

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 6162S.08A
 Bill No.: SS for SCS for HCS for HB Nos. 2637 & 3155 with SA 1 and SA 3
 Subject: Children and Minors; Courts; Courts, Juvenile; Crimes and Punishment; Criminal Procedure; Law Enforcement Officers and Agencies
 Type: Original
 Date: April 23, 2026

Bill Summary: This proposal modifies provisions relating to the criminal justice systems.

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND

#FUND AFFECTED	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029	Fully Implemented (FY 2036)
General Revenue*	(\$1,250,268 to Unknown)	More or less than \$445,523	(More or less than \$871,169,756)	(More or less than \$26,224,770)
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue	(\$1,250,268 to Unknown)	More or less than \$445,523	(More or less than \$871,169,756)	(More or less than \$26,224,770)

*Oversight assumes due to the capacity projections noted by DOC and the length of offenders' sentences under this proposed legislation which would increase the offender population by 1,806 by year ten, Oversight has made the decision to reflect the cost of one new prison (could exceed \$825,000,000) along with operational costs (approximately \$50,000,000) beginning in FY 2029.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS

FUND AFFECTED	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029	Fully Implemented (FY 2036)
Missouri State Prosecutorial Services Grant Fund*	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other State Funds</u>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

*Transfer in less distributions net to zero.

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS

FUND AFFECTED	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029	Fully Implemented (FY 2036)
Federal Funds*	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All Federal Funds</u>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

*Revenue gain and costs to DMH are unknown but could exceed \$250,000 annually and net to \$0.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)

FUND AFFECTED	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029	Fully Implemented (FY 2036)
General Revenue	0 FTE	4 FTE	12 FTE	20 FTE
Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE	0 FTE	4 FTE	12 FTE	20 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 2036)
Local Government	(Unknown) to Unknown	(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.

§§43.500, 43.503, 43.506, 43.509, 43.527, 43.530, 527.270, 589.400, 589.401, 589.403, 589.404, 589.405, 589.407, 589.410, 589.411, 589.412, 589.413, 589.414, 589.415, 589.417, 632.489, 632.492, 632.495, 632.504, and 632.520 – Sexual Offenses

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** state it is unknown the number of petitioners that would request to access records outlined in §589.401, however, this could have a minimal impact on the department, which could be absorbed. Should the number of petitioners increase substantially, it could have a significant fiscal impact on the department.

Section 632.495 modifies a provision regarding the Department of Mental Health (DMH) entering into an interagency agreement with DOC for the housing of sexually violent predators or those that may meet the definition of such as determined by the courts. It adds that the department would have to have necessary space and services available, and the director would have to agree to provide such confinement. It also allows DOC to enter into other contractual agreements to provide necessary services. Currently, no plans to enter into an interagency agreement have been made, however, this legislation permits future joint collaboration should this legislation pass. Should arrangements be made and the department enters into an agreement with the Department of Mental Health, the DOC could request any necessary funding from the General Assembly through the budget process. However, at this time, the department assumes a no impact to this section.

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight assumes the DOC 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 DOC for fiscal note purposes. However, if multiple bills pass which require additional staffing and duties, the DOC may request funding through the appropriation process.

In response to a previous version, officials from the **Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA)** stated there may be some impact but there is no way to quantify that amount currently. Any significant changes will be reflected in future budget requests.

Oversight notes OSCA assumes this proposal may have some impact on their organization although it can't be quantified at this time. As OSCA is unable to provide additional information regarding the potential impact, Oversight assumes the proposed legislation will have a \$0 or

(Unknown) cost to the General Revenue Fund. For fiscal note purposes, Oversight also assumes the impact will be under \$250,000 annually. If this assumption is incorrect, this would alter the fiscal impact as presented in this fiscal note. If additional information is received, Oversight will review it to determine if an updated fiscal note should be prepared and seek approval to publish a new fiscal note.

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 a previous version, officials from the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services (MOPS)** stated they provide training and continuing legal education to Missouri's elected prosecuting attorneys and assistant prosecuting attorneys. Each year, MOPS reviews criminal justice-related legislation enacted by the General Assembly and incorporates those statutory changes into training materials and legislative update presentations provided at statewide conferences and other continuing legal education programs.

To implement the provisions of this legislation, MOPS staff will be required to review the enacted statutory language, analyze the changes for purposes of criminal enforcement and charging decisions, update training materials and presentations, and then deliver the new information to law enforcement officers and prosecutors across the state.

MOPS anticipates that implementation of this legislation would require a modest amount of staff time to review and incorporate the statutory changes into existing training materials. The cost associated with this activity is unknown but expected to be minimal.

MOPS notes, however, that each legislative session produces numerous changes to criminal statutes that must be reviewed and incorporated into statewide training materials. While the fiscal impact of any individual bill is minimal, the cumulative effect of multiple statutory changes is not insignificant.

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight assumes MOPS will be able to perform any additional duties required by this proposal with current staff and resources and will reflect no fiscal impact to MOPS for fiscal note purposes.

In response to similar legislation, HCS SB 982 (2026), officials from the **Department of Health and Senior Services, Department of Mental Health, and Department of Public Safety – Missouri Highway Patrol** each assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

In response to a previous version, officials from the **Department of Social Services, Office of Administration**, and **Office of the State Public Defender** assumed 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.

§56.265 – Compensation for Prosecuting Attorneys

Oversight notes the provisions of §56.265.1(1) state a full-time prosecuting attorney of a charter, first or second class county, or of a city not within a county shall receive a compensation of 100% of a circuit judge salary (\$182,427). There are five charter counties, thirteen 1st class counties and three 2nd class counties along with the City of St. Louis.

Oversight notes the provisions of §56.265.1(2) state a full-time prosecuting attorney of 3rd and 4th class counties shall receive compensation equal to 95% of a circuit judge or (\$173,306). There are 89 3rd class counties and four 4th class counties.

