

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 0410S.04F
Bill No.: #SS No. 2 for HB 419
Subject: Business and Commerce; Department of Economic Development; Higher Education; Military Affairs; State Treasurer; Veterans
Type: #Corrected
Date: May 5, 2025
#Corrected bill string to include "No. 2"

Bill Summary: This proposal clarifies that military personnel are eligible for in-state tuition for undergraduate and graduate degree programs.

FISCAL SUMMARY

| ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND | | | | |
|--|--------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| FUND AFFECTED | FY 2026 | FY 2027 | FY 2028 | Fully Implemented (FY 2031) |
| | | | | |
| General Revenue* | (\$240,951) | More or less than (\$767,330) | More or less than (\$1,442,619) | More or less than (\$3,944,464) |
| | | | | |
| Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue | (\$240,951) | More or less than (\$767,330) | More or less than (\$1,442,619) | More or less than (\$3,944,464) |

***Oversight** notes the Public Safety Recruitment and Retention Fund is subject to appropriation by the General Assembly and awarded by the DHEWD. If changes to the program are not funded, the impact will be \$0. DHEWD's estimate includes cost for loan services, 1 FTE, and grants to cover the cost of tuition and fees at Missouri public postsecondary institutions for public safety officers and first responders from §173.2655. Costs include increases to the Line of Duty Compensation Act from §287.243.

| ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| FUND AFFECTED | FY 2026 | FY 2027 | FY 2028 | Fully Implemented (FY 2031) |
| Public Safety Recruitment and Retention Fund | \$0 | \$0 or Unknown | \$0 or Unknown | \$0 or Unknown |
| College & University Funds* | Could exceed (\$5,500,000) | Could exceed (\$4,869,798) | Could exceed (\$4,176,616) | Could exceed (\$1,681,378) |
| Total Estimated Net Effect on Other State Funds | Could exceed (\$5,500,000) | Could exceed (\$4,869,798) | Could exceed (\$4,176,616) | Could exceed (\$1,681,378) |

*Oversight assumes any reduction in tuition and fees received by colleges and universities would not reach the \$250,000 threshold annually.

*This section 172.345 will provide a public holiday for all employees of the University of Missouri resulting in a cost that exceeds \$250,000.

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

| ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS | | | | |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------------------|
| FUND AFFECTED | FY 2026 | FY 2027 | FY 2028 | Fully Implemented (FY 2031) |
| | | | | |
| Total Estimated Net Effect on All Federal Funds | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |

| ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) | | | | |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|--|
| FUND AFFECTED | FY 2026 | FY 2027 | FY 2028 | Fully Implemented (FY 2031) |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE | 1 FTE | 1 FTE | 1 FTE | 1 FTE |

- ☒ Estimated Net Effect (expenditures or reduced revenues) expected to exceed \$250,000 in any of the three fiscal years after implementation of the act or at full implementation of the act.
- ☐ Estimated Net Effect (savings or increased revenues) expected to exceed \$250,000 in any of the three fiscal years after implementation of the act or at full implementation of the act.

| ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS | | | | |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|--|
| FUND AFFECTED | FY 2026 | FY 2027 | FY 2028 | Fully Implemented (FY 2031) |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Local Government | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |

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's information regarding a similar bill. Upon the receipt of the agency responses, Oversight will review to determine if an updated fiscal note should be prepared and seek approval to publish a new fiscal note.

§§41.890 and 173.1153 – Military personnel eligible for in-state tuition

In response to similar legislation, HB 419 (2025), officials from the **University of Missouri** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

In response to similar legislation, HB 1832 (2024), officials from **Northwest Missouri State University (NWMSU)** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact to their organization unless the State does not reimburse for tuition and fees (e.g. Returning Heroes Program).

Due to the limited number of responses received from colleges and universities, **Oversight** assumes Colleges and Universities may experience a reduction in tuition and fees received from military personnel and relatives and will reflect a potential (\$0 or) negative unknown fiscal impact for College and University Funds. Oversight has no information on the number of military personnel or their family members that take advantage of this benefit, or if any of them are paying out of state tuition for undergraduate or graduate degree programs. Oversight assumes this proposal clarifies that the benefit applies to both undergraduate and graduate degree programs. For fiscal note purposes, Oversight assumes if some colleges are not applying the benefit to both, there could be a reduction in tuition revenue to colleges and universities with the passage of this proposal; however, Oversight assumes any decrease in tuition and fees would not reach the \$250,000 threshold per year.

