield, Belton, Benton County R-2, Bismark R-5, Bloomfield R-14, Blue Springs, Bolivar R-I, Bowling Green R-1, Branson, Brentwood, Bronaugh R-7, Campbell R-2, Carrollton R-7, Caruthersville, Cassville R-4, Central R-III, Chilhowee R-4, Chillicothe R-II, Clarkton C-4, Cole R-I, Columbia, Concordia R-2, Crawford County R-1, Crocker R-II, Delta C-7, East Carter R-2, East Newton R-6, Eldon R-I, Everton R-III, Fair Grove, Fair Play, Fayette R-3, Forsyth R-3, Fox C-6, Fredericktown R-I, Fulton, Grain Valley, Hancock Place, Hannibal, Harrisonburg R-8, Harrisonville, Hillsboro R-3, Hollister R-5, Humansville R-4, Hurley R-1, Independence,

L.R. No. 5749-01 Bill No. HB 2251 Page 5 of 6 February 12, 2016

### <u>ASSUMPTION</u> (continued)

Jefferson City, Kansas City, Kearney R-1, Kennett #39, King City R-1, Kingston 42, Kirbyville R-VI, Kirksville, Lee Summit, Leeton R-10, Lewis County C-1, Lindbergh, Lonedell R-14, Macon County R-1, Macon County R-4, Mehville, Meramec Valley R-3, Mexico, Midway R-1, Milan C-2, Moberly, Monroe City R-I, Morgan County R-2, New Haven, Nixa, North St. Francois Co. R-1, Northeast Nodaway R-5, Odessa R-VII, Oregon-Howell R-III, Orrick R-11, Osage County R-II, Osborn R-O, Parkway, Pattonville, Pierce City, Plato R-5, Princeton R-5, Raymore-Peculiar R-III, Raytown, Reeds Springs R-IV, Renick R-5, Richland R-1, Richmond R-XVI, Riverview Gardens, Salisbury R-4, Sarcoxie R-2, Scotland County R-I, Sedalia, Seymour R-2, Shelby County R-4, Shell Knob #78, Sikeston, Silex, Smithville R-2, Special School District of St. Louis County, Spickard R-II, Springfield, St Joseph, St Louis, St. Charles, Sullivan, Valley R-6, Verona R-7, Warren County R-3, Warrensburg R-6, Webster Groves, Westview C-6 and the Wright City R-2 School District did not respond to **Oversight's** request for fiscal impact.

FISCAL IMPACT - State Government	FY 2017 (10 Mo.)	FY 2018	FY 2019
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government	FY 2017 (10 Mo.)	FY 2018	FY 2019
	<u><b>\$0</b></u>	<u><b>\$0</b></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 direct fiscal impact.

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

L.R. No. 5749-01 Bill No. HB 2251 Page 6 of 6 February 12, 2016

#### **SOURCES OF INFORMATION**

Office of the State Treasurer Joint Committee on Administrative Rules Department of Economic Development

Division of Business and Community Services Missouri Housing Development Commission

Division of Energy

Missouri Development Finance Board

Department of Insurance, Finance and Professional Registration

Department of Revenue

Division of Taxation

Office of Administration

Office of Missouri State Auditor

Office of the Secretary of State

St. Louis County

City of Kansas City

Malta Bend School District

City of Columbia

West Plains Schools

Pettis County R-XII School District

Middle Grove C-I

St. Elizabeth R-4 School District

Mickey Wilson, CPA

Mickey Wilen

Director

February 12, 2016

Ross Strope Assistant Director February 12, 2016