

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 5144H.02C
 Bill No.: HCS for SB 1067
 Subject: Administrative Law; Cities, Towns, and Villages; Civil Procedure; Civil Rights; Counties; County Government; Courts; Evidence; Uniform Laws; Liability
 Type: Original
 Date: May 1, 2026

Bill Summary: This proposal modifies and establishes provisions relating to civil jurisprudence.

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND

FUND AFFECTED	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029
General Revenue*	\$0 to (Could exceed \$1,520,839)	(Could exceed \$3,253,492)	(Could exceed \$4,136,254)
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue	\$0 to (Could exceed \$1,520,839)	(Could exceed \$3,253,492)	(Could exceed \$4,136,254)

*Unknown potential increase in costs for DOC assumed to exceed \$250,000 annually if incurred.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS

FUND AFFECTED	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029
Statewide Court Automation	\$1,793,426	Could exceed \$2,152,111	Could exceed \$2,152,111
Missouri Expungement*	\$0	\$0	\$0
State Highways and Transportation Department	(\$233,316)	(\$274,563)	(\$280,054)
Total Estimated Net Effect on Other State Funds	\$1,560,110	Could exceed \$1,877,548	Could exceed \$1,872,057

*Gifts, donations, grants, etc. and expenditures net to \$0.

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS

FUND AFFECTED	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)

FUND AFFECTED	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029
General Revenue	Up to 19 FTE	Up to 27 FTE	Up to 33 FTE
State Highways and Transportation Department Fund	1 FTE	1 FTE	1 FTE
Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE	Up to 20 FTE	Up to 28 FTE	Up to 34 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	Less than \$130,200	Less than \$156,240	Less than \$156,240

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

§57.540 – Compensation for the Attorney of the Sheriff of the City of St. Louis

In response to 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.

§§287.200 and 287.470 – Worker's Compensation

In response to similar legislation, HB 3072 (2026), officials from the **City of O'Fallon** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

Oversight notes that the above-mentioned agency has stated the proposal would not have a direct 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.

In response to similar legislation, HCS for HB 3072 (2026), officials from **Northwest Missouri State University** assumed that if an employee dies due to a worker's compensation covered incident, the University could be liable to pay the employees' survivors for life.

Oversight notes that this legislation does not change an employer's liability responsibilities and only addresses administrative procedures related to changes in attorneys handling the cases. Therefore, for purposes of this fiscal note, Oversight will reflect no fiscal impact resulting from the legislation.

§§347.044, 347.143 and 347.186 – Limited Liability Companies

In response to similar legislation, HCS for HB 1713 (2026), officials from the **Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA)** stated HCS for HB 1713 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 1713 (2026), officials from the **Office of Attorney General (AGO)** assumed any potential litigation costs arising from this proposal could 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, HCS for HB 2508 (2026), officials from the **Office of the Secretary of State (SOS)** stated is no timeframe for getting all Series profiled. There are roughly 3,500 active individual series, many of which are not profiled. It takes roughly 5-10 minutes to profile and ensure that each individual series is searchable. This is equivalent to 290-585 hours of work (.25-.5 FTE). This cost can be absorbed.

This proposal allows each series to receive a Good Standing Certificate. As the current system is to allow one Certificate of Good Standing given to an LLC to be applied to all series created under the LLC, it is unknown how many companies will want to purchase these Certificates of Good Standing for each series.

Oversight assumes the proposal could result in additional filings and requests for certificates of good standing related to the series of limited liability companies. Any increase in filing fee revenue is indeterminate and dependent upon the number of businesses electing to form series under this section but is not expected to be significant. Therefore, Oversight will reflect no impact in the fiscal note for this provision.

§478.003 – Treatment Courts

In response to similar legislation, HCS for SB 945 (2026), officials from the **Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA)** stated the proposed legislation modifies and establishes provisions relating to court operations.

Section 478.003 adds treatment court administrators, subject to appropriations, in each circuit with a treatment court division that has neither a treatment court administrator nor a treatment court commissioner.

The following circuits would be eligible for treatment court administrators: third; fourth; eighth; tenth; fourteenth; fifteenth; seventeenth; eighteenth; twenty-fifth; twenty-sixth; twenty-seventh; thirtieth; thirty-first; thirty-fourth; thirty-seventh; thirty-eighth; forty-first; forty-third; and forty-sixth.

The FY27 salary is projected to be \$1,768,425 ($\$93,075 * 19$ FTE) including fringe, plus E&E of \$56,582 ($\$2,978 * 19$ FTE) of that \$40,223 is one-time ($\$2,117 * 19$ FTE one-time).

If the compensation of an administrator is provided from a source other than state funds, that source would need to be reimbursed for the actual costs of the salary and benefits.