Oversight notes a part-time prosecuting attorney shall receive compensation equal to 30-60% of an associate circuit judge or (\$50,350 to \$100,700).

Oversight does not have the information to determine which counties have full-time or part-time prosecuting attorneys on staff and what their current salaries are. Oversight assumes §56.265.9 sets up the Missouri State Prosecutorial Service Grant Fund to help supplement salaries for 3rd and 4th class counties based on need. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a \$0 or (Unknown) transfer from General Revenue going into the Missouri State Prosecutorial Service Grand Fund and a \$0 or (Unknown) transfer from this fund to 3rd and 4th class counties.

§211.071 – Juvenile Courts

Officials from the **DOC** state §211.071 is modified to allow juvenile offenders who are between 14 and 18 to be tried as adults if they have: committed an A or B felony, have committed any kind of felony under section 566 (sexual offenses), or have committed two felonies within 180 days of each other. The impact of section 211.071 is difficult to estimate. In FY 2025, there were:

- 2 Class D felony probations
- 1 Class E felony probation
- 1 Class A misdemeanor probation
- 1 Class E felony sent to prison
- 4 Class D felonies sent to prison
- 2 Class C felonies sent to prison

for offenders who were under 18 at the commission of offenses. It is unclear if these would have been subject to the new law, as we cannot determine the timing of offenses or if these sentences were the result of plea bargains. Therefore, the fiscal impact from this section is unknown.

§211.342 – Juvenile Detention Center

In response to similar legislation, TAFP SS #3 SB 888 (2026), officials from the **Office of Administration - Budget and Planning (B&P)** stated §211.342 of the proposal allows counties to establish a 1% sales tax for the purpose of establishing juvenile detention centers. B&P defers to local government for the fiscal impact. To the extent that increased sales taxes are collected by the Director of DOR, any collection fee would be an increase to TSR. B&P defers to DOR on the estimate of any tax collections.

Officials from the **Department of Revenue (DOR)** state this proposal would grant counties the ability to create a juvenile detention center. It would also allow counties within the same circuit to establish one juvenile detention center to share. This proposal also grants the counties the ability to adopt by a vote of the citizens of a county a sales tax to fund their portion of the juvenile detention center. The sales tax can be up to 1% on all retail sales in the county. The tax is to be collected by DOR who is allowed to retain 1% of the amount collected to reimburse the expense of collection.

The language of this proposal would become effective August 28, 2026, and it appears the first election in which the sales tax could be voted on would be the April 2027 municipal election. This proposal adds language stating that the sales tax would become effective the first day of the second quarter following the election. DOR notes that upon receipt of the election they would notify the vendors in the area of the new sales tax, and it would become effective October 1, 2027.

DOR is unable to predict which counties may choose to adopt this sales tax. DOR notes that once a new county passes the sales tax and notifies DOR, the DOR would get the new county set up. It will require the Department to make changes to Revenue Premier, Rate Manager, MyTax portal, Avalara Sales and use tax rate map, and website changes. These changes are estimated at \$1,887 per system change (\$7,548) for each county that passes it.

Oversight assumes DOR is provided with core funding to handle a certain amount of activity each year. Oversight assumes DOR could absorb the costs related to administrative and computer updates that could occur from the impact of a new county sales tax from the provisions of this proposal. If multiple bills pass which require additional staffing and duties at substantial costs, DOR could request funding through the appropriation process.

Oversight notes the first election in which the sales tax could be voted on would be in the April 2027 municipal election. If the sales tax is approved by the voters, then the first day the sales tax could take effect would begin October 1, 2027 (FY28). DOR's administrative collection of the sales tax from the counties would be in November of 2027. Oversight is also not aware of how

many counties would choose to adopt this sales tax. Therefore, Oversight will assume the unknown revenue collection from DOR's 1% fee will not meet the \$250,000 threshold.

Oversight does not have information to the contrary and therefore, Oversight will reflect a \$0 (no voter approval) or unknown revenue impact to general revenue for DOR's administrative collection of sales tax for the counties who vote in a sales tax to fund a Juvenile Detention Center within their judicial circuit beginning in FY28. Oversight will also reflect a \$0 (no voter approval) or unknown revenue to the County Juvenile Detention Center Sales Tax Trust Fund beginning in FY28.

In response to a previous version, officials from the **Department of Social Services (DSS)** stated this legislation, as written, could cause the Division of Youth Services to see an increase in Dual Jurisdiction referrals, potentially impacting the number of individuals served annually by this programming. It is difficult to predict whether that number will be minimal or substantial and what fiscal impact may occur. Juvenile Office and judicial discretion would play into each individual youth's case, making the impact more difficult to calculate.

Oversight assumes DSS would have a \$0 or (Unknown) fiscal impact. If DSS has an impact, it is assumed it could exceed \$250,000 annually.

Officials from the **DOC** state this proposal modifies provisions relating to the criminal justice system as follows:

§556.061 – Dangerous Felonies

Section 556.061 is modified to include all statutory rape in the first degree and all statutory sodomy in the first-degree cases to be dangerous felonies, not just those where the victim is less than 12 years old at the time of the offense. It also adds abuse through forced labor when punished under subsection 4 of §566.203, trafficking for the purposes of slavery, involuntary servitude, peonage, or forced labor or attempted trafficking for the purposes of slavery, involuntary servitude, peonage, or forced labor when punished under subsection 4 of section 566.206, trafficking for the purposes of sexual exploitation or attempted trafficking for the purposes of sexual exploitation when the offense was effected by force, abduction, or coercion, sexual trafficking of a child in the first degree, sexual trafficking of a child in the second degree, failure to register as a sex offender as a third offense as dangerous felonies, and endangering the welfare of a child in the first degree when punished under §568.045.

