

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 3988H.01P
Bill No.: Perfected HB 1730
Subject: Firearms; Business and Commerce
Type: Original
Date: April 8, 2026

Bill Summary: This proposal modifies provisions relating to firearm suppressors.

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND

FUND AFFECTED	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029
General Revenue	Could be less than \$27,808	Could be less than \$68,073	Could be less than \$92,579
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue	Could be less than \$27,808	Could be less than \$68,073	Could be less than \$92,579

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS

FUND AFFECTED	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS

FUND AFFECTED	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)

FUND AFFECTED	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029
Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE	0	0	0

- 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 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029
Local Government*	(Less than \$250,000)	(Less than \$250,000)	(Less than \$250,000)

*Unknown reduction in penalties and fines collected related to the removal of firearm suppressor violations.

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

§§571.010, 571.020, 571.935, and 571.940 – Firearm Suppressors

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** state this proposal modifies provisions relating to firearm suppressors. Section 571.020 is modified to remove a firearm silencer from the list of weapon related items it is illegal to possess, manufacture, transport, repair or sell. These actions have the effect of removing a nonviolent class D felony offense.

As there is no way for the department to know how many offenses occurring under section 571.020 included the use of a firearm silencer, there is little direct data on which to base an estimate, and as such, the department estimates an impact comparable to the removal of a standard nonviolent class D felony.

For each new nonviolent class D felony, the department estimates three people could have been sentenced to prison and five to probation. The average sentence for a nonviolent class D felony offense is 5 years, of which 2.8 years will be served in prison with 1.7 years to first release. The remaining 2.2 years will be on parole. Probation sentences will be 3 years.

The cumulative impact on the department is estimated to be 8 fewer offenders in prison and 16 fewer offenders on field supervision by FY 2029.

	# to prison	Cost per year	Total Savings for prison	Change in probation & parole officers	Total cost for probation and parole	# to probation & parole	Grand Total - Prison and Probation (includes 2% inflation)
Year 1	(3)	(\$11,123)	\$27,808	0	\$0	(5)	\$27,808
Year 2	(6)	(\$11,123)	\$68,073	0	\$0	(10)	\$68,073
Year 3	(8)	(\$11,123)	\$92,579	0	\$0	(16)	\$92,579
Year 4	(8)	(\$11,123)	\$94,431	0	\$0	(19)	\$94,431
Year 5	(8)	(\$11,123)	\$96,319	0	\$0	(22)	\$96,319
Year 6	(8)	(\$11,123)	\$98,246	0	\$0	(22)	\$98,246
Year 7	(8)	(\$11,123)	\$100,210	0	\$0	(22)	\$100,210
Year 8	(8)	(\$11,123)	\$102,215	0	\$0	(22)	\$102,215
Year 9	(8)	(\$11,123)	\$104,259	0	\$0	(22)	\$104,259
Year 10	(8)	(\$11,123)	\$106,344	0	\$0	(22)	\$106,344

The department will assume a marginal cost (multiplied by number of offenders) for any projected increase or decrease in the incarcerated population. Marginal cost is \$30.47 per day or an annual cost of \$11,123 per offender which includes costs such as medical, food, wages and

operational E&E. The unknown amount is a result of the uncertainty in the growth of the underlying offender population. The impact of any new legislation combined with the growth of the underlying population could result in the tiered approach below in order to meet the population demands.

1. Fully staffing the current capacity (27,368) which is habitable, but DOC does not have the staffing resources for all bed space.
2. Rehabilitating current space that is not currently habitable and obtaining staffing resources for that space (requires capital improvements).
3. Expanding new capacity by adding housing units or wings to existing prisons and obtaining staffing resources for that space (requires capital improvements).
4. Constructing a new prison and obtaining staffing resources. Based on current construction projects in other Midwest states, the department estimates the cost of constructing a new 1,500-bed maximum security prison at approximately \$825 million to \$900 million plus annual operating costs of approximately \$50 million (requires capital improvements).