Oversight has no information to the contrary. Oversight will range costs for the treatment court administrators from \$0 to \$1,825,007 ($\$93,075 + \$2,978 = \$96,053 * 19$ circuits) annually to General Revenue.

§§476.055, 483.005, 483.082, and 509.520 – Court Operations

In response to similar legislation, SB 945 (2026), officials from the **OSCA** stated the proposed legislation modifies and establishes provisions relating to court operations.

Sections 476.055, 483.005, 483.082, & 509.520 may have some impact but there is no way to quantify that currently. Any significant changes will be reflected in future budget requests.

Oversight notes these sections were not addressed in OSCA's response to this proposal except for a statement that any additional costs would be reflected in future budget requests. For fiscal note purposes, Oversight is presenting a \$0 or (Unknown) cost for various sections of this proposal.

§§478.385, 478.387, 478.550, 478.600, 478.630, 478.700, 478.705, and 487.020 – Judgeships in Certain Judicial Circuits

In response to similar legislation, HCS SB 945 (2026), officials from the **Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA)** stated this proposed legislation modifies provisions relating to certain Judicial Circuits.

Section 478.385 adds one additional circuit judge to the seventh Judicial circuit to be elected in 2028. The FY27 salary for circuit judges is projected to be \$182,427 plus E&E of \$2,978 ($\$2,117$ one-time).

Section 478.385 addition of a circuit judge this includes a court reporter. The FY26 starting salary for court reporters is \$72,516 plus E &E of \$2,978 ($\$2,117$ one-time).

Oversight notes the provisions of this section state there will be an additional circuit judge beginning in FY28. Oversight assumes the judge will be elected in November 2027 and take the bench 1-1-28. FY28 expenses for the judge and court reporter will be presented for 6 months.

OSCA stated §478.550 adds one additional associate circuit judge to the twenty-third Judicial circuit to be elected in 2028. This shall not be included in the statutory formula for authorizing additional judges per county as provided in §478.320. The FY27 salary of an associate circuit judge is projected to be \$167,833 plus E&E of \$2,978 (\$2,117 one-time).

Section 478.550 addition of an associate circuit judge includes a senior court clerk for the associate circuit judge. The FY26 starting salary for a senior court clerk is \$46,057 plus E & E of \$2,978 (\$2,117 one-time).

Oversight notes the Governor is to appoint the judge in 2028. Oversight assumes the judge will be appointed and start 7-1-27. Therefore, FY28 costs for the associate judge and senior court clerk will be reflected for 12 months.

OSCA stated §478.600 adds one additional circuit judge to the eleventh Judicial circuit to be elected in 2028. The FY27 salary for circuit judges is projected to be \$182,427 plus E&E of \$2,978 (\$2,117 one-time).

Section 478.600 addition of a circuit judge this includes a court reporter. The FY26 starting salary for court reporters is \$72,516 plus E &E of \$2,978 (\$2,117 one-time).

Section 478.600 adds two additional associate circuit judges to the eleventh Judicial circuit to be elected in 2028. These shall not be included in the statutory formula for authorizing additional judges per county as provided in §478.320. The FY27 salary of two associate circuit judges is projected to be \$335,666 (\$167,833 x 2) plus E&E of \$5,956 (\$2,978 x 2) of that \$4,234 is one-time (\$2,117 x 2 one-time).

Section 478.600 addition of two associate circuit judges includes a senior court clerk for each associate circuit judge. The FY26 starting salary for two senior court clerks is \$92,114 (\$46,057 x 2) plus E&E of \$5,956 (\$2,978 x 2) of that \$4,234 is one-time (\$2,117 x 2 one-time).

Oversight notes the provisions of this section provide for a circuit judge to be elected in 2028. Oversight assumes the judge will be elected in November 2028 and take the bench 1-1-29; therefore, costs for the judge and court reporter will be presented for 6 months beginning in FY29.

Oversight also notes the provisions of this section provide for two (2) additional associate circuit judges to be elected in 2028. Oversight assumes the judges will be elected in November 2028 and take the bench 1-1-29. FY29 expenses for the judges and senior court clerks will be presented for 6 months.

OSCA stated §478.630 adds one additional associate circuit judge to Franklin County to be elected in 2028. This shall not be included in the statutory formula for authorizing additional judges per county as provided in § 478.320. The FY27 salary of an associate circuit judge is projected to be \$167,833 plus E&E of \$2,978 (\$2,117 one-time; \$861 on-going).

Section 478.630 addition of an associate circuit judge includes a senior court clerk for the associate circuit judge. The FY26 starting salary for a senior court clerk is \$46,057 plus E & E of \$2,978 (\$2,117 one-time; \$861 on-going).