During FY 2025, there were 81 first releases from prison that would qualify as dangerous felonies under the proposed bill that were not required to serve 85 percent of their prison sentence under current statute. The average stay for these 81 releases was 6.5 years, with the average sentence being 11.2 years. If everyone in this group were to have been required to serve 85 percent, the stay length would have instead been 9.8 years.

The estimated impact of this section is 178 additional offenders in the prison population and 178 less in the field population by FY 2037. In the first ten years, the estimated impact is an additional 154 offenders in the prison population and 154 less in the field population by FY 2036.

§§558.011 and 558.016 – Prison Terms

It is assumed that those serving an MPT under 558.019 would instead serve the new minimum prison term (MPT) under §558.011. Due to uncertainty of how §558.016 will impact sentence lengths given by the courts, two sets of assumptions are given: The first set assumes the length of sentence will increase by a factor proportionate with the length of sentence from those who were release and would have met the definition of a persistent offender from FY 2022 to FY 2025. (For those going from B to A, a factor of 1.55 is applied to the actual sentence length. For those going from C to B, a factor of 1.42 is applied to the actual sentence length. For those going from D to C, a factor of 1.46 is applied to the actual sentence length. For those going from E to D, a factor of 1.4 is applied to the actual sentence length). A second set assumes the length of the sentence will stay the same or increase to the minimum sentence length for the new penalty class, whichever is greater. For instance, a class B felony sentence of 7 years would increase to 10 years, the minimum sentence length for a class A felony.

Class A Felonies (70%)

In FY 2025, there were 407 first releases from prison where the most serious sentence was a class A felony or have a class B felony and would be considered under class A felony parole guidelines after revised prior and persistent definitions are applied. These offenders served an average of 12.9 years to first release on an average sentence of 16.2 years. If offenders in this group had instead served at least 70% of their stay, they would have served 15.3 years to first release with an average sentence length of 18.1 years.

Due to the long length of sentences, this will result in no impact for the first ten fiscal years.

Class B Felonies (50%)

In FY 2025, there were 416 first releases on class B felonies or have a class C felony and would be considered under class B felony parole guidelines after revised prior and persistent definitions are applied. The average stay for these offenders was 5.6 years on an average sentence of 10.1 years. If instead these offenders were to serve at least 50% of their sentence, the average sentence length would be 11.5 years with 7.0 years served to first release. This would result in an increase of the prison population of 582 offenders and no change in the field population by FY 2038. In the first ten fiscal years, this will result in an increase in the prison population of 582 offenders and a decrease in the prison population of 582 offenders by FY 2036.

Class C Felonies (30 to 50%)

In FY 2025, there were 1,002 first releases whose most serious offense was a class C felony or have a class D felony and would be considered under class C felony parole guidelines after revised prior and persistent definitions are applied. These offenders served 2.5 years on average

of a 6.1-year average prison sentence. If these offenders had served under the proposed law the average sentence would have been 8.3 years with 3.7 years served to first release. Going forward, this would lead to an increase in the prison population of 1,503 offenders and an increase in the field population of 701 offenders by FY 2035.

Class D Felonies (20 to 50%)

In FY 2025, there were 1,341 first releases whose most serious offense was a class D felony or have a class E felony and would be considered under class D felony parole guidelines after revised prior and persistent definitions are applied. Of these offenders, the average stay was 1.9 years with an average sentence length of 4.9 years. If these offenders were required to serve under the proposed law, the average stay would have been 1.4 years with 5.2 years served to first release, resulting in a decrease of 268 offenders from the prison population and an increase of 670 offenders to the field population by FY 2032.

Class E Felonies (15 to 50%)

In FY 2025, there were 366 first releases who most serious offense was a class E felony. Of these offenders, the average stay was 1.6 years and the average sentence length was 3.6 years. If the current proposal were applied, the average stay would have been 1.5 years with an average sentence length of 3.6 years, resulting in a decrease to the prison population of 256 offenders and an increase in the field population of 256 offenders by FY 2029.

Bill as a Whole

In response to similar legislation, TAFP SS #3 SB 888 (2026), officials from the **Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA)** stated the proposed legislation modifies provisions relating to the criminal justice system.

The impact of any new legislation on the caseload of juvenile officers or the population of individuals in juvenile detention is difficult to predict. As drafted, the legislation would affect juvenile officer caseload complexity and could cause an unknown increase in the number of individuals in juvenile detention. For FY2027, based on the current juvenile caseload and detention population, the Judiciary has identified and requested a total of \$11,670,601 and 13.36 FTE. This includes the following:

- Based on the juvenile officer weighed workload model and support staff guidelines, no fewer than 13.36 FTE, with a personal services cost of \$817,516 and E&E of \$39,799 (\$28,281 one-time cost; \$11,518 on-going); and
- To staff and maintain juvenile detention centers at full capacity and in compliance with juvenile detention facility standards, a total of \$10,813,306, with personal services costs of \$1,057,306 and E&E of \$9,756,000 for security and mental health services.

Should the new legislation increase caseload or detention population beyond current staffing or current bed space, the necessary staffing resources will be reflected in future budget requests.

The proposed legislation is approximately 13.36 FTE and \$11,670,601 to an unknown amount.

Upon further inquiry, OSCA noted the costs they provided for the fiscal note are New Decision Items (NDIs) listed in the Judiciary FY 2027 Appropriations book. OSCA indicated the cost noted above is based on the current juvenile caseload and detention population. The impact of any new legislation on the caseload of juvenile officers or the population of individuals in juvenile detention is difficult to predict. As drafted, the legislation would affect juvenile officer caseload complexity and could cause an unknown increase in the number of individuals in juvenile detention. Should the new legislation increase caseload or detention population beyond current staffing or current bed space, the necessary staffing resources will be reflected in future budget requests.

