

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH  
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

**FISCAL NOTE**

L.R. No.: 5546H.02C  
 Bill No.: HCS for HB 2904  
 Subject: Crimes and Punishment; Criminal Procedure; Animals  
 Type: Original  
 Date: April 13, 2026

Bill Summary: This proposal modifies and establishes provisions relating to animal abuse.

**FISCAL SUMMARY**

**ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND**

FUND AFFECTED	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029
General Revenue*	(\$9,269 to Unknown)	(\$22,691 to Unknown)	(\$23,145 to Unknown)
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue</b>	<b>(\$9,269 to Unknown)</b>	<b>(\$22,691 to Unknown)</b>	<b>(\$23,145 to Unknown)</b>

\*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
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

**ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS**

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

**ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)**

FUND AFFECTED	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

- Estimated Net Effect (expenditures or reduced revenues) expected to exceed \$250,000 in any of the three fiscal years after implementation of the act or at full implementation of the act.
- Estimated Net Effect (savings or increased revenues) expected to exceed \$250,000 in any of the three fiscal years after implementation of the act or at full implementation of the act.

**ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS**

FUND AFFECTED	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029
<b>Local Government</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**FISCAL ANALYSIS**

**ASSUMPTION**

**§§578.006 and 578.012 – Animal Abuse**

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** state this proposal modifies the offense of animal abuse.

Section 578.012 is modified to include a clause that makes animal abuse a class E felony when it involves lack of adequate care that resulted in starvation.

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, of which 2.1 years could be served in prison with 1.4 years to first release. The remaining 1.3 years could be on parole. Probation sentences could 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.

	# to prison	Cost per year	Total Costs for <b>prison</b>	Change in probation & parole officers	Total cost for <b>probation and parole</b>	# 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.

Officials from the **Office of the State Public Defender (SPD)** state per the National Public Defense Workload Study, the new charge contemplated by the addition of the new 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 not create the number of new cases required to request additional FTE for the SPD 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 a 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 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.

Officials from the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol, Missouri Department of Agriculture, Office of the State Courts Administrator, City of Kansas City, Phelps County Sheriff, Branson Police Department, Kansas City Police Department, and St. Louis County Police Department** each assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

In response to a previous version, officials from the **Blue Springs Police Department** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

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

Oversight only reflects the responses that we have received from state agencies and political subdivisions; however, other cities, counties, local law enforcement were requested to respond to this proposed legislation but did not. Upon the receipt of additional responses, Oversight will review to determine if an updated fiscal note should be prepared and seek the necessary approval to publish a new fiscal note. A general listing of political subdivisions included in our database is available upon request.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2027 (10 Mo.)	FY 2028	FY 2029
<b>GENERAL REVENUE</b>			
<u>Cost – DOC (§578.012) Increased incarceration costs p.3-4</u>	(\$9,269 to <u>Unknown</u> )	(\$22,691 to <u>Unknown</u> )	(\$23,145 to <u>Unknown</u> )
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE GENERAL REVENUE FUND</b>	<b>(\$9,269 to <u>Unknown</u>)</b>	<b>(\$22,691 to <u>Unknown</u>)</b>	<b>(\$23,145 to <u>Unknown</u>)</b>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – Local Government</u>	FY 2027 (10 Mo.)	FY 2028	FY 2029
	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>	<b><u>\$0</u></b>

FISCAL IMPACT – Small Business

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

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

ANIMAL ABUSE (Sections 578.006 and 578.012)

The bill creates the offense of filing a malicious false report of animal abuse, which is a class C misdemeanor. This bill specifies that the offense of animal abuse is a class E felony if the person who has ownership or custody of an animal knowingly starves the animal. The bill also removes the requirement that any torture or mutilation inflicted on a live animal be done consciously.

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

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Attorney General’s Office  
 Department of Corrections  
 Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol  
 Missouri Department of Agriculture  
 Office of the State Courts Administrator  
 Office of the State Public Defender  
 Missouri Office of Prosecution Services

L.R. No. 5546H.02C  
Bill No. HCS for HB 2904  
Page 7 of 7  
April 13, 2026

City of Kansas City  
Phelps County Sheriff  
Blue Springs Police Department  
Branson Police Department  
Kansas City Police Department  
St. Louis County Police Department



Julie Morff  
Director  
April 13, 2026



Jessica Harris  
Assistant Director  
April 13, 2026