Oversight notes the Governor is to appoint the judge in 2028. Oversight assumes the judge will be appointed and start 7-1-27. Therefore, FY28 costs for the associate judge and senior court clerk will be reflected for 12 months.

Oversight notes §478.700 provides for three (3) circuit judges in the 25th judicial circuit. OSCA's 2027 budget already shows 3 circuit judges for this judicial circuit. This legislation appears to clarify election dates for the existing judges. Oversight assumes no fiscal impact for this section.

OSCA stated §478.705 adds one additional associate circuit judge to Miller County to be elected in 2028. This shall not be included in the statutory formula for authorizing additional judges per county as provided in section 478.320. The FY27 salary of an associate circuit judge is projected to be \$167,833 plus E&E of \$2,978 (\$2,117 one-time; \$861 on-going).

Section 478.705 addition of an associate circuit judge includes a senior court clerk for the associate circuit judge. The FY26 starting salary for a senior court clerk is \$46,057 plus E & E of \$2,978 (\$2,117 one-time; \$861 on-going).

Oversight notes the Governor is to appoint the judge in 2028. Oversight assumes the judge will be appointed and start 7-1-27. Therefore, FY28 costs for the associate judge and senior court clerk will be reflected for 12 months.

OSCA stated §487.020.2 includes provisions that shall not be construed to allow appointment of a family court commissioner in the seventh judicial circuit in addition to the number of family court commissioners holding office.

The proposed legislation's addition of two circuit court judges, two court reporters, five associate circuit judges and five senior court clerks total approximately \$1,579,336 plus E & E of \$41,692 (\$29,638 one-time) and 14 FTE.

Oversight assumes costs provided by OSCA are for a full year and notes the estimate of the costs of this proposal provided by OSCA do not include fringe benefits or inflationary increases for salaries and equipment and expenses for the three- year period of the fiscal note. Oversight further notes the judges are not all appointed/elected at the same time and has adjusted the fiscal note to reflect the provisions in the proposal as noted by the sections above.

§§488.012 and 488.027 – Court Costs

In response to similar legislation, HCS SB 945 (2026), officials from the **Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA)** stated during the past five fiscal years there was an average of 1,405,422 cases filed with the current fee of \$7. The average total assessment amount was \$9,837,954, and the average amount of revenue collected was \$5,021,725 (approximately a 51.044 % collection rate).

The court automation fee increase to \$10.00 is expected to result in approximately \$14,054,220 in assessments (average cases 1,405,422 x \$10.00). With the collection rate of 51.044 %, the estimated amount of revenue is approximately \$7,173,836. This would increase the average amount of revenue collected by \$2,152,111.

The Missouri Court Automation Committee would request an increase in appropriation authority from the statewide court automation fund to correspond with court automation fee assessments. The additional spending authority would assist in maintaining and advancing the judiciary's use of automation in the local courts.

Officials from the **Office of Administration - Budget and Planning (B&P)** state §488.014 would increase the court fee to be deposited into the Statewide Automation Fund by \$3. This would increase total state revenues.

Section 488.027 would adjust court fees annually for inflation based on the Consumer Price Index each January 1, 2027. This would increase total state revenues.

B&P defers to Office of the State Courts Administrator for specific estimates of potential impact.

Oversight has no information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will present the fiscal impact of this proposal as provided by OSCA, adjusted to 10 months for FY27. However, Oversight notes the provisions of §488.027.4 provide that beginning July 1, 2027 (FY28), and each year thereafter, the fee authorized shall be adjusted annually for inflation. As a result, Oversight assumes the fees presented could exceed the amount provided by OSCA once adjusted by the Consumer Price Index beginning in FY28.

§488.426 – St. Louis City Circuit Court Civil Case Filing Fee

In response to similar legislation, HCS SB 945 (2026), officials from the **Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA)** stated the proposed legislation allows the circuit court in St. Louis City to collect a fee not to exceed twenty dollars, rather than fifteen, to go toward the law library.

During the past five years there was an average of 11,383 circuit civil case filings, 4,856 domestic relations civil case filings and 15,009 associate civil and small claims civil case filings for a total of 31,248 case filings.

Based upon the increase in the collection fee not to exceed \$20.00, rather than \$15.00, to go toward the library, OSCA estimates the increase to be \$0 to \$156,240 (\$5 x 31,248).

Oversight assumes fees collected would go directly to the St. Louis City Circuit Court and will present a positive fiscal impact of \$0 to \$156,240 (\$5 x 31,248) annually. Oversight also assumes the provisions of this section will not create a material fiscal impact to local political subdivisions other than St. Louis City Circuit Court.