For purposes of this fiscal note, **Oversight** assumes cost associated with this proposal would be in addition to the cost noted above for existing caseloads/detention population. Oversight will reflect an unknown cost for OSCA based on a potential increase in the number of individuals in juvenile detention.

In response to a previous version, officials from the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services (MOPS)** stated MOPS provides training and continuing legal education to Missouri's elected prosecuting attorneys and assistant prosecuting attorneys. Each year, MOPS reviews criminal justice-related legislation enacted by the General Assembly and incorporates those statutory changes into training materials and legislative update presentations provided at statewide conferences and other continuing legal education programs.

To implement the provisions of this legislation, MOPS staff will be required to review the enacted statutory language, analyze the changes for purposes of criminal enforcement and charging decisions, update training materials and presentations, and then deliver the new information to law enforcement officers and prosecutors across the state.

MOPS anticipates that implementation of this legislation would require a modest amount of staff time to review and incorporate the statutory changes into existing training materials. The cost associated with this activity is unknown but expected to be minimal.

MOPS notes, however, that each legislative session produces numerous changes to criminal statutes that must be reviewed and incorporated into statewide training materials. While the fiscal impact of any individual bill is minimal, the cumulative effect of multiple statutory changes is not insignificant.

In response to a previous version, officials from the **Office of the Secretary of State (SOS)** noted many bills considered by the General Assembly include provisions allowing or requiring agencies to submit rules and regulations to implement the act. The SOS is provided with core funding to handle a certain amount of normal activity resulting from each year's legislative session. The fiscal impact for this fiscal note to the SOS for Administrative Rules is less than

\$5,000. The SOS recognizes that this is a small amount and does not expect that additional funding would be required to meet these costs. However, the SOS also recognizes that many such bills may be passed by the General Assembly in a given year and that collectively the costs may be in excess of what the office can sustain with its core budget. Therefore, the SOS reserves the right to request funding for the cost of supporting administrative rules requirements should the need arise based on a review of the finally approved bills signed by the governor.

In response to a previous version, officials from the **Department of Mental Health, Department of Public Safety – Missouri Highway Patrol, Missouri Department of Transportation, and Branson Police Department** each assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

In response to similar legislation, TAFP SS #3 SB 888 (2026), officials from the **Office of the State Public Defender** 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.

§§577.800, 589.900, and 589.902 – Interception of Unmanned Aircraft Systems

In response to similar legislation, SCS HCS HB 2587 (2026), officials from the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol (MHP)** stated the Missouri State Highway Patrol's bomb squad is scheduled to receive federally funded equipment that will enhance its ability to respond to drone-related detection and mitigation calls, consistent with the capabilities contemplated in this legislation. This acquisition is tied to preparations for the upcoming FIFA World Cup and the need to safeguard event venues from drone-related threats. Although the initial purchase is federally funded, ongoing maintenance costs including licensing, warranties, and required software or hardware updates for the drone-related equipment will still be necessary to maintain operational readiness and compliance.

Oversight notes upon further inquiry, the Division of Drug and Crime Control (DDCC) indicated they will not need two (2) FTE to cover calls for drone and explosive related incidents; however, on-going maintenance fees/costs of \$193,469 annually would be required. Therefore, Oversight will reflect MHP's impact for fiscal note purposes.

Officials from the **DOC** state section 577.800 modifies provisions relating to law enforcement interception of unmanned aircraft systems.

Section 577.800 expands the offense of unlawful use of unmanned aircraft over an open-air facility to include a critical infrastructure facility. The penalty is an infraction, unless it is used to deliver a weapon, in which case it is a class B felony, or to deliver a controlled substance, in which case it is a class D 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 D felony and a new class B felony.

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

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

Given the seriousness of class B felony offenses and that the introduction of a completely new class B felony offense is a rare event, the department assumes the admission of one person per year to prison following the passage of the legislative proposal.

Offenders committed to prison with a class B felony as their most serious sentence, have an average sentence length of 9.0 years and serve on average, 3.4 years in prison prior to first release. The department assumes one third of the remaining sentence length will be served in prison as a parole return, and the rest of the sentence will be served on supervision in the community.

The cumulative impact on the department is estimated to be 5 additional offenders in prison and 0 additional offenders on field supervision by FY 2031.

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, SCS HCS HB 2587 (2026), officials from the **Department of Commerce and Insurance, Department of Natural Resources, Missouri Department of Conservation, Missouri Department of Transportation, Missouri National Guard, Office of the State Courts Administrator, City of Kansas City, Branson Police Department, and Wayne County PWSD #2** each assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

In response to a previous version, officials from the **Office of the State Public Defender, Missouri Office of Prosecution Services, and City of O'Fallon** each assumed 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.

This part of the proposal has an emergency clause.

Responses regarding the proposed legislation as a whole

In response to a previous version, officials from the **Department of Public Safety - Office of the Director, Kansas City Police Department, and St. Louis County Police Department** each assumed 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.

This proposal has a delayed implementation date of January 1, 2028, for §§211.436, 217.362, 217.690, 217.760, 557.011, 557.021, 558.011, 558.019, 558.026, 558.031, 558.046, 559.115, 566.030, 566.060, 566.125, 566.210, 566.211, 568.060, and 589.425.

Senate Amendment (SA) 1 - §27.117 – Assistance from the Attorney General

Oversight notes the provisions of this proposal state that a prosecuting or circuit attorney may request assistance from the Attorney General to assist in the prosecution of a violation of sections 565.090, 565.091, 565.225, 565.227, 565.400, 565.405, 573.570 or 573.575. The prosecuting or circuit attorney may request any resource or capability of the Attorney General when prosecuting such cases.

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. The AGO may seek additional appropriations if the proposal results in a significant increase in litigation or investigation costs.

