

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 5090-08
Bill No.: Truly Agreed To and Finally Passed CCS No. 2 for HCS for SCS for SB 672
Subject: Political Subdivisions; Fire Protection; Cities, Towns, and Villages; Annexation;
Department of Health; County Government; Retirement Systems and Benefits -
General; Attorneys
Type: Original
Date: June 9, 2014

Bill Summary: Changes the laws regarding political subdivisions

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 24 pages.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017
Agriculture Protection Fund	(\$60,269)	(\$70,316)	(\$71,205)
MO Real Estate Appraiser Commission Fund	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
Road Fund	(Greater than \$100,000)	(Greater than \$100,000)	(Greater than \$100,000)
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds	(Greater than \$160,269)	(Greater than \$170,316)	(Greater than \$171,205)

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017
Agriculture Protection Fund	1 FTE	1 FTE	1 FTE
Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE	1 FTE	1 FTE	1 FTE

- 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).

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017
Local Government	Greater than \$1,087,873 to (Greater than \$100,000)	Greater than \$3,426,540 to (Greater than \$100,000)	Greater than \$3,426,540 to (Greater than \$100,000)

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

§49.266 - Authorizes county commissions in non-charter county to issue burn bans

Officials at the **Office of Administration's Division of Budget and Planning** assume this proposal allows all noncharter counties to promulgate vehicular traffic and parking regulations. This is a change from all first, second and fourth class counties, which may exclude some counties previously operating under this provision. The addition or exclusion of a county under this provision may increase or decrease local revenue by an unknown amount.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Oversight assumes this proposal is permissive in nature and would have no local fiscal impact without action by the governing body. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a \$0 impact to Local Political Subdivisions.

Officials at the **Department of Conservation**, the **Department of Agriculture**, the **Department of Natural Resources**, the **Department of Public Safety's Division of Fire Safety** and the **Joint Committee on Administrative Rules** each assume no fiscal impact to their respective agencies from this proposal.

Officials at **St. Louis County**, the **St. Louis County Board of Election Commission** and **Platte County** each assume no fiscal impact to their respective organizations from this proposal.

In response to a previous version, officials at **Cole County** assumed no fiscal impact from this proposal.

§§56.067, 56.265, 56.363, 56.807, 56.816 - Modifies provisions of prosecuting attorneys

Officials at the **Office of Administration's Division of Budget and Planning (BAP)** assume this proposal will allow counties, upon voter approval, to elect to create the office of District Prosecuting Attorney. BAP defers to the Office of the State Courts Administrator and the Prosecuting and Circuit Attorneys Retirement System for other funds impact.

Officials at the **Prosecuting and Circuit Attorneys Retirement System** assume that this proposal would permit counties which have elected, in the past, to make the position of prosecutor a full-time position to make a new election to return the position to a part-time position. Because the extent to which this option would be utilized is unknown, it is impossible to assess the financial impact of the proposal in this regard. Further, the changes in the contributions required by the county should reflect the change in the retirement benefit structure resulting from the change from full-time to part-time status.

Officials at the **Office of the State Courts Administrator** assume the proposed legislation modifies provisions relating to county prosecuting attorneys. There may be some impact but there is no way to quantify that currently. Any significant changes will be reflected in future budget requests.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Officials at the **Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration** and the **Office of the State Treasurer** each assume no fiscal impact to their respective agencies from this proposal.

In response to a previous version, officials at the **Office of the Secretary of State** assumed no fiscal impact from this proposal.

Officials at **Platte County**, the **St. Louis County Board of Election Commission** and **St. Louis County** each assume no fiscal impact to their respective organizations from this proposal.

In response to a previous version, officials at the **City of Kansas City, Cole County, the Missouri Sheriff's Retirement System** and the **County Employee's Retirement Fund** each assumed no fiscal impact to their respective organizations from this proposal.

The proposal is permissive in nature. If counties decide to have such a proposition submitted to their voters, they would incur election costs. If approved, the county could realize savings by going to a part-time county prosecutor position. For fiscal note purposes, **Oversight** will show \$0 fiscal impact (no sharing) to Unknown savings starting in FY 2017.

