

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 4920H.03P
 Bill No.: Perfected HCS for HB 2292
 Subject: Animals; Department of Health and Senior Services; Children's Division
 Type: Original
 Date: April 2, 2026

Bill Summary: This proposal modifies provisions relating to abuse and neglect reporting, including a requirement to report companion animal abuse.

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND

FUND AFFECTED	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029
General Revenue*	(\$41,109 to Unknown)	(\$61,030 to Unknown)	(\$62,251 to Unknown)
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue	(\$41,109 to Unknown)	(\$61,030 to Unknown)	(\$62,251 to Unknown)

*DOC notes that current capacity will be met by July 2029 (FY 2030) or potentially much sooner. Therefore, Oversight has made the decision to reflect the marginal cost of incarceration up to an unknown cost if DOC needs to add staff and/or rehabilitate, expand or construct additional capacity. Oversight assumes the unknown cost has the potential to exceed \$250,000.

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	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

Officials from the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services** did not respond to **Oversight's** request for fiscal impact for this proposal.

§§192.2405, 192.2510, 210.115, 210.191, 273.410 and 273.415 – Abuse and Neglect Reporting, Including Reporting Animal Abuse

In response to a previous version, HCS for HB 2292 (2026), officials from the **Department of Public Safety-Missouri Veterans Commission (MVC)** stated every MVC Homes employee would require 60 minutes of training on animal abuse/neglect. There are approximately 1,574 FTEs in the Homes Program. The average hourly salary for Homes FTEs is \$23.88. The fiscal impact for training all Homes employees for one hour is \$37,587.12. This does not take into consideration hourly and intermittent employees who are also mandatory reporters.

Oversight notes MVC has provided a range of impact based on 1,574 to 1,600 employees.

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

Officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)** state §273.415 requires those that are mandated reporters that fail to make a report as required by this section shall be subject to discipline by his or her respective licensing board. This process would require hearings with a potential cost up to \$100,000. These costs which will be dependent on the number of hearing appeals the State Board receives, which include but are not limited to:

- Hearing officer time for hearing and drafting recommendations for the State Board.
- Administrative assistant time to schedule hearings, provide notice to parties and any settlement negotiations.
- Court reporter costs.

For cost explanation purposes, the average cost for a teacher discipline hearing is \$566.55/hearing:

- Average of 3 hours of hearing officer time * average of \$58.08/hour
- Average of 7 hours administrative assistant time * \$31.08/hour
- Average of \$174.75 in court reporter costs/hearing.

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a range of impact of \$0 (no hearings) to Less than \$100,000 in costs (hearings by the State Board) as estimated by DESE in the fiscal note.

In response to a previous version, HCS for HB 2292 (2026), officials from the **Office of Administration - Budget and Planning (B&P)** stated to the extent that this proposal creates new professional disciplinary fines for failure to report animal abuse and introduces penalties for false reporting, Total State Revenue and 18e may increase by an unknown amount.

In response to similar legislation, SB 995 (2024), **Oversight** contacted the **Department of Commerce and Insurance**, since it appears the fines imposed would be administrative fines rather than criminal fines. DCI stated their position regarding administrative fines is that the intent of the fine is the same as the intent of criminal fines. Any fines collected by professional licensing boards would be distributed to schools.

Oversight notes that violations of section §273.410 could result in fines or penalties. Oversight also notes per Article IX Section 7 of the Missouri Constitution fines and penalties collected by counties are distributed to school districts. Fine varies widely from year to year and are distributed to the school district where the violation occurred. Oversight will reflect a positive fiscal impact of \$0 to Unknown to local school districts. For simplicity, Oversight will not reflect the possibility that fine revenue paid to school districts may act as a subtraction in the foundation formula.

In response to a previous version, HCS for HB 2292 (2026), officials from the **Department of Health and Senior Services (DHSS)** stated sections 192.2510 and 273.415 of the proposed legislation require all persons providing protective services to eligible adults to complete at least one and a half hours of training on how to identify companion animal neglect, how to make a report of companion animal abuse or neglect, and the relationship between adult abuse and neglect and companion animal abuse and neglect within the first sixty days of employment. Further, this section also requires the Department of Health and Senior Services (DHSS), in consultation with animal welfare associations, to develop or adapt available training materials.

