

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH  
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

**FISCAL NOTE**

L.R. No.: 0768-04  
Bill No.: Truly Agreed To and Finally Passed CCS for SCS for SB 248  
Subject: County Officials; Property, Real and Personal; Taxation and Revenue - Property  
Type: Original  
Date: May 31, 2013

---

Bill Summary: This proposal modifies provisions of law relating to collection of special assessments and delinquent property taxes.

**FISCAL SUMMARY**

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND</b>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS</b>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

Numbers within parentheses: ( ) indicate costs or losses.  
This fiscal note contains 6 pages.

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS</b>			
<b>FUND AFFECTED</b>	<b>FY 2014</b>	<b>FY 2015</b>	<b>FY 2016</b>
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)</b>			
<b>FUND AFFECTED</b>	<b>FY 2014</b>	<b>FY 2015</b>	<b>FY 2016</b>
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

- Estimated Total Net Effect on All funds expected to exceed \$100,000 savings or (cost).
- Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund expected to exceed \$100,000 (cost).

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS</b>			
<b>FUND AFFECTED</b>	<b>FY 2014</b>	<b>FY 2015</b>	<b>FY 2016</b>
<b>Local Government</b>	<b>(Less than \$100,000)</b>	<b>(Less than \$100,000)</b>	<b>(Less than \$100,000)</b>

## FISCAL ANALYSIS

### ASSUMPTION

#### § 67.457 - Neighborhood Improvement District documentation

Officials from the **City of Kansas City** assume there will be internal/staff costs incurred in compiling the information in the format required by this bill and in recording, but they will be nominal as this information is already in the city's possession and/or required to be generated in making the assessments.

**Oversight** assumes costs to implement this proposal would be minimal and could be absorbed by the entities involved.

#### §67.463 - Collection of assessments - Jackson County

Officials from the **City of Kansas City** assume the extent of the losses resulting from this section is dependent on the extent to which Jackson County would elect to collect/deduct a fee from the special assessment collections. Revenue losses can be eliminated, however, if this change is made applicable only to Neighborhood Improvement Districts established after the bill's effective date.

**Oversight** assumes this provision is permissive and for fiscal note purposes only, will assign no fiscal impact.

#### §140.290 & 140.470 - Elimination of tax deed fees

Officials from the **Boone County Collector** assume the changes in this proposal will reduce revenue to county general revenue and some programming costs will occur to remove the fees from collection and distribution software. Those amounts are unknown but assumed to be negligible.

**Oversight** assumes a minimal impact less than \$100,000 to local county government funds from the elimination of a fee for certain tax deeds.

In response to similar language in House Committee Substitute for HB 175, officials from the **Office of Administration - Division of Budget and Planning (BAP)** assumed this proposal changes procedures for local government officials and laws regarding property tax collections. This will have no impact on general and total state revenues. However, changes to the fee

ASSUMPTION (continued)

schedules for county collectors could impact the calculation in Article X, Section 18(e) on the Missouri Constitution.

BAP assumed this proposal should not result in additional costs or savings to BAP.

Also in response to HCS for HB 175, officials from the **Department of Transportation** indicated no fiscal impact.

Officials from the **Office of Attorney General, Department of Revenue, Office of State Treasurer, Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration, Department of Natural Resources, Office of Secretary of State, Missouri Tax Commission, St. Louis County**, and the **City of Columbia** each assume the proposal would not fiscally impact their respective agencies.

Officials from numerous counties did not respond to **Oversight's** request for fiscal impact.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2014 (10 Mo.)	FY 2015	FY 2016
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
 <u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	 FY 2014 (10 Mo.)	 FY 2015	 FY 2016
<b>LOCAL FUNDS</b>			
<u>Loss - Counties - Elimination of Tax Deed Fees (\$140.290 &amp; 140.470)</u>	(Less than <u>\$100,000</u> )	(Less than <u>\$100,000</u> )	(Less than <u>\$100,000</u> )
<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS</b>	<b>(Less than <u>\$100,000</u>)</b>	<b>(Less than <u>\$100,000</u>)</b>	<b>(Less than <u>\$100,000</u>)</b>

FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

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

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

§140.290 & 140.470 - Elimination of tax deed fees

This proposal eliminates specific language authorizing fees of twenty-five and fifty cents that the county collector is authorized to collect when recording a certificate of purchase of land sold at a tax sale. The collector will continue to be authorized to receive the fee necessary to record the certificate of purchase. The proposal eliminates language authorizing a one dollar and fifty cent fee for certain tax deeds.

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

Department of Revenue  
Office of Attorney General  
Missouri Tax Commission  
Office of Administration -  
    Division of Budget and Planning  
Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration  
Office of Secretary of State  
Office of State Treasurer  
Department of Natural Resources  
Department of Transportation  
Counties  
    St. Louis County  
    Boone  
Cities  
    Columbia  
    Kansas City

**Not Responding:**

Numerous Counties



Ross Strope  
Acting Director  
May 31, 2013