§57.095 - Immunity from conducting service of process by a court for law enforcement officers

Officials at the **Office of Administration's Division of Budget and Planning** assume this proposal reduces the liability of law enforcement agencies fulfilling a court order. The proposal could have a potential positive impact to local revenues due to decreased liability of law enforcement agencies carrying out court orders, such as evictions.

§67.281 - Installation of Fire Sprinklers

Officials at the **Department of Economic Development** and the **Department of Public Safety's Division of Fire Safety** each assume no fiscal impact to their respective agencies from this proposal.

Officials at **St. Louis County** assume no fiscal impact from this proposal.

In response to a previous version, officials at the **City of Columbia** assumed no fiscal impact from this proposal.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

§67.320 - Modifies provisions related to municipal courts in Jefferson and Franklin counties.

Officials at the **Office of the State Courts Administrator** and the **Office of Prosecution Services** each assume no fiscal impact to their respective agencies from this proposal.

In response to similar legislation (SB 824), officials at the **Office of the State Public Defender** assumed no fiscal impact from this proposal.

Officials at the Jefferson County and Franklin County did not respond to **Oversight's** request for fiscal impact.

§§79.130, 79.135 - Voters in fourth class cities to propose ordinances

In response to a previous version, officials at the **City of Raytown** assumed this proposal has the potential to cost their community hundreds of thousands of dollars. Each election the City holds has a cost of \$20,000 to \$35,000 and that does not count their staff time to verify petitions. Given that only 25% of the people voting in the last election would amount to approximately 7% of their registered voters, it is realistic that 500 people in a community of 30,000 could force an immediate election on pretty much anything and everything considered via ordinance.

Oversight assumes there would be no cost to political subdivisions until a petition is presented. Then, there would be cost to the affected city clerk to verify signatures. Election costs would be incurred if the affected Board of Aldermen did not approve the petition proposal. Oversight will reflect a \$0 impact (no petition proposals presented) to unknown costs.

Officials at the **Office of Administration's Division of Budget and Planning** assume this proposal may impact local revenues by an unknown amount.

In response to a previous version, officials at the **Office of the Secretary of State** assumed no fiscal impact from this proposal.

Officials at the **Springfield Police Department** and **St. Louis County** each assume no fiscal impact to their respective organizations from this proposal.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

In response to a previous version, officials at the **Boone County Sheriff's Department**, the **Jefferson City Police Department**, the **City of Kansas City**, the **City of Columbia** and the **Columbia Police Department** each assumed no fiscal impact to their respective organizations from this proposal.

§94.270 - Collecting or levy a license fee on hotels or motels

Officials at the **Office of Administration's Division of Budget and Planning** assume this proposal may impact local revenues by an unknown amount.

Oversight assumes the proposal permits the city of Edmundson to collect or levy a license fee on hotels or motels in an amount in excess of thirteen dollars and fifty cents per room per year. Current law allows a license fee of up to \$27 per room per year. **Oversight** will, for fiscal note purposes, show an unknown loss of income to Edmundson.

§105.1415 - Volunteer work for a judge or prosecutor

Officials at the **Office of the State Courts Administrator** assume no fiscal impact from this proposal.

Officials at **St. Louis County** assume no fiscal impact from this proposal.

In response to a previous version, officials at the **City of Columbia** assumed no fiscal impact from this proposal.

§135.980 - Public Financial Incentive

Officials at the **State Tax Commission**, the **Department of Economic Development** and the **Department of Revenue** assume no fiscal impact to their respective agencies from this proposal.

Officials at **St. Louis County** assume no fiscal impact from this proposal.

In response to similar legislation (SB 824), officials at the **City of Columbia** assumed no fiscal impact from this proposal.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

§182.802 - Library district sales tax in Saline County

In response to similar legislation (HB 1553), officials from the **Office of the Secretary of State (SOS)** assumed this proposal would allow public libraries in Saline County to put before the voters a maximum one half cent sales tax to support library services. The sales tax could potentially provide a good revenue source for library service, and reduce the need for property tax increases.

