

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 4108S.08A
Bill No.: SS for SCS for HCS for HB Nos 1768 & 2060 as amended
Subject: Taxation and Revenue - Property
Type: Original
Date: May 15, 2026

Bill Summary: This proposal modifies provisions relating to property taxes.

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND

FUND AFFECTED	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029
General Revenue	(\$5,872,302)	(\$1,002,624)	(\$1,020,064)
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue	(\$5,872,302)	(\$1,002,624)	(\$1,020,064)

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS

FUND AFFECTED	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029
Blind Pension Fund (1621)	\$0	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
Missouri School Facilities Partnership Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds	\$0	(Unknown)	(Unknown)

*Oversight assumes the fiscal impact could exceed the \$250,000 threshold.

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
General Revenue - DESE	8 FTE	8 FTE	8 FTE
Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE	8 FTE	8 FTE	8 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 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029
Local Government	(Unknown) to Unknown	(Unknown) to Unknown	(Unknown) to Unknown

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 information regarding a similar bill. Upon the receipt of agency 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.

§53.255 – Assessor Training & Certification Requirements

Oversight notes this section modifies assessor training requirements. Oversight assumes counties may experience minimal increases in training-related costs for newly elected assessors and assessors-elects required to complete the expanded training hours. The fiscal impact to counties is expected to be minimal and absorbable, therefore Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note.

§67.496 - “Not Increasing Taxes” Language Prohibited

In response to similar legislation, HCS No. 2. for HB 2668 (2026), officials from the **Department of Revenue (DOR)** noted this provision restricts how increases to the tax rate can be described on the ballot. This will not fiscally impact DOR.

Oversight assumes this provision prohibits any political subdivision or election authority from advertising or describing any proposed property tax as a “no tax increase” tax proposal.

Oversight does not anticipate a fiscal impact from this provision. However, Oversight received a limited number of responses from local political subdivisions related to the fiscal impact of this proposal. Oversight has presented this fiscal note on the best information available. Upon the receipt of additional responses, Oversight will review to determine if an updated fiscal note should be prepared and seek approval to publish a new fiscal note.

§115.240 - Ballot Labeling

Oversight does not anticipate a fiscal impact from these provisions. However, Oversight received a limited number of responses from local political subdivisions related to the fiscal impact of this proposal. Oversight has presented this fiscal note on the best information available. Upon the receipt of additional responses, Oversight will review to determine if an updated fiscal note should be prepared and seek approval to publish a new fiscal note.

§137.016 – Reclassification of Certain Real Property

In response to similar legislation, HCS for SS for SCS for SB Nos 1066 & 1088 (2026), officials from the **Office of Administration – Budget & Planning (B&P)** assumed this proposal would classify single family short-term rental property as residential real property. B&P notes that such property is currently assessed as either commercial or mixed-use (residential and commercial). Residential real property is assessed at 19% of true market value, while commercial real property is assessed at 32% of true market value.

B&P notes that in addition to local property taxes, the Blind Pension Trust fund levies a statewide property tax of \$0.03 per \$100 value. Therefore, assessing such property as only residential real property will likely result in lower state and local property tax collections by an unknown amount.

In response to similar legislation, HCS for SS for SCS for SB Nos 1066 & 1088 (2026), officials from the **State Tax Commission** reviewed this proposal and determined this proposal may have a negative impact on the taxing jurisdictions relying on property taxes as a source of revenue. Current statute allows assessors to assess single family homes as commercial properties if they are regular rented out for time periods less than a month, and this proposal would require assessors to assess these homes as residential property, which includes a lower rate.

The commission notes that this version of the bill contains several provisions dealing with the levy setting process and bond issues. The commission does not anticipate any increased impact from these provisions.

In response to similar legislation, HB 1768 (2026), officials from the **City of Kansas City** assumed the proposed legislation has a negative fiscal impact of \$1.4 to \$1.5 million.

