COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

<u>L.R. No.:</u>	0521-01
<u>Bill No.:</u>	HB 133
Subject:	Labor and Industrial Relations, Department; Labor and Management; Elementary
	and Secondary Education, Department
<u>Type</u> :	Original
Date:	January 26, 2017

Bill Summary: This proposal establishes the School Construction Act, which exempts construction and maintenance work done for certain school districts from the prevailing wage requirement upon the school board's approval.

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue	\$0	\$0	\$0	

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 7 pages.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	
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	AFFECTED FY 2018 FY 2019			
Local Government	Could exceed \$1,000,000	Could exceed \$1,000,000	Could exceed \$1,000,000	

L.R. No. 0521-01 Bill No. HB 133 Page 3 of 7 January 26, 2017

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

Officials at the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education** (**DESE**) assume there is no fiscal impact to the Department from this proposal. This proposal would require zero increase in state costs and has the added benefit of reducing public school district facility construction costs significantly. DESE is unable to estimate a savings to the school districts.

Officials at the **Department of Labor and Industrial Relations** assume there is no fiscal impact from this proposal.

Officials at the **Concordia R-II School District** assume this could have substantial fiscal impact on the school district. During our last bond project we had local vendors who were willing to not bid prevailing wage on projects from painting to carpeting. The district was told that it could save up to 1/3 on some projects if prevailing wage was not required. The carpeting/tiling project was \$41,810.99, which could have saved \$13,935.61. The painting bid was \$28,434, which could have saved \$9,477. Between the summer of 2012 and 2014, we had approximately \$2,000,000 in bond projects completed including things like: roofs, HVAC units, security upgrades, lighting, ventilation, playground construction, fencing, new doors. If the district was able to save 1/3 on even half the projects that could have saved the district and our tax-payers \$666,600.

Officials at the **Warren County R-II School District** assume that on a particular project, 2/3 of the total is made up of materials and the remaining 1/3 is labor. Of that labor, the district estimates somewhere between 20% to 40% can be attributed to prevailing wage, depending on the type of project undertaken. From an overall project standpoint, that translates into between 7% and 13%.

Officials at the **West Plains School District** assume this proposal would result in annual savings related to small scale capital improvements and some maintenance items that currently require prevailing wage. Estimated Savings: \$50,000 - \$150,000 annually. New construction savings is estimated at \$1 million to \$3 million annually.

In response to similar legislation filed this year, HB 79, officials at the **St. Elizabeth R-IV School District** assumed the impact would vary but an estimate could be close to a 35% - 45% savings in some cases if we were relieved from paying prevailing wage. Here are some examples. L.R. No. 0521-01 Bill No. HB 133 Page 4 of 7 January 26, 2017

ASSUMPTION (continued)

For 2016 prevailing wage rate for a carpenter runs \$24.75 per hour in Miller County versus a local carpenter that charges the public \$15.00 (per information given over the phone from a local carpenter). So, as you can see, the savings and value could be quite large.

Or our custodian receives a fair wage of \$14.80 for general labor duties. Under prevailing wage, we would have to pay a general labor hired by another company \$27.36 an hour for the same type of work.

In response to similar legislation filed this year, HB 79, officials at the **Eldon School District** assumed savings based on previous project:

Eldon Fine	Arts Prevailing Wage	Non Prevailing Wage Rates
Carpenter	\$39.41	\$25
Laborer	\$33.50	\$23
Cement	\$37.83	\$25
Steel	\$54.85	\$25

In response to similar legislation filed this year, HB 79, officials at the **Bowling Green School District** assumed a construction cost savings of 25%.

Officials at the **Bakersfield School District** assume this would save \$500,000.

Officials at the Everton School District assume a savings of 30% in construction costs.

Officials at the Forsyth R-III School District assume a savings of thousands of dollars.

Officials at the **Campbell R-II**, **Malta Bend**, **Shell Knob** and **Pettis County R-XII** school districts each assume this could have a positive fiscal impact on their district.

Officials at the Wright City R-II School District assume there is no cost from this proposal.

Officials at the **Kirksville R-III** and **Middle Grove** school districts each responded to Oversight's request but did not indicate a fiscal impact.