§160.701 – Provisions for activities associations

Oversight notes based on conversations with the deputy director of the Missouri National Guard, there are approximately 400 split training students. This legislation is directed at creating exemptions for students in regard to school activity association. Therefore, Oversight assumes this provision will have no fiscal impact.

Section 172.640 – State University Seminary Fund

In response to similar legislation, SB 627 (2025), officials from the **University of Missouri (UM)** assumed this would have a positive impact on the university. It would simplify the process for handling the seminary fund.

Upon further inquiry, **UM** stated the current operational process for investing and withdrawing the funds involves an unduly cumbersome and time-consuming multi-step process involving several departments on the part of both the University and the Treasurer, all to administer a relatively small amount of money in the context of the overall finances of the State and the University. The real savings come in time savings from a more efficient process and the reduction in possible mistakes from staff turnover in either office. This fund will last forever, so any improvements will be beneficial for the long term.

Furthermore, they stated this does not impact the size of their staff. The improvement is to simplify the process between their office and the Missouri Treasurer's office. The MO Treasurer's office will no longer have to purchase the bonds and custody the investments on their behalf. UM will handle that in their office, and they are already equipped to do this.

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for this agency.

In response to similar legislation, SB 627 (2025), officials from the **Office of Attorney General (AGO)** assumed any potential litigation costs arising from this proposal can be absorbed with existing resources. The AGO may seek additional appropriations if the proposal results in a significant increase in litigation or investigation costs.

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight assumes the AGO will be able to perform any additional duties required by this proposal with current staff and resources and will reflect no fiscal impact to the AGO for fiscal note purposes.

In response to similar legislation, SB 627 (2025), officials from the **Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development** and **Office of the State Treasurer** both assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

§§172.280 & 174.160 – Authority to confer degrees at colleges/universities

In response to similar legislation, HCS for SS for SB 38 (2025), officials from the **University of Missouri System (UM)** stated that the fiscal impact on the UM System is hard to predict. The fiscal impact to the UM System of MSU offering research doctorates and/or a bachelor's degree in veterinary technology is unknown.

In response to similar legislation, SB 11 (2025), officials from the **UM** stated the fiscal impact on the UM System is difficult to predict but could be significant. It is reasonable to believe that starting new PhD programs, professional degrees, and engineering degrees will significantly increase expenditures at other institutions. These cost increases would require a significant increase in state funding for these institutions, causing a corresponding loss of state funding to the UM System and its four universities.

Oversight assumes UM could experience a negative fiscal impact as a result of this proposal since students could opt to attend another university to obtain their desired degree and that other universities in Missouri would incur additional administrative expenses starting up/adding new programs. The administrative expenses may or may not be offset by an increase in enrollment. Therefore, for fiscal note purposes, Oversight assumes this proposal will have a \$0 or unknown negative fiscal impact on universities.

In addition, the net effect on tuition/fees lost by UM and received by other universities will not be significantly different. Lastly, Oversight assumes the impact could be greater than \$250,000 if even one university decided to create a new graduate, professional and/or engineering program at their institution. Oversight will range the impact from \$0 to an unknown amount.

In response to similar legislation, SB 11 (2025), officials from **Southeast Missouri State University** assumed there is the potential for a likely positive impact on Southeast Missouri State University.

In response to similar legislation, SB 479 (2024), officials from the **Northwest Missouri State University** assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their organization

§172.345 - Veterans Day shall be a public holiday for all employees of the University of Missouri System

In response to similar legislation, SB 89 (2025), officials from the **University of Missouri (UM)** stated that designating Veteran's Day as a holiday is projected to cost the University \$5.5 million.

Oversight does not have information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect the estimated cost as provided by the University of Missouri.