In response to similar legislation, officials from the **County Employees' Retirement Fund (CERF)** assumed there is insufficient data to quantify this section's exact impact. Section 137.016.1(g) may have an unknown, possibly negative, fiscal impact to the County Employees' Retirement Fund. A certain portion of the moneys that are used to fund CERF are tied to the collection of property taxes. CERF notes that the amount of these revenues fluctuates from year to year.

In response to a previous version, officials from the **St Louis City Assessor's Office** assumed the following fiscal impact:

Commercial tax	Residential tax	Diff in taxes
\$2,006,106	\$999,916	(\$1,006,189)

(\$1,006,189) Loss to all taxing jurisdictions
(\$201,238) Loss to City of St. Louis
(\$15,093) Loss to Collector of Revenue Fund
(\$6,289) Loss to Assessment Fund

In response to similar legislation, HCS for SS for SCS for SB Nos 1066 & 1088 (2026), officials from the **Adair County SB 40 DD Board** assumed a reduction in funding from personal and/or real property taxes would have a direct and significant impact on the essential supports provided by the Adair County SB40 Developmental Disability Board. SB40 funding enables the board's local system to assess community needs and sustain a coordinated network of services that currently support approximately 465 individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities and their families across Adair County.

In response to similar legislation, HCS for SS for SCS for SB Nos 1066 & 1088 (2026), officials from the **Callaway County SB 40 Board** assumed Senate Bill 1066 revises statutory definitions governing the classification of real property for property tax purposes, including residential, agricultural, and commercial categories. While the bill does not alter tax rates or levy authority, changes in property classification may shift assessed valuation among subclasses with differing assessment percentages.

Senate Bill 40 organizations, including Callaway County Special Services (CCSS), rely on levy-based property tax revenue to sustain essential community-based services for individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities (IDD) and their families. Reclassification of property from higher-assessed commercial or industrial categories to lower-assessed residential or agricultural categories may reduce effective taxable value and slow revenue growth for local taxing entities.

Additionally, allocation of mixed-use properties across multiple subclasses may increase valuation variability and appeal activity, further affecting revenue predictability. Although the bill allows certain levy adjustments to mitigate losses, those adjustments are subject to constitutional limitations and may not fully offset long-term valuation shifts. Absent mitigation, SB 1066 may create structural fiscal pressure on levy-dependent SB40 boards by constraining revenue growth needed to keep pace with rising service demand and operational costs.

In response to similar legislation, HCS for SS for SCS for SB Nos 1066 & 1088 (2026), officials from the **City of Kansas City** assumed this bill will likely have a negative fiscal impact on Kansas City. The bill would require single family homes leased for a period of less than 30 days to be "residential" property, which carries a lower rate of tax per assessed value compared to commercial property. This change would likely reduce property tax revenue received from properties currently classified as commercial that would meet the requirements of a residential property under this amendment.

In response to similar legislation, HCS for SS for SCS for SB Nos 1066 & 1088 (2026), officials from the **High Point R-III School District** assumed a fiscal impact but did not provide any additional information.

In response to similar legislation, HCS for SS for SCS for SB Nos 1066 & 1088 (2026), officials from the **Department of Social Services** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

Oversight notes this provision reclassifies single family short-term rental properties as residential property.

Oversight notes according to the [Property Reassessment and Taxation Manual](#) on the MO State Tax Commission website, Real Property is currently assessed as follows:

Subclass	Rate
(1) residential	19%
(2) agricultural and horticultural	12%
(3) utility, industrial, commercial, railroad, and other property	32%

Oversight notes the reduction of assessment percentage from 32% to 19%, (approximately a 41% proportional decrease) for qualifying properties will result in a decrease in assessed value relative to current law.

Oversight is uncertain what proportion of assessed value would be reclassified under this proposal.