Senate Amendment (SA) 1 - §57.540 – Compensation for the Attorney of the Sheriff of the City of St. Louis

In response to a similar legislation, SCS SB 944 (2026), officials from the **City of St. Louis** stated the proposed legislation would raise the salary limit for the position of Attorney of the Sheriff of the City of St. Louis. The current limit under the existing statute is \$15,000 (although payroll records may indicate current salary of \$25,000). Should the Sheriff of the City elect to raise this position's salary to the new limit, there would be an increase in cost to the City of at least \$50,000 in salary plus another \$14,000 in fringe benefits (FICA, pension, life insurance, etc.) bringing the total additional cost to nearly \$65,000.

Oversight notes in this version of the bill, the \$15,000 salary per annum is repealed and the sheriff will set the compensation for an attorney hired. Oversight is unaware how much the

compensation will be should this proposal be enacted. Therefore, Oversight will reflect an unknown cost for this proposal.

Senate Amendment (SA) 1 - §455.098 – Lifetime Protection Orders

In response to similar legislation, SB 869 (2026), officials from the **Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA)** stated §455.098 would have a technological fiscal impact that would be at least \$750,000 to \$1,000,000. There may be some additional impact as well, but there is no way to quantify that currently. Any significant changes will be reflected in future budget requests.

Oversight notes OSCA assumes this proposal may have some additional fiscal impact beyond the technological costs that can't be quantified at this time. As OSCA is unable to provide additional information regarding this potential impact, Oversight assumes the proposed legislation will have a cost to General Revenue (GR) of \$750,000 to Greater than \$1,000,000 for FY 2027 and \$0 or (Unknown) cost to GR for subsequent years. If these assumptions are incorrect, they would alter the fiscal impact as presented in this fiscal note. If additional information is received, Oversight will review it to determine if an updated fiscal note should be prepared and seek approval to publish a new fiscal note.

Upon further inquiry in response to similar legislation, SB 197 (2025), **OSCA** stated for the protection order to be extended to the lifetime of the respondent, the Statewide Case Management System (SMC) might require modifications and the interface with the Missouri Highway Patrol might also require modifications. The uncertainty of the technical requirements/impact of this proposed legislation is what is driving the estimated amount of the fiscal impact. If more information can be provided regarding how the lifetime protection order process will be implemented, the estimated fiscal impact can be revisited.

In response to similar legislation, SB 869 (2026), 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, SB 869 (2026), officials from the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol, Department of Social Services, Office of the State Public Defender, Kansas City Police Department, and St. Louis County Police Department** each assumed 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 similar legislation, SB 869 (2024), officials from the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services** assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their organization.

Senate Amendment (SA) 1 - §§544.667, 565.090, 565.091, 565.260, 565.400, 565.405, 573.570, and 573.575 – Forfeiture, Harassment, Unlawful Tracking, Cyberharassment, Cyberstalking, and Disclosure of Intimate Digital Depictions

Officials from the **DOC** state §565.090 expands the offense of harassment in the first degree, adding a class D felony if the defendant has previously been found guilty of a violation of this section or §565.091, or any offense committed in another jurisdiction which, if committed in this state, would be chargeable or indictable as a violation of any offense listed in this section or §565.091.

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

For each new violent class D felony, the **DOC** estimates four people could be sentenced to prison and four to probation. The average sentence for a nonviolent class D felony offense is 5.7 years with 3 years served in prison prior to first release. Probation sentences will be 4 years.

The cumulative impact on the **DOC** is estimated to be 16 additional offenders in prison and 16 additional offenders on field supervision by FY 2030.

Section 565.091 modifies the class E felony offense of harassment in the 2nd degree to include when a person has previously been found guilty of harassment in the 1st degree or 2nd degree.

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 violent class E felony, the department estimates two people will be sentenced to prison and one to probation. The average sentence for a violent class E felony offense is 4 years, with 2.2 years to first release. Probation sentences will be 4 years.

The cumulative impact on the department is estimated to be 6 additional offenders in prison and 3 additional offenders on field supervision by FY 2029.

Section 565.260 creates the offense of unlawful tracking of a motor vehicle if a person knowingly installs, conceals, or otherwise places an electronic tracking device in or on a motor vehicle without the consent of all owners of the vehicle. The penalty is a class A misdemeanor for the first offense, and a class E felony for any second or subsequent offenses.

As misdemeanors fall outside the purview of **DOC**, there is no impact to **DOC** for the offense resulting in the class A misdemeanor. The offense resulting in a class E felony would be

considered a new crime. As there is little direct data on which to base an estimate, the DOC estimates an impact comparable to the creation of a new class E felony.

For each new nonviolent class E felony, the DOC 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.

Section 565.405 creates the offense of cyberstalking if such person purposely engages in a threatening or aggressive course of conduct by using digital technology, internet service providers, or other electronic communications and devices to enhance the ability to intimidate, track or cause undue stress to another person. The penalty is a class A misdemeanor for the first offense, and a class E felony for any second or subsequent offense.

As misdemeanors fall outside the purview of DOC, there is no impact to DOC for the offense resulting in the class A misdemeanor. The offense resulting in a class E felony would be considered a new crime. As there is little direct data on which to base an estimate, the DOC estimates an impact comparable to the creation of a new class E felony.

For each new nonviolent class E felony, the DOC 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 DOC is estimated to be 2 additional offenders in prison and 7 additional offenders on field supervision by FY 2029.

Section 573.570 creates the offense of disclosure of an intimate digital depiction. The penalties for this offense include: a class D felony for a violation of subdivision (1) of subsection 2; a class E felony for a violation of subdivision (2) of subsection 2; and, a class C felony if it is a second or subsequent violation of subsection 2 or it is reasonable to expect that the offense could impact government activity or facilitate violence.