Officials from the **Office of Administration's Division of Budget and Planning (BAP)** assume this proposal would not result in any additional costs or savings to their organization. BAP officials noted this proposal would allow Saline County, upon voter approval, to levy a sales tax of up to 0.5% for a public library district. BAP officials stated that the Department of Revenue reported taxable sales in Saline County in 2013 of \$210.6 million. Therefore this proposal might generate $(\$210,600,000 \times 1/2\%) = \$1,053,000$ in local revenues.

Officials from the **Department of Revenue (DOR)** assume no fiscal impact from this proposal.

Oversight assumes any administrative impact to DOR would be minimal and could be absorbed with existing resources.

DOR officials provided an estimate of the IT cost to implement this proposal of \$1,092 based on 40 hours of programming to make changes to DOR systems.

Oversight assumes OA - ITSD (DOR) is provided with core funding to handle a certain amount of activity each year. Oversight assumes OA - ITSD (DOR) could absorb the costs related to this proposal. If multiple bills pass which require additional staffing and duties at substantial costs, OA - ITSD (DOR) could request funding through the budget process.

In response to similar legislation (HB 1553), officials from the **Marshall Public Library** assumed this proposal would not have a fiscal impact on their organization.

Officials from Saline County did not respond to **Oversight's** request for fiscal impact.

Oversight notes this proposal would allow Saline County officials to submit a proposition to the voters for a one-half cent sales tax for library purposes.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

§190.088 - Notice of detachment from Ambulance district

Officials at the **Office of Administration's Division of Budget and Planning** assume this proposal may impact local revenues by an unknown amount.

Officials at various Ambulance Districts, the City of Riverside and Platte County did not respond to **Oversight's** request for fiscal impact.

Oversight assumes this proposal is permissive in nature and would have no local fiscal impact without action by the governing body. Oversight will reflect a \$0 impact to Local Political Subdivisions.

§192.310 - City of St. Charles to establish and maintain a local health department

In response to a previous version, officials at **St. Charles County** estimated the fiscal impact of this proposal to be unknown. The County has no information as to the City's intentions should this legislation be passed into law.

Officials at the **Department of Health and Senior Services** assume no fiscal impact from this proposal.

In response to a previous version, officials at the **City of St. Charles** assumed no fiscal impact from this proposal.

§249.424 - Lateral Sewer Service line repair

Officials at the **Office of Administration** assume this proposal would allow, upon voter approval, a Sewer District to levy an annual fee of not more than \$36 per year for repair of lateral sewer services lines. This proposal may increase local revenues by an unknown amount.

In response to similar legislation (SB 581), officials at the **Platte County Board of Election Commission** assumed no fiscal impact from this proposal. However, each of their sewer districts could incur costs up to approximately \$9,000 for related election expenses.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Officials at the **Department of Economic Development 's Public Service Commission** and the **Department of Natural Resources** each assume no fiscal impact to their respective agencies from this proposal.

In response to similar legislation (HB 1692), officials at the **Office of the Secretary of State** assumed no fiscal impact from this proposal.

Officials at the **St. Louis County Board of Election Commission** and the **Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District** each assume no fiscal impact to their respective organizations from this proposal.

In response to similar legislation (SB 581), officials at the **City of Kansas City**, the **City of Columbia** and the **Kansas City Board of Election Commission** each assumed no fiscal impact to their respective organizations from this proposal.

Oversight assumes this proposal is permissive in nature and would have no local fiscal impact without action by the governing body and approval by the majority of voters. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a \$0 impact to Local Political Subdivisions.

§§262.960, 262.962 and 348.407 - Farm to School Act

Officials at the **Office of Administration's Division of Budget and Planning (BAP)** assume this proposal would require the Department of Health and Senior Services (DHSS), the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) and the Office of Administration (OA) to make staff available to implement the "Farm to School Act". The act would require the establishment and maintaining of a website, regular workshop and training sessions and the seeking of grants another funding sources to support the "Farm to School Program". Also, §348.407 would allow the authority to make grants, loans or loan guarantees to Missouri businesses for accessing and processing locally grown agriculture products for use in schools within the state. BAP defers to the Department of Agriculture, the DHSS, the DESE and OA for other fund and current resource impacts.