DHSS, Division of Senior and Disability Services (DSDS), Section for Adult Protective Services (APS) has 257 team members that would require this training. Furthermore, APS hires approximately 44 Social Service Specialists each year that would be required to take the training described above. APS estimates it would take one training staff 40 hours to develop or modify existing training materials in collaboration with DSS. Additionally, APS estimates that this would equate to an additional 12 hours per year to facilitate such training for our staff on an ongoing basis.

It is assumed that the Department can absorb the costs of this bill with current resources. However, if the workload significantly increased or other legislation was enacted, additional resources would be requested through the appropriation process.

Oversight assumes DHSS is provided with core funding to handle a certain amount of activity each year. Oversight assumes DHSS could absorb the costs related to this proposal. If multiple bills pass which require additional staffing and duties at substantial costs, DHSS could request

funding through the appropriation process. Officials from the DHSS assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

Officials from the **Department of Mental Health (DMH)** state this proposal adds or modifies sections 192.2405, 192.2510, 210.115, 210.191, 273.410, and 273.415 with various requirements about abuse and neglect reporting and animal abuse.

Section 192.2510.1 is added stating all persons providing protective services to eligible adults, defined in section 192.400, shall be required to complete at least one hour of training within the first sixty days of employment that can be completed during regular working hours. Subsection 2 states DHSS in consultation with animal welfare associations, shall develop or adapt and use available training materials for the required training under this section.

Section 210.191 is added stating all children's division employees and their contractors who have direct contact with children through the state's child protection and welfare system shall be required to complete at least one hour of animal abuse training within the first sixty days of employment.

Section 273.410.1 is added stating if there is reasonable cause to suspect that an animal may be subjected to abuse, the person shall immediately make a report to the hotline. Subsection 4 states a person required to report animal abuse shall be immune from civil or criminal liability. Subsection 6 states if any state agency determines a mandated reporter employee has failed to make a report, the agency shall include a finding of facts and the notice shall be retained in a separate file maintained by the agency and considered a closed record under chapter 610. Subsection 7 is added stating any required person who is subject to professional licensure, and who fails to make a report, shall be subject to discipline by their licensing board.

It is unclear to what extent the Department of Mental Health (DMH) team members would be included within this mandate as persons "who have direct contact with such adults". It is possible that all direct care workers, plus additional administrative team members would need this training. Adding an additional hourly training will increase overall training costs for DMH team members. It would also need to be determined how the training will be tracked and if any extra procedures need to be developed to allow for reporting.

DMH cannot calculate a fiscal impact on the Department at this stage; therefore, the fiscal impact is unknown.

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Oversight assumes the DMH has sufficient staff and resources to absorb the additional duties required by this proposal as it relates to the one hour of additional training personnel would be required to receive. However, if the DMH would require additional resources to meet the requirements of this proposal, Oversight assumes they could request those resources through the appropriations process. Oversight will reflect no fiscal impact for this agency for purposes of this fiscal note.

In response to a previous version, HCS for HB 2292 (2026), officials from the **Office of Attorney General (AGO)** assumed any potential litigation costs arising from this proposal could 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 **St. Louis County Police Department** estimate the proposed bill will require an hour of training for all commissioned officers. The average pay for Police Officers including fringe benefits is \$53.03 an hour. The Department currently has approximately 820 officers. The total cost for an hour and a half of training is \$65,226.90.

Officials from the **Branson Police Department** assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

However, in response to a previous version, HB 2292 (2026), officials from the **Branson Police Department** assumed there would be a minimal impact to this agency, as the Department employs one animal control officer. Since this officer works well with their police officers, they already have a relationship to report concerns to the police. The cost would be to have the animal control officer attend or complete the training and any travel to the training location. Again, this will have minimal impact and is a small price to pay to ensure that any suspected child abuse or neglect is reported.

In response to a previous version, HB 2292 (2026), officials from the **Perryville Police Department** indicated a fiscal impact, but do not specify the type or amount.

Oversight notes the fiscal impact for the St. Louis County and Branson police departments. Oversight is unable to project a statewide cost; therefore Oversight will reflect a potential \$0 or (Unknown) cost to local police and sheriffs' departments from this proposal to update policies and conduct training.

In response to a previous version, HB 2292 (2026), officials from the **High Point R-III School District** indicate a fiscal impact, but do not specify the type or amount.

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. However, Oversight assumes school districts have sufficient ability to provide one hour of training to staff within current funding levels and will present no fiscal impact to this agency for fiscal note purposes.

