

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 0846-04
Bill No.: Perfected HCS for HB 762
Subject: Administration, Office of; Cities, Towns, and Villages; Public Records; Public Meetings
Type: Original
Date: April 1, 2019

Bill Summary: This proposal establishes the Missouri Municipal Government Expenditure Database.

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022
General Revenue	\$0	\$0	Unknown to (Unknown - Could exceed \$201,398)
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue	\$0	\$0	Unknown to (Unknown - Could exceed \$201,398)

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 17 pages.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022
General Revenue	0 FTE	0 FTE	0 to 3 FTE
Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE	0 FTE	0 FTE	0 to 3 FTE

☐ 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 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022
Local Government	\$0	\$0	(Unknown)

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

Officials from the **Office of Administration (OA)** state:

37.1091 - 37.1098 The proposal requires the creation of a "Missouri Municipal Government Expenditure Database" by the OA, to be maintained on the Missouri Accountability Portal. The database would include information on expenditures made by municipalities in each fiscal year, beginning with expenditures on or after January 1, 2022. The database shall be accessible by members of the public without charge. ITSD would establish and maintain the database.

ITSD's previous response included contracting cloud-based services to establish and support the proposed expenditure database. However, after further consideration/review of the Missouri Accountability Portal (MAP) it was determined that the proposed requirements could be incorporated within the existing MAP structure, removing the need to establish a new system, greatly decreasing the estimated cost.

As MAP is a currently maintained application, any on-going costs associated with supporting the additional database would be absorbed by the normal annual maintenance of MAP.

The database would be incorporated within the MAP, allowing municipalities to login and upload data files at any time. The expenditure information would be reported/posted on the MAP, similar to how grants are currently reported.

The proposal provides January 1, 2022, as the reporting start date, which falls in fiscal year 2022. The cost estimate is therefore adjusted to reflect an inflation factor of 1.025%.

Cost estimates include the following consolidated agencies:

Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Department of Higher Education
Department of Revenue
Office of Administration
Department of Agriculture
Department of Natural Resources
Department of Economic Development
Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration
Department of Labor and Industrial Relations
Department of Public Safety

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Department of Corrections
Department of Mental Health
Department of Health and Senior Services
Department of Social Services

In summary, **OA** assumes there will be IT costs at a rate of \$75 per hour. Total estimated cost is \$10,507 (133.34 hours x \$75 per hour).

OA states that in order to meet requirements of the proposal municipalities would be required to upload a CVS file to the existing MAP. **OA** will provide instruction on their website but are assuming they are not required to contact municipalities to provide guidance or training on how to complete this process.

Officials from the **OA** also assume there will be an unknown fiscal impact due to issuing refunds to the municipalities but there is no way to estimate the cost.

OA states based on their experience with existing accountability portal requirements, including the existing bond reporting requirements of political subdivisions, we expect our role to be minimal. We will make a standard form for the municipalities to fill out, along with detailed instructions. We believe the legislation is sufficiently clear related to reporting expectations that follow-up conversations will be limited. We will run queries to ensure data has been submitted and include format edits to the upload site to ensure data is in the format expected. Given the reporting requirement is only twice annually, sending a list of entities to the Department of Revenue will be simple.

Oversight has reached out to other states that have expenditure databases in place to gather implementation information and costs.

Data Operations Manager from the **State of Iowa** stated that while the Iowa Data Portal includes municipal expenditure data, it can't be explored in the same way as the state-level data central to the Iowa Data Portal and Iowa Checkbook. Implementation costs would depend on who would be responsible for entering the data and based on how much of the system was already in place. Portals rely on methods of data collection, data authentication, data storage, and data presentation, and those costs could differ based on how much of the structure is in place. Iowa had a collection method in place for preexisting data. Iowa's HF 2278 (2018), dealt with a similar database for school districts. The estimated costs were between \$225,000 and \$350,000 for purposes of collection and presentation. For the Iowa Data Portal itself - HF 94 (2011), costs "were well over \$500,000."

ASSUMPTION (continued)

The **State of Ohio** passed HB 40 (2018) which provided that the initial cost to implement the Ohio Checkbook (state expenditure database) was about \$0.8 million. Prior to HB 40, only state expenditures were included in the database. Subsequently, the Office of Ohio State Treasurer spent a total of \$2.6 million between FY 2015 and FY 2018 when it added local governments' and public retirement systems' expenditures in the database.