Officials from the **Department of Agriculture (AGR)** assume this proposal would require one new Marketing Specialist II/III, related equipment, materials, and travel. AGR assumes the position will be required to deliver the new scope of work for farm-to-school outreach detailed throughout the proposal. AGR assumes this position will be incorporated into the existing Agri-Missouri program and all other costs would be absorbed with existing appropriation and funding.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Oversight assumes this is a new program requiring AGR to designate an employee to administer and monitor the farm-to-school program and serve as a liaison between farmers and schools.

Oversight assumes this proposal will require 1 additional FTE paid from the Agriculture Protection Fund for AGR.

Officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)** assume AGR is responsible to designate an employee, administer, and monitor the farm-to-school program and serve as a liaison between farmers and schools. DESE would provide professional consultation and staff support for this program DESE assumes a taskforce would be established with DESE as a participant at the scheduled meetings. DESE does not anticipate a direct fiscal impact from this proposal.

Oversight assumes this proposal allows local school districts to incorporate locally grown agricultural products into their cafeteria offerings, salad bars, and vending machines.

Oversight assumes this proposal would have no direct fiscal impact on local school districts

Officials at the **Department of Health and Senior Services** and the **Department of Social Services** each assume no fiscal impact to their respective agencies from this proposal.

Officials at the **Office of Administration (OA)** assume this proposal requires OA to provide assistance to the Department of Agriculture with the implementation of the 'Farm to School Program'. In addition, the 'Farm to School Taskforce' would be created. This legislation requires that a representative from OA be chosen to serve as a member of the taskforce through December 31, 2015. OA's role would be minimal with this proposal and can be absorbed with existing resources.

In response to similar legislation (HB 2088), officials from the **University of Missouri** assumed the proposal would not fiscally impact their agency.

304.190 - Motor Vehicle height and weight limits

Officials from the **Department of Public Safety's Missouri Highway Patrol** assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their agency.

Officials at the **City of Columbia** assume that the proposal allows for an extension of the

ASSUMPTION (continued)

commercial district in Columbia. If heavier truck traffic is routed over an airport access road maintained by the City, there could be additional maintenance costs from wear and tear. It is not clear if the zone would extend north of southern or northern city limits.

In response to similar legislation (SB 824), officials from the **Department of Transportation (DHT)** assumed an unknown negative impact to the Road Fund from the increased cost of additional wear and tear to the highways and bridges.

Oversight will estimate a cost to the Road Fund and the Local Political Subdivisions of “(Greater than \$100,000)”, since there is no way to quantify the dollar amount of additional wear and tear to the highways and bridges for additional maintenance.

§321.322 - Fire protection district annexation procedures for the City of Harrisonville

Officials at the **Department of Public Safety - Division of Fire Safety** and the **State Tax Commission** each assume no fiscal impact to their respective agencies from this proposal.

Officials at the City of Harrisonville and Cass County did not respond to **Oversight's** request for fiscal impact.

§§339.507 and 339.531 - Missouri Certified Licensed Real Estate Appraisers and Appraisal Management Company Regulation Act

Officials from the **Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration** assume this proposal makes the Missouri Real Estate Appraisers Commission liable for the cost of an appraisal and an appraisal report if complaint investigation requirements are not met. There is no way to determine how many appraisals would be to be investigated and how many appraisals and reports have to be paid at the commission's expense. Therefore, there is an unknown fiscal impact with the implementation of this legislation to the Missouri Real Estate Appraisers Commission.

§407.1610 - Asphalt roofing shingles

Officials at the **Office of the State Courts Administrator** and the **Department of Natural Resources** each assume no fiscal impact to their respective agencies from this proposal.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Officials at **St. Louis County** assume no fiscal impact from this proposal.

In response to a previous version, officials at the **City of Columbia** assumed no fiscal impact from this proposal.

§§408.040, 488.305, 525.040, 525.070, 525.080, 525.230 & 525.310 - Garnishments

Officials at the **Office of Administration's Division of Budget and Planning (BAP)** assume this proposal changes numerous laws related to garnishments and will allow circuit clerks to collect a surcharge of up to \$10 in cases where garnishments are granted. BAP defers to the Office of the State Courts Administrator and the Office of Administration for other fund and current resource impacts.

Officials at the **Office of the State Courts Administrator (CTS)** assume the proposed legislation allows circuit court clerks to charge and collect a surcharge of up to \$10 in cases where a garnishment is granted.