Officials from the **Office of Administration - Budget and Planning (B&P)** state \$488.426 appears to alter the scope of circuits to which certain surcharge authorizations apply, potentially impacting TSR.

These changes would potentially increase Total State Revenue. B&P defers to OSCA for specific estimates of the potential impact.

§§506.290, 510.030, and 515.625 – Civil Jurisprudence

In response to similar legislation, HB 3116 (2026), officials from the **Office of the Secretary of State** 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 in the fiscal note for this agency.

§§510.500, 510.503, 510.506, 510.509, 510.512, 510.515, 510.518, and 510.521 – Uniform Interstate Depositions and Discovery Act

Officials from the **Department of Public Safety-Missouri Highway Patrol (MHP)** state this proposal authorizes an alternative dispute resolution program, similar to federal court, and creates a Uniform Depositions and Discovery Act in §§510.500 to 510.521. With this proposed legislation the MHP anticipates an increased workload related to foreign subpoenas and/or discovery requests. There may also be increased litigation costs associated with non-party subpoena and discovery responses. These increased costs would likely cause a direct impact on the Patrol because the Missouri Attorney General's Office does not normally represent the Patrol in such cases. Many of these non-party legal matters would likely involve some of the over 30,000 motor vehicle crashes the Patrol investigates each year. As a result of the expected workload increase, the Patrol forecasts the need to add one Legal Counsel FTE.

The MHP estimates one FTE Legal Counsel plus equipment and expense would be a cost to the State Highways and Transportation Department Fund (1644) of up to \$233,316 for FY 2027; \$274,563 for FY 2028 and \$280,054 for FY 2029.

Oversight has no information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will present the fiscal impact of this proposal as the amount provided by the MHP.

In response to similar legislation, HCS HB 3116 (2026), officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** stated §510.506 provides a mechanism by which a foreign subpoena could be issued, served, and enforced on a person or entity in Missouri.

It is unknown if and when any of the DOC's offenders or staff would be subpoenaed. Therefore, the department is unable to project a fiscal cost and assumes a (\$0 – Unknown) fiscal impact. It is further assumed the unknown fiscal impact could exceed the \$250,000 threshold.

Oversight has no information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will range the fiscal impact of this proposal as provided by the DOC as \$0 or Unknown cost to General Revenue. Oversight assumes if DOC experiences an impact, that the impact to General Revenue could exceed \$250,000 annually.

In response to similar legislation, HB 1711 (2026), officials from the **Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA)** stated this proposal may have some fiscal 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 1711 (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.

§537.529 – Uniform Public Expression Protection Act

In response to a previous version, officials from the **Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA)** stated this proposal 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.

Officials from the **City of Kansas City** state the proposed legislation has a potential negative fiscal impact of an indeterminate amount because it increases the City's exposure to liability.

In response to similar legislation, SB 503 (2025), officials from the **Concordia R-II School District** stated the fiscal impact of this proposal would be approximately \$7,000 in increased legal fees per action.

Oversight notes based on the local responses above there is potential negative fiscal impact due to increased legal expenses. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a \$0 or (Unknown) cost to local political subdivisions. Oversight assumes costs to local political subdivisions will be less than \$250,000 annually.

In response to a previous version of this proposal, 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.

§610.144 – Missouri Expungement Fund

Officials from the **Office of Administration - Budget and Planning (B&P)** state §610.144 establishes the Missouri Expungement Fund that will consist of moneys deposited from any source, including gifts, donations, grants, and bequests, as well as interest or other earnings as a result of investments by the State Treasurer's Office. The fund may be used to support expenses related to the statewide court automation system and the Missouri criminal history record information system. These changes would potentially increase Total State Revenue. B&P defers to OSCA for specific estimates on the potential impact.

In response to similar legislation, HCS HB 2967 (2026), **OSCA** assumed this proposal may have some impact on their organization, but there is no way to quantify that amount currently. Any significant changes will be reflected in future budget requests.

Oversight notes the provisions of this proposal provide that the Missouri Expungement Fund shall consist of monies deposited into the fund from any source, but not limited to gifts,

donations, grants and bequests. The Office of State Courts Administrator, the Department of Public Safety, and the ITSD within the Office of Administration shall expend moneys from the fund, upon appropriation, on the Statewide Court Automation System and the Missouri Criminal History Record Information System for purposes specified in the bill.

Oversight assumes, for fiscal note purposes, unknown contributions, etc. coming into the fund as well as unknown expenses incurred by OSCA, DPS and OA-ITSD; income and expenses will net to \$0.