The **State of Massachusetts** lists some expenditure data online. The Municipal Data Bank Director stated the Data Bank has been in operation for over 30 years, and that due to the age of implementation the Division of Local Services doesn't have a reliable cost estimate as if it had been implemented today. They stated that the transition from using paper to digital for data entry began in 1984, and that paper was more or less eliminated by 2000. Furthermore, while the transition and implementation of the Data Bank was done in pieces, they believe most of the money was allocated for personnel rather than data bank creation, as the Division would recruit local students to manually enter the existing information into the system.

The Transparency Coordinator for **State of Utah's** Division of Finance stated that the Transparency Portal, created legislatively back in 2008 via SB 38 and municipalities were added in 2011. The Fiscal Note states that the entire system would have \$480,400 appropriated in FY 2009 as a one-time cost, and \$250,800 after that for annual costs. Services were contracted out to a third party called Utah Interactive, and that currently, it is estimated they pay \$80,000 a year for their services.

Oversight notes that in a previous response, OA-ITSD estimated costs of Up to \$349,760 to implement the requirements of this proposal. While OA-ITSD has since revised the response to reflect costs of \$10,507.

Officials from the **Office of the Secretary of State (SOS)** assume 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 \$5,000. 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

ASSUMPTION (continued)

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 require additional resources.

Officials from the **Joint Committee on Administrative Rules (JCAR)** state this legislation is not anticipated to cause a fiscal impact beyond its current appropriation.

Oversight assumes JCAR will be able to administer any rules resulting from this proposal with existing resources.

Officials from the **Department of Economic Development, Department of Public Safety-Missouri State Highway Patrol, Office of the Governor, Office of Administration-Administrative Hearing Commission, Missouri House of Representatives, Office of the State Treasurer, Office of the State Public Defender, Department of Health and Senior Services, Office of Prosecution Services, Missouri Tax Commission, Department of Higher Education, Missouri Ethics Commission, Missouri Lottery Commission, Department of Public Safety-Missouri Gaming Commission, Office of State Courts Administrator, Missouri Senate, Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Revenue, Department of Public Safety-Missouri State Highway Patrol, State Auditor's Office, Missouri State Employees' Retirement System, Legislative Research, Department of Public Safety-Office of the Director, Department of Public Safety-Missouri National Guard, Department of Public Safety-Missouri Capitol Police, Office of Administration-Budget and Planning, Missouri Consolidated Health Care Plan, Department of Transportation, Department of Agriculture, and Department of Public Safety-Alcohol and Tobacco Control** each assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

In response to a previous version, officials from the **Department of Public Safety-Veterans Commission, Attorney General's Office, Department of Public Safety-State Emergency Management Agency, Department of Public Safety-Division of Fire Safety, Missouri Department of Conservation** each assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Oversight notes that the Department of Economic Development, Missouri House of Representatives, Office of the Governor, Office of Administration-Administrative Hearing Commission, Department of Public Safety-Missouri State Highway Patrol, Office of the State Treasurer, Department of Public Safety-Veterans Commission, Office of Prosecution Services, Department of Transportation, Office of Administration-Administrative Hearing Commission, State Auditor's Office, Department of Economic Development, Department of Public Safety-Missouri National Guard, Missouri House of Representatives, Missouri Ethics Commission, Office of the Governor, Department of Public Safety-Missouri Capitol Police, Department of Agriculture, Department of Health and Senior Services, Attorney General's Office, Department of Public Safety-Missouri State Highway Patrol, Department of Public Safety-Division of Alcohol and Tobacco Control, Department of Public Safety-Office of the Director, Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Higher Education, Missouri Senate, Missouri Department of Conservation, Department of Public Safety-Missouri Gaming Commission, Missouri Tax Commission, Office of the State Public Defender, Department of Public Safety-State Emergency Management Agency, Missouri Consolidated Health Care Plan, Legislative Research, Missouri Lottery Commission, Missouri State Employees' Retirement System, Department of Public Safety-Division of Fire Safety, and Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration has stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organization. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact on the fiscal note for these agencies.

Officials from the **Department of Mental Health, Department of Corrections, Department of Social Services, Department of Natural Resources, Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration, and Department of Labor and Industrial Relations** each defer to the Office of Administration to estimate the fiscal impact of the proposed legislation on their respective organizations.

Officials from the **City of Kansas City** assume the legislation to establish the Missouri Municipal Government Expenditure Database would have a negative impact on the City. The City already publishes expenditures on its website. While it's possible to provide all of this information, it would require some reprogramming to pull the data requested in the proposed legislation. That would come at some unknown cost, both in personnel and software.

Officials from the **City of Boonville** assume the proposal will have a fiscal impact of \$40,000 per year.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

In response to a previous version, officials from the **City of St. Louis** (Chief Information Officer of the City of St. Louis) stated there would be no fiscal impact for the City to provide expenditure data files to the State because the data is already collected for the City's website.