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

For each new nonviolent class E felony, the DOC 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 DOC is estimated to be 2 additional offenders in prison and 7 additional offenders on field supervision by FY 2029.

For each new nonviolent class D felony, the DOC estimates three people could be sentenced to prison and five to probation. The average sentence for a nonviolent class D felony offense is 5 years, with 1.7 years served in prison prior to first release. Probation sentences will be 3 years.

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

For each new class C felony, the DOC estimates four people could be sentenced to prison and six to probation. The average sentence for a class C felony offense is 6.9 years, with 2.1 years served prior to first release. Probation sentences will be 3 years.

The cumulative impact on the DOC is estimated to be 15 additional offenders in prison and 19 additional offenders on field supervision by FY 2030.

Section 573.575 creates the offense of sadistic online exploitation if a person uses the internet to manipulate, hurt or threaten a victim through forcing their submission, use of violence, self-harm, or destruction, or to extort another person for financial gain. 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 DOC estimates an impact comparable to the creation of a new class E felony.

For each new nonviolent class E felony, the DOC 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 DOC is estimated to be 2 additional offenders in prison and 7 additional offenders on field supervision by FY 2029.

In response to similar legislation, SCS SB 928 (2026), officials from the **Office of the State Public Defender (SPD)** stated per the National Public Defense Workload Study, the new charges contemplated by §§544.667, 565.260, 565.400 and 565.405 would each take approximately twenty-two hours of SPD work for reasonably effective representation. If one hundred cases were filed under these sections in a fiscal year, representation would result in a need for an additional attorney. Because the number of cases that will be filed under these statutes 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 charges were classified as class D misdemeanors, then no jail time would be authorized, and the cases would not qualify for SPD representation.

In addition, per the National Public Defense Workload Study, the new charges contemplated by §§573.570 and 573.575 would each take approximately thirty-five hours of SPD work for reasonably effective representation. If one hundred cases were filed under these sections in a fiscal year, representation would result in a need for an additional one to two attorneys. Because

the number of cases that will be filed 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.

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, SCS SB 928 (2026), officials from the **Department of Mental Health, Department of Natural Resources, Department of Labor and Industrial Relations, Department of Public Safety – (Office of the Director and Missouri Highway Patrol), Department of Social Services, Missouri Department of Conservation, Missouri Department of Transportation, Kansas City Police Department, and St. Louis County Police Department** each assumed 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.

Senate Amendment (SA) 1 - §590.192 – Critical Incident Stress Management Program

Oversight assumes this language gives another option to satisfy the requirement under subsection 2 and will have no fiscal impact on the proposal.

Senate Amendment (SA) 1 - §632.305 - Civil Detention Procedures

In response to similar legislation, Perfected HB 1977 (2026), officials from the **Department of Commerce and Insurance, Department of Health and Senior Services, Department of Mental Health, Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol, Office of the State Courts Administrator, Office of the State Public Defender, Kansas City Police Department and St. Louis County Police Department** each assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

In response to similar legislation, HB 543 (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 on the fiscal note.

Senate Amendment (SA) 1 - §§632.580, 632.585, 632.590, 632.593, 632.595, 632.600, 632.605 and 632.610 - Court-Ordered Involuntary Outpatient Treatment for Persons with Mental Disorders

Officials from the **DOC** state perjury committed in any proceeding not involving felony charges is a class E nonviolent 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 will be served in prison with 1.4 years to first release. The remaining 1.3 years will be on parole. 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.

Perjury committed in any proceeding involving felony charges is a class D nonviolent felony.

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

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

It is a class B felony if perjury is committed during a criminal trial for the purpose of securing the conviction of an accused for any felony except murder.

Given the seriousness of class B felony offenses and that the introduction of a completely new class B felony offense is a rare event, the department assumes the admission of one person per year to prison following the passage of the legislative proposal.

Offenders committed to prison with a class B felony as their most serious sentence, have an average sentence length of 9.0 years and serve on average, 3.4 years in prison prior to first release. The department assumes one third of the remaining sentence length will be served in prison as a parole return, and the rest of the sentence will be served on supervision in the community.

The cumulative impact on the department is estimated to be 5 additional offenders in prison and no additional offenders on field supervision by FY 2031.

It is class A felony if the perjury is committed during a criminal trial for the purpose of securing the conviction of an accused for murder.

Given the seriousness of class A felony offenses and that the introduction of a completely new class A felony offense is a rare event, the department assumes the admission of one person per year to prison following the passage of the legislative proposal.

Offenders committed to prison with a class A felony have an average sentence length of 17.1 years and serve on average, 12.3 years in prison prior to first release. The department assumes one third of the remaining sentence length will be served in prison as a parole return, and the rest of the sentence will be served on supervision in the community.

The sentence lengths associated with these offenses pushes the estimate of total cumulative impact on the department beyond the 10-year time frame of this fiscal note. However, the estimated impact by FY 2036 is 10 additional offenders in prison.

In response to similar legislation, HB 3313 (2026), officials from the **Department of Mental Health (DMH)** stated this proposal creates provisions relating to court ordered involuntary outpatient treatment for persons with mental disorders.

Section 632.580 defines “assisted outpatient treatment” as court ordered involuntary outpatient mental health care services that are provided by a mental health program under a treatment plan developed and monitored by a master’s level mental health professional. The services can include case management, medication management, therapy, substance use treatment, crisis intervention services, and assistance with housing, employment, or other county resources necessary to an individual’s stability.

