

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 6221H.07C
 Bill No.: HCS for HB Nos. 2751, 2831 & 2695
 Subject: Department of Corrections; Prisons and Jails; Crimes and Punishment; Criminal Procedure
 Type: Original
 Date: February 22, 2026

Bill Summary: This proposal modifies provisions relating to public safety.

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND

| FUND AFFECTED | FY 2027 | FY 2028 | FY 2029 |
|--|--|--|--|
| General Revenue | (More or less than \$1,199,718) | (More or less than \$1,371,391) | (More or less than \$1,512,973) |
| Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue | (More or less than \$1,199,718) | (More or less than \$1,371,391) | (More or less than \$1,512,973) |

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 |
|---|------------|------------|------------|
| Federal Funds* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Revenue gain and costs are estimated at \$3 million annually and net to zero.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)

| FUND AFFECTED | FY 2027 | FY 2028 | FY 2029 |
|--|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| General Revenue | Could exceed 6 FTE | Could exceed 6 FTE | Could exceed 6 FTE |
| Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE | Could exceed 6 FTE | Could exceed 6 FTE | Could exceed 6 FTE |

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

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS

| FUND AFFECTED | FY 2027 | FY 2028 | FY 2029 |
|-------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Local Government | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

§115.133 - Restores Voting Rights to Individuals on Probation and Parole

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** state Section 115.133 restores voting rights to individuals on probation and parole. The DOC assumes the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization. The DOC states in FY25, they averaged 53,000 offenders under supervision. **Oversight** assumes there could be an increase in registered voters.

In response to similar legislation, HCS for HB Nos. 2592, 2834 & 2787 (2026), officials from the **Jackson County Election Board** and **Platte County Board of Elections** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations for this proposal. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

§208.247 - Provisions of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)

Officials from the **Department of Social Services (DSS)** state [21 U.S.C. Section 862a\(d\)](#) provides states the option to exempt any or all individuals from prohibition of SNAP eligibility required under [21 U.S.C. Section 862a](#). Currently, Missouri exercises the option to exempt some individuals allowed under [21 U.S.C. Section 862a\(d\)](#) in [208.247 RSMo](#), which provides exemptions for individuals who have been convicted of a felony for drug possession or drug use if they meet certain exemption requirements. Missouri could exercise the option to exempt individuals from prohibition of SNAP eligibility based on the provisions of this legislation for those individuals convicted of any drug related felony.

The number of individuals who would be eligible for SNAP under the provisions of this legislation is unknown. Therefore, for the purposes of this fiscal note, the Family Support Division (FSD) estimates an increase in SNAP benefits in the following manner:

In SFY 25, there were 138 individuals who applied for and were found ineligible for SNAP due to a drug-related felony. As of November 30, 2025, there were a total of 1,297 permanently disqualified due to a drug related felony, who are a member of a household actively receiving SNAP benefits.

In SFY 25, the average monthly SNAP benefit was \$197 per person. Therefore, the FSD estimates an annual increase in SNAP benefits of \$0 to \$3,392,340 [$1,435 (1,297 + 138) * \$197 * 12 = \$3,392,340$]. If this legislation passes, the implementation date is August 28, 2026, therefore the FSD estimates an increase in SNAP benefits of \$2,826,950 [$1,435 (1,297 + 138) * \$197 * 10 = \$2,826,950$] in SFY 2027. Effective FFY 2028, states will be responsible for funding up to 15% of SNAP benefits, which will be determined based on the state's SNAP Payment Error Rate (PER). It is unknown at this time what the match rate for FFY 2028 will be

and will not be determined until FFY 2027. Therefore, for purposes of this fiscal note, FSD is using the full 15% match rate to determine the fiscal impact of this legislation. DSS estimates the fiscal impact for the state share of the SNAP benefits to be up to \$381,638 ($\$1,435 * \$197 * 9 \text{ mos.} * 0.15 = \$381,638.25$, rounded down) in SFY 2028 and up to \$508,851 ($\$3,392,340 * 0.15 = \$508,851$) in SFY 2029 and ongoing.