Bill as a Whole

Officials from the **Office of the Governor (GOV)** state this bill adds to the Governor's current load of appointment duties. Individually, additional requirements should not fiscally impact the GOV. However, the cumulative impact of additional appointment duties across all enacted legislation may require additional resources for the GOV.

Oversight has no information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will present no fiscal impact for this proposal for the GOV.

Officials from the **Office of Administration - Administrative Hearing Commission, Department of Commerce and Insurance, Department of Economic Development, Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development, Department of Health and Senior Services, Department of Mental Health, Department of Natural Resources, Department of Labor and Industrial Relations, Department of Revenue, Department of Public Safety, Divisions of: Alcohol and Tobacco Control, Capitol Police, Fire Safety, Director's Office, Missouri Gaming Commission, Missouri Veterans Commission, and State Emergency Management Agency, MoDOT & Patrol Employees' Retirement System, Department of Social Services, Missouri Department of Agriculture, Missouri Department of Conservation, Missouri Department of Transportation, Missouri National Guard, Office of Administration, Office of the State Treasurer, University of Missouri System, Platte County Board of Elections, St. Louis City Board of Elections, St. Louis County Board of Elections, Newton County Health Department, Phelps County Sheriff, Kansas City Police Department, St. Louis County Police Department, County Employees Retirement Fund, Public Education Employees' Retirement System, Sheriff's Retirement System, University of Central Missouri, Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District, South River Drainage District, Wayne County Public Water Supply District #2, Joint Committee on Public Employee Retirement, Legislative Research, Oversight Division, Missouri Senate, Missouri Lottery, Missouri Consolidated Health Care Plan, Missouri State Employees Retirement System and State Tax Commission** each assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

Oversight has no information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will present no fiscal impact for these organizations for this proposal.

In response to previous versions of SB 945, HB 3116 and/or SB 1067 (2026), officials from the **Office of the Lieutenant Governor, Missouri House of Representatives, Office of the State Auditor, Office of the State Public Defender and Missouri Office of Prosecution Services** each assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their organization.

Oversight has no information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will present no fiscal impact for this organization for this proposal.

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.

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.

Oversight only reflects the responses that we have received from state agencies and political subdivisions; however, other cities, local election authorities, various county officials, local public health agencies, nursing homes, local law enforcement agencies, fire protection districts, ambulance & EMS, retirement, school districts & charter schools, utilities, hospitals, colleges & universities and electric companies and coops 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 – OSCA and (Various Sections)</u> Potential increase in costs p.3-4, 5, 10 & 11	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
<u>Cost – OSCA (§478.003) Treatment</u> court administrator costs p.4-5	(\$0 to \$1,520,839)	(\$0 to \$1,825,007)	(\$0 to \$1,825,007)
FTE Change - OSCA	Up to 19 FTE	Up to 19 FTE	Up to 19 FTE
<u>Cost – OSCA (§478.385) p.5-6</u>			
Personal service	\$0	(\$130,304)	(\$264,895)
Fringe benefits	\$0	(\$97,824)	(\$198,491)
Equipment and expense	\$0	(\$5,112)	(\$1,792)
<u>Total Costs - OSCA</u>	\$0	(\$233,240)	(\$465,178)
FTE Change - OSCA	0 FTE	2 FTE	2 FTE
<u>Cost – OSCA (§478.550) p.6</u>			
Personal service	\$0	(\$218,268)	(\$221,782)
Fringe benefits	\$0	(\$174,157)	(\$176,621)
Equipment and expense	\$0	(\$5,990)	(\$1,792)
<u>Total Costs - OSCA</u>	\$0	(\$398,415)	(\$400,195)
FTE Change - OSCA	0 FTE	2 FTE	2 FTE
<u>Cost – OSCA (§478.600) p.6</u>			
Personal service	\$0	\$0	(\$354,229)
Fringe benefits	\$0	\$0	(\$275,865)
Equipment and expense	\$0	\$0	(\$15,390)
<u>Total Costs - OSCA</u>	\$0	\$0	(\$645,484)
FTE Change - OSCA	0 FTE	0 FTE	6 FTE
<u>Cost – OSCA (§478.630) p.7</u>			
Personal service	\$0	(\$218,268)	(\$221,782)
Fringe benefits	\$0	(\$174,157)	(\$176,621)
Equipment and expense	\$0	(\$5,990)	(\$1,792)
<u>Total Costs - OSCA</u>	\$0	(\$398,415)	(\$400,195)
FTE Change - OSCA	0 FTE	2 FTE	2 FTE