Based on data for the past four years, FY09 through FY12, CTS assumes that the average is approximately 237,354 executions and garnishments on which this surcharge could be applied. CTS assumes all circuit courts would collect a \$10.00 surcharge and anticipates the revenue would be approximately \$2,373,540 in any given year.

FY 09	211,043
FY 10	231,258
FY 11	250,212
FY 12	<u>256,904</u>
Total	949,417
Average	237,354

Oversight assumes all circuit court clerks will collect this fee.

In response to a previous version, officials at the **City of Columbia** assumed an unknown fiscal impact from this proposal. §525.310.1 potentially makes the City responsible for payment of a garnishee's debt for a ministerial error by a City employee.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Oversight assumes that fiscal impact due to §525.310.1 would not happen unless a city employee makes an error. If this happens, the city will have to address the situation through the budget process.

Officials at the **Department of Labor and Industrial Relations**, the **Office of Administration**, the **Department of Social Services**, the **Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration**, the **Department of Conservation** and the **Office of Prosecution Services** each assume no fiscal impact to their respective agencies from this proposal.

In response to a previous version, officials at the **Office of the State Public Defender** and the **Missouri Department of Transportation** each assumed no fiscal impact to their respective agencies from this proposal.

Officials at the **St. Louis County** assume no fiscal impact from this proposal.

In response to a previous version, officials at the **City of Kansas City**, the **St. Charles County Recorder of Deeds**, the **Cape Girardeau County Recorder of Deeds** and the **City of Jefferson** each assumed no fiscal impact to their respective organizations from this proposal.

Oversight notes that these sections have an effective date of January 15, 2015, and will reflect five and one-half months impact in FY 2015.

Bill as a whole

Officials at the **Office of Administration's Administrative Hearing Commission** assume no fiscal impact from this proposal.

Officials at the **Jackson County Board of Election Commission**, the **Mississippi County Recorder of Deeds** and **St. Francois County** each assume no fiscal impact to their respective organizations from this proposal.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u> (continued)	FY 2015 (10 Mo.)	FY 2016	FY 2017
--	---------------------	---------	---------

ROAD FUND

<u>Cost - DHT</u> Increased maintenance cost (§304.190)	(Greater than <u>\$100,000</u>)	(Greater than <u>\$100,000</u>)	(Greater than <u>\$100,000</u>)
--	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON ROAD FUND	(Greater than <u>\$100,000</u>)	(Greater than <u>\$100,000</u>)	(Greater than <u>\$100,000</u>)
--	--	--	--

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2015 (10 Mo.)	FY 2016	FY 2017
---	---------------------	---------	---------

LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS

<u>Costs - Local Political Subdivisions - petition proposals (§§79.130, 79.135, 79.145)</u>	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)	\$0 to (Unknown)
---	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------

<u>Cost - Local Political Subdivisions - establishing and maintaining a local health department (§192.310)</u>	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
--	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------

<u>Cost - City of Columbia</u> Increased maintenance cost (§304.190)	(Greater than \$100,000)	(Greater than \$100,000)	(Greater than \$100,000)
---	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------

<u>Loss - City of Edmundson - Reduced hotel and motel room fees (§94.270)</u>	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
---	-----------	-----------	-----------

<u>Saving - Immunity for law enforcement agents conducting court-ordered services of process.(§59.095)</u>	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
--	---------	---------	---------

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u> (continued)	FY 2015 (10 Mo.)	FY 2016	FY 2017
<u>Savings</u> - Counties - Cost sharing of DA costs between multiple counties (§§56.067, 56.265, 56.363, 56.807, 56.816)	\$0	\$0	\$0 to Unknown
<u>Income</u> - Saline County - Library District Sales Tax (§182.802)	\$0	\$0 or \$1,053,000	\$0 or \$1,053,000
<u>Income</u> - Circuit Clerks - fees on garnishments	<u>\$1,087,873</u>	<u>\$2,373,540</u>	<u>\$2,373,540</u>
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS	Greater than \$1,087,873 to (Greater than <u>\$100,000</u>)	Greater than \$3,426,540 to (Greater than <u>\$100,000</u>)	Greater than \$3,426,540 to (Greater than <u>\$100,000</u>)

FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

There may be a direct fiscal impact to small businesses as a result of this proposal.