There will be increased EBT costs to process the additional SNAP payments to recipients. The cost of EBT services to process each new SNAP case is \$0.43 per month. Since the 1,297 individuals permanently disqualified are members of a household actively receiving SNAP benefits, there would not be additional costs for EBT services for these individuals. The cost would only apply to the 138 individuals who applied and were found ineligible. If this legislation passes, the earliest implementation date would be August 28, 2026, therefore the additional cost for EBT services would be \$0 to \$593 ($138 * \$0.43 \text{ monthly} * 10 \text{ months} = \593.40 , rounded down) in FFY27. The additional cost for EBT services would be \$0 to \$712 ($138 * \$0.43 \text{ monthly} * 12 \text{ months} = \712.08 , rounded down) in FFY28 and ongoing. At this time, the additional cost for EBT services to process each new SNAP case can be absorbed in the FSD EBT Core Appropriation.

FSD assumes existing staff will be able to complete the necessary work to implement the provisions of the section.

FSD defers to the Office of Administration (OA), Information Technology Services Division (ITSD)/DSS for the system changes necessary to implement the provisions of this section.

SFY 2027: No state impact. Up to \$2,826,950 SNAP Benefits (100% Federally funded through SFY 2027). EBT costs - \$593 (absorbed).

SFY 2028: Up to \$381,638 state impact. Up to \$3,392,340 SNAP Benefits [State share up to 15% - up to \$381,638 ($1,435 * \$197 * 9 \text{ months.}$)]. EBT costs - \$712 (absorbed).

SFY 2029 and ongoing: Up to \$508,851 state impact. Up to \$3,392,340 SNAP Benefits (State share up to 15% - up to \$508,851). EBT costs - \$712 (absorbed).

Oversight does not have information to the contrary and therefore, Oversight will reflect the estimate as provided by the DSS/FSD.

Officials from the **OA/ITSD, DSS** assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for this agency.

Oversight notes that in previous sessions, DSS included an estimate for updates to the Missouri Eligibility Determination and Enrollment System (MEDES) system.

DSS officials state that, because DSS leadership is evaluating MEDES, estimate for MEDES has been removed from this year's response.

Oversight notes the proposed legislation repeals felony related application processing and verifications required for persons who have pled guilty or nolo contendere to or found guilty under federal or state law of a felony involving possession or use of a controlled substance.

[21 U.S.C. Section 862a\(a\)](#) states:

An individual convicted (under Federal or State law) of any offense which is classified as a felony by the law of the jurisdiction involved and which has as an element the possession, use, or distribution of a controlled substance (as defined in section 802(6) of this title) shall not be eligible for—

(1) assistance under any State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act [42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.], or

(2) benefits under the supplemental nutrition assistance program (as defined in section 3 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012)) or any State program carried out under that Act [7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.].

The state option under 21 U.S.C. Section 862a(d)(1) states, "A State may, by specific reference in a law enacted after August 22, 1996, **exempt any or all individuals** domiciled in the State from the application of subsection (a).

§217.443 – Inmate release from Corrections

Officials from the **DOC** state this proposal requires the DOC to provide certain services to inmates prior to their release from the department. The department has an established process to assist offenders in obtaining a copy of their birth certificate, social security card and state identification prior to release.

In order to comply with this legislation, the department would need to alter the existing process for obtaining source documents. In addition, this legislation would require the department to provide additional records to the offender upon release from custody. The DOC is unable to quantify the amount of staff time that would be required to prepare the additional records; therefore, this will have a \$0 or (unknown) negative impact. DOC assumes the impact will be less than \$250,000.

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 **Department of Revenue (DOR)** state the Department currently has a memorandum of agreement (MOA) with the DOC to issue nondriver credentials for inmates at certain facilities. The nondriver credential issued under this MOA are for a term of six years and are mailed to the DOC facility prior to the inmate's release.