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2027 (10 Mo.)	FY 2028	FY 2029
<u>Cost – OSCA (§478.705) p.7</u>			
Personal service	\$0	(\$218,268)	(\$221,782)
Fringe benefits	\$0	(\$174,157)	(\$176,621)
Equipment and expense	<u>\$0</u>	<u>(\$5,990)</u>	<u>(\$1,792)</u>
Total Costs - OSCA	<u>\$0</u>	<u>(\$398,415)</u>	<u>(\$400,195)</u>
FTE Change - OSCA	0 FTE	2 FTE	2 FTE
<u>Cost – DOC (§§510.500 to 510.521)</u> Increase in deposition and discovery costs p.9-10	\$0 or <u>(Unknown)</u>	\$0 or <u>(Unknown)</u>	\$0 or <u>(Unknown)</u>
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE	<u>\$0 to (Could exceed \$1,520,839)</u>	<u>(Could exceed \$3,253,492)</u>	<u>(Could exceed \$4,136,254)</u>
Estimated Net FTE Change on General Revenue	Up to 19 FTE	Up to 27 FTE	Up to 33 FTE
STATEWIDE COURT AUTOMATION FUND (1270)			
<u>Revenue Gain – OSCA (§§488.012 and 488.027) Increase in court fees p.8</u>	<u>\$1,793,426</u>	Could exceed <u>\$2,152,111</u>	Could exceed <u>\$2,152,111</u>
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE STATEWIDE COURT AUTOMATION FUND	<u>\$1,793,426</u>	<u>Could exceed \$2,152,111</u>	<u>Could exceed \$2,152,111</u>
MISSOURI EXPUNGEMENT FUND			
<u>Income – Gifts, grants, donations and bequests p.11</u>	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown
<u>Cost – Various expenditures by OSCA, DPS-MHP, and OA-ITSD p.7-8</u>	\$0 or <u>(Unknown)</u>	\$0 or <u>(Unknown)</u>	\$0 or <u>(Unknown)</u>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2027 (10 Mo.)	FY 2028	FY 2029
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE MISSOURI EXPUNGEMENT FUND	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
STATE HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT FUND (1644)			
<u>Cost – DPS/MHP (§§510.500 to 510.521) p.9</u>			
Personal service	(\$119,260)	(\$145,974)	(\$148,894)
Fringe benefits	(\$105,056)	(\$128,589)	(\$131,160)
Equipment and expense	<u>(\$9,000)</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
<u>Total Costs – DPS/MHP</u>	<u>(\$233,316)</u>	<u>(\$274,563)</u>	<u>(\$280,054)</u>
FTE Change – DPS/MHP	1 FTE	1 FTE	1 FTE
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE STATE HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT FUND	<u>(\$233,316)</u>	<u>(\$274,563)</u>	<u>(\$280,054)</u>
Estimated Net FTE Change on the State Highways and Transportation Department Fund	1 FTE	1 FTE	1 FTE

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – Local Government</u>	FY 2027 (10 Mo.)	FY 2028	FY 2029
LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS			
<u>Revenue – St. Louis City Circuit (§488.426) Increase in fees for law library p.8-9</u>	Up to \$130,200	Up to \$156,240	Up to \$156,240
<u>Cost – City of St. Louis (§57.540) Attorney’s salary set by the Sheriff of the City of St. Louis p.3</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – Local Government</u>	FY 2027 (10 Mo.)	FY 2028	FY 2029
Cost – (§537.529) Potential increase in liability costs p.11	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS	Less than \$130,200	Less than \$156,240	Less than \$156,240

FISCAL IMPACT – Small Business

This proposal may impact small business limited liability companies. (§§347.044, 347.143 and 347.186)

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

Current law provides that compensation for the attorney for the sheriff of the City of St. Louis shall be not less than \$3,000 and not more than \$15,000 per year. This act provides that the sheriff shall set the rate of compensation for the attorney, and the attorney shall serve at the pleasure of the sheriff. (§57.540)

The bill permits the Labor and Industrial Relations Commission to change the name, information, or fee arrangement of the attorney or law firm representing a claimant upon the filing of a written agreement, signed by both the claimant and the attorney and the new attorney, with the Commission.

This bill allows for any person to apply to the Secretary of State (SOS) for a certificate of good standing for a domestic limited liability company (LLC) or a foreign LLC. The requirements to receive a certificate of good standing from the SOS are outlined in the bill. A certificate of good standing issued by the SOS will be prima facie evidence that the domestic or foreign LLC exists and is authorized to transact business in this State.

Current law allows an LLC to establish one or more designated series with separate rights, powers, and liabilities. Each series can hold assets and incur debts that are enforceable only against the assets of that series.

Further, the current law allows an operating agreement to establish one or more designated series of members, managers, or interests, each of which may have separate rights, powers, duties, business purposes, investment objectives, and liabilities distinct from the LLC or other series. Debts, liabilities, and obligations incurred by a series are enforceable only against the assets of that series if the records of the series are maintained separately and the articles of organization contain notice of such limitation.