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

COUNTY PROPERTY - 49.266 - Under current law, county commissions in first, second, and fourth class counties may promulgate reasonable regulations concerning the use of county property. This act allows all noncharter counties to promulgate such regulations. This provision is identical to HB 2193 (2014).

PROSECUTING ATTORNEYS - 56.067, 56.363, 56.807, & 56.816 - Currently, the county commission of any county may or shall upon voter petition submit to the voters at a general or special election the proposition of making the county prosecutor a full-time position. This act provides that in Cedar County, the county commission may or shall upon voter petition submit to the voters a proposition to change the full-time county prosecutor position back to a part-time

FISCAL DESCRIPTION (continued)

position. If the prosecutor position is changed back to a part-time position, the contribution the county must pay in to the retirement system and the retirement benefit earned by the prosecutor will prospectively be that of a part-time prosecutor.

LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER IMMUNITY - 57.095 - This act provides law enforcement officers with immunity from any civil or criminal liability while conducting service of process.

INSTALLATION OF FIRE SPRINKLERS - 67.281 - Currently, builders of one and two family dwellings must offer to install fire sprinklers in the home. This provision has an expiration of December 31, 2019. This act makes the expiration date December 31, 2024. This provision is similar to a provision of HCS/SB 24 (2013).

JEFFERSON COUNTY MUNICIPAL COURTS - 67.320 - The act modifies the county description of Jefferson County in provisions of law which allow Jefferson and Franklin Counties to prosecute violations of county orders in a county municipal court. This provision is identical to provisions contained in HB 1921 (2014), HCS/SB 621 (2014), and HCS/SB 614 (2014).

INITIATIVE PETITION IN SAVANNAH- 79.130 & 79.135 - This act allows voters in the City of Savannah to propose ordinances via initiative petition. In order for a petition to be certified by the city clerk, it must be signed by at least ten percent of the city's registered voters voting for mayor at the last municipal election. Once the petition has been certified by the clerk, the board of aldermen must either pass the ordinance or submit the question of whether to pass the ordinance to the voters at the next municipal election, unless the petition has been signed by 25 percent or more of the registered voters, in which case the board of aldermen must immediately submit the question. The ordinance is enacted if it receives approval from a majority of the voters. Ordinances enacted via initiative petition cannot be repealed or amended except by a vote of the people. These provisions are similar to SB 764 (2014).

CITY FEES IN FLORDELL HILLS AND EDMUNDSON - 94.270 - Under current law, the cities of Flordell hills and Edmundson can levy a license fee on hotel and motel rooms of up to \$27 per room per year. Under this act, such cities may impose of license fee of up to \$13.50 per room per year.

COURT VOLUNTEERS - 105.1415 - This act provides that any person who performs unpaid volunteer work for a judge or prosecutor shall not be considered an employee of the county or municipality.

FISCAL DESCRIPTION (continued)

PUBLIC FINANCIAL INCENTIVES - 135.980 - This act prohibits the City of St. Louis from imposing restrictions by ballot measure on public financial incentives authorized by statute for businesses involved in bituminous coal and lignite surface mining. This provision expires on December 31, 2017. This provision is similar to a provision contained in HCS/SB 693 (2014).

PUBLIC LIBRARY DISTRICT - 182.802 - This act authorizes any public library district located in Saline County to impose a sales tax not to exceed one-half of one cent upon voter approval. This act is identical to SB 768 (2014) and HB 1553 (2014).

AMBULANCE DISTRICT DETACHMENT - 190.088 - Under this act, the City of Riverside may file with the ambulance district's board of directors a notice of intention of detachment stating that an area located in both the city and the district is to be taken from the district. After filing the notice, the city must conduct a public hearing. This act specifies the notice requirements the city must follow in regard to the public hearing. After the hearing, the city may approve the detachment by enacting an ordinance with the approval of two-thirds of the board of aldermen. Upon the effective date of the ordinance, the ambulance district must no longer provide services to the detached area and may no longer collect property taxes on property in the area. This act requires the city, on or before January first of the second calendar year after the property was detached, to pay the ambulance district a fee equal to the amount of revenue that would have been generated by the ambulance district's tax on property in the area. For the next four years, the city must pay a gradually decreasing fee to the district. The provisions of this section do not apply to St. Louis County.