Administrative Impact

To implement the proposed legislation, the Department will:

- Coordinate with the DOC to define a systematic process for DOC to verify whether an inmate currently holds a Missouri driver license or nondriver identification card;
- Review rules and regulations if proposed by the DOC;
- Collaborate with vendor to develop business requirements and system design for FUSION to add a new credential status verification inquiry for pre-verification by DOC staff, create a new indicator for nondriver identification cards issued per these provisions to identify DOC requested identification documents for statistical purposes and to deny any renewal or transfer of such documents, and modify current nondriver identification card expiration date evaluations to no longer tie to the applicant's date of birth but define as six years from month and day of issuance, not to exceed any lawful status related restrictions;
- Collaborate testing and implementation of changes with DOC;
- Update procedures; and
- Train internal and external partners.

FY 27-Driver License Bureau

Associate Research/Data Analyst 60 hrs. @ \$31.16 per hr. =\$1,870
Research/Data Analyst 125 hrs. @ \$37.14 per hr. =\$4,643
Administrative Manager 30 hrs. @ \$51.40 per hr. =\$1,542
Total =\$8,055

FY 27-Strategy and Communications Office

Associate Research/Data Analyst 40 hrs. @ \$31.16 per hr. = \$1,246
Total = \$1,246

Total Costs \$9,301

Oversight assumes DOR will use existing staff and will not hire additional FTE to conduct these activities; therefore, Oversight will not reflect the administrative costs DOR has indicated on the fiscal note.

FY 27-Motor Vehicle and Driver Licensing Integrated System Vendor

Implementation Development 100 hrs. @ \$225 per hr. = \$22,500
Implementation Testing 100 hrs. @ \$225 per hr. = \$22,500

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary; therefore, Oversight will reflect DOR's cost of \$45,000 to the General Revenue Fund.

§558.041 – Earned credits

Officials from the **DOC** state Section 558.041 is modified to stipulate offenders “shall” receive additional credit, and modifies the requirements for such time, to include obtaining a high school diploma or equivalent, completion of a substance use treatment program, and other programs.

Currently, the department does not have an automated system that could track and calculate the credits that are described in the legislation. At this time, the department is unsure if an automated system can be created because of the different criteria it takes to calculate credits. This is a labor-intensive calculation done by hand by our Records Officer staff. It is unknown to the department how many additional staff may be needed in order to comply with this legislation.

As such, the department is unable to project the impact to the prison population. However, it is assumed the legislation would decrease the number of individuals incarcerated.

Oversight does not have any information contrary to that provided by DOC. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a potential cost for the IT system development that could occur in FY 2027 or a potential unknown cost for FTE to handle the calculations. Additionally, as this new program may decrease populations for DOC, Oversight will reflect a potential savings (\$0 or Unknown) in FY 2028 and FY 2029. Oversight notes, in response to other legislation this year, DOC has used a per-inmate cost of \$11,123 to the General Revenue Fund per year.

§589.710 – Release of Data on Criminal Activity

Officials from the **DOC** state Section 589.710 requires the department to share all criminal justice data and records, regardless of its physical form with a bona fide researcher relating to a criminal charge, disposition, or sentence; pretrial or post-trial release from custody, or any terms or conditions of release; participation in correctional or rehabilitative programs; or formal discipline, reclassification, or relocation of any person under criminal sentence or correctional control. In addition, the department is required to share with a bona fide researcher all criminal justice data and records, including relevant personally identifying information and demographic information, held by that agency that is subject to mandatory or discretionary disclosure to any member of the public and not otherwise closed pursuant to chapter 610.

The collection and sharing of criminal justice data would require additional FTE for the department to be compliant with this new legislation. It is unknown how many additional FTE the department will need to fulfill these data requests; therefore, it is estimated to be an unknown cost.

In addition, the department could be required to release data that includes any closed/confidential information that affects the safety and security of DOC’s institutions. This could increase the number of litigations filed against the department; therefore, the department is unable to project a fiscal impact at this time.

Oversight has no information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will present the fiscal impact of this proposal as provided by DOC. It is assumed unknown costs will exceed \$250,000 annually.