This bill requires that no later than January 31, 2027, each series to be individually profiled and searchable on the SOS's business entity database and authorizes a series to obtain a separate certificate of good standing.

Currently, a limited liability company (LLC) can be dissolved by a decree of the circuit court located in the county of the registered office of the LLC upon application by or for a member of the LLC when it is not reasonably practicable to carry on business in conformity with the operating agreement.

This bill expands this provision to also allow the court to dissolve an LLC:

- (1) When dissolution is reasonably necessary for protection of the rights or interests of complaining members;
- (2) When the business of the LLC has been abandoned;
- (3) The management of the LLC is deadlocked or subject to internal dissension;
- (4) The business operations of the LLC are substantially impaired; or
- (5) Those in control of the LLC have been found guilty of, or have knowingly allowed, persistent and pervasive fraud, mismanagement, or abuse of authority.

This bill updates current statute to include "or her" in those rather than "his" and makes other technical changes. (§§287.200, 287.470, 347.044, 347.143, and 347.186)

The Missouri supreme court may assign a treatment court commission to serve in the treatment court division of a circuit other than the circuit in which the commissioner is appointed. In each circuit having a treatment court division that has neither a treatment court administrator nor a treatment court commissioner, the court shall employ a treatment court administrator, subject to appropriations. (§478.003)

This bill amends various statutes related to certain judicial circuits by repealing references to the specific counties of which the individual circuits consist. The bill also adds a circuit judge to the 7th and 11th judicial circuits as well as associate circuit judges to the 11th, 23rd, Franklin and Miller counties.

Currently, the court collects as a court cost \$7 for the statewide court automation fund. This bill increases the amount to \$10. The bill specifies that, starting July 1, 2027, and every July thereafter, the fee associated with all civil cases and certain criminal cases assessed as court costs will be adjusted annually for inflation based on the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers rounded to the nearest whole dollar. The annual adjustment will apply to all cases filed on or after January 1st of the year in which the adjustment was made. (§§488.012 and 488.027)

Currently, any circuit court may collect a civil case filing surcharge of an amount not to exceed \$15 for the maintenance of a law library, the county's or circuit's family services and justice fund, or courtroom renovation and technology enhancement. If the circuit court reimburses the state for salaries of family court commissioners or is the circuit court in Jackson County, the

surcharge may be up to \$20. This act provides that the circuit court in the City of St. Louis may charge a filing surcharge up to \$20. (§488.426)

This bill establishes the "Uniform Interstate Depositions and Discovery Act". The bill specifies the procedures and processes for the submission of a foreign subpoena that originates in a state other than Missouri, and the processes by which Missouri county clerks must administer foreign subpoenas.

These provisions apply to requests for discovery in cases pending August 28, 2026.

Currently, when a lawsuit is filed against non-resident motorists, there are certain rules to determine which venue is proper to bring such a suit. This bill updates the range of Sections under which lawsuits of this nature are brought. (§§510.030, 510.500, 510.503, 510.506, 510.509, 510.512, 510.515, 510.518, 510.521 and 515.625)

This act establishes the "Uniform Public Expression Protection Act". Currently, any action against a person for conduct or speech undertaken or made in connection with a public hearing or meeting in a quasi-judicial proceeding before a tribunal or decision-making body of the state or a political subdivision thereof is subject to a special motion to dismiss, a motion for judgment on the pleadings, or motion for summary judgment and any such motion shall be considered by the court on a priority or expedited basis. This act repeals this provision and creates procedures for dismissal of causes of action asserted in a civil action based on a person's:

- (1) Communication in a legislative, executive, judicial, administrative, or other governmental proceeding;
- (2) Communication on an issue under consideration or review in a legislative, executive, judicial, administrative, or other governmental proceeding; or
- (3) Exercise of the right of freedom of speech or of the press, the right to assemble or petition, or the right of association, guaranteed by the United States Constitution or the Missouri Constitution, on a matter of public concern.

However, this act shall not apply to a cause of action asserted:

- (1) Against a governmental unit, as described in the act, or an employee or agent of a governmental unit acting in an official capacity;
- (2) By a governmental unit or an employee or agent of a governmental unit acting in an official capacity to enforce a law to protect against an imminent threat to public health or safety; or
- (3) Against a person primarily engaged in the business of selling or leasing goods or services if the cause of action arises out of a communication related to the sale or lease of such goods or services.