HEALTH OFFICERS IN ST. CHARLES - 192.310 - Current law exempts cities with a population of 75,000 or more from certain laws dealing with local and state health rules. Under this act, the City of St. Charles is also exempted from such laws.

LATERAL SEWER SERVICE LINE REPAIR PROGRAM - 249.424 - This act allows a sewer district created and organized under Chapter 249 to impose a fee of up to \$50 per year for a lateral sewer service line repair program upon approval by a majority of voters in the district and the adoption of a resolution by the sewer district's board of trustees. Under the act, the fee cannot be imposed in any city, town, village, or the unincorporated area of a county that has already approved a fee for a sewer line repair program. Voters in such municipalities that already have the program are not eligible to vote on the question of whether the sewer district can impose the fee. This act allows the county collector to add the lateral sewer service fee to property tax bills. If a city, town, village, or the county had imposed a fee for a sewer line repair program, but later rescinded its fee after voters have authorized the sewer district to impose a fee, the sewer district

FISCAL DESCRIPTION (continued)

can request approval from voters in the municipality or unincorporated area to impose its fee. This provision was in sb 581 (2014) and the perfected version of SCS/SB 297 (2013).

FARM-TO-SCHOOL PROGRAM - 262.960, 262.962, & 348.407 - This act creates the Farm-to-School Program within the Department of Agriculture to provide schools with locally grown agricultural products for inclusion in school meals and snacks and to strengthen local farming economies. This act also creates the Farm-to-School Taskforce. The taskforce will include at least one representative from each of the following agencies: The University of Missouri extension service; the Department of Agriculture; the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education; and the Office of Administration. The director of the Department of Agriculture will appoint two persons actively engaged in the practice of small agribusiness. The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education will appoint two persons from schools who direct a food service program.

The task force mission is to provide recommendations for strategies that allow schools to more easily incorporate locally grown agricultural products into their food service and allow schools to work with food service providers to ensure greater use of locally grown agricultural products by developing standardized language for food service contracts. The taskforce must review various food service contracts to identify standardized language that could be included in contracts to allow schools to more easily procure and use locally grown agricultural products. The taskforce must prepare a report with findings and recommendations and submit it to the Governor, the General Assembly, and the director of each agency on the taskforce by December 31, 2015. The Missouri Agricultural and Small Business Development Authority may make grants, loans, or loan guarantees to Missouri businesses to access resources for accessing and processing locally grown agricultural products for use in schools.

MOTOR VEHICLE HEIGHT AND WEIGHT LIMITS - 304.190 - This act changes the laws regarding motor vehicle height and weight limits for the commercial zones in the city of Columbia. The act creates a 15-foot height limitation and a 22,400 pound weight limitation for any motor vehicle within the commercial zone of Columbia. The commercial zone extends from the city limits along U.S. Highway 63 for 8 miles, and extends east from the city limits along State Route WW to the intersection of State Route J and continues south on State Route J for four miles. This provision is identical to HB 2163 (2014).

ANNEXATION PROCEDURES IN HARRISONVILLE - 321.322 - Current law provides procedures for when property located within the boundaries of a fire protection district is annexed by a city that has a population of 2,500 to 65,000. The statute excludes annexations by

FISCAL DESCRIPTION (continued)

the City of Harrisonville from such procedures. That city is required to follow procedures provided under law for annexations in St. Louis County. This act repeals the provision exempting Harrisonville from the statute, so that the procedures provided for cities with a population of 2,500 to 65,000 apply to annexations by Harrisonville.

MISSOURI REAL ESTATE APPRAISERS COMMISSION - 339.507 & 339.531 - This act provides that members of the Missouri Real Estate Appraisers Commission appointed after August 28, 2014 must not be from the same congressional district. This act requires the commission to report annually to the General Assembly. This act creates procedures for a person to file complaints with the commission about licensed appraisers. In addition, this act requires the commission to appoint a probable cause committee to review such complaints. This commission is required to adopt rules regarding the committee.