In response to a previous version, HB 2292 (2026), officials from the **Eastern Clay Ambulance District** indicated a fiscal impact, but do not specify the type or amount.

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. However, Oversight assumes ambulance districts have sufficient ability to provide one hour of training to staff within current funding levels and will present no fiscal impact to this agency for fiscal note purposes.

Officials from the **University of Missouri System** expect that compliance with the proposed legislation could increase costs in excess of \$500,000 with a recurring cost in excess of \$50,000 per year, depending on how the mandated 90-minute training is implemented.

Oversight assumes colleges and universities are provided with core funding to handle a certain amount of activity each year. Oversight further assumes that a full-time trainer will not be required to provide one and one-half hour of training within the first sixty days of employment. Oversight assumes cities and counties could absorb the costs related to this proposal.

Officials from the **City of Kansas City** state the proposed legislation will have a negative fiscal impact because the City will have to hire a trainer and have employees spend time on training.

However, in response to a previous version, HB 2292 (2026), officials from the **City of Kansas City** assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their organization. **Oversight** notes the one and one-half hour of training within the first sixty days of employment provision is the same in this version as in the previous version.

Oversight assumes cities and counties are provided with core funding to handle a certain amount of activity each year. Oversight further assumes that a full-time trainer will not be required to provide one and one-half hour of training within the first sixty days of employment. Oversight assumes cities and counties could absorb the costs related to this proposal.

In response to the bill as a whole as amended, officials from the **Office of the State Auditor, Office of the State Courts Administrator, Missouri Department of Transportation, Missouri Department of Conservation, Department of Labor and Industrial Relations, Department of Revenue, Office of Administration - Administrative Hearing Commission, Department of Commerce and Insurance, Department of Natural Resources, Department of Public Safety (Office of the Director, Alcohol and Tobacco Control, Division of Fire Safety and State Emergency Management Agency), Department of Social Services, Missouri Department of Agriculture, MoDOT & Patrol Employees' Retirement System, Office of Administration, Office of the State Treasurer, Platte County Board of Elections, Newton County Health Department, Phelps County Sheriff's Department, Kansas City Police Department, Northwest Missouri State University, Office of the Lieutenant Governor, Legislative Research, Oversight Division, Missouri Lottery, Missouri House of Representatives, Joint Committee on Public Employee Retirement, Missouri Senate, Missouri State Employees' Retirement System and State Tax 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 a previous version, HCS for HB 2292 (2026), officials from **Department of Economic Development, Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development, Department of Public Safety (Capitol Police, Missouri Gaming Commission and Missouri Highway Patrol), Missouri National Guard, Office of the State Public Defender, St. Louis County Board of Elections, St. Louis City Board of Elections, University of Central Missouri, Office of the Governor** and the **Missouri Consolidated Health Care Plan** each assumed the proposal would 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 a previous version, HB 2292 (2026), officials from the **Kansas City Election Board** 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.

In response to similar legislation, HB 1298 (2025), officials from the **Joint Committee On Education, City of O'Fallon, City of Osceola, Jackson County Election Board, and East Buchanan County C-1 School District** each assumed the proposal would 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 that we have received from state agencies and political subdivisions; however, other cities, various county officials, local public health agencies, nursing homes, public administrators, sheriffs' and police departments, ambulance and EMS organizations, schools, hospitals and colleges and universities 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.

House Amendment 1

§§578.006 & 578.012 – Animal Abuse

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** state section 578.012, found in HA 1, expands the offense of animal abuse to include starvation knowingly inflicted on an animal. The penalty is a class E felony.

As these are new crimes, there is little direct data on which to base an estimate, and as such, the department estimates an impact comparable to the creation of a new class E felony.

For each new nonviolent class E felony, the department estimates one person could be sentenced to prison and two to probation. The average sentence for a nonviolent class E felony offense is 3.4 years, with 1.4 years served in prison prior to first release. Probation sentences will be 3 years.

The cumulative impact on the department is estimated to be 2 additional offenders in prison and 7 additional offenders on field supervision by FY 2029.

The cumulative impact on the department is estimated to be 2 additional offenders in prison and 7 additional offenders on field supervision by FY 2029.

