COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 4181H.05P
Bill No.: Perfected HCS for HB Nos. 2747 & 2047
Subject: Courts; Crimes and Punishment; Criminal Procedure; Boards, Commissions, Committees, and Councils
Type: Original
Date: February 26, 2026

Bill Summary: This proposal modifies provisions relating to proceedings resulting from criminal conduct.

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND

FUND AFFECTED	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029	Fully Implemented (FY 2031)
General Revenue	(Could exceed $5,450,173)	(Could exceed $4,447,770)	(Could exceed $4,517,111)	(Likely to exceed $1,423,885)
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue	**(Could exceed $5,450,173)**	**(Could exceed $4,447,770)**	**(Could exceed $4,517,111)**	**(Likely to exceed $1,423,885)**

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS

FUND AFFECTED	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029	Fully Implemented (FY 2031)
Missouri Expungement*	$0	$0	$0	$0
Total Estimated Net Effect on Other State Funds	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**

* Transfers-in, gifts, grants, bequests and expenses net to $0.
Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS

FUND AFFECTED	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029	Fully Implemented (FY 2031)
Federal*	$0 or (Could exceed $555,876)	$0 or (Could exceed $1,111,753)	$0 or (Could exceed $2,779,382)	$0 or (Could exceed $5,558,765)
Total Estimated Net Effect on All Federal Funds	**$0 or (Could exceed $555,876)**	**$0 or (Could exceed $1,111,753)**	**$0 or (Could exceed $2,779,382)**	**$0 or (Could exceed $5,558,765)**

*Potential loss due to non-compliance with Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)

FUND AFFECTED	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029	Fully Implemented (FY 2031)
Missouri Expungement	Could exceed 28 FTE	Could exceed 28 FTE	Could exceed 28 FTE	Could exceed 7 FTE
Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE	**Could exceed 28 FTE**	**Could exceed 28 FTE**	**Could exceed 28 FTE**	**Could exceed 7 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	Fully Implemented (FY 2031)
Local Government*	**(Unknown)**	**(Unknown)**	**(Unknown)**	**(Unknown)**

*Unknown costs relating to expunging records.

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

Oversight was unable to receive some agency responses in a timely manner and performed limited analysis. Oversight has presented this fiscal note on the best current information that we have or on information regarding a similar bill(s). 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.

§§476.411, 565.030, 610.141, 610.143, and 610.144 – Proceedings from Criminal Conduct

In response to the previous version, from the **Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA)** stated the fiscal impact for modifications to Show-Me Courts and possibly other systems would be approximately $2,250,000, appropriated over three years ($750,000 per year), and thereafter, $500,000 annually to manage the system.

Any additional costs will be reflected in future budget requests.

Oversight has no information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will present the fiscal impact of this proposal as provided by OSCA. Since OSCA indicated that additional costs will be reflected in future budget requests, Oversight will present OSCA's costs as "Could exceed $750,000" for each year, FY27-FY29, and (Could exceed $500,000) for FY31.

Officials from the **Department of Public Safety (DPS) - Missouri Highway Patrol (MHP)** state currently, there are approximately 455,708 conviction records in the Traffic Arrest System/Driving While Intoxicated Tracking System (TAS/DWITS) that could possibly meet the criteria of this proposed legislation. This does not include driving while intoxicated-related offenses as these are excluded from expungement pursuant to §610.140. These expungements are processed by the Patrol Records Division. In addition, the MHP anticipates receiving an estimated 100,380 Criminal History Records System expungement requests per year.. These requests are processed within the Patrol by the Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) Division. Once the court expungement order is received by the MHP, the Patrol Records Division and the CJIS Division personnel would be required to make certain the individual(s) meets the criteria for expungement noted in this legislation. There are not enough existing Patrol personnel to handle the potential increased volume of expungement requests resulting from this proposed legislation. The Patrol is factoring a range as for the number of personnel needed in order to provide an idea of what the costs may be. In addition, there is an average of 300,000 court dispositions with the offense class of misdemeanor, infraction, or local ordinance and a finding of guilty or guilty-SIS added to TAS/DWITS each year.

The Patrol anticipates the need to begin the design and bid process for the technical interface with the courts in FY27. The Patrol will also need to start the process of hiring and training personnel in FY27 in an effort to be prepared for the implementation as required in Sections

610.141.2(1) and 610.141.3(2). Included within the costs would be leased space, a computer system software upgrade, and expense and equipment such as office equipment and computers.

