

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH  
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

**FISCAL NOTE**

L.R. No.: 1185H.03P  
Bill No.: Perfected HCS for HB 489  
Subject: Agriculture; Animals; Law Enforcement Officers and Agencies  
Type: Original  
Date: March 27, 2025

---

Bill Summary: This proposal modifies provisions relating to the confiscation of animals.

**FISCAL SUMMARY**

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND</b>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028
General Revenue*	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue</b>	<b>(Unknown)</b>	<b>(Unknown)</b>	<b>(Unknown)</b>

\*Oversight assumes MHP and OSCA could experience increased duties. Oversight assumes the costs would be less than \$250,000.

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS</b>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

☐ 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
<b>Local Government*</b>	<b>(Unknown)</b>	<b>(Unknown)</b>	<b>(Unknown)</b>

\*Oversight assumes law enforcement agencies could incur some costs related to the care of confiscated animals.

## **FISCAL ANALYSIS**

### **ASSUMPTION**

#### **§578.018 – Confiscation of Animals**

Officials from the **Missouri Department of Agriculture** 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.

Officials from the **Attorney General’s Office (AGO)** assume 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** assumes AGO is provided with core funding to handle a certain amount of activity each year. Oversight assumes AGO could absorb the costs related to this proposal. If multiple bills pass which require additional staffing and duties at substantial costs, AGO could request funding through the appropriation process. Officials from the AGO assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

Officials from the **Missouri Highway Patrol (MHP)** assume the proposal as outlined in Section 578.018.1 and Section 578.018.5, the Highway Patrol, could be liable for costs related to the care of confiscated animals in connection with a criminal investigation. The fiscal impact to the Patrol could range from zero to unknown due to the many variables associated with the proposed legislation, such as the number and type of animals and the length of time for adjudication of a case, or cases.

**Oversight** does not have information to the contrary and therefore, Oversight will reflect an “Unknown” cost to MHP on the fiscal note. For fiscal note purposes, Oversight will assume the unknown fiscal impact will be less than \$250,000.

In response to a previous version, officials from **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services (MOPS)** assumed there is no measurable fiscal impact to MOPS. The enactment of a new crime [578.018.7] creates additional responsibilities for county prosecutors and the circuit attorney which may in turn result in additional costs which are difficult to determine.

In response to a previous version, officials from the **Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA)** assumed there may be some impact but there is no way to quantify that currently. Any significant changes will be reflected in future budget requests.

**Oversight** notes OSCA assumes this proposal may have some impact on their organization although it can’t be quantified at this time. As OSCA is unable to provide additional information regarding the potential impact, Oversight assumes the proposed legislation will have a \$0 to

(Unknown) cost to the General Revenue Fund. For fiscal note purposes, Oversight also assumes the impact will be under \$250,000 annually. If this assumption is incorrect, this would alter the fiscal impact as presented in this fiscal note. If additional information is received, Oversight will review it to determine if an updated fiscal note should be prepared and seek approval to publish a new fiscal note.

Officials from the **St. Louis County Police Department** assume, if passed, this bill would allow for animal control officers or law enforcement officers to apply for animal confiscation warrants, however service of the actual warrant would require the response of a police officer. While the Police Department currently assists the health department with these cases, the animal control officers would no longer be able to solely function without Police involvement.

The increase in man hours, paperwork, and overtime are difficult to estimate. The police officers process, if involved in an animal confiscation case would be as follows:

The officer would have to compile evidence and apply for a warrant (in some situations). After approval, the officer would then have to respond to the location where the animal is being maintained with the health department and animal control to serve the warrant. If the owner of the animal is not on-scene, the officer must locate a resident of the property and serve them in person, which may be impossible. During this process, the officer involved would no longer be able to respond to other calls and additional officers would have to complete the work the missing officer would generally complete, generating overtime costs.

**Oversight** assumes any confiscated animal care costs, should the animal owner be acquitted, has an inability to pay before the initial disposition hearing, or upon conviction, would be incurred by veterinarians, local government dog pounds, animal shelters, animal rescue facilities, or another third party with existing animal care facilities approved by the court.

Officials from the **Phelps County Sheriff, Kansas City Police Department**, and the **Newton County Health Department** each assume 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.

**Oversight** only reflects the responses received from state agencies and political subdivisions; however, other sheriffs, police departments and local political subdivisions were requested to respond to this proposed legislation but did not. A general listing of political subdivisions included in Oversight's database is available upon request.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2026 (10 Mo.)	FY 2027	FY 2028
<b>GENERAL REVENUE FUND*</b>			
<u>Cost</u> – MHP – Increased duties in the animal confiscation process	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
<u>Cost</u> – OSCA – Increased duties related to the animal confiscation procedures	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE GENERAL REVENUE FUND</b>	<b>(Unknown)</b>	<b>(Unknown)</b>	<b>(Unknown)</b>

\*Oversight assumes MHP and OSCA could experience increased duties. Oversight assumes the costs would be less than \$250,000.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – Local Government</u>	FY 2026 (10 Mo.)	FY 2027	FY 2028
<b>LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS*</b>			
<u>Revenue</u> - Animal Rescue Facilities - Bond or security for animal care costs from the animal owner	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
<u>Cost</u> - Animal Rescue Facilities - Care of animals held until final disposition of charges and acquittal or inability to pay	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
<u>Cost</u> - Law Enforcement Agencies - Increased duties in the animal confiscation process	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS</b>	<b>(Unknown)</b>	<b>(Unknown)</b>	<b>(Unknown)</b>

\*Oversight assumes law enforcement agencies could incur some costs related to the care of confiscated animals.

FISCAL IMPACT – Small Business

Small business animal shelters and veterinary facilities might incur additional costs as a result of this proposal.


FISCAL DESCRIPTION

This bill changes the laws regarding the confiscation of animals.

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 Agriculture  
Office of the State Courts Administrator  
Office of Prosecution Services  
Attorney General's Office  
Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol  
Phelps County Sheriff  
Kansas City Police Department  
St. Louis County Police Department  
Newton County Health Department



Julie Morff  
Director  
March 27, 2025



Jessica Harris  
Assistant Director  
March 27, 2025