Officials from the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol (MHP)** state since this legislation limits only the release to "bona fide researchers" this could be a substantial number of requests. The Patrol has millions of records in various systems and depending on the request by the researcher, it could take days to weeks to process the requests since the MHP may have to extract records from various systems and merge them together. The current language doesn't limit the data that can be requested and could cover any law enforcement stop, search or seizure as well as arrests, citations or warrants. This data could include video and audio requests. For a large data request, a Data Specialist may be able to process 1 request a week, medium data requests would be 2 requests per week, and small data requests could be up to 4 a week. Since the number and size of the requests are unknown, the MHP's best estimate for workload is that most of the requests will be medium to large. It is further anticipated that the Patrol would receive 50-100 requests per year.

Additionally, each full-time Program Assistant in the Patrol's Custodian of Records section processes approximately 785 record requests annually. Considering the requests received by researchers are often large and voluminous, the average time spent to process each request will greatly increase. Based upon this factor, it is anticipated that the Patrol would need three (3) additional Program Assistants and one (1) Database Specialist to handle the additional requests for records.

Additional fees will be collected for the time needed to locate requested records, however these fees do not adequately cover the personnel costs. Governmental agencies may not charge entities and requestors for redaction of information pursuant to the Driver's License Privacy Protection Act. This constitutes the majority of the time spent reviewing and redacting requests.

Oversight has no information to the contrary. However, since it is unknown how many data requests MHP may receive annually, Oversight will range the fiscal impact as "Up to" the amount/FTE provided by the Patrol.

Oversight notes provisions in §589.710.3(2) provide that an agency may assess reasonable fees, not to exceed actual costs, for the retrieval of information. For fiscal note purposes, Oversight will range fee revenue as \$0 or Unknown to General Revenue as fees may be waived by the agency.

In response to a previous version, officials from the **Attorney General's Office (AGO)** stated this proposal will increase personnel costs. One (1) AAG and one (1) Paralegal will be necessary to create the initial "guidance" and "process" as well as to respond and review subsequent requests. The AGO anticipates holding a massive number of records in Public Protection, Consumer Protection, and Civil Trials (through their representation of DOC and DMH, etc.).

Oversight does not have any information contrary to that provided by AGO. Therefore, Oversight will reflect AGO's impact for fiscal note purposes.

Responses regarding the proposed legislation as a whole

Officials from the **Office of State Courts Administrator (OSCA)** state there may be some impact 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 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 **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services (MOPS)** stated the proposal will have no measurable fiscal impact to the Missouri Office of Prosecution Services.

Officials from the **Department of Commerce and Insurance, Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development, Department of Health and Senior Services, Department of Mental Health, Department of Natural Resources, Department of Public Safety – (Division of Alcohol and Tobacco Control, Capitol Police, Fire Safety, Office of the Director, and Missouri Veterans Commission), Missouri Department of Conservation, Office of the State Public Defender, University of Missouri System, City of Kansas City, Kansas City Election Board, St. Louis City Board of Elections, St. Louis County Board of Elections, Phelps County Sheriff, Branson Police Department, Kansas City Police Department, St. Louis County Police Department, Northwest Missouri State University, and University of Central Missouri** each assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

In response to a previous version, officials from the **Office of Administration** 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.

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.

Oversight only reflects the responses that we have received from state agencies and political subdivisions; however, other cities, counties, local election authorities, local law enforcement, and colleges 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 |
|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| GENERAL REVENUE | | | |
| <u>Cost</u> – DSS/FSD (§208.247) SNAP benefits p.3-5 | \$0 | (Up to \$381,638) | (Up to \$508,851) |
| <u>Cost</u> – DOC (§217.443) Services to inmates prior to release p.5 | \$0 or (Unknown) | \$0 or (Unknown) | \$0 or (Unknown) |
| <u>Cost</u> – DOR (§217.443) Implementation development and testing p.5-6 | (\$45,000) | \$0 | \$0 |
| <u>Savings</u> - DOC (§558.041) Potential impact to the population relating to good time credit p.7 | \$0 | \$0 or Unknown | \$0 or Unknown |
| <u>Cost</u> – DOC (§558.041) Calculation of good-time credits p.7 | (Unknown, could exceed \$250,000) | (Unknown) | (Unknown) |