The department's population projections indicate current physical capacity will be met by July 2029; however recent trends indicate that capacity could be met much sooner. Should new construction be the result of the increasing offender population, the full cost per day per offender would be used which is \$106.96 or an annual cost of \$39,040. This includes all items in the marginal cost calculation plus fringe, personal service, utilities, etc.

DOC's cost of probation or parole is determined by the number of P&P Officer II positions that are needed to cover its caseload. The DOC average district caseload across the state is 51 offender cases per officer. An increase/decrease of 51 cases would result in a cost/cost avoidance equal to the salary, fringe, and equipment and expenses of one P&P Officer II. Increases/decreases smaller than 51 offender cases are assumed to be absorbable.

In instances where the proposed legislation would only affect a specific caseload, such as sex offenders, the DOC will use the average caseload figure for that specific type of offender to calculate cost increases/decreases.

* If this impact statement has changed from statements submitted in previous years, it could be due to an increase/decrease in the number of offenders, a change in the cost per day for institutional offenders, and/or an increase in staff salaries.

Oversight does not have any information contrary to that provided by DOC. Therefore, Oversight will reflect DOC's impact for fiscal note purposes.

Officials from the **Office of Administration - Budget and Planning (B&P)** state this bill removes restrictions from §571.020 restricting the possession, manufacture, transportation, repair, or sale of firearm silencers. Article IX, Section 7 of the Missouri Constitution requires that penalties, forfeitures, and fines collected for violations of state law be distributed to the

schools. To the extent any such revenues are currently deposited into the state treasury, TSR may decrease.

Oversight assumes the proposal would result in a decrease in court fees and fine revenues paid to local governments. Oversight also assumes the reduction in court fees and associated fine revenues distributed to schools would be less than \$250,000 and not significantly impact school districts or counties. Oversight will present a negative loss of court fees and fine revenues to local governments for fiscal note purposes.

Officials from the **Office of State Courts Administrator (OSCA)** state 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 or (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 **Office of Attorney General (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 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.

Officials from the **City of Kansas City** state the proposed legislation has a potential negative fiscal impact of an indeterminate amount. **Oversight** notes the City of Kansas City provided no information explaining the potential fiscal impact this proposal would have on their organization. Therefore, for fiscal note purposes, Oversight assumes any fiscal impact incurred would be absorbable within current funding levels.

Officials from the **High Point R-III School District** indicate this proposal would have a fiscal impact on their organization. However, Oversight notes they provided no information explaining the potential fiscal impact this proposal would have on their organization. Therefore, for fiscal note purposes, Oversight assumes any fiscal impact incurred would be absorbable within current funding levels.

Officials from the **Department of Commerce and Insurance, Department of Economic Development, Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Health and Senior Services, Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development, Department of Labor and Industrial Relations, Department of Mental Health, Department of Natural Resources, Department of Public Safety (Division of Alcohol and Tobacco Control, Capitol Police, Fire Safety, Missouri Gaming Commission, Missouri Highway Patrol, Missouri Veterans Commission, Office of the Director, State Emergency Management Agency), Department of Revenue, Department of Social Services, Joint Committee on Administrative Rules, Joint Committee on Legislative Research (Legislative Research and Oversight Division), Missouri Consolidated Health Care Plan, Missouri Higher Education Loan Authority, Missouri Department of Agriculture, Missouri Department of Conservation, Missouri Department of Transportation, Missouri Ethics Commission, Missouri House of Representatives, Missouri Lottery Commission, Missouri National Guard, Missouri Senate, Missouri State Employee's Retirement System, Office of Administration - Administrative Hearing Commission, Office of the Governor, Office of the Lieutenant Governor, Office of the State Auditor, Office of the State Public Defender, Office of the State Treasurer, State Tax Commission, University of Missouri, MoDOT & Patrol Employees' Retirement System, Petroleum Storage Tank Insurance Fund, Joint Committee on Public Committee Employee Retirement, Platte County Board of Elections, St. Louis City Board of Elections, St. Louis County Board of Elections, Newton County Health Department, Christian County Auditor, Phelps County Sheriff, Kansas City Police Department, St. Louis County Police Department, County Employees Retirement Fund, Kansas City Civilian Police Employees' Retirement, Kansas City Police Retirement System, Metro St. Louis Sewer District Employees Pension Plan, Public Education Employees' Retirement System, Sheriff's Retirement System, Little Blue Valley Sewer District, Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District, South River Drainage District, Wayne County Public Water Supply District #2, Northwest Missouri State University, University of Central Missouri, and Rolling Hills Consolidated Library** each assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations for this proposal.