Oversight notes the Blind Pension Fund (1621) is calculated as an annual tax of three cents on each one hundred dollars of assessed valuation of taxable property ((Total Assessed Value/100)*.03). Because this proposal reduces the assessed value portion of this equation, the Blind Pension Fund will experience a decrease in revenue relative to what it would have received under current law.

Oversight does not have enough information to estimate a fiscal impact to the Blind Pension Fund or to local political subdivisions from these changes. Therefore, Oversight will show an unknown loss in property tax revenue beginning in FY 2028.

Oversight notes to reach a revenue impact of \$250,000 in the Blind Pension Fund would require a change in assessed value of approximately \$830,000,000. This would be approximately a 1.0% change in the assessed value of all residential property.

Oversight notes property tax revenues are designed to be relatively revenue neutral from year to year. The tax rate is adjusted relative to the assessed value to produce roughly the same revenue from the prior year with an allowance for growth. Therefore, this proposal may result in a higher tax rate relative to current law thus distributing more of the tax burden to other property owners.

Oversight notes some taxing entities have tax rate ceilings that are at their statutory or voter approved maximum or are at a fixed rate. For these taxing entities, any decrease in the assessed values would not be offset by a higher tax rate (relative to current law), rather it would result in an actual loss of revenue.

§137.067 – Modifying a Tax on Residential Real Property

Oversight does not anticipate a fiscal impact from this provision. However, Oversight received a limited number of responses from local political subdivisions related to the fiscal impact of this proposal. Oversight has presented this fiscal note on the best information available. Upon the receipt of additional responses, Oversight will review to determine if an updated fiscal note should be prepared and seek approval to publish a new fiscal note.

§137.073.5.(3) – Temporary vs. Permanent Levy

In response to similar legislation, officials from the **County Employees' Retirement Fund (CERF)** assumed there is insufficient data to quantify this section's exact impact. It may result in an unknown, possibly negative, fiscal impact.

Oversight assumes this provision specifies that, if the voters in a political subdivision approve a temporary levy increase prior to the expiration of a previously approved temporary levy increase, the new tax rate ceiling will remain in effect only until the temporary levy increase expires under the terms originally approved by a vote of the people. At that time, the tax rate ceiling will be decreased by the amount of the temporary levy increase unless voters of the political subdivision are asked to approve an additional permanent increase and such increase is approved.

Oversight assumes no impact from this provision of the proposal.

§137.073.5(6) - Voter-Approved Increased Tax Rate Ceiling

Oversight assumes this provision clarifies the treatment of voter-approved increases to property tax rate ceilings. Oversight assumes this provision does not mandate a tax increase; it only governs the treatment of rates already approved by voters. Therefore, Oversight does not anticipate a fiscal impact from this proposal.

§137.073.6(3) – Reports from Taxing Authorities

Oversight assumes this provision adds language for taxing authorities to report to the Office of the State Auditor if there is an increase in the rate of levy of debt service. Oversight assumes no impact from this provision of the proposal.

§137.115 – Requirements for Subclass (3) Real Property

In response to similar legislation, HCS for SS for SCS for SB Nos 1066 & 1088 (2026), officials from the **City of St. Louis Assessor's Office** stated this change is not practical and do not comport with real estate valuation norms. Real Estate professionals are aware that residential and commercial property valuation are different and unique disciplines – the same rules do not apply to one as it does to the other.

The requirement that there be sales of at least 3 comparable properties may not be possible for some property types (casinos, data centers, stadiums, arenas, natural or petroleum gas storage, etc.) Additionally, for some commercial sales, like hotels and motels, the sales prices include business value and personal property value and would overstate the value to the land and buildings if required to be used.