	# to prison	Cost per year	Total Costs for prison	Change in & parole officers	Total cost for probation and parole	# to probation & parole	Grand Total - Prison and Probation (includes 2% inflation)
Year 1	1	(\$11,123)	\$ 9,269	0	\$0	2	\$ 9,269
Year 2	2	(\$11,123)	\$ 22,691	0	\$0	4	\$ 22,691
Year 3	2	(\$11,123)	\$ 23,145	0	\$0	7	\$ 23,145
Year 4	2	(\$11,123)	\$ 23,608	0	\$0	7	\$ 23,608
Year 5	2	(\$11,123)	\$ 24,080	0	\$0	7	\$ 24,080
Year 6	2	(\$11,123)	\$ 24,561	0	\$0	7	\$ 24,561
Year 7	2	(\$11,123)	\$ 25,053	0	\$0	7	\$ 25,053
Year 8	2	(\$11,123)	\$ 25,554	0	\$0	7	\$ 25,554
Year 9	2	(\$11,123)	\$ 26,065	0	\$0	7	\$ 26,065
Year 10	2	(\$11,123)	\$ 26,586	0	\$0	7	\$ 26,586

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.

In response to similar legislation, SB 1304 (2026), officials from the **Office of the State Public Defender (SPD)** assume, per the National Public Defense Workload Study, the new charge contemplated by this change to Section 578.006, would take approximately fourteen hours of SPD work for reasonably effective representation. If one hundred cases were filed under this

section in a fiscal year, representation would result in a need for an additional attorney. Because the number of cases that will be filed under this statute is unknown, the exact additional number of attorneys necessary is unknown. Each case would also result in unknown increased costs in the need for core staff, travel, and litigation expenses. However, if the charge was classified as a class D misdemeanor no jail time would be authorized and the cases would not qualify for SPD representation.

Oversight assumes this proposal will create a minimal number of new cases and that the SPD can absorb the additional caseload required by this proposal with current staff and resources. Therefore, Oversight will reflect no fiscal impact to the SPD for fiscal note purposes. However, if multiple bills pass which require additional staffing and duties, the SPD may request funding through the appropriation process.

In response to similar legislation, SB 1304 (2026), officials from the **Missouri Highway Patrol** assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their organization.

In response to similar legislation, HB 910 (2025), officials from the **Office of the State Courts Administrator** assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their organization.

In response to similar legislation, HB 910 (2025), officials from the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services (MOPS)** stated this proposal has no measurable fiscal impact to MOPS. However, the enactment of a new crime (§578.006) creates additional responsibilities for county prosecutors and the circuit attorney which may in turn result in additional costs which are difficult to determine.

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

Oversight notes a violation of the provisions of this proposal results in a misdemeanor or felony charge which carries a fine in addition to any individual county/municipal fees and court costs. The fine revenue for the ticket goes to local school funds and court costs go to various state and local funds. Oversight assumes there will be some (less than \$250,000) amount of fine revenue from violations of the statute. For simplicity, Oversight will not reflect the increased revenue from fines and court costs to various state funds and local political subdivisions. Below are examples of some of the state and local funds which court costs are distributed to.

	Fee Amount
Basic Civil Legal Services Fund	\$8.00
Clerk Fee	\$15.00 (\$12 State/\$3 County)
County Fee	\$25.00
State Court Automation Fund	\$7.00
Crime Victims' Compensation Fund	\$7.50
DNA Profiling Analysis Fund	\$15.00
Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) Fund	\$1.00
Motorcycle Safety Trust Fund	\$1.00
Brain Injury Fund	\$2.00
Independent Living Center Fund	\$1.00
Sheriff's Fee	\$10.00 (County)
Prosecuting Attorney and Circuit Attorney Training Fund	\$5.00
Prosecuting Attorney Training Fund	\$5.00 (\$2.50 State/\$2.50 County)
Spinal Cord Injury Fund	\$2.00

House Amendment 2

In response to similar legislation, HB 3038 (2026), officials from the **Department of Health and Senior Services (DHSS)** 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 notes that the DHSS website (<https://health.mo.gov/seniors/abuse.php>) describes the current Adult Protective Services (APS) program as follows:

APS is a social services program focused on helping elderly adults and adults with disabilities live with dignity and respect by investigating allegations of abuse, neglect, self-neglect, and exploitation.

