

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 5940S.07S
 Bill No.: CCS for SS for SB 1421
 Subject: Crimes and Punishment; Criminal Procedure; Professional Registration and Licensing; Department of Public Safety
 Type: Original
 Date: May 14, 2026

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

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND

FUND AFFECTED	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029	Fully Implemented (FY 2033)
General Revenue*	Could exceed (\$2,698,428 to \$3,198,428)	Could exceed (\$2,610,986)	Could exceed (\$3,125,733)	Could exceed (\$3,473,987)
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue	Could exceed (\$2,698,428 to \$3,198,428)	Could exceed (\$2,610,986)	Could exceed (\$3,125,733)	Could exceed (\$3,473,987)

*DOC notes that current capacity will be met by July 2029 (FY 2030) or potentially much sooner. Therefore, Oversight has made the decision to reflect the marginal cost of incarceration up to an unknown cost if DOC needs to add staff and/or rehabilitate, expand or construct additional capacity. DOC estimates the offender population would increase by approximately 130 by year seven under this legislation.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS

FUND AFFECTED	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029	Fully Implemented (FY 2033)
Board of Private Investigator Examiners Fund (1802)	(\$83,396)	\$0	\$0	\$0
Board of Private Investigators, Private Fire Investigators and Professional Surety Bail Bonds Agents Fund	\$5,591	\$154,571	(\$81,618)	\$0
Insurance Dedicated Fund (1566)	\$98,559	\$119,710	\$35,105	\$123,613
PR Fees Fund (1689)*	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State Legal Expense*/**	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
College and University**	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
Other/Variou State**	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
Missouri Expungement***	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Estimated Net Effect on Other State Funds	Less than \$20,754	Less than \$274,281	(Could exceed \$46,513)	Less than \$123,613

* Transfer-In and expenses net to zero.

** Oversight notes litigation exposure as described by OA could apply to the State Legal Expense fund, various other state funds and Colleges and Universities. It is assumed costs could exceed \$250,000 annually.

*** Transfers-in, gifts, grants, bequests and expenses net to \$0

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS

FUND AFFECTED	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029	Fully Implemented (FY 2033)
Federal**/**	\$0 or (Could exceed \$555,876)	\$0 or (Could exceed \$1,111,753)	\$0 or (Could exceed \$2,779,382)	\$0 or (Could exceed \$5,558,765)
Total Estimated Net Effect on All Federal Funds	\$0 or (Could exceed \$555,876)	\$0 or (Could exceed \$1,111,753)	\$0 or (Could exceed \$2,779,382)	\$0 or (Could exceed \$5,558,765)

*Oversight notes litigation exposure as described by OA could apply to federal funds. It is assumed costs could exceed \$250,000 annually.

**Potential loss due to non-compliance with Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)

FUND AFFECTED	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029	Fully Implemented (FY 2033)
General Revenue	4 FTE	5 FTE	6 FTE	8 FTE
Insurance Dedicated Fund (1566) (savings)	(1 FTE)	(1 FTE)	(1 FTE)	(1 FTE)
PR Fees Fund	1 FTE	1 FTE	1 FTE	1 FTE
Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE	4 FTE	5 FTE	6 FTE	8 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	Fully Implemented (FY 2033)
Local Government	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

Due to time constraints, **Oversight** was unable to receive some agency responses in a timely manner and performed limited analysis. Oversight has presented this fiscal note on the best current information that we have or on information regarding a similar bill(s). Upon the receipt of agency 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.

§27.020 – Staffing of the Attorney General’s Office

In response to similar legislation, HB 2167 (2026), officials from the **Attorney General’s Office, Department of Natural Resources, Department of Labor and Industrial Relations, Department of Public Safety, Divisions of: Capitol Police, Director’s Office and Missouri Highway Patrol, Department of Social Services, Missouri Department of Conservation, Office of Administration, Office of the State Courts Administrator, Office of the Secretary of State, Phelps County Sheriff, Kansas City Police Department and St. Louis County Police Department** each assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

§43.500 – Administration of Criminal Justice

Oversight notes this section provides that the administration of criminal justice shall include the discretion to disclose closed mobile video recordings. Oversight assumes there will be no fiscal impact from this section.

§43.530 -Criminal History Records

In response to similar legislation, SCS for SB Nos. 854 & 1494 (2026), officials from the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol (MHP)** assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their organization.