In response to similar legislation, SB 89 (2025), officials from the **Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development** and the **Office of Administration (Budget and Planning)** each assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, **Oversight** will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies

§173.1352 – Undergraduate course credits for students who score 4 or higher on international baccalaureate exams

In response to similar legislation, SB 243 (2025), officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education**, the **Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development**, and the **University of Missouri System** each assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

In response to similar legislation, HB 2415 (2025), officials from **Northwest Missouri State University** assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

§173.2655 - Public Safety Recruitment and Retention Act

Officials from the **Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development (DHEWD)** assume this legislation creates two new sections, 173.2655 and 173.2660, which establishes the “Public Safety recruitment and Retention Act.” This act creates a grant for public safety officers and first responders (dispatchers, EMTs, fire fighters, paramedics, and police officers) to cover the cost of tuition and fees at Missouri public postsecondary institutions after working for 6 years, and for their dependents after working 10 years.

According to data from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics’ Occupational Employment and Wage Statistics Program (BLS – OEWS), there are 29,050 full-time public safety officers and first responders in the state (3,190 dispatchers, 3,670 EMTs, 5,570 fire fighters, 3,550 paramedics, and 13,070 police officers). Although the legislation limits this award to those with at least six years of service, the best available data, from Zippia.com, indicates that just over 44 percent of public safety officers and first responders have been on the job for at least five years, and that 47.5 percent have below a bachelor’s degree. Assuming a three percent utilization rate for those meeting the eligibility criteria, the department estimates that **183 individuals** would be eligible ($29,050 * 44.2 \text{ percent with eligible service} * 47.5 \text{ percent below a bachelor’s degree} * 3 \text{ percent utilization}$).

Additionally, this allows the dependents of public safety officers and first responders, who have at least 10 years of service (19 percent), to receive this grant, which would include spouses and children. According to Pew Research, about 53 percent of individuals are married, and Census data indicates that 68 percent of adults have below a bachelor’s degree. Applying national enrollment trends by age on the population, they estimate that around three percent of Missourians between the ages of 25 and 64 attend college, which would result in **60 eligible spouses** ($29,050 * 19 \text{ percent with 10 years of service} * 53 \text{ percent that are married} * 68 \text{ percent below a bachelor’s degree} * \text{three percent utilization}$). Further, Pew Research estimates that 19 percent of families have children, and the average family size is 1.9 children. Of those, roughly 9.5 percent are 18-24, of which 80 percent will stay in state and 60 percent will attend a public postsecondary institution, resulting in **91 eligible children** ($29,050 * 19 \text{ percent with 10 years of service} * 19 \text{ percent with children} * 1.9 \text{ children} * 9.5 \text{ percent of college going age} * 80 \text{ percent staying in-state} * 60 \text{ percent attending a public college or university}$).

This results in **334 individuals eligible for the award**. If they assume that roughly 32 percent attend community colleges (where tuition and fees average \$5,140 a year for full-time students) and 68 percent attend a public four-year institution (where tuition and fees average \$11,418.73 a year for full-time students), they get a total of \$3.13 million. Because these individuals have been working in their positions at least six years, the department does not believe they would be Pell or Fast Track eligible, and only a negligible amount would be eligible to receive a small Access Missouri award.

DHE/OA-ITSD states the project would take 1,587.60 hours at a contract rate of \$105 for a total cost of **\$166,698** in FY 2026 with on-going support costs of **\$34,173** in FY 2027 and **\$35,027** in FY 2028.

Oversight notes DHEWD is assuming a three percent utilization rate for those meeting the eligibility criteria. Oversight has calculated the below based on DHEWD's methodology to show a range of utilization rates. However, Oversight is unable to determine how many individuals will be eligible or utilize the grant. Oversight further assumes transfers-in, and grants provided will net to \$0.

| Percentage utilization/ individuals eligible | Cost |
|--|--------------------|
| 1% / 111 | \$1,043,333 |
| 2% / 222 | \$2,086,667 |
| 3% / 334 | \$3,138,180 |
| 6% / 518 | \$6,260,000 |
| 9% / 640 | \$9,390,000 |
| 12% / 883 | \$12,520,000 |

Oversight notes DHEWD is assuming a three percent utilization rate for those utilizing these programs. Oversight assumes there will be a gradual rise in participation as students receive the award over several years and new students are added to the participant group; therefore, Oversight will reflect a step up in participation. In response to similar legislation HCS for HB Nos. 1514, 1525, and 1527, DHE provided the average award amounts for students receiving the award, which included a 5% inflation rate for award amounts. Therefore, using their estimates and Oversight calculations for stepped up participation, Oversight will reflect the cost below:

| R&R | FY26 | FY27 | FY28 | FY29 | FY30 | FY31 |
|------------|------|-----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| student | 0 | 67 | 134 | 200 | 267 | 334 |
| avg. award | \$0 | \$9,406 | \$9,876 | \$10,370 | \$10,889 | \$11,433 |
| award sub. | \$0 | \$630,202 | \$1,323,384 | \$2,074,000 | \$2,907,363 | \$3,818,622 |

Officials from the **University of Central Missouri** assume the proposal will have an indeterminate fiscal impact. Possible increase in revenue from the Public Safety Retention Fund tuition awards.