Section 632.585 states a petition for an order authorizing involuntary outpatient treatment may be filed by the director, administrator or treating physician of a mental health program of where the individual is hospitalized or an emergency center where the individual is receiving services or the Department of Health and Senior Services (DHSS), the DMH or any local public health agency located within the judicial district in which the petition is filed. Subsection 3 states the petition shall allege under oath, without a notarization requirement, that the petitioner has reason to believe that the respondent meets the criteria for assisted outpatient treatment in section 632.590 and the petition shall specify factual information on which such belief is based and shall contain the names and addresses of all persons known to the petitioner who have knowledge of such facts through personal observation. Subsection 4 states no notarization shall be required for a petition or for any affidavits, declarations or other documents supporting a petition and shall be subject to the provisions of section 492.050 allowing for declaration under penalty of perjury.

Section 632.590 states a court may issue an order requiring a respondent to participate in assisted outpatient treatment if they are eighteen years of age or older, is suffering from a mental disorder, will not obtain treatment voluntarily and is unable to make an informed decision to seek or to comply with the voluntary treatment. The court shall assign a case manager from a Certified Community Behavioral Health Clinic (CCBHC) to individuals ordered to assisted outpatient treatment, and the case manager shall monitor compliance of the court order. The case worker and respondent shall report to court at least every 90 days unless the court request more frequent appearances. Respondents that do not comply with the order may be court ordered to an evaluation or hospitalization as outlined.

DMH does not directly provide outpatient services. The Department of Mental Health (DMH) contracts with Community Mental Health Centers (CMHC) and CCBHC providers who provide Assisted Outpatient Treatment (AOT). Because of the case management and treatment requirements included in the proposal, DMH community providers will likely see increased costs. The fiscal impact at this time is unknown as it is not known how many individuals being ordered to AOT would be new to their system.

Oversight does not have information to the contrary and therefore, Oversight will reflect the estimates as provided by the DMH. Oversight assumes the unknown negative impact to DMH could exceed \$250,000 annually each to GR and Federal Funds.

In response to similar legislation, HB 3313 (2026), officials from the **Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA)** stated HB 3313 may have some impact but there is no way to quantify that amount currently. Any significant changes will be reflected in future budget requests.

Oversight notes OSCA assumes this proposal may have some impact on their organization although it can't be quantified at this time. As OSCA is unable to provide additional information regarding the potential impact, Oversight assumes the proposed legislation will have a \$0 or (Unknown) cost to the General Revenue Fund. For fiscal note purposes, Oversight also assumes the impact will be under \$250,000 annually. If this assumption is incorrect, this would alter the fiscal impact as presented in this fiscal note. If additional information is received, Oversight will review it to determine if an updated fiscal note should be prepared and seek approval to publish a new fiscal note.

In response to similar legislation, HB 3313 (2026), officials from the **Department of Health and Senior Services, Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol, Department of Social Services, Office of the State Public Defender, Kansas City Police Department and St. Louis County Police Department** each assumed 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.

Senate Amendment (SA) 3

Oversight assumes Senate Amendment 3 will have no additional fiscal impact on the underlying proposal.

Responses regarding the proposed legislation as a whole, as amended

Officials from **Department of Corrections** state:

Combined Cumulative Estimated Impact for DOC

In the first 10 years, this proposal will increase the prison population by 1,806 offenders and increase the field population by 1,060 offenders by FY 2036.

The combined cumulative estimated impact on the department is 2,725 additional offenders in prison and 1,496 additional offenders on field supervision by FY 2045.

	# to prison	Cost per year	Total savings and/or cost for prison	Change in probation & parole officers	Total savings and/or cost for probation and parole	# to probation & parole	Grand Total - Prison and Probation (includes 2% inflation)
Year 1	27	(\$11,123)	(\$250,268)	0	\$0	36	(\$250,268)
Year 2	(92)	(\$11,123)	\$1,043,782	4	(\$404,790)	218	\$638,992
Year 3	(451)	(\$11,123)	\$5,219,139	12	(\$1,195,426)	640	\$4,023,713
Year 4	(140)	(\$11,123)	\$1,652,534	7	(\$664,969)	365	\$987,566
Year 5	865	(\$11,123)	(\$10,414,507)	(9)	\$864,015	(495)	(\$9,550,492)
Year 6	1,066	(\$11,123)	(\$13,091,216)	(8)	\$776,153	(418)	(\$12,315,063)
Year 7	1,067	(\$11,123)	(\$13,365,567)	9	(\$882,428)	490	(\$14,247,995)
Year 8	1,442	(\$11,123)	(\$18,424,190)	21	(\$2,168,772)	1,120	(\$20,592,962)
Year 9	1,724	(\$11,123)	(\$22,467,801)	22	(\$2,213,190)	1,141	(\$24,680,992)
Year 10	1,806	(\$11,123)	(\$24,007,184)	20	(\$2,024,117)	1,061	(\$26,031,302)

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 assumes due to the capacity projections noted by DOC and the length of offenders' sentences under this proposed legislation, Oversight has made the decision to reflect the cost of one new prison (could exceed \$825,000,000) along with operational costs (approximately \$50,000,000) beginning in FY 2029.

Officials from the **Office of the State Treasurer, University of Missouri System, Newton County Health Department, St. Louis City Assessors Office, Phelps County Sheriff, Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District, South River Drainage District, 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.