Oversight reached out to the MHP with questions relating to changes in Chapter 43. MHP stated the changes in this chapter simply gives authority to increase fees, not actual revenue itself.

§56.265 – Compensation for Prosecuting Attorneys

Oversight notes the provisions of §56.265.1(1) state a full-time prosecuting attorney of a charter, first or second class county, or of a city not within a county shall receive a compensation of

100% of a circuit judge salary (\$182,427). There are five charter counties, thirteen 1st class counties and three 2nd class counties along with the City of St. Louis.

Oversight notes the provisions of §56.265.1(2) state a full-time prosecuting attorney of 3rd and 4th class counties shall receive compensation equal to 95% of an associate circuit judge or (\$159,441). There are 89 3rd class counties and four 4th class counties.

Oversight notes a part-time prosecuting attorney shall receive compensation equal to 30-60% of an associate circuit judge or (\$50,350 to \$100,700).

Oversight does not have the information to determine which counties have full-time or part-time prosecuting attorneys on staff and what their current salaries are. Oversight assumes §56.265.9 sets up the Missouri State Prosecutorial Service Grant Fund to help supplement salaries for 3rd and 4th class counties based on need. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a \$0 or (Unknown) transfer from General Revenue going into the Missouri State Prosecutorial Service Grand Fund and a \$0 or (Unknown) transfer from this fund to 3rd and 4th class counties.

§§160.3300, 302.302 & 304.070 – Failing to Stop for a School Bus

In response to similar legislation, HCS for HB 2742 (2026), officials from the **Department of Revenue (DOR)** assumed the following regarding this proposal:

Administrative Impact

To implement the proposed legislation, the Department will:

- Update Missouri driver guide
- Update Missouri motorcycle operator manual
- Update website information
- Update interactive applications for automated responses to customers through online system
- Work with MSHP and OSCA to define new charge codes and conviction codes for new 5-point violation

FY 2027 – Driver License Bureau

Associate Research Data Analyst 240 hrs. x \$31.16 per hr. = \$7,478

Research/Data Analyst 280 hrs. x \$37.14 per hr. = \$10,399

Administrative Manager 80 hrs. x \$51.40 per hr. = \$4,112

FY 2027 – Strategy and Communications Office (forms and website updates)

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

Total = \$23,235

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

FUSION Impact

DOR notes: Implementation Consultant Fee 250 hrs. x \$225 per hour = **\$56,250**

Oversight does not have information to the contrary and therefore, Oversight will reflect the FUSION estimate as provided by DOR.

Revenue Impact

DOR notes statistical information is not available to confirm the possible school bus stop violations that may result in points assessment and suspensions. The work will be absorbed without additional staffing unless volume of violations would require FTE to manage daily operations. If such occurs, the Department would be required to submit a request for budget appropriations.

In response to similar legislation, HCS for HB 2742 (2026), officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Public Safety-Missouri Highway Patrol, Office of the State Courts Administrator, Office of the State Public Defender and Missouri Department of Transportation** each assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

In response to similar legislation, HCS for HB 2742 (2026), officials from the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services** assumed there is no measurable fiscal impact to the Missouri Office of Prosecution Services. The enactment of new crimes creates additional responsibilities for county prosecutors and the circuit attorney that may in turn result in additional costs that are difficult to determine.

In response to similar legislation, HCS for HB 2742 (2026), officials from the **High Point R-III School District** assumed there would be a fiscal impact but did not provide any additional information.

Oversight notes, per the Office of the State Courts Administrator, the following misdemeanor convictions for violations of §304.050:

2025	0
2024	128
2023	102

2022 75
 2021 62

Oversight notes there were no felony convictions for the same time period.

Oversight notes this proposal adds fines for violations of §304.050.1:

- \$500 to \$1,000 for a first offense
- \$1,000 to \$2,000 for a second offense (within a five-year period)
- \$1,500 to \$3,000 for a third offense (within a five-year period)

In addition, no court shall suspend any portion of these fines, and they may not be disposed of through the State Fine Collection Center or by paying the fine without an appearance in open court.

Oversight notes a violation of the provisions of this proposal results in a misdemeanor or felony charge which carries a fine in addition to any individual county/municipal fees and court costs. The fine revenue for the ticket goes to local school funds and court costs go to various state and local funds. Oversight assumes there will be some (less than \$250,000) amount of fine revenue from violations of the statute. For simplicity, Oversight will not reflect the increased revenue from fines and court costs to various state funds and local political subdivisions.

