COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

<u>L.R. No.</u>: 4557-01 <u>Bill No.</u>: HB 1396

Subject: Political Subdivisions; Merchandising Practices; Cities, Towns and Villages

Type: Original

Date: December 28, 2017

Bill Summary: This proposal prohibits political subdivisions from adopting ordinances

restricting the use of plastic bags or other disposable containers.

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue	\$0	\$0	\$0	

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 5 pages.

L.R. No. 4557-01 Bill No. HB 1396 Page 2 of 5 December 28, 2017

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
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 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	
Local Government	\$0	\$0	\$0	

L.R. No. 4557-01 Bill No. HB 1396 Page 3 of 5 December 28, 2017

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

Officials at the **City of Kansas City** assume this legislation could have a negative fiscal impact on the City. For instance, the City would be prohibited from imposing a special tax on water sold in plastic bottles and may be unable to impose a sales tax on cups and bags.

Oversight inquired the City of Kansas City regarding this proposal. There is no current special tax on water sold in plastic bottles, cups and/or bags. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a \$0 fiscal impact for this proposal.

Officials at the **Office of the Attorney General (AGO)** assume that any potential costs arising from this proposal can be absorbed with existing resources. The AGO may seek additional appropriations if there is a significant increase in litigation.

Officials at the Office of Administration and the Office of Administration's Administrative Hearing Commission, the Office of the State Courts Administrator and the Department of Natural Resources each assume no fiscal impact to their respective agencies from this proposal.

Officials at **Boone County**, the **Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District** and **St. Louis County** each assume there is no fiscal impact from this proposal to their respective organizations.

In response to similar legislation from 2017, HCS for HB 1116, officials at the **Callaway County Commission** and **Clinton County** each assumed no fiscal impact to their respective entities from this proposal.

Officials from the following **counties**: Andrew, Atchison, Audrain, Barry, Benton, Bollinger, Buchanan, Camden, Cape Girardeau, Carroll, Cass, Christian, Clay, Cole, Cooper, Davies, Dekalb, Dent, Franklin, Greene, Holt, Jackson, Jefferson, Johnson, Knox, Laclede, Lawrence, Lincoln, Maries, Marion, McDonald, Miller, Moniteau, Monroe, Montgomery, New Madrid, Nodaway, Ozark, Perry, Pettis, Platte, Pulaski, Scott, St. Charles, St. Francois, Taney, Wayne, and Worth did not respond to **Oversight's** request for fiscal impact.

L.R. No. 4557-01 Bill No. HB 1396 Page 4 of 5 December 28, 2017

<u>ASSUMPTION</u> (continued)

Officials from the following **cities**: Ashland, Belton, Bernie, Bonne Terre, Boonville, California, Cape Girardeau, Clayton, Columbia, Dardenne Prairie, Excelsior Springs, Florissant, Frontenac, Fulton, Grandview, Harrisonville, Independence, Jefferson City, Joplin, Kearney, Knob Noster, Ladue, Lake Ozark City, Lee Summit, Liberty, Louisiana, Maryland Heights, Maryville, Mexico, Monett, Neosho, O'Fallon, Peculiar, Pineville, Popular Bluff, Raytown, Republic, Richmond, Rolla, Sedalia, Springfield, St. Charles City Administrator, St. Louis City Budget Division, 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 sewer districts: Boone County Regional Sewer District, Little Blue Valley Sewer District and the Pulaski County Sewer District did not respond to **Oversight's** request for fiscal impact.

FISCAL IMPACT - State Government	FY 2019 (10 Mo.)	FY 2020	FY 2021
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government	FY 2019 (10 Mo.)	FY 2020	FY 2021
	<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 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. 4557-01 Bill No. HB 1396 Page 5 of 5 December 28, 2017

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Callaway County
City of Kansas City
Department of Natural Resources
Office of Administration
 Administrative Hearing Commission
Office of the Attorney General
Office of the State Courts Administrator
St. Louis County
Boone County
Clinton County
Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District

Mickey Wilson, CPA

Ross Strope

Director

December 28, 2017

Assistant Director December 28, 2017