| <u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u> | FY 2027 (10 Mo.) | FY 2028 | FY 2029 |
|---|--|--|--|
| <u>Revenue Gain</u> – Various State Agencies (\$589.710) Fees charged for criminal data retrieval p.7-8 | \$0 or Unknown | \$0 or Unknown | \$0 or Unknown |
| <u>Cost</u> – DOC (\$589.710) FTE, fringe benefits, E&E needed to gather various data for researchers p.7-8 | (Unknown, greater than \$250,000) | (Unknown, greater than \$250,000) | (Unknown, greater than \$250,000) |
| <u>Cost</u> – MHP (\$589.710) p.8 | Up to... | Up to... | Up to... |
| Personal Service | (\$217,513) | (\$266,236) | (\$271,561) |
| Fringe Benefits | (\$191,607) | (\$234,528) | (\$239,218) |
| Expense & Equipment | (\$37,600) | \$0 | \$0 |
| <u>Total Costs</u> – MHP | (\$446,721) | (\$500,764) | (\$510,779) |
| FTE Change – MHP | Up to 4 FTE | Up to 4 FTE | Up to 4 FTE |
| <u>Cost</u> – AGO (\$589.710) p.8-9 | | | |
| Personal Service | (\$108,333) | (\$132,600) | (\$135,252) |
| Fringe Benefits | (\$69,740) | (\$84,730) | (\$85,793) |
| Exp. & Equip. | (\$29,924) | (\$21,659) | (\$22,298) |
| <u>Total Costs</u> - AGO | (\$207,997) | (\$238,989) | (\$243,343) |
| FTE Change - AGO | 2 FTE | 2 FTE | 2 FTE |
| <u>Cost</u> – OSCA (Various sections) Potential increase in court costs p.9 | \$0 or (Unknown) | \$0 or (Unknown) | \$0 or (Unknown) |
| ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE | (More or less than \$1,199,718) | (More or less than \$1,371,391) | (More or less than \$1,512,973) |
| Estimated Net FTE Change on General Revenue | Could exceed 6 FTE | Could exceed 6 FTE | Could exceed 6 FTE |
| FEDERAL FUNDS | | | |
| <u>Revenue Gain</u> – DSS/FSD (\$208.247) Reimbursement for SNAP benefits p.3-5 | \$2,826,950 | More than \$3,010,702 | More than \$2,883,489 |
| <u>Cost</u> - DSS/FSD (\$208.247) SNAP benefits p.3-5 | (\$2,826,950) | (More than \$3,010,702) | (More than \$2,883,489) |

| <u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u> | FY 2027 (10 Mo.) | FY 2028 | FY 2029 |
|--|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | | | |
| ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS | <u>\$0</u> | <u>\$0</u> | <u>\$0</u> |

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

FISCAL IMPACT – Small Business

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

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

The proposed legislation modifies provisions relating to public safety.

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 Commerce and Insurance
 Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development
 Department of Health and Senior Services
 Department of Mental Health
 Department of Natural Resources
 Department of Corrections
 Department of Revenue
 Department of Public Safety -
 Division of Alcohol and Tobacco Control
 Capitol Police
 Fire Safety
 Office of the Director
 Missouri Highway Patrol
 Missouri Veterans Commission
 Department of Social Services
 Missouri Department of Conservation

Office of Administration
Office of the State Courts Administrator
Office of the Secretary of State
Office of the State Public Defender
University of Missouri
Joint Committee on Administrative Rules
Missouri Office of Prosecution Services
City of Kansas City
Phelps County Sheriff
Branson Police Department
Kansas City Police Department
St. Louis County Police Department
Northwest Missouri State University
University of Central Missouri
Kansas City Election Board
Jackson County Election Board
Platte County Board of Elections
St. Louis City Board of Elections
St. Louis County Board of Elections



Julie Morff
Director
February 22, 2026



Jessica Harris
Assistant Director
February 22, 2026