Below are examples of some of the state and local funds which court costs are distributed to:

	Fee Amount
Basic Civil Legal Services Fund	\$8.00
Clerk Fee	\$15.00 (\$12 State/\$3 County)
County Fee	\$25.00
State Court Automation Fund	\$7.00
Crime Victims' Compensation Fund	\$7.50
DNA Profiling Analysis Fund	\$15.00
Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) Fund	\$1.00
Motorcycle Safety Trust Fund	\$1.00
Brain Injury Fund	\$2.00
Independent Living Center Fund	\$1.00
Sheriff's Fee	\$10.00 (County)
Prosecuting Attorney and Circuit Attorney Training Fund	\$5.00
Prosecuting Attorney Training Fund	\$5.00 (\$2.50 State/\$2.50 County)
Spinal Cord Injury Fund	\$2.00

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** state Section 304.070 is modified to include violations of subsection 1 of section 304.050 that result in serious physical injury as class D felonies.

As these are new crimes, there is little direct data on which to base an estimate, and as such, the department estimates an impact comparable to the creation of a new class D felony.

§§195.417 and 579.060 – Limits on Selling or Purchasing Certain Drugs (House Amendment 6)

In response to similar legislation, HCS for HB 1962 (2026), officials from the **Department of Health and Senior Services, Department of Commerce and Insurance, Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol, Office of the State Courts Administrator, Office of the State Public Defender, Phelps County Sheriff's Department, Branson Police Department, Kansas City Police Department and St. Louis County Police Department** each assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

Oversight notes that the above-mentioned agencies have 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, HB 1036 (2025), officials from the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services** 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.

§210.1700 – Residential and Overnight Camp Background Checks

Oversight notes this section requires any overnight or residential camp staff member or volunteer to receive a qualifying background check. Oversight assumes this section will not have a fiscal impact.

§301.287 – Persons with Impaired or Limited Ability to Communicate with Law Enforcement (Mason's Law)

In response to similar legislation, HCS for HB 3175 (2026), officials from the **Department of Revenue (DOR)** assumed the following regarding this proposal:

Administrative Impact

To implement the proposed language the department will be required to:

- Design a new form

- Update the department's website
- Create correspondence letters
- Create procedures
- Train department staff

Because of the limited timeframe between the proposed language's effective date and the anticipated integration of motor vehicle processes into the FUSION system, implementation of this bill will coincide with the launch of the modernized system.

FY 2027 – Motor Vehicle Bureau

Associate Research/Data Analyst 150 hrs. @ \$31.16/hr. =\$4,674
Research/Data Analyst 50 hrs. @ \$37.14/hr. =\$1,857
Administrative Manager 40 hrs. @ \$51.40/hr. =\$2,056

FY 2027 – Strategy & Communications Office

Associate Research/Data Analyst 40 hrs. @ \$31.16/hr. =\$1,246
Research/Data Analyst 50 hrs. @ \$37.14/hr. =\$1,857

Total = \$11,690

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

FUSION Impact

DOR notes: 500 hours of Development + 500 hours of Testing @ \$225/hr. = **\$225,000**
Development includes:

- Integrate disability status into existing vehicle registration transactions (new registration, renewal, registration correction)
- New standalone transaction to allow adding/modifying/renewing the disability status
- eService request to add/update/remove/renew
- Define system rules for reapplication letter
- Updates to MULES interface

The fiscal impact estimated above is based on changes in the current Department's Motor Vehicle system environment. The implementation of this legislation will be coordinated with the integration of the Department's Motor Vehicle and Driver Licensing software system approved and passed by the General Assembly in 2020 (Senate Bill 176). To avoid duplicative technology development and associated costs to the state, it is recommended a delayed effective date be added to this bill to correlate with the installation of the new system.

Oversight does not have information to the contrary and therefore, Oversight will reflect the FUSION estimate as provided by DOR.

§§320.405 and 650.240 – Deputy Boiler Inspectors

In response to similar legislation, HCS for HB 2269 (2026), officials from the **Department of Public Safety – Division of Fire Safety (DPS-DFS)** stated DPS-DFS will need to obtain IBC membership for codes at \$1,058 annually and will need to pay travel expenses for 17 field inspectors to do training. DFS estimates the initial cost to be nearly \$5,100 with an ongoing amount of \$1,058.