Furthermore, sales of commercial properties are rarely within a mile of each other. Many property types may be the only one in a jurisdiction (casino, data center) or may be spread out in location and not typically grouped together (malls, grocery, veterinary, etc.) There have been many professional appraisals provided to assessors on specialty properties where sales comparisons come from the Midwest region or from elsewhere in the continental states. The requirement to be with 500 sq.ft. in size would likely result in no comparable sales being applied to any commercial property. When dealing with a 100,000 sq.ft. warehouse, comparables of anywhere from 50,000 to 150,000 or more might be used. For large offices of 500,000 sq.ft., comparables may range in size from 250,000 sq.ft. to 1,000,000 sq.ft. Because commercial properties are often tens of thousands of square feet, it would be very difficult, if not almost impossible, to meet this requirement.

The sales approach is not always used, nor is it always the best indicator of value for commercial property. The Income Approach is used in many commercial valuations because it is more relevant to market value in many cases, such as office buildings, retail property, many industrial and warehouse properties, hotels and motels, and many others. Requiring sales information for property that is more appropriately valued by the income approach will have a negative effect on the assessment process in Missouri.

Additionally, officials from the **City of St. Louis Assessor's Office** assumed this provision requires physical inspections on subclass (3) real property which would require one to two additional employees at \$65,000 per employee for a total cost of \$130,000.

Oversight will show an unknown cost to local political subdivisions to meet the requirements of this provision.

§137.121, 137.180, 137.355, & 137.490 – Electronic Records/Notifications for Assessors

Oversight notes these provisions allow assessors the option to keep records and/or send notices to property owners electronically. Oversight notes this provision may result in savings to counties for postage and printing. Oversight notes this provision is optional, therefore Oversight will show a range of \$0 (no counties opt in) to an unknown savings to county assessors.

§137.1050.6 - Senior Citizen Homestead Tax Credit Eligibility

In response to similar legislation, officials from the **County Employees' Retirement Fund (CERF)** assumed data is not available to quantify the impact of section 137.1050 but the County Employees' Retirement Fund assumes it would have a negative fiscal impact of an indeterminate

amount. A certain portion of the moneys that are used to fund the County Employees' Retirement Fund are tied to the collection of property taxes.

Oversight notes that this provision modifies language for the property tax credit established in SB 190 (2023).

Oversight notes this provision states eligible taxpayers shall not be required to reapply for the credit annually. Oversight does not anticipate an additional fiscal impact from this provision.

§137.1060 – Report on Property Tax Credits Provided to School Districts

Oversight notes this provision requires the district secretary of school districts to include the total amount of property tax credits authorized by §§137.1050 & 137.1055 that are applicable to the district for the prior year. Oversight does not anticipate an additional fiscal impact from this provision.

§§139.031 & 139.053 – Payment of Property Taxes

In response to similar legislation, officials from the **County Employees' Retirement Fund (CERF)** assumed Section 139.031.1(2)(b) may have a negative fiscal impact of an indeterminate amount. There is insufficient data to quantify this section's impact. A certain portion of the moneys that are used to fund CERF are tied to the collection of property taxes.

Oversight notes these provisions allow the governing body of any county to provide for partial payments on residential real property taxes assessed and in dispute in certain circumstances.

Oversight further notes these provisions also require the governing body of each county or city not within a county to allow for pre-payment of current real property taxes owed on an annual, semiannual, quarterly, or monthly basis at such times as determined by such governing body.

Oversight assumes there could be costs for implementation and computer programming. Oversight will show an unknown cost to county assessors to implement this proposal beginning in FY 2028.

§139.145 - Grace Period on Assessment Related Filings

In response to similar legislation, officials from the **County Employees' Retirement Fund (CERF)** assumed Section 139.145: This section would likely have a negative fiscal impact because it would be expected to reduce the current revenue stream by an indeterminate amount. There is insufficient data to quantify the impact but we assume it would be negative.

Oversight notes this provision states that the county assessor, township assessor or other county designee may allow a grace period not to exceed ten days following the statutory deadline for

submission of forms when such forms are transmitted through the United States Postal Service. Oversight does not anticipate an additional fiscal impact from this provision.