In response to similar legislation, SCS for SB 71 (2025), officials from the **University of Missouri System** assumed that 120 credit hours tuition cost \$54,600 in academic year 2025. This fiscal impact would be this amount multiplied by the number of students who were eligible to receive this waiver, which they cannot estimate at this time.

Oversight notes the University of Missouri's response indicates an average cost per credit hour of \$455 (\$54,600/ 120 hours) for academic year 2025.

In response to similar legislation, SCS for SB 71 (2025), officials from **Northwest Missouri State University** assumed potential material fiscal impact; volume is unknown and state funding is not guaranteed; also costly to manage because their system will not automatically manage the criteria for eligibility and continuation; the five-year residency in MO will be difficult to track and they will not be able to utilize the debt offset in MO so there will ultimately be no payback of the funds.

Officials from **DHEWD** estimate that the fiscal impact for FY 2026 is between zero and \$241,673, to stand up the program. The department estimates this program will go into effect in FY 2027 and estimates the fiscal impact to be between zero and \$3.25 million. Assuming an annual inflationary increase of five percent per year, the costs for FY 2028 would range from zero to \$3.41 million.

In response to similar legislation, HB 1525 (2025), officials from the **Office of Budget and Planning** assumed this proposal creates the "Public Safety Recruitment and Retention Fund" to support public safety tuition awards. This fund does not have a dedicated source; transfers from General Revenue would be subject to appropriation. There are no limits on awards and is subject to appropriation. There is no direct impact on Total State Revenues.

The DPS provided the current number of commissioned peace officers (law enforcement officer) count in the table below.

| | |
|--------------------------------------|--------|
| Full-time Peace Officers | 14,307 |
| Reserve Peace Officers | 1,568 |
| Officers Not Working and Not Expired | 7,833 |
| Active Agencies | 597 |
| Firefighters | 22,000 |

Section 173.2660 - provisions for "Public Safety Recruitment and Retention Act"

Officials from **DHEWD** assume section 173.2660 requires the recipients of this award to remain in the state for five years and provide tax documentation to the department. For those who fail to remain in Missouri or file taxes over this five-year period, the grant would convert to a loan, which would require repayment. The department would need to contract with a loan servicer to handle this repayment and estimates that initial costs include at least \$20,000 in set up fees, and that ongoing costs would include \$25 per loan for onboarding and \$3.50 per loan per month servicing fee. Beyond the initial set up fees, these costs will not be immediate and will only be incurred later in the life of the program.

Oversight notes the servicer of the loans shall be the **Higher Education Loan Authority of the State of Missouri (MOHELA)**. However, without a response from MOHELA, Oversight will reflect the estimated impact by DHEWD in the fiscal note of \$20,000 in FY 2027 for loan servicing set up fee and zero (no repayments) or unknown cost starting in FY 2028.

Oversight notes, if a recipient of the award does not remain a Missouri resident for five years after accepting the award and does not garnish tax returns the recipient agreed that the award would be treated as a loan. Therefore, Oversight assumes repayment of the award through this loan process will result in an income to the Public Safety Recruitment and Retention Fund as \$0 to Unknown as it is unclear how many award recipients would be in violation.

§§191.600-191.615 - Missouri State Loan Repayment Program (MOSLRP)

Officials from **Department of Health and Senior Services (DHSS)** state the proposed legislative changes to 191.600 to 191.615 would update the list of eligible profession types to include all professions allowable under the federal Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) state loan repayment program (SLRP) grant, expanding the eligible professions that Missouri can offer loan repayment to under the SLRP grant.