Officials from the **Office of the Secretary of State (SOS)** note 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.

In response to similar legislation, HCS HB Nos. 548 & 898, officials from the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services** assumed 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.

Oversight only reflects the responses that we have received from state agencies and political subdivisions; however, other cities, local election authorities, various county officials, local public health agencies, nursing homes, local law enforcement, fire protection districts, ambulance & EMS, retirement, schools, utilities, hospitals, colleges and universities, electric companies and coops, solid waste management districts and public libraries were requested to respond to this proposed legislation but did not. Upon the receipt of additional responses, Oversight will review to determine if an updated fiscal note should be prepared and seek the necessary approval to publish a new fiscal note. A general listing of political subdivisions included in our database is available upon request.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2027 (10 Mo.)	FY 2028	FY 2029
GENERAL REVENUE			
<u>Savings</u> – DOC (§571.020) Reduction in incarceration costs p.3-4	\$27,808	\$68,073	\$92,579
<u>Cost</u> – OSCA (§571.020) Unknown cost relating to the removal of restrictions on firearm suppressors p.5	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE	Could be less than \$27,808	Could be less than \$68,073	Could be less than \$92,579

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – Local Government</u>	FY 2027 (10 Mo.)	FY 2028	FY 2029
LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS			
<u>Loss</u> – Schools (§571.020) Reduction in fine revenue p.5	(Less than \$250,000)	(Less than \$250,000)	(Less than \$250,000)
<u>Loss</u> – Counties (§571.020) Reduction in court fees p.5	(Less than \$250,000)	(Less than \$250,000)	(Less than \$250,000)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT TO LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS	(Less than \$250,000)	(Less than \$250,000)	(Less than \$250,000)

FISCAL IMPACT – Small Business

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

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

FIREARM SUPPRESSORS (Sections 571.010, 571.020, 571.935, and 571.940)

Currently, a person commits a criminal offense if he or she knowingly possesses, manufactures, transports, repairs, or sells a firearm silencer in violation of Federal law.

This bill adds the phrase "firearm suppressor" to the existing definition of "firearm silencer" and adds new definitions for "generic and insignificant part" and "manufacture".

Beginning August 28, 2026, the possession, manufacture, transportation, repair, or sale of a firearm suppressor will no longer be a criminal offense. If a criminal action for this offense is still pending on August 28, 2026, the action must be dismissed on that date. Final convictions for this offense that existed prior to August 28, 2026, will not be affected.

Beginning August 28, 2026, a firearm suppressor that is manufactured in Missouri and remains in Missouri will not be subject to Federal law or regulation, including registration, under the U.S. Congress's authority to regulate interstate commerce. A firearm suppressor must be deemed to have been manufactured in Missouri if the item is:

- (1) Made from basic materials; and
- (2) Does not include parts imported from another state, other than generic and insignificant parts. A firearm suppressor manufactured in Missouri that is subsequently attached to a firearm that was imported from another state will still be considered to have been manufactured in Missouri.

Basic materials, such as unmachined steel, used in the manufacturing process of firearm suppressors will not be deemed to be a firearm suppressor, and will not be subject to Federal regulation under the U.S. Congress's authority to regulate interstate commerce, as if it actually were a firearm suppressor. A firearm suppressor manufactured and sold in Missouri must have the words "Made in Missouri" clearly stamped on it.

