

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 2474-01
Bill No.: SB 787
Subject: Cities, Towns and Villages; Counties; Elections; Gambling.
Type: Original
Date: January 26, 2004

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 4 pages.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
Local Government*	\$0 or (UNKNOWN)	\$0 or (UNKNOWN)	\$0 or (UNKNOWN)

*** Note: Election costs at a general or primary election would be minimal, however, if the question was put before the voters at a special election, the election costs could be material. Also, the question would only be put before the voters of a county if a city within that county approves excursion gambling boats.**

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

Officials from the **Missouri Gaming Commission** and the **Office of Administration - Budget and Planning** each assume the proposal would not fiscally impact their respective agencies.

In response to a similar proposal from this year, officials from the **Office of the Secretary of State** assumed the proposal would not fiscally impact their agency.

Officials from **Jefferson County** state they would incur a cost of \$200,000 for holding an election county-wide after a city election for gambling, depending on what, if any, other issues would be appearing on the ballot. This is also a fiscal issue because Jefferson County has already voted to approve gambling county-wide, but by this amendment, would be required to conduct a new vote each time any city would put the proposal on their ballot. As such, this could be more than a one-time cost.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Officials from **St. Louis City** and **St. Louis County** did not respond to our request for fiscal impact.

Oversight will range the fiscal impact to county governments from \$0 to (Unknown), since a county would be required to place before voters the gambling boat question only if a city within the county authorized a gambling boat. Obviously, this proposal would not have a fiscal impact on most counties in Missouri, but could result in additional election costs to a few Missouri counties. If the county referendum is held at a general or primary election, the costs would be minimal, however, if the county referendum utilizes a special election, the costs to the county could be material.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2005 (10 Mo.)	FY 2006	FY 2007
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2005 (10 Mo.)	FY 2006	FY 2007
-----------------------------------------	---------------------	---------	---------

COUNTY GOVERNMENTS

<u>Costs - election costs *</u>	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
---------------------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT TO COUNTY GOVERNMENTS *	\$0 or (UNKNOWN)	\$0 or (UNKNOWN)	\$0 or (UNKNOWN)
---------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------

*** Note: Election costs at a general or primary election would be minimal, however, if the question was put before the voters at a special election, the election costs could be material. Also, the question would only be put before the voters of a county if a city within that county approves excursion gambling boats.**

FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

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

DESCRIPTION

This proposal provides that if the voters of a city approve the licensing of gambling boats within the city, then the voters of the county must subsequently approve the licensing of gambling boats within such city. Currently, once a city approves of the licensing of gambling boats within the city, there is no subsequent county-wide vote on the matter.

The provisions of this proposal shall not apply to any city which has voted to approve the licensing of gambling boats and where a license has been granted to an entity to operate a gambling boat prior to August 28, 2004.

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

Missouri Gaming Commission
Office of Administration
Office of the Secretary of State
Jefferson County

NOT RESPONDING: St. Louis City, St. Louis County, Stone County



Mickey Wilson, CPA
Director
January 26, 2004