In response to a previous version, officials from the **Monroe County Assessor**, **St. Francois County Assessor**, and **St. Louis County** each assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

Officials from the **Wellsville Middletown R-1** and **State Technical College of Missouri** both assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

In response to a previous version, officials from the **Francis Howell School District** and **Missouri State University** both assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

Oversight notes that there could be cost to municipalities to create or reprogram systems in order to meet requirements to upload expenditure information to the state and manage the system, therefore, Oversight will reflect an unknown cost to local political subdivisions with potential (subject to appropriations) reimbursement for the state, per Section 37.1094.5.

House Amendment 1

Oversight assumes House Amendment 1 will have no fiscal impact on state or local governments.

House Amendment 2

Officials from the **Department of Revenue (DOR)** assume:

Section 37.1094

This proposed section states that all municipalities shall provide the information outlined in Section 30.492 biannually. This section states that any municipality that fails to timely submit such expenditure information to the Office of Administration shall be subject to a fine of one hundred dollars per day. OA is to notify the DOR of any municipalities who are in violation of this section.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Once notified of any violation, the Department of Revenue shall notify the municipality via certified mail. The notice is to include the following information:

- The name of the municipality;
- That the municipality shall be subject to a fine of one hundred dollars per day if the municipality does not provide the expenditure information to OA within fourteen business days from the postmarked date of the certified mail envelope;
- That the fine will be enforced and collected as provided in subsection 4 of this section; and
- That the fine will begin accruing on the fifteenth day from the postmarked date of the certified envelope and will continue to accrue until OA receives the expenditure information.

In the event, the Office of Administration does not receive such expenditure information within the fourteen-day period, this section states that the Department of Revenue may offset any sales or use tax distributions in order to collect the fine authorized in this section. The Department of Revenue shall retain two percent of any fees collected and the remaining revenues from any violations shall be distributed annually to the schools of the county in the same manner that proceeds for all penalties, forfeitures, and fines collected for any breach of the penal laws of the state are distributed.

Based on the language in the proposed legislation, the Department of Revenue considers this fine to be similar the fine imposed on all political subdivisions by the State Auditor's Office under Section 479.359. Currently, 94 municipalities in Missouri have been assessed a fine by the State Auditor's Office. The Department of Revenue took the total amount assessed for each municipality and divided that number by \$500 (the amount assessed per day under Section 479.359) to get the total number of days late. The Department of Revenue then found the average number of days late for all 94 municipalities, which came to a total of 105 average days late (9,877 total days late divided by 94 municipalities).

The fine assessed in the proposed legislation is \$100 per day after failure to submit timely remittance of expenditure information. The Department of Revenue assumes the proposed legislation to have a positive impact on Total State Revenue in an amount estimated of \$987,000 (105 average days x \$100 per day x 94 municipalities).

The Department of Revenue is to retain two percent of all fees collected and it is to be deposited into the General Revenue Fund. The remaining ninety-eight percent shall be distributed to the schools in each municipality.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Impact to Total State Revenue		
FY20	FY21	FY22
\$ -	\$ 987,000	\$ 987,000
Impact to Schools		
\$ -	\$ 967,260	\$ 967,260
Impact to General Revenue		
FY20	FY21	FY22
\$ -	\$ 19,740	\$ 19,740

Section 37.1094.2 states “Any municipality that fails to timely submit the required expenditure information to the Office of Administration shall be subject to a fine of one hundred dollars per day.” This proposal allows for the Department of Revenue to collect a late fee of \$100 per day for any municipality that is late providing the information to OA. This money is offset against sales tax collections due the municipalities and then distributed to school districts. Therefore, **Oversight** will reflect a zero (no fines assessed to municipalities) or could exceed \$19,740 (estimate of fine revenue retained by DOR for collection efforts provided by DOR) to General Revenue and \$0 (no fines assessed to municipalities) or could exceed \$967,260 (estimate of fine revenue provided by DOR to be distributed) for the school districts.