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, local law enforcement, utilities, hospitals, electric companies and coops, and solid waste management districts 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	FY 2028	FY 2029	Fully Implemented (FY 2036)
GENERAL REVENUE				
<u>Transfer Out – (\$56.265) from General Revenue p.6</u>	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
<u>Revenue Gain – DOR (\$211.342) 1% administration fee on county sales tax to fund a new Juvenile Detention Center p.7-8</u>	\$0	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown
<u>Cost (\$211.342) – DSS costs related to juvenile facilities p.8</u>	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
<u>Cost – OSCA (\$455.098) Technological modifications to the SMC System and potential increase in other court expenditures p.15 (SA 1)</u>	(\$750,000 to Greater than \$1,000,000)	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)
<u>Savings/Cost – DOC (§§211.871, 556.061, 558.011, 558.016, 565.090, 565.091, 565.260 565.405, 573.570, 573.575, 577.800 and 632.585) p.23</u>				
Personal Service	\$0	(\$208,132)	(\$630,648)	(\$1,126,880)
Fringe Benefits	\$0	(\$149,708)	(\$453,619)	(\$810,560)
Equip. & Exp.	\$0	(\$46,950)	(\$111,159)	(\$86,677)
<u>Total - DOC</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>(\$404,790)</u>	<u>(\$1,195,426)</u>	<u>(\$2,024,117)</u>
FTE Change - DOC	0 FTE	4 FTE	12 FTE	20 FTE

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029	Fully Implemented (FY 2036)
<u>Savings/Cost - DOC</u> (§§211.871, 556.061, 558.011, 558.016, 565.090, 565.091, 565.260 565.405, 573.570, 573.575, 577.800 and 632.585) Incarceration costs p.23	(\$250,268)	\$1,043,782	\$5,219,139	(\$24,007,184)
<u>Cost – DOC (§558.011)</u> Cost of a new prison and operations p.24	\$0	\$0	(Likely to exceed \$875,000,000)	\$0
<u>Cost – MHP (§§577.800, 589.900 and 589.902)</u> Counter Drone Equipment Maintenance Fees p.12	\$0	(\$193,469)	(\$193,469)	(\$193,469)
<u>Cost – OSCA (§§632.580-632.610)</u> Increased court costs p.22* (SA 1)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
<u>Cost – DMH (§632.590)</u> Outpatient services p.21-22* (SA 1)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
<u>Cost – OSCA (various sections) To staff & maintain juvenile detention centers p.10-11</u>	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
<u>Cost – OSCA (various sections) Increase in potential court cases p.4-5</u>	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029	Fully Implemented (FY 2036)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE	(\$1,250,268 to <u>Unknown</u>)	More or less than <u>\$445,523</u>	(More or less than <u>\$871,169,756</u>)	(More or less than <u>\$26,224,770</u>)
Estimated Net FTE Change on General Revenue	0 FTE	4 FTE	12 FTE	20 FTE
MISSOURI STATE PROSECUTORIAL SERVICES GRANT FUND				
<u>Transfer In</u> – (\$56.265) from General Revenue p.6	\$0 or <u>Unknown</u>	\$0 or <u>Unknown</u>	\$0 or <u>Unknown</u>	\$0 or <u>Unknown</u>
<u>Transfer Out</u> – (\$56.265) To counties p.6	\$0 or <u>(Unknown)</u>	\$0 or <u>(Unknown)</u>	\$0 or <u>(Unknown)</u>	\$0 or <u>(Unknown)</u>
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE MISSOURI STATE PROSECUTORIAL SERVICES GRANT FUND	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
FEDERAL FUNDS				
<u>Revenue Gain</u> – DMH (\$632.590) Outpatient services p.24-25** (SA 1)	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
<u>Cost</u> – DMH (\$632.590) Outpatient services p.24-25** (SA 1)	<u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029	Fully Implemented (FY 2036)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

*Costs to DMH are unknown but could exceed \$250,000 annually.

**Revenue gain and costs to DMH are unknown but could exceed \$250,000 annually and net to \$0.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – Local Government</u>	FY 2027	FY 2028 (6 Mo.)	FY 2029	Fully Implemented (FY 2036)
LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS				
<u>Transfer In</u> – (\$56.265) To counties to supplement 3 rd and 4 th class counties salaries for prosecuting attorneys p.6	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown
<u>Cost</u> – City of St. Louis (\$57.540) Attorney’s salary set by the Sheriff of the City of St. Louis p.14-15 (SA1)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
<u>Cost</u> – (various sections) For an increase in juvenile detentions p.7	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
<u>Revenue Gain</u> - Counties (\$211.342) Sales tax to fund a new Juvenile Detention Center for the county p.8	<u>\$0</u>	\$0 or <u>Unknown</u>	\$0 or <u>Unknown</u>	\$0 or <u>Unknown</u>
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS	(Unknown) to <u>Unknown</u>	(Unknown) to <u>Unknown</u>	(Unknown) to <u>Unknown</u>	(Unknown) to <u>Unknown</u>

FISCAL IMPACT – Small Business

Small businesses could be impacted from this proposal if a new sales tax is voted in to fund a new Juvenile Detention Center. (§211.342)

Community providers may see an increase in business from court-ordered treatment. (§§632.580, 632.585, 632.590, 632.593, 632.595, 632.600, 632.605 and 632.610)

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

This proposal legislation modifies provisions relating to the criminal justice systems.

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

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Attorney General's Office
Department of Commerce and Insurance
Department of Health and Senior Services
Department of Mental Health
Department of Natural Resources
Department of Corrections
Department of Revenue
Department of Public Safety –
 Director's Office
 Missouri Highway Patrol
Missouri Department of Conservation
Department of Social Services
Missouri Department of Transportation
Missouri National Guard
Missouri Office of Prosecution Services
Office of Administration
Office of Administration - Budget and Planning
Office of the State Courts Administrator
Office of the Secretary of State
Office of the State Public Defender
Office of the State Treasurer
University of Missouri System
City of Kansas City
City of O'Fallon
City of St. Louis
Newton County Health Department
St. Louis City Assessors Office

L.R. No. 6162S.08A

Bill No. SS for SCS for HCS for HB Nos. 2637 & 3155 with SA 1 and SA 3

Page **30** of **30**

April 23, 2026

Phelps County Sheriff
Branson Police Department
Kansas City Police Department
St. Louis County Police Department
Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District
South River Drainage District
Wayne County PWSD #2
State Tax Commission



Julie Morff
Director
April 23, 2026



Jessica Harris
Assistant Director
April 23, 2026