§140.010 – Trusted Contact Program for Delinquent Property Tax Notices

In response to similar legislation, SCS for SBs Nos. 1410 & 853 (2026), officials from the **Howell County Assessors' Office** assumed the proposed changes conflict with §§138.010, 138.050, 138.090, 138.100 and 138.170, RSMo. The changes will put the Board of Equalization opening date after the date for it to open, unless the intention is to leave it open for an entire year.

In response to similar legislation, SCS for SBs Nos. 1410 & 853, officials from the **St. Louis City Assessors' Office** stated while there is no direct fiscal impact on the Assessor's office, there will be other impacts. The change to the June 1st notification date by the assessor (instead of June 15th) will impact the amount of time assessors have to perform duties. Two weeks doesn't sound like a lot, but every day counts in the enormity of the reassessment process.

More concerning is moving the deadline to appeal back to August 1st (instead of the 2nd Monday in July). Again, 2 to 3 weeks does not sound like much, but it will be impactful.

Adding time to the process is not the issue. The issue is not adding corresponding time for the Assessor and/or the Board of Equalization (BOE). It will make an already challenging administrative problem worse from having even less time. When taxpayers have more time to appeal but the Assessor/BOE is not given additional time also, it will likely result in continued frustration on the part of the taxpayers; for any appeals filed at the Aug. 1st date, there will be a rush to get them all schedules by the existing end of August deadline for the BOE and they will likely be crammed in to the schedule instead of allowing ample time.

Oversight assumes no direct fiscal impact from this provision.

Senate Amendment 1 (SA 1) §143.998 - DOR Records

In response to similar legislation, CCS for HCS for SB 994 (2026), officials from the **Department of Revenue (DOR)** stated this provision would require DOR to provide information about tax returns to the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. DOR notes that they do not track individual income tax returns by school district and to do so would require upgrades to their computer systems. Based on estimates received for different upgrades to our system it could cost over \$5 million.

Oversight does not have information to the contrary and therefore, Oversight will reflect the estimates as provided by the DOR.

§164.151 – Ballot Language

Oversight does not anticipate a fiscal impact from these provisions. However, Oversight received a limited number of responses from local political subdivisions related to the fiscal impact of this proposal. Oversight has presented this fiscal note on the best information available. Upon the receipt of additional responses, Oversight will review to determine if an updated fiscal note should be prepared and seek approval to publish a new fiscal note.

§1 – Missouri Taxpayer Debt Relief and School Facilities Act

In response to similar legislation, SS for HCS for HB Nos. 2097 & 1905 with SA1, SA2, SA4 and SA5 (2026), officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)** noted this section establishes the Missouri Taxpayer Debt Relief and School Facilities Act and the Missouri Commission on Academic Facilities to be housed within DESE. DESE shall provide staff and administrative support to the commission. The commission support will minimally require 8 FTE to include an Executive Director, Administrative Assistant, Director, Assistant Director, Program Coordinator, and three Program Specialists.

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect the impact as estimated by DESE.

Oversight notes this section does not change how property taxes are calculated; Oversight assumes any impacts to tax levies and local property tax revenues would only occur if state funding reduced the amount of local debt a district needs to issue. Therefore, Oversight will assume this impact is indirect and will not show the impact to local political subdivisions in the fiscal note.

Oversight notes this proposal creates the Missouri School Facilities Partnership Fund which shall consist of money appropriated by the general assembly and any other money authorized by law to be deposited in the fund. Oversight notes school districts may apply to the commission for state financial participation in an academic facilities project. Oversight notes awards are subject to appropriation and it is unclear how many districts have projects that would qualify or the number of districts that would apply. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero or unknown cost to the Missouri School Facilities Partnership Fund and a revenue gain to school districts that may receive additional state aid for projects eligible under the proposal.

Responses regarding the proposed legislation as a whole

Officials from the **St. Louis County Board of Elections** 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 this agency.

Oversight only reflects the responses that we have received from state agencies and political subdivisions; however, other local political subdivisions 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.