No later than 60 days after a party is served with a complaint, cross-claim, counterclaim, third-party claim, or other pleading that asserts a cause of action covered by this act, or at a later time upon a showing of good cause, a party may file a special motion to dismiss. The court shall hear

and rule on such motion no later than 60 days after the filing of the motion, unless the court orders a later hearing to allow for limited discovery or upon good cause. However, this act provides that the court shall hear and rule on the motion for dismissal no later than 60 days after the order allowing for discovery.

This act provides that all other proceedings between the moving party and the responding party in the action, including discovery and any pending hearings or motions, shall be stayed upon the filing of the special motion to dismiss. Additionally, this act provides that the court may stay, upon motion by the moving party, a hearing or motion involving another party or discovery by another party if a ruling on such hearing or motion or discovery relates to a legal or factual issue.

Any stay pursuant to this act shall remain in effect until the entry of an order ruling on the special motion to dismiss and the expiration of the time to appeal the order. A moving party may appeal an order denying the special motion to dismiss in whole or in part within 21 days of such order. If a party appeals an order ruling on a special motion to dismiss, this act provides that all proceedings between all parties shall be stayed until the conclusion of the appeal.

The court may allow discovery if a party shows that specific information is necessary to establish whether a party has satisfied or failed to satisfy the requirements of this act and such information is not reasonably available without discovery. Additionally, a motion for costs and expenses, voluntary dismissal, or a motion to sever shall not be stayed. During a stay, the court upon good cause may hear and rule on any motions unrelated to the special motion to dismiss and any motions seeking a special or preliminary injunction to protect against an imminent threat to public health or safety.

In ruling on a special motion to dismiss, this act provides that the court shall consider the parties' pleadings, the motion, any replies and responses to the motion, and any evidence that could be considered in a ruling on a motion for summary judgment. The court shall dismiss the cause of action with prejudice if:

- (1) The moving party has established that the cause of action is covered by this act;
- (2) The responding party has failed to establish that this act does not apply to the cause of action; and
- (3) Either the responding party failed to establish a prima facie case as to each essential element of the cause of action, or the moving party has established that the responding party failed to state a cause of action upon which relief can be granted or that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and that the party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.

A voluntary dismissal without prejudice of a cause of action that is subject to a special motion to dismiss pursuant to this act shall not affect the moving party's right to obtain a ruling on the motion and seek costs, reasonable attorneys' fees, and reasonable litigation expenses. Additionally, if the moving party prevails on the motion, this act provides that such costs, fees, and expenses shall be awarded to the moving party. A voluntary dismissal with prejudice of a cause of action that is subject to a special motion to dismiss establishes that the moving party

prevailed on the motion. The responding party shall be entitled to such costs, fees, and expenses if the responding party prevails on the motion and the court finds that the motion was frivolous or filed solely with the intent to delay the proceeding.

Finally, this act applies to causes of action filed or asserted on or after August 28, 2026. (§537.529)

This bill creates in the State Treasury the "Missouri Expungement Fund", the funds of which will be used by the Office of State Courts Administrator, the Department of Public Safety, and the Information Technology Services Division within the Office of Administration on the statewide court automation system and the Missouri criminal history record information system for the purposes specified in the bill. (§610.144)

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
Office of Administration –
 Administrative Hearing Commission
 Budget and Planning
Department of Commerce and Insurance
Department of Economic Development
Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
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 Labor and Industrial Relations
Department of Revenue
Department of Public Safety –
 Alcohol and Tobacco Control
 Capitol Police
 Fire Safety
 Director's Office
 Missouri Gaming Commission
 Missouri Highway Patrol
 Missouri Veterans Commission
 State Emergency Management Agency
Department of Social Services
Office of the Governor
Missouri Department of Agriculture

Missouri Department of Conservation
Missouri Department of Transportation
Missouri National Guard
MoDOT & Patrol Employees' Retirement System
Office of Administration
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
Platte County Board of Elections
St. Louis City Board of Elections
St. Louis County Board of Election
Newton County Health Department
Phelps County Sheriff
Kansas City Police Department
St. Louis County Police Department
Concordia R-II School District
County Employees Retirement Fund
Public Education Employees' Retirement System
Sheriff's Retirement System
University of Central Missouri
Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District
South River Drainage District
Wayne County Public Water Supply District #2
Northwest Missouri State University
Joint Committee on Administrative Rules
Joint Committee on Public Employee Retirement
Office of the Lieutenant Governor
Office of the State Auditor
Missouri House of Representatives
Missouri Senate
Legislative Research
Oversight Division
Missouri Lottery
Missouri Consolidated Health Care Plan
Missouri Office of Prosecution Services
Missouri State Employees Retirement System
State Tax Commission



Julie Morff
Director
May 1, 2026



Jessica Harris
Assistant Director
May 1, 2026