If a U.S. citizen residing in Missouri makes a written notification to the Attorney General of his or her intent to manufacture a firearm suppressor, the Attorney General will seek a declaratory judgment from a Federal district court in this State that the manufacturing process described in this bill is consistent with the U.S. Constitution.

This bill prohibits any State or local government entity, as specified in the bill, from adopting a rule, order, ordinance, or policy under which a State or local government entity attempts to enforce a Federal statute, order, rule, or regulation that regulates a firearm suppressor if the statute, order, rule, or regulation seeks to impose a prohibition, restriction, or other regulation

that does not exist under the laws of this State, nor will any State or local government entity enforce, or attempt to enforce, any Federal statute, order, rule, or regulation that seeks to regulate firearm suppressors.

If any State or local government entity adopts a rule, order, ordinance, or policy that seeks to enforce a Federal law related to firearm suppressors, or allows the enforcement of such a Federal law, such entity will not receive State grant funds.

Any citizen residing in the jurisdiction of an entity described in this bill can file a complaint with the Attorney General if the citizen offers evidence that the entity has adopted a rule, order, ordinance, or policy under which the entity enforces a Federal law as described above. The citizen must include in the complaint any evidence that the citizen has in support of his or her contention.

If the Attorney General determines that a complaint filed against an entity is valid, the Attorney General can compel the entity's compliance with the law by filing a Writ of Mandamus or other equitable relief in an appropriate court of law.

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

Attorney General's Office
Department of Commerce and Insurance
Department of Corrections
Department of Economic Development
Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Department of Health and Senior Services
Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development
Department of Labor and Industrial Relations
Department of Mental Health
Department of Natural Resources
Department of Public Safety
 Alcohol and Tobacco Control
 Capitol Police
 Fire Safety
 Missouri Gaming Commission
 Missouri Highway Patrol
 Missouri Veterans Commission
 Office of the Director
 State Emergency Management Agency
Department of Revenue
Department of Social Services

Joint Committee on Administrative Rules
Joint Committee on Legislative Research
 Legislative Research
 Oversight Division
Joint Committee on Public Employee Retirement
Missouri Consolidated Health Care Plan
Missouri Department of Agriculture
Missouri Department of Conservation
Missouri Department of Transportation
Missouri Ethics Commission
Missouri Higher Education Loan Authority
Missouri House of Representatives
Missouri Lottery Commission
Missouri National Guard
Missouri Office of Prosecution Services
Missouri Senate
Missouri State Employee's Retirement System
MoDOT & Patrol Employees' Retirement System
Office of Administration
 Administrative Hearing Commission
 Budget and Planning
Office of the Governor
Office of the Lieutenant Governor
Office of the Secretary of State
Office of the State Auditor
Office of the State Courts Administrator
Office of the State Public Defender
Office of the State Treasurer
Petroleum Storage Tank Insurance Fund
State Tax Commission
City of Kansas City
Platte County Board of Elections
St. Louis City Board of Elections
St. Louis County Board of Elections
Newton County Health Department
Christian County Auditor
Phelps County Sheriff
Kansas City Police Department
St. Louis County Police Department
County Employees Retirement Fund
Kansas City Civilian Police Employees' Retirement
Kansas City Police Retirement System
Metro St. Louis Sewer District Employees Pension Plan
Public Education Employees' Retirement System

L.R. No. 3988H.01P
Bill No. Perfected HB 1730
Page **11** of **11**
April 8, 2026

Sheriff's Retirement System
High Point R-III School District
Little Blue Valley Sewer District
Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District
South River Drainage District
Wayne County Public Water Supply District #2
Northwest Missouri State University
University of Central Missouri
Rolling Hills Consolidated Library



Julie Morff
Director
April 8, 2026



Jessica Harris
Assistant Director
April 8, 2026