Patrol Records Division (PRD)

The Patrol will process the requested expungements within two separate divisions. Those divisions are identified as the Patrol Records Divisions (PRD) and the Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) Division. Each division is tasked with varying processes for each expungement type.

The MHP calculates that one (1) Patrol Records Division (PRD) FTE can process approximately 3,728 expungements per year. Currently, there are approximately 455,708 records in the TAS/DWITS with Guilty, or Guilty-Suspended Imposition of Sentence (SIS) dispositions that do not include offenses under chapters 301, 302, 304 or 307. (These do not include DWI-related offenses, which are excluded from expungement pursuant to §610.140. Some of the 455,708 records will be expunged pursuant to the passage of Amendment 3 in 2022.)

If only 20% of the individuals who qualified to have his or her record expunged pursuant to this proposed bill were granted, there would be approximately 91,141 initial expungement orders submitted to the Patrol, which would require 5 FTE for the first 5 years in order to be expunged by the January 1, 2031 deadline (when the annual reports are to begin)(§476.411).

With the current 91,141 records possibly eligible for expungement, the following percentages of persons actually receiving an expungement will directly relate to the number of PRD staff needed. 91,141/5 years = 18,228 records/yr to be expunged/ 3,728 expungements per FTE/yr = 5 FTE.

Using the 20% figure above, an additional 1 FTE would warrant the positions classified as Senior Program Specialist (Supervisory).

The Patrol Records Division would have to find additional office space to accommodate 6 FTE needed to process only 20% of the possible expungements. There would be recurring costs for office supply charges per FTE.

After the 5-year window to complete the backlog is passed, quarterly expungements will be required. On average, the Arrest Records Section of the Patrol Records Division receives 11,500 dispositions per month. If one assumes 20% of those records will be clean slate eligible, one FTE PRD Program Assistant will be needed at the salary listed above (11,500 records * 20% = 2,240 records/ 3,728 expungements/FTE = 0.6 FTE, rounded to 1).

Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS)

Based on the Patrol's experience with expunging and vacating records related to Constitutional Amendment XIV, the Patrol estimates that 2,550,000 records would become eligible on the implementation date of the system which would be July 1, 2029. CJIS would have 4 and half years to process these records. On average 1 person can process 34,560 records per year.

2,550,000 records divided by 4.5 years = 566,666 records processed per year to meet the proposed deadline.

566,666 records divided by 34,560 records = 17 FTE's needed.

The CJIS Division estimates it would need a minimum of 17 CJIS Program Assistants to process the request along with 3 CJIS Senior Program Specialists/Supervisor and 1 Program Coordinator for a total of 21 FTE. This does not account for review by MSHP legal counsel.

The MHP states, without space available for the additional personnel needed to fulfill the requirements of this legislation, the Patrol would need leased space for the additional employees. A cost range is based on existing leased space in Cole County. The Patrol used the FY27 Budget Instructions for Expense and Equipment Guidelines for New Staff and its costs for computer equipment to calculate the cost of the 27 FTE (+1 FTE grounds technician for rental space) required of this proposal.

For on-going record expungements, the CJIS Division estimates that 8,365 records would become eligible each month. This equates to 100,380 records per year. On average 1 person can process 23,040 records per year.

8,365 records eligible per month x 12 months = 100,380 records per year.

100,380 records divided by 23,040 records = 5 FTE's

The CJIS Division estimates it would need a minimum of 5 FTE CJIS Program Assistants to process the request. This does not account for review by MSHP legal counsel.

Oversight notes per OA- Budget and Planning's Budget Instructions for FY27, agencies are to use 250 sq. ft./ FTE. The regional rental rate for Jefferson City is $18/ sq.ft., janitorial rates are $2.47/sq. ft. and utility rates are $2.80/ sq. ft.; therefore, the total cost per sq.ft. is $23.27/FTE. Therefore, MHP's estimated annual rental costs are expected to be $162,890 (250 sq.ft/FTE * $23.27*28 FTE).

Oversight also notes that beginning in FY31, MHP has indicated the number of staff required to continue expungement reviews will be reduced from 28 FTE to approximately 7 FTE (1 PRD Program Assistant + 5 CJIS Program Assistants + 1 CJIS Senior Program Specialist/Supervisor), although more FTE may be needed depending on the number of expungement reviews; FTE for the Patrol will be presented as "Could exceed" the number provided by MHP. Therefore, rental space costs beginning with FY31 are unknown. For fiscal note purposes, Oversight will present rental space costs as $0 (FTE can be moved from rental space necessary under this proposal to current existing space) or (Up to $162,890) depending on whether or not the lease agreement can be modified.