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

In response to similar legislation, HCS for HB 2269 (2026), officials from the **Department of Public Safety – Office of the Director** and the **City of Kansas City** each assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

§§324.1100 - 374.051 - Professional Bail Bondsman and Surety Recovery Agent Act

In response to similar legislation, HCS for HB 3111 (2026), officials from the **Department of Commerce and Insurance (DCI)** assumed Section 324.1102 adds the profession and renames the board to the Board of Private Investigators, Private Fire Investigators, and Professional Surety Bail Bond Agents consisting of ten members.

Board members may receive compensation and are reimbursed for travel costs and actual and necessary expenses. No mention of the number of board meetings. Section 324.1102 also creates the Board of Private Investigators, Private Fire Investigators, and Professional Surety Bail Bond Agents Fund. No language regarding transferring current funds to this fund.

Licensee/Revenue

363 Bail Bond Agents

\$550 Initial License Fee (limited by statute)

\$500 Biennial Renewal Fee (limited by statute)

98 General Bail Bond Agents

\$550 Initial License Fee (limited by statute)

\$500 Biennial Renewal Fee (limited by statute)

5 General Bail Bond Corporations

\$550 Initial License Fee (limited by statute)
\$500 Biennial Renewal Fee (limited by statute)

18 Surety Recovery Agents
\$550 Initial License Fee (limited by statute)
\$500 Biennial Renewal Fee (limited by statute)

- Projected revenue reflects fees collected for all categories of licensure.
- A 3% growth rate has been estimated.
- It is estimated that the collection of renewal fees will begin in FY 2028.
- If the number of licensees largely vary from the number estimated above, the licensure fees will be adjusted accordingly.

In summary, DCI assumes revenue of \$244,200 in FY 2028 (484 licensees x \$500 + 4 licensees (3% growth) x 4) and \$1,650 (3 x \$550) in FY 2029 to the newly created Board of Private Investigators, Private Fire Investigators, and Professional Surety Bail Bond Agents Fund as a result of the implementation of the changes in this proposal.

Staffing-Estimated at PR current staffing salaries

1 Customer Service Representative, at \$39,227 annually, needed to provide technical support, process applications for licensure, and respond to inquiries related to the licensure law and/or rules and regulations.

“Professional Bail Bondsman and Surety Recovery Agent Licensure Act” appears to mirror current laws regulating bail bond and surety recovery agents but now transfers regulatory oversight to Division of Professional Registration creating a board. This would reduce the need for 1 FTE of a Regulatory Auditor in the Insurance Divisions. Creating a reduction to the Insurance Dedicated Fund.

Oversight will reflect estimated revenues from licenses to the newly created Board of Private Investigators, Private Fire Investigators, and Professional Surety Bail Bond Agents Fund and the board-specific expenses to the Professional Registration Fees Fund (1689), with a transfer from the newly created fund to support the FTE expense.

Oversight notes, according to DCI, this proposal is moving these requirements from one division to another. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a savings of 1 FTE to the Insurance Dedicated Fund (1566) and also a loss of fees that was once collected into the Insurance Dedicated Fund and now will be deposited into the Professional Surety Bail Bond Agents Fund as estimated by DCI.

According to section 324.1102.9, all money held in the Board of Private Investigator and Private Fire Investigator Examiners Fund (0802) shall be transferred to the newly created fund, Board of Private Investigators, Private Fire Investigators, and Professional Surety Bail Bond Agents Fund.

As of February, 2026, there was a current balance of \$82,396.32 in the Board of Private Investigator Examiners Fund. (0802). Oversight will reflect a transfer-out of these funds to the newly created fund.

Response Regarding §§324.1100 – 374.051 As a Whole

In response to similar legislation, HCS for HB 3111 (2026), officials from the **Office of the Governor (GOV)** stated this bill adds to the Governor's current load of appointment duties. Individually, additional requirements should not fiscally impact the Office of the Governor. However, the cumulative impact of additional appointment duties across all enacted legislation may require additional resources for the Office of the Governor.

Officials from the GOV assume the proposal cost of the proposal can be absorbed. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for this agency.