Oversight inquired with Department of Revenue regarding the number of municipalities that were imposed fines under Section 479.359. Here is a sample (first 30 of 94 municipalities) listing the fine imposed by municipality:

	Municipality	2010 Census Population	Total Fine Imposed	Current Outstanding Fine
1	Oakwood Park	185	\$ 192,500	\$ 192,500
2	Claycomo	1,430	\$ 14,500	\$ 0
3	Blackwater	162	\$ 17,500	\$ 3,284
4	Scotsdale	222	\$ 51,500	\$ 44,921
5	Gibbs	107	\$ 184,500	\$ 184,500
6	Harwood	47	\$ 170,550	\$ 170,550
7	Gentry	72	\$ 174,500	\$ 174,500
8	Portageville	3,228	\$ 43,000	\$ 0
9	Risco	346	\$ 96,500	\$ 95,229
10	Whitewater	125	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000
11	Baldwin Park	92	\$ 142,000	\$ 142,000
12	Lake Annette	100	\$ 142,000	\$ 142,000
13	Brunswick	858	\$ 39,500	.

14	St. Cloud	41	\$ 142,000	\$ 142,000
15	Gasconade	223	\$ 22,500	\$ 21,433
16	Morrison	139	\$ 10,500	\$ 8,867
17	Darlington	121	\$ 142,000	\$ 142,000
18	Galt	253	\$ 123,000	\$ 123,000
19	Ironton	1,460	\$ 2,000	\$ 0
20	Lake Tapawingo	730	\$ 4,000	\$ 4,000
21	Holden	2,252	\$ 1,500	\$ 0
22	Evergreen	28	\$ 142,000	\$ 142,000
23	Aullville	100	\$ 28,500	\$ 28,500
24	Chula	210	\$ 500	\$ 500
25	Cobalt City	226	\$ 142,000	\$ 142,000
26	Howardville	383	\$ 12,500	\$ 10,560
27	Lilbourn	1,190	\$ 23,000	\$ 0
28	Granby	2,134	\$ 15,000	\$ 0
29	Arkoe	68	\$ 142,000	\$ 142,000
30	Barnard	221	\$ 142,000	\$ 142,000

Source: Department of Revenue

Oversight notes that in response to similar legislation HB 2242 from 2018, officials from the **Office of the State Treasurer (STO)** assumed the proposal would require:

§30.493 - While the municipalities are required to submit expenditure data, the lack of the specified form will require FTEs to ensure a conversion. STO will need 3 FTE: 2 Information Technologist I (\$50,112 annually) and 1 Information Support Coordinator (\$39,708 annually), to manage and administer the website, as well as coordinate with the municipalities and refer delinquent municipalities to DOR.

In summary, STO assumed a cost of approximately \$230,000 per year for the three additional FTE and related expenses.

Oversight assumes given the trend with past similar legislation that the mandatory participation could result in smaller municipalities in Missouri needing assistance to perform the requirements of the proposal. Oversight assumes that this proposal could require OA to hire at least 3 FTE (Information Support Coordinator - as assumed by STO in response to similar legislation) to manage and administer the website and coordinate with municipalities. Using STO's FTE cost in their 2018 response, Oversight assumes hiring three (3) additional FTE, each at approximately \$39,700 per year, would cost \$200,000 per year.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Officials from the **Office of Administration-ITSD** state that the amendment will not change their response for this fiscal note.

Officials from the **Office of Administration-Accounting** assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

Officials from the **Office of the Secretary of State (SOS)** assume 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 \$5,000. 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 require additional resources.

Officials from the **Joint Committee on Administrative Rules (JCAR)** state this legislation is not anticipated to cause a fiscal impact beyond its current appropriation.

Oversight assumes JCAR will be able to administer any rules resulting from this proposal with existing resources.

Officials from the **Office of Administration-Budget and Planning** assume Article IX, Section 7 of the Missouri Constitution requires that all penalties, forfeitures and fines collected for violations of state law be distributed to the schools. To the extent any additional such revenues are deposited into the state treasury, total state revenue may increase.

Officials from the **Office of the State Treasurer, Department of Health and Senior Services, State Auditor's Office, Missouri Lottery Commission, Missouri Ethics Commission, Department of Public Safety-Gaming Commission, Missouri Senate, Missouri Consolidated Health Care Plan, Department of Public Safety-Alcohol and Tobacco Control, Office of State Courts Administrator, Department of Transportation, Department of Higher**

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Education, Department of Public Safety-Missouri State Highway Patrol, Department of Agriculture, Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Public Safety-Office of the Director, Department of Public Safety-State Emergency Management Agency, Missouri State Employees' Retirement System, Office of Administration - Administrative Hearing Commission, Department of Public Safety-Fire Safety, Office of Prosecution Services, Office of the State Public Defender, Department of Economic Development, Department of Public Safety-Missouri State Highway Patrol, Office of the Governor, and Missouri Tax Commission, each assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

Officials from the **Department of Corrections, Department of Labor and Industrial Relations, Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration, Department of Natural Resources, Department of Social Services, and Department of Mental Health** each defer to the Office of Administration to estimate the fiscal impact of the proposed legislation on their respective organization.