The expansion of the eligible health professions in the proposed legislation would allow the Department of Health and Senior Services (DHSS), Office of Rural Health and Primary Care (ORHPC) to request additional federal funds for the SLRP program. The maximum award under the federal SLRP grant is \$1,000,000. Because the grant requires a 1:1 state match, ORHPC has historically only been able to apply for a maximum of \$425,000 in SLRP funds under the match requirement, utilizing donated funds to meet the match requirement.

Under the proposed legislation, health professions eligible under the state SLRP statutes would align with HRSA eligible health professions, allowing state funding received for the HPLRP program to be used to meet the HRSA SLRP match requirement. ORPHC could then receive up to an additional \$575,000 in federal funding to award loans to health professionals under the SLRP program, increasing the number of health professionals providing services in underserved areas. The Health Professional Student Loan Repayment Program (HPLRP) eligible professions are chosen by the Director of DHSS in consultation with the Office of Workforce Development in the Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development and the Department of Mental Health.

In further discussions with DHSS, officials from the **DHSS** state they can absorb the state match requirement for this federal program due to existing funding that can be used as match.

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight assumes the DHSS will be able to absorb the funding requirements of this proposal with current resources and will reflect no fiscal impact to the DHSS for fiscal note purposes.

§620.3250 - Boots to Business Program

For informational purposes, **Oversight** has provided the number of linked deposits approved to veteran-owned businesses according to the Office of the State Treasurer website ([Linked Deposit Annual Reports](#)) for the MO BUCKS program.

| Program Year | Participants / Veterans | Total Amount | Average Loan amount per participant |
|--------------|-------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|
| 2024 | 15 | \$8,347,901 | \$556,527 |
| 2023 | 27 | \$12,561,025 | \$465,223 |
| 2022 | 5 | \$5,595,779 | \$1,119,155 |
| 2021 | 5 | \$1,729,603 | \$345,921 |

Oversight notes current law requires any veteran who receives a small business loan through the State Treasurer's linked deposit program to complete a boots-to-business program approved by the Department of Economic Development. This proposal makes participation in such a program optional. Oversight notes that the Small Business Administration (SBA) offers the Boots to Business program at no cost for all veterans who provide a valid Department of Defense I.D. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note.

Bill as Whole

Officials from the **Department of Revenue**, **Department of Public Safety-Office of the Director**, **Missouri National Guard**, and the **Office of the State Treasurer** each assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organizations. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

In response to the previous version, officials from the **Office of Administration – Budget & Planning**, the **Department of Economic Development**, and the **Department of Public Safety – Veterans Commission** each assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

Rule Promulgation

In response to the previous version, officials from the **Joint Committee on Administrative Rules** assumed this proposal is not anticipated to cause a fiscal impact beyond its current appropriation.

In response to the previous version, officials from the **Office of the Secretary of State (SOS)** noted 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 its 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.