In Missouri, an elderly adult or adult with disabilities must meet all of these criteria:

- *18-59 years old with a disability or 60 and over.*
- *Unable to protect his/her own interests or meet his/her essential needs.*
- *Lives in the community or a facility and is currently located in Missouri.*

APS will investigate the suspected abuse, neglect, self-neglect, or exploitation and connect the individual with support services if the individual wishes to receive them.

If the alleged victim lives in his or her own home or community, an investigator will help the alleged victim determine the services or interventions needed to stop or alleviate the abuse. The services may include:

- *community supportive services, such as personal care, respite, or chore services;*

- *home-delivered nutrition services;*
- *financial or legal assistance and protections, such as representative payee, direct deposit, trusts, protective services, civil suit or criminal charges;*
- *counseling for the victim;*
- *referral to other community resources, and;*
- *when needed, guardianship proceedings or nursing home placement.*

In response to similar legislation, HB 3038 (2026), officials from the **Department of Public Safety (Office of the Director, Missouri Highway Patrol and Missouri Veterans Commission)** assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their organization.

Oversight notes that the above-mentioned agencies have stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organization. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact on the fiscal note for this amendment.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2027 (10 Mo.)	FY 2028	FY 2029
GENERAL REVENUE			
<u>Cost – DPS-MVC (\$192.2510)</u> Additional employee training p.3	Up to (\$31,840)	Up to (\$38,972)	Up to (\$39,752)
<u>Cost – DESE (\$273.410)</u> Hearings held by the State Board p.3	Less than (\$100,000)	Less than (\$100,000)	Less than (\$100,000)
<u>Cost (\$578.012)</u> DOC– increase in incarceration and probation and parole costs p.9-10	(\$9,269 to <u>Unknown</u>)	(\$22,691 to <u>Unknown</u>)	(\$23,145 to <u>Unknown</u>)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE	(\$41,109 to <u>Unknown</u>)	(\$61,030 to <u>Unknown</u>)	(\$62,251 to <u>Unknown</u>)

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – Local Government</u>	FY 2027 (10 Mo.)	FY 2028	FY 2029
LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS			
<u>Revenue Gain</u> – School Districts (§273.410) Fines p.4	\$0 to Unknown	\$0 to Unknown	\$0 to Unknown
<u>Cost</u> – Local Law Enforcement Agencies (§273.415) Additional training p.6	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)

FISCAL IMPACT – Small Business

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

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

This bill modifies provisions relating to abuse and neglect reporting, including a requirement to report companion animal abuse.

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
- Office of Administration
- Administrative Hearing Commission
- Budget and Planning
- Department of Commerce and Insurance
- Department of Corrections
- Department of Economic Development
- Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
- Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development
- Department of Health and Senior Services
- Department of Mental Health
- Department of Natural Resources

Department of Labor and Industrial Relations
Department of Revenue
Department of Public Safety –
 Alcohol and Tobacco Control
 Capitol Police
 Division of Fire Safety
 Office of the Director
 Missouri Gaming Commission
 Missouri Highway Patrol
 Missouri Veterans Commission
 State Emergency Management Agency
Department of Social Services
Joint Committee On Education
Missouri Department of Agriculture
Missouri Department of Conservation
Missouri Department of Transportation
MoDOT & Patrol Employees' Retirement System
Missouri National Guard
Office of the Secretary of State
Office of the State Courts Administrator
Office of the State Public Defender
Office of the State Treasurer
City of Kansas City
City of O'Fallon
City of Osceola
Jackson County Election Board
Kansas City Election Board
Platte County Election Authority
St. Louis City Board of Elections
St. Louis County Election Authority
Newton County Health Department
Phelps County Sheriff's Department
Branson Police Department
Kansas City Police Department
Perryville Police Department
St. Louis County Police Department
East Buchanan County C-1 School District
High Point R-III School District
Northwest Missouri State University
University of Central Missouri
University of Missouri System
Office of the Governor
Office of the Lieutenant Governor
Office of the State Auditor

L.R. No. 4920H.03P
Bill No. Perfected HCS for HB 2292
Page **16** of **16**
April 2, 2026

Missouri House of Representatives
Joint Committee on Administrative Rules
Joint Committee on Public Employee Retirement
Legislative Research
Oversight Division
Missouri Senate
Missouri Lottery
Missouri Consolidated Health Care Plan
Missouri State Employee's Retirement System
State Tax Commission



Julie Morff
Director
April 2, 2026



Jessica Harris
Assistant Director
April 2, 2026