Oversight only reflects the responses that we have received from state agencies and political subdivisions; however, other municipalities were requested to respond to this proposed legislation but did not. For a general listing of political subdivisions included in our database, please refer to www.legislativeoversight.mo.gov.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2020 (10 Mo.)	FY 2021	FY 2022
GENERAL REVENUE FUND			
<u>Income</u> - DOR- §37.1094 - allowed to retain 2% of \$100 per day late fee p. 9-10	\$0	\$0	\$0 or could exceed \$19,740
<u>Cost</u> - OA p. 11			
Salaries	\$0	\$0	\$0 to (\$121,518)
Fringe Benefits	\$0	\$0	\$0 to (\$74,863)
Expense & Equipment	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0 to (\$14,250)</u>
<u>Total Cost</u> - OA	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0 to (\$210,631)</u>
FTE Change - OA	0 FTE	0 FTE	0 to 3 FTE
<u>Cost</u> - OA - ITSD p. 3-4	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>Could exceed (\$10,507)</u>
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>Unknown to (Unknown - Could exceed \$201,398)</u>
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND			
Estimated Net FTE Change for General Revenue	<u>0 FTE</u>	<u>0 FTE</u>	<u>0 to 3 FTE</u>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2020 (10 Mo.)	FY 2021	FY 2022
LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS			
<u>Income</u> - School Districts - \$100 per day late fee for data submissions per §37.1094.2	\$0	\$0	\$0 or could exceed \$967,260
<u>Cost</u> - Municipalities - \$100 per day late fee for data submissions per §37.1094.2	\$0	\$0	\$0 or could exceed (\$987,000)
<u>Cost</u> - Municipalities - create or reprogramming system for expenditures to upload to state	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>

FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

No direct fiscal impact to small businesses would be expected as a result of this proposal.

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

This bill establishes the "Missouri Municipal Government Expenditure Database," to be maintained by the Office of Administration. For each fiscal year beginning on or after January 1, 2022, the database must include extensive information about a given municipality's expenditures and the vendors to whom payments were made. The data base must be accessible by the public without charge and have multiple ways to search and filter the information. Municipalities with websites must provide a link to the database.

A municipality must provide the information to the Office of Administration on a biannual basis or it will be fined \$100 per day after 30 days. The fine will be collected by offsetting sales and use tax distributions due to the municipality not to exceed 10% of the total collected. The Director of the Department of Revenue will retain 2% for the cost of the collection and the remaining revenue collected will be distributed annually to the schools of the county in the same manner that penalties, forfeitures, and fines for breaches of penal laws are distributed. If a municipality fails to report the required information within one year of the expiration of the 30 days, it will be subject to dissolution.

FISCAL DESCRIPTION (continued)

Other duties and responsibilities of the Office of Administration regarding the database are detailed in the bill.

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

Office of Administration
Office of the Secretary of State
Joint Committee on Administrative Rules
Office of Administration-Budget and Planning
Office of the State Treasurer
Department of Public Safety-Veterans Commission
Office of Prosecution Services
Department of Transportation
Office of Administration-Administrative Hearing Commission
State Auditor's Office
Department of Economic Development
Department of Public Safety-Missouri National Guard
Missouri House of Representatives
Missouri Ethics Commission
Office of the Governor
Department of Public Safety-Capitol Police
Department of Agriculture
Department of Health and Senior Services
Attorney General's Office
Department of Public Safety-Missouri State Highway Patrol
Department of Public Safety-Division of Alcohol and Tobacco Control
Department of Public Safety-Office of the Director
Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Department of Higher Education
Missouri Senate
Department of Public Safety-Missouri Gaming Commission
Missouri Tax Commission
Office of the State Public Defender
Missouri Department of Conservation
Department of Public Safety-State Emergency Management Agency

SOURCES OF INFORMATION (continued)

Missouri Consolidated Health Care Plan
Legislative Research
Missouri Lottery Commission
Missouri State Employees' Retirement System
Department of Public Safety-Fire Safety
Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration
Department of Mental Health
Department of Natural Resources
Department of Corrections
Department of Social Services
Department of Labor and Industrial Relations
Office of Administration-Budget and Planning
City of Kansas City
City of Boonville
City of St. Louis
Wellsville-Middletown R-1
State Technical College of Missouri
Monroe County Assessor
St. Francois County Assessor
St. Louis County
Francis Howell School District
Missouri State University
State Technical College of Missouri



Kyle Rieman
Director
April 1, 2019

Ross Strobe
Assistant Director
April 1, 2019