This act provides procedures for the review and investigation of the complaint, including notice requirements for the licensee. If the probable cause committee determines that the grievance has merit, it must present the case to the commission and the commission decides whether to proceed with an investigation. If the commission decides to investigate, the complaint becomes part of the licensee's record. This act provides procedures for the commission's investigation, including notification procedures. The commission is provided rule-making authority. The provision regarding complaints to the commission takes effect August 28, 2015.

SPECULATIVE ACCUMULATION OF ASPHALT SHINGLES - 407.1610 - This act makes it a violation of the Merchandising Practices Act to accumulate asphalt shingles in the City of St. Louis without showing that at least 75% of the material will be recycled for other use in a calendar year. This provision is similar to a provision contained in HCS/SB 693 (2014).

GARNISHMENTS - 408.040, 488.305, 525.040 to 525.310 - The act provides a definition for the term "judgment balance" and states that post-judgment payments shall be applied first to post-judgment costs, then to interest, and then to judgment balance. Under the act, clerks of circuit courts are authorized to collect a surcharge of up to ten dollars when processing garnishments and money from the surcharge is to be used to maintain and improve case processing and record preservation.

The act adds language which provides that in the case of a continuous wage garnishment notice of garnishment served as provided by law shall have the effect of attaching all personal property until the judgment is paid in full or the employment relationship is terminated. Garnishments which would otherwise have equal priority shall have priority according to the date of service,

FISCAL DESCRIPTION (continued)

and when wages have been attached by more than one writ of garnishment then the employer must inform the inferior garnishor of the other garnishments.

When applicable, a garnishee may discharge himself by paying the money or giving the property owed to the defendant to the attorney for the party on whose behalf the order of garnishment was issued. Additionally, the court may order the delivery of the defendant's property possessed by the garnishee to the attorney for the party on whose behalf the order of garnishment was issued. The act allows the garnishee to deduct up to twenty dollars, or a fee previously agreed upon between the garnishee and judgment debtor when the garnishee is a financial institution, for expenses in answering interrogatories and withholding the funds. The garnishee may also file a motion with the court to obtain additional costs incurred in answering the interrogatories.

The act modifies provisions relating to the issuance of a writ of sequestration. Under current law, the wages of state government employees are not subject to direct garnishment, and instead must be collected under a process called sequestration. This act provides that the government employer shall have the same duties as a private employer when served with a garnishment order. The act repeals language requiring a writ of sequestration when the judgment debtor is a government employee, and provides that all garnishments against such employees shall proceed in the same manner as any other garnishment proceedings. These provisions have an effective date of January 15, 2015.

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 Conservation
Missouri Sheriff's Retirement System
Marshall Public Library
Platte County Board of Election Commission
Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District
Department of Agriculture
Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Department of Social Services
University of Missouri
St. Louis County Board of Election Commission

SOURCES OF INFORMATION (continued)

Cole County
St. Louis County
Office of the State Treasurer
Platte County Board of Election Commission
Prosecuting and Circuit Attorneys Retirement System
Office of the State Courts Administrator
Office of Prosecution Services
Department of Revenue
City of Columbia
City of Jefferson
Kansas City Board of Election Commission
Office of Administration
 Division of Budget and Planning
 Administrative Hearing Commission
Department of Economic Development
 Public Service Commission
Department of Agriculture
Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration
State Tax Commission
St. Charles County Recorder of Deeds
Department of Natural Resources
Department of Health and Senior Services
Department of Labor and Industrial Relations
Department of Public Safety
 Missouri Highway Patrol
 Division of Fire Safety
Joint Committee on Administrative Rules
Jackson County Board of Election Commission
City of Kansas City
Cape Girardeau County Recorder of Deeds
County Employee Retirement Fund
City of Raytown
Springfield Police Department
Boone County Sheriff's Department
Jefferson City Police Department
Columbia Police Department

SOURCES OF INFORMATION (continued)

St. Charles County
City of St. Charles
St. Francois County
Mississippi County Recorder of Deeds

Not Responding

Office of the Secretary of State
Missouri Department of Transportation
Office of the State Public Defender



Mickey Wilson, CPA
Director
June 9, 2014

Ross Strobe
Assistant Director
June 9, 2014