| <u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u> | FY 2026 (10 Mo.) | FY 2027 | FY 2028 | Fully Implemented (FY 2031) |
|--|---------------------------|---|---|---|
| GENERAL REVENUE | | | | |
| | | | | |
| <u>Costs – DHEWD/ITSD – FAMOUS changes/updates - §173.2655 p.8</u> | (\$166,698) | (\$34,173) | (\$35,027) | (\$37,720) |
| | | | | |
| <u>Costs – DHEWD §173.2655 p.8</u> | | | | |
| Personnel Service | (\$36,550) | (\$44,737) | (\$45,632) | (\$48,426) |
| Fringe Benefits | (\$27,809) | (\$33,723) | (\$34,081) | (\$35,201) |
| Expense & Equipment | (\$5,399) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| ITSD ongoing costs | (\$4,495) | (\$4,495) | (\$4,495) | (\$4,495) |
| <u>Total Costs – DHEWD</u> | <u>(\$74,253)</u> | <u>(\$82,955)</u> | <u>(\$84,208)</u> | <u>(\$88,122)</u> |
| FTE Change | 1 FTE | 1 FTE | 1 FTE | 1 FTE |
| | | | | |
| <u>Costs – DHEWD – Loan servicing §173.2660 p.10</u> | \$0 | (\$20,000) | \$0 or (Unknown) | \$0 or (Unknown) |
| | | | | |
| <u>Transfer out – DHEWD - Public Safety Recruitment and Retention Fund §173.2655 p.8</u> | <u>\$0</u> | <u>More or less than (\$630,202)</u> | <u>More or less than (\$1,323,384)</u> | <u>\$0 or More or less than (\$3,818,622)</u> |
| | | | | |
| ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE | <u>(\$240,951)</u> | <u>More or less than (\$767,330)</u> | <u>More or less than (\$1,442,619)</u> | <u>More or less than (\$3,944,464)</u> |
| | | | | |
| Estimated Net FTE Change on the General Revenue Fund | 1 FTE | 1 FTE | 1 FTE | 1 FTE |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|---------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | |
| PUBLIC SAFETY RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION FUND | | | | |
| | | | | |
| <u>Transfer in</u> – §173.2655 from General Revenue to Public Safety Recruitment and Retention Fund p.8 | \$0 | \$0 or More or less than \$630,202 | \$0 or More or less than \$1,323,384 | \$0 or More or less than \$3,818,622 |
| | | | | |
| <u>Income</u> – §173.2655 Award repayment for violation of conditions p.8 | \$0 | \$0 or Unknown | \$0 or Unknown | \$0 or Unknown |
| | | | | |
| <u>Income</u> – §173.2655 Gifts, donations, bequests p.8 | \$0 | \$0 or Unknown | \$0 or Unknown | \$0 or Unknown |
| | | | | |
| <u>Transfer out</u> – §173.2655 Distributions of tuition awards from Public Safety Recruitment and Retention Fund p.8 | \$0 | \$0 or More or less than (\$630,202) | \$0 or More or less than (\$1,323,384) | \$0 or More or less than (\$3,818,622) |
| | | | | |
| ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON PUBLIC SAFETY RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION FUND | <u>\$0</u> | <u>\$0 or Unknown</u> | <u>\$0 or Unknown</u> | <u>\$0 or Unknown</u> |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| COLLEGE & UNIVERSITY FUNDS | | | | |
| | | | | |
| <u>Income</u> – §173.2655 Tuition awards from Public Safety Recruitment and Retention Fund p.8 | \$0 | More or less than \$630,202 | More or less than \$1,323,384 | \$0 or More or less than \$3,818,622 |
| | | | | |
| <u>Costs</u> – §§172.280 & 174.160 Increased administrative costs p.6 | \$0 or (Unknown) | \$0 or (Unknown) | \$0 or (Unknown) | \$0 or (Unknown) |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| <u>Loss</u> – §§41.890 and 173.1153 Reduction in tuition and fees received by colleges and universities p. 4 | \$0 or (Unknown) | \$0 or (Unknown) | \$0 or (Unknown) | \$0 or (Unknown) |
| <u>Costs</u> – §172.345 Increased administrative costs p.6 | (\$5,500,000) | (\$5,500,000) | (\$5,500,000) | (\$5,500,000) |
| ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON COLLEGE & UNIVERSITY FUNDS | Could exceed <u>(\$5,500,000)</u> | Could exceed <u>(\$4,869,798)</u> | Could exceed <u>(\$4,176,616)</u> | Could exceed <u>(\$1,681,378)</u> |

| | | | | |
|---|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <u>FISCAL IMPACT – Local Government</u> | FY 2026 (10 Mo.) | FY 2027 | FY 2028 | Fully Implemented (FY 2031) |
| | | | | |
| | <u>\$0</u> | <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

This proposal modifies provisions governing educational institutions.

This proposal modifies provisions relating to public safety.

This bill clarifies that specified military service personnel, their spouses, and their unemancipated children under 24, individuals serving in the Missouri National Guard, and any individuals serving in a reserve component of the Armed Forces of the United States, be considered Missouri residents for the purposes of any undergraduate or graduate degree program in Missouri institutions of higher education.

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 Higher Education and Workforce Development

GS:LR:OD

Missouri National Guard
University of Missouri System
Northwest Missouri State University
University of Central Missouri
Southeast Missouri State University
Office of Administration – Budget and Planning
Department of Economic Development
Department of Revenue
Department of Public Safety – Director’s Office
Department of Public Safety – Veterans Commission
Office of the Secretary of State
Office of the State Treasurer
Joint Committee on Administrative Rules
Attorney General’s Office
Department of Health and Senior Services



Julie Morff
Director
May 5, 2025



Jessica Harris
Assistant Director
May 5, 2025