In response to similar legislation, HCS for HB 3111 (2026), officials from the **Office of Administration - Administrative Hearing Commission, Department of Corrections, Department of Revenue, Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol, Office of the State Courts Administrator, Office of the State Public Defender, Office of the State Treasurer** and the **Missouri Senate** each assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

In response to similar legislation, HCS for HB 3111 (2026), officials from the **Office of the State Public Defender** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

§454.1050 - "Bentley and Mason's Law"

In response to similar legislation, SS for SB 1135 (2026), officials from the **Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA)** stated this section would have an impact on Show-Me Courts and possibly other systems. It is estimated the fiscal impact would be \$500,000 to \$1,000,000 to develop a new Child Support module.

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

In response to similar legislation, SS for SB 1135 (2026), officials from the **Department of Social Services** and **Office of the State Public Defender** each assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

In response to similar legislation, SB 235 (2025), officials from the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

Responses Regarding §454.1050 As a Whole

In response to similar legislation, SS for SB 1135 (2026), officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development, Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol, Missouri Department of Transportation, University of Missouri System, Northwest Missouri State University** and the **University of Central Missouri** each assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

§§557.035 & 565.097 – Masked Intimidation

Officials from the **DOC** assume §557.035 adds §565.097 to the list of offenses which the state may believe to have been knowingly motivated by “race, color, religion, national origin, sex, sexual orientation, or disability of the victim or victims”, for which a class E felony may be charged.

As there is little direct data on which to base an estimate, the department estimates an impact comparable to the creation of a new class violent E felony.

For each new violent class E felony, the department estimates two people could be sentenced to prison and one to probation. The average sentence for a violent class E felony offense is 4 years, of which 3 years could be served in prison with 2.2 years to first release. The remaining 1.0 year could be on parole. Probation sentences could be 4 years.

The cumulative impact on the department is estimated to be 6 additional offenders in prison and 3 additional offenders on field supervision by FY 2029.

Section 565.097 creates the offense of masked intimidation if that person intentionally intimidates any other person while concealing their face with a mask. The penalty is a class E felony for the first offense, a class D felony for the second offense, and a class C felony for a third or subsequent offense.

As these are new crimes, there is little direct data on which to base an estimate, and as such, the department estimates an impact comparable to the creation of a new class E felony, a new class D felony, and a new class C felony.

For each new violent class E felony, the department estimates two people will be sentenced to prison and one to probation. The average sentence for a violent class E felony offense is 4 years, with 2.2 years served in prison prior to first release. Probation sentences will be 4 years.

The cumulative impact on the department is estimated to be 6 additional offenders in prison and 3 additional offenders on field supervision by FY 2029.

For each new violent class D felony, the department estimates four people will be sentenced to prison and four to probation. The average sentence for a violent class D felony offense is 5.7 years, with 3 years served in prison prior to first release. Probation sentences will be 4 years.

The cumulative impact on the department is estimated to be 16 additional offenders in prison and 16 additional offenders on field supervision by FY 2030.

For a new class C felony, the department estimates four people could be sentenced to prison and six to probation. The average sentence for a class C felony offense is 6.9 years, with 2.1 years to first release. The remaining 3.2 years will be on parole. Probation sentences will be 3 years.

The cumulative impact on the department is estimated to be 15 additional offenders in prison and 19 additional offenders on field supervision by FY 2030.

In response to similar legislation, HB 2848 (2026), officials from the **Office of the State Public Defender (SPD)** stated per the National Public Defense Workload Study, the new charge contemplated by Section 565.097, would take approximately fourteen hours of SPD work for reasonably effective representation. If one hundred cases were filed under this section in a fiscal year, representation would result in a need for an additional attorney. Because the number of cases that will be filed under this statute is unknown, the exact additional number of attorneys necessary is unknown. Each case would also result in unknown increased costs in the need for core staff, travel, and litigation expenses. However, if the charge was classified as a class D misdemeanor no jail time would be authorized and the cases would not qualify for SPD representation.

Oversight assumes this proposal will create a minimal number of new cases and that the SPD can absorb the additional caseload required by this proposal with current staff and resources. Therefore, Oversight will reflect no fiscal impact to the SPD for fiscal note purposes. However, if multiple bills pass which require additional staffing and duties, the SPD may request funding through the appropriation process.