Rule Promulgation

Officials from the **Joint Committee on Administrative Rules** assume this proposal is not anticipated to cause a fiscal impact beyond its current appropriation.

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.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2027 (10 Mo.)	FY 2028	FY 2029
GENERAL REVENUE			
<u>Cost – DOR (\$143.998) DOR programing for DESE reports p.10</u>	(\$5,000,000)	\$0	\$0
<u>Transfer out – DESE (\$1) – School Facilities Partnership state financial participation</u>	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
<u>Cost – DESE (\$1)</u>			
Personal Service	(\$477,700)	(\$584,705)	(\$596,399)
Fringe Benefits	(\$301,038)	(\$365,856)	(\$370,560)
Expense & Equipment	(\$93,564)	(\$52,063)	(\$53,105)
<u>Total Costs – DESE</u>	<u>(\$872,302)</u>	<u>(\$1,002,624)</u>	<u>(\$1,020,064)</u>
FTE Change – DESE	8 FTE	8 FTE	8 FTE
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE	<u>(\$5,872,302)</u>	<u>(\$1,002,624)</u>	<u>(\$1,020,064)</u>
Estimated Net FTE Change on General Revenue	8 FTE	8 FTE	8 FTE

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2027 (10 Mo.)	FY 2028	FY 2029
BLIND PENSION FUND (1621)			
<u>Revenue Loss</u> - (§137.016) Loss of tax revenue from the reclassification of certain single family short-term rental properties p.5-6	\$0	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON BLIND PENSION FUND (1621)	\$0	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
MISSOURI SCHOOL FACILITIES PARTNERSHIP FUND			
<u>Transfer in</u> – DESE (§1) – from General Revenue	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown
<u>Cost</u> – DESE (§1) – awarding of state financial participation for eligible projects	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
NET EFFECT ON MISSOURI SCHOOL FACILITIES PARTNERSHIP FUND	\$0	\$0	\$0

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – Local Government</u>	FY 2027 (10 Mo.)	FY 2028	FY 2029
LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS			
<u>Revenue Loss</u> - (§137.016) Loss of tax revenue from the reclassification of certain single family short-term rental properties p.5-6	\$0	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
<u>Cost</u> – Counties (§137.115) for additional requirements for valuation of subclass (3) real property p.7-8	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – Local Government</u>	FY 2027 (10 Mo.)	FY 2028	FY 2029
Saving – County Assessors (§§137.121, 137.180, 137.355, & 137.490) Electronic Records/Notifications p.8	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Cost - (§§139.031 & 139.053) for implementation and software changes to allow prepayment/partial payment of property taxes p.8-9	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
Revenue Gain– School Districts (§1) – School Facilities Project receiving state financial participation awards	<u>\$0 or Unknown</u>	<u>\$0 or Unknown</u>	<u>\$0 or Unknown</u>
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS	(Unknown) to <u>Unknown</u>	(Unknown) to <u>Unknown</u>	(Unknown) to <u>Unknown</u>

FISCAL IMPACT – Small Business

There could be a fiscal impact on small businesses if tax rates/taxes are adjusted relative to changes in assessed values. Certain small businesses that pay property taxes could be impacted by this proposal.

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

This proposal modifies provisions relating to the classification of certain real property.

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 - Budget and Planning
 State Tax Commission
 Department of Social Services
 County Employees Retirement Fund (CERF)
 Department of Social Services
 City of Kansas City
 St Louis City Assessor’s Office
 Adair County SB 40 DD Board
 Callaway County SB 40 Board

L.R. No. 4108S.08A
Bill No SS for SCS for HCS for HB Nos 1768 & 2060 as amended
Page **15** of **15**
May 15, 2026

High Point R-III School District
Platte County Board of Elections
St. Louis County Board of Elections
Eastern Clay Ambulance District

Julie Morff
Director

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jessica Harris". The signature is stylized with a large initial "J" and "H".

Jessica Harris
Assistant Director
May 15, 2026