MHP officials state the Patrol does not have the technical capabilities with the current criminal history system nor does it have the interfaces with OSCA needed for this requirement. Therefore, the CJIS Division estimates the technical interface will cost $1,500,000 to $2,250,000 based on other criminal history related projects with the current criminal history vendor. A project of this magnitude would take approximately 3 years to complete which would go well beyond the August 28, 2029, requirement.

Oversight will present $1,500,000 to $2,250,000 in costs for the MHP's Criminal History System's upgrade to expunge records in FY27. Assuming funds would not be appropriated for this upgrade in the FY27 budget, MHP believes it would be required to submit a supplemental appropriation request. By placing the costs in FY27, a new decision item could be submitted in the FY27 budget request to cover this cost.

Oversight notes §610.144 establishes a new fund which consists of moneys appropriated by the General Assembly to the fund or any gifts, bequests, or grants. The Department of Public Safety, the Information Services Division within the Office of Administration and Office of the State Courts Administrator will be able to expend moneys from this fund, upon appropriation, for implementation costs, system upgrades or staffing needs incurred under §§610.141 to 610.143. For fiscal note purposes, Oversight will reflect the cost for this program as **(Could exceed $5,450,173) for FY27; (Could exceed $4,447,770) for FY28; (Could exceed $4,517,111) for FY29;** and **(Likely to exceed $923,885)** for **FY31** to the General Revenue Fund. Additionally, Oversight also assumes an unknown income to the Missouri Expungement Fund from gifts, grants, or donations.

For fiscal note purposes, Oversight assumes services provided under this proposal will equal income and net to zero.

In response to the previous version, from the **Missouri Department of Transportation (MODOT)** stated this bill does not exclude offenses while operating a commercial motor vehicle. This could result in a variance with Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations (FMCSRs). 49 CFR 391.15 addresses disqualification of drivers (CDL and non-CDL CMV drivers). A driver who is convicted of a disqualifying offense is disqualified for one year from the date of conviction for first offenders and 3 years after the date of conviction if during the previous 3 years preceding the conviction date the driver was convicted of a disqualifying offense possessing or using a Schedule 1 substance while on duty. A CMV driver convicted of possession of marijuana while on duty is a disqualified driver. If prior non-violent possessions of marijuana convictions are wholly expunged from the criminal records, CMV drivers who would be disqualified under the FMCSRs would be allowed to drive.

In addition, 49 CFR 392.4 prohibits possession or use of any Schedule 1 substance. With marijuana being a Schedule 1 substance at the federal level, commercial motor vehicle drivers are prohibited from possessing and using marijuana in a CMV while on duty.

If a variance with federal law is found, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) Program funding (MCSAP) could be withheld. Missouri's FY26 MCSAP award is anticipated to be around $11,117,529.

The penalty imposed upon states found to be in non-compliance can be as harsh as withholding all MCSAP funding, or potential withholding amounts are as follows:

YEAR 0 (during the FY that FMCSA notifies Missouri of its noncompliance): up to 5%	$555,876
YEAR 1 (next full fiscal year): up to 10%	$1,111,753
YEAR 2 (2nd full fiscal year): up to 25%	$2,779,382
YEAR 3+ (ongoing until variance resolved): not more than 50%.	$5,558,765

Oversight does not have information to the contrary and, therefore, Oversight will reflect the potential loss of federal funding as provided by MoDOT. Oversight will reflect the fiscal impact as $0 (Missouri is not found to be out of compliance) up to the amounts listed above (Missouri is found to be out of compliance of federal rules).

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** state this legislation modifies provisions relating to proceedings resulting from criminal conduct.

Expunging these records for the specified offenses in §610.141, through destruction, or removal will result in an increase in workload for the Department's Institutional Records Officers, as they are the custodian of records for DOC's offender files. This may also affect records kept at Probation and Parole Offices.

While the department assumes a $0 - Unknown impact, there is some concern for tracking previous medical, mental health, substance use treatment, and education records should the offender return to supervision by the DOC.

If there should be a significant number of additional requests for expungement or a significant expansion of the number of offenses that could be expunged, it could result in additional costs to the department. The DOC anticipates the unknown impact will exceed $250,000 annually.

Oversight does not have any information contrary to that provided by DOC. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a $0 (can absorb) to DOC's (unknown) impact to the General Revenue. Oversight assumes DOC could have an impact for record review prior to the implementation date.