In response to similar legislation, HB 2848 (2026), officials from the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol** and **Office of the State Courts Administrator** each assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

Oversight notes a violation of the provisions of this proposal results in a misdemeanor or felony charge which carries a fine in addition to any individual county/municipal fees and court costs. The fine revenue for the ticket goes to local school funds and court costs go to various state and local funds.

Oversight assumes there will be some (less than \$250,000) amount of fine revenue from violations of the statute. For simplicity, Oversight will not reflect the increased revenue from fines and court costs to various state funds and local political subdivisions.

Below are examples of some of the state and local funds which court costs are distributed to.

	Fee Amount
Basic Civil Legal Services Fund	\$8.00
Clerk Fee	\$15.00 (\$12 State/\$3 County)
County Fee	\$25.00
State Court Automation Fund	\$7.00
Crime Victims' Compensation Fund	\$7.50
DNA Profiling Analysis Fund	\$15.00
Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) Fund	\$1.00
Motorcycle Safety Trust Fund	\$1.00
Brain Injury Fund	\$2.00
Independent Living Center Fund	\$1.00
Sheriff's Fee	\$10.00 (County)
Prosecuting Attorney and Circuit Attorney Training Fund	\$5.00
Prosecuting Attorney Training Fund	\$5.00 (\$2.50 State/\$2.50 County)
Spinal Cord Injury Fund	\$2.00

§§569.086, 569.117 & 569.119 – Telecommunications Infrastructure

Officials from the **DOC** assume the following regarding this proposal:

§569.117 – Damage of a Critical Infrastructure Facility (House Amendment 10)

Section 569.117 creates the offense of purposely damages a critical infrastructure facility, which is a class D felony. It also creates the offense of willfully or maliciously damages a critical infrastructure facility or removes any component, which is a class A misdemeanor if the damage is under \$750, a class E felony if the damage is \$750 to \$25,000, a class D felony if the damage is more than \$25,000, and a class C felony if the damage causes interruption of service.

As misdemeanors fall outside the purview of DOC, there is no impact to DOC for the offense resulting in the class A misdemeanor. The offenses resulting in a class E felony, class D felony or class C felony would be considered a new crime. As there is little direct data on which to base

an estimate, the department estimates an impact comparable to the creation of a new class E felony, class D felony, and class C felony.

For each new nonviolent class E felony, the department estimates one person could be sentenced to prison and two to probation. The average sentence for a nonviolent class E felony offense is 3.4 years, with 1.4 years to first release. The remaining 1.3 years will be on parole. Probation sentences will be 3 years.

The cumulative impact on the department is estimated to be 2 additional offenders in prison and 7 additional offenders on field supervision by FY 2029.

For each new nonviolent class D felony, the department estimates three people could be sentenced to prison and five to probation. The average sentence for a nonviolent class D felony offense is 5 years, with 1.7 years to first release. The remaining 2.2 years will be on parole. Probation sentences will be 3 years.

The cumulative impact on the department is estimated to be 8 additional offenders in prison and 16 additional offenders on field supervision by FY 2029.

For each new class C felony, the department estimates four people could be sentenced to prison and six to probation. The average sentence for a class C felony offense is 6.9 years, with 2.1 years to first release. The remaining 3.2 years will be on parole. Probation sentences will be 3 years.

The cumulative impact on the department is estimated to be 15 additional offenders in prison and 19 additional offenders on field supervision by FY 2030.

In response to similar legislation, SCS for SB 903 (2026), officials from the **Office of the State Public Defender (SPD)** stated per the National Public Defense Workload Study, the new charge contemplated by 569.117 would take approximately twenty-two hours of SPD work for reasonably effective representation. If one hundred cases were filed under this section in a fiscal year, representation would result in a need for an additional attorney. Because the number of cases that will be filed under this statute is unknown, the exact additional number of attorneys necessary is unknown. Each case would also result in unknown increased costs in the need for core staff, travel and litigation expenses. However, if the charge was classified as a class D misdemeanor no jail time would be authorized and the cases would not qualify for SPD representation.

Oversight assumes this proposal will create a minimal number of new cases and that the SPD can absorb the additional caseload required by this proposal with current staff and resources. Therefore, Oversight will reflect no fiscal impact to the SPD for fiscal note purposes. However, if multiple bills pass which require additional staffing and duties, the SPD may request funding through the appropriation process.

§569.119 – Unauthorized Possession of Regulated Metals