Oversight notes this proposal would allow a school district, with school board approval to exempt itself from the prevailing wage laws. Schools in counties with a charter form of government, including Jackson County, St. Charles County, St. Louis County and Jefferson County would not be allowed to opt out of the prevailing wage requirements. Oversight assumes this would be a savings to school districts that chose to participate. However, the exact savings

JH:LR:OD

L.R. No. 0521-01 Bill No. HB 133 Page 5 of 7 January 26, 2017

ASSUMPTION (continued)

can not be calculated as it is unknown how many districts would have projects that could be exempt. Oversight will show the savings as Could exceed \$1 million annually.

Officials at the following school districts: Arcadia Valley R-2, Avilla R-13, Belton, Benton County R-2, Bismark R-5, Bloomfield R-14, Bolivar R-I, Bowling Green R-1, Branson, Bronaugh R-7, Carrollton R-7, Caruthersville, Central R-III, Chilhowee R-4, Chillicothe R-II, Clarkton C-4, Cole R-I, Columbia, Crawford County R-1, Crocker R-II, Delta C-7, East Carter R-2, Fair Play, Favette R-3, Fredericktown R-I, Fulton, Hancock Place, Hannibal, Harrisonburg R-8, Harrisonville, Hollister R-5, Humansville R-4, Hurley R-1, Jefferson City, Kansas City, Kearney R-1, Kennett #39, King City R-1, Kingston 42, Kirbyville R-VI, Leeton R-10, Lewis County C-1, Lincoln R-II, Lonedell R-14, Macon County R-1, Meramec Valley R-3, Mexico, Midway R-1, Milan C-2, Moberly, Monroe City R-I, Morgan County R-2, New Haven, Nixa, North Kansas City, North St. Francois Co. R-1, Northeast Nodaway R-5, Odessa R-VII, Oregon-Howell R-III, Orrick R-11, Osborn R-0, Pierce City, Plato R-5, Princeton R-5, Raymore-Peculiar R-III, Reeds Springs R-IV, Renick R-5, Republic R-III, Richards R-V, Richland R-1, Richmond R-XVI, Salisbury R-4, Sarcoxie R-2, Sedalia, Seymour R-2, Sikeston, Silex, Smithville R-2, Spickard R-II, Springfield, St Joseph, St Louis, Sullivan, Valley R-6, Verona R-7, Warrensburg R-6, Waynesville and the Westview C-6 school districts did not respond to **Oversight's** request for fiscal impact.

FISCAL IMPACT - State Government	FY 2018 (10 Mo.)	FY 2019	FY 2020
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS	FY 2018 (10 Mo.)	FY 2019	FY 2020
<u>Savings</u> - school district's exemption from prevailing wage	Could exceed <u>\$1,000,000</u>	Could exceed <u>\$1,000,000</u>	Could exceed <u>\$1,000,000</u>
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS	Could exceed <u>\$1,000,000</u>	Could exceed <u>\$1,000,000</u>	Could exceed <u>\$1,000,000</u>

L.R. No. 0521-01 Bill No. HB 133 Page 6 of 7 January 26, 2017

FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

This proposal could impact small businesses that are contracted to do maintenance, renovations or construction projects at school districts.

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

This bill establishes the School Construction Act which exempts construction and maintenance work done for certain school districts from the prevailing wage requirement upon majority vote of the district's school board. The school district must notify the Division of Labor Standards within the Department of Labor and Industrial Relations of the exemption. This provision does not apply to school districts in Jackson, St. Charles, St. Louis, or Jefferson counties.

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

Bakersfield R-IV School District Bowling Green School District Campbell R-II School District Concordia School District Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Department of Labor and Industrial Relations Eldon School District Everton School District Forsyth R-III School District Kirksville R-III School District Malta Bend School District Middle Grove School District Pettis County R-XII School District Shell Knob School District St. Elizabeth R-IV School District L.R. No. 0521-01 Bill No. HB 133 Page 7 of 7 January 26, 2017

SOURCES OF INFORMATION (continued)

Warren County R-III School District West Plains School District Wright City R-II School District

Mickey Wilen

Mickey Wilson, CPA Director January 26, 2017

Ross Strope Assistant Director January 26, 2017