In response to the previous version, from the **Branson Police Department (Branson PD)** stated automatic expungement will require extra Records Staff hours to remove all records that will be generated. Branson PD anticipates that this will add enough work that it will require another staff position.

Officials from the **City of Kansas City** state the proposed legislation will have a negative fiscal impact of an indeterminate amount.

Oversight has no information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will present an (Unknown) fiscal impact to local governments. Oversight assumes local governments could have an impact for record review prior to the implementation date.

In response to the previous version, from the **Department of Revenue (DOR)** stated §610.141.2(2) provides that records pertaining to juvenile adjudications or offenses involving the operation of a motor vehicle are not eligible for automated expungement; §610.141.3(11) states that once the transmitted records are expunged, OSCA shall provide notice to all state agencies maintaining official copies of the record that they have thirty (30) days to expunge the records once the order is received from the court; §610.141.6 states that the provisions of this section shall apply retroactively.

The DOR anticipates that it would continue to receive court orders of expungement for any conviction or action related to these sections to be reviewed and processed manually by the department.

With the statutory requirement of thirty (30) days to process the expungement, and the provisions applying retroactively, the DOR is concerned that its existing staff may not be able to process the volume of orders in the mandated timeframe. There is no data to assist in determining the volume of orders the department will receive. If the increase is more significant than anticipated, and unable to be absorbed by existing staff, additional FTE may be requested through the routine appropriations process.

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect no fiscal impact for this agency.

In response to the previous version, 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 the previous version, from the **Office of Administration (OA)** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization. OA states from the plain language of the bill that it appears that a state agency obtaining a credit report could be a “user of information”. However, the violation identified in §610.143 for which a penalty could be assessed is only for improperly “reporting” an arrest, indictment or conviction. A state agency using information from a credit agency would not appear to be “reporting” that information. Therefore, OA assumes that there would be no impact from this bill. If OA’s interpretation of this provision is incorrect, fiscal impact to the LEF could result.

Oversight has no information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will present no fiscal impact for OA for this proposal.

Officials from the **Department of Commerce and Insurance**, **Department of Labor and Industrial Relations**, **Department of Public Safety – Director’s Office**, **Department of Social Services**, **Office of the State Public Defender**, **Office of the State Treasurer**, **Phelps County Sheriff**, **Missouri House of Representatives**, **Legislative Research**, and **Missouri Lottery Commission** 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.

In response to the previous version, officials from the **Office of the Governor, Kansas City Police Department**, **Branson Police Department**, **St. Louis County Police Department** and **Missouri Senate** each 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 this agency.

In response to similar legislation, SB 19 (2025), officials from the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services** assumed the proposal would 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 cities, various county officials and local law enforcement agencies 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.

House Amendment 1 (HA 1) - §610.141 – Reporting to Consumer Reporting Agency

Oversight assumes HA 1 will have no fiscal impact as the amendment was not specifically addressed by any of the responding agencies.

FISCAL IMPACT – State Government	FY 2027 (10 Mo.)	FY 2028	FY 2029	Fully Implemented (FY 2031)
GENERAL REVENUE				
Cost – DOC (§610.141) Expungement of records p.7	$0 or (Unknown)	$0 or (Unknown)	$0 or (Unknown)	$0 or (Unknown)
Transfer Out – To the Missouri Expungement Fund p.6	(Could exceed $5,450,173)	(Could exceed $4,447,770)	(Could exceed $4,517,111)	(Likely to exceed $1,423,885)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE	**(Could exceed $5,450,173)**	**(Could exceed $4,447,770)**	**(Could exceed $4,517,111)**	**(Likely to exceed $1,423,885)**
MISSOURI EXPUNGEMENT FUND				
Revenue – (§610.144) Gifts, grants, donations p.6	$0 or Unknown	$0 or Unknown	$0 or Unknown	$0 or Unknown
Transfer In – (§§610.141 - 610.144) From General Revenue p.6	Could exceed $5,450,173	Could exceed $4,447,770	Could exceed $4,517,111	Likely to exceed $1,423,885
Cost – OSCA (§§610.141 - 610.144) Show-Me Courts & Other System updates and maintenance p.3	(Could exceed $750,000)	(Could exceed $750,000)	(Could exceed $750,000)	(Could exceed $500,000)
Cost – DPS-MHP (§610.141 - 610.144) p.3-5	Could exceed	Could exceed	Could exceed	Likely to exceed
Personal service	($1,505,937)	($1,843,266)	($1,880,132)	($482,172)
Fringe benefits	($1,326,850)	($1,623,733)	($1,656,208)	($424,745)
Equipment and expense	($231,644)	($67,881)	($67,881)	($16,968)
Total Costs – DPS-MHP	($3,064,431)	($3,534,880)	($3,604,221)	($923,885)
FTE Change – DPS-MHP	Could exceed 28 FTE	Could exceed 28 FTE	Could exceed 28 FTE	Could exceed 7 FTE

FISCAL IMPACT – State Government	FY 2027 (10 Mo.)	FY 2028	FY 2029	Fully Implemented (FY 2031)
Cost – DPS-MHP (§§610.141 to 610.144) Leased space for 28 FTE p.5	(Could exceed $135,742)	(Could exceed $162,890)	(Could exceed $162,890)	$0 or (Up to $162,890)
Cost – DPS-MHP (§§610.141 to 610.144) Criminal History System upgrade p.5-6	($1,500,000 to $2,250,000)	$0	$0	$0
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE MISSOURI EXPUNGEMENT FUND	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**
Estimated Net FTE Change on the Missouri Expungement Fund	Could exceed 28 FTE	Could exceed 28 FTE	Could exceed 28 FTE	Could exceed 7 FTE
FEDERAL FUNDS				
Revenue Loss – MODOT (§§610.141) Non-compliance with Federal rules p.6-7	$0 or (Up to $555,876)	$0 or (Up to $1,111,753)	$0 or (Up to $2,779,382)	$0 or (Up to $5,558,765)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS	**$0 or (Up to $555,876)**	**$0 or (Up to $1,111,753)**	**$0 or (Up to $2,779,382)**	**$0 or (Up to $5,558,765)**

FISCAL IMPACT – Local Government	FY 2027 (10 Mo.)	FY 2028	FY 2029	Fully Implemented (FY 2031)
LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS				
Cost – (§610.144.2) To expunge records p.7-8	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS	**(Unknown)**	**(Unknown)**	**(Unknown)**	**(Unknown)**

FISCAL IMPACT – Small Business

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

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

The bill specifies that, starting January 1, 2031, the Office of State Courts Administrator (OSCA) must submit an annual report to the Joint Committee on the Justice System, the House Judiciary Committee, and the Senate Judiciary and Civil and Criminal Jurisprudence Committee. This report must include specified statistical information, including the number of eligible offenses identified, the number of records objected to for automatic expungement, and the number of expungement orders issued.

Currently, in a criminal prosecution for murder in the first degree, the court must instruct the jury that, in the event it cannot reach a consensus on punishment, the court may assess punishment, including death. This bill repeals that provision and provides a procedure for when a jury cannot reach a unanimous decision on punishment.

This bill also establishes an automatic record-clearing or expungement process for closing records pertaining to a “clean slate eligible offense”, which is an offense not excluded from the eligibility for expungement. This process will be phased in and an individual can be granted more than one expungement under this bill, subject to specified parameters and expectations. This bill also provides that, on a quarterly basis, OSCA must identify records that have become eligible in the last quarter and make these records accessible to the central repository and every prosecuting agency in the State within 100 days of the record becoming eligible for automated expungement. If a court finds, after a motion, a conviction was improperly or erroneously expunged under this provision, the court must reinstate the conviction.

The bill provides that a credit bureau can report records of arrests, indictments pending trial, and convictions for no more than seven years from the date of final disposition. A credit bureau can no longer report these records if at any time after conviction, indictment, or arrest it is learned that a full pardon or expungement has been granted for the conviction.

This bill creates in the State Treasury the "Missouri Expungement Fund", which is a fund dedicated to the creation, operation, and maintenance of the program. OSCA, the Department of Public Safety, and the Information Technology Services Division within the Office of Administration will expend money from the Fund, upon appropriation.

This legislation is not federally mandated, would not duplicate any other program but would require additional capital improvements or rental space.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Attorney General's Office
Department of Commerce and Insurance
Department of Corrections
Department of Labor and Industrial Relations
Department of Revenue
Department of Public Safety –
    Director's Office
    Missouri Highway Patrol
Department of Social Services
Office of the Governor
Missouri Department of Transportation
Office of Administration
Office of the State Courts Administrator
Office of the State Public Defender
Office of the State Treasurer
City of Kansas City
Phelps County Sheriff
Branson Police Department
Kansas City Police Department
St. Louis County Police Department
Missouri House of Representatives
Missouri Senate
Missouri Lottery Commission

Julie Morff
Director
February 26, 2026

Jessica Harris
Assistant Director
February 26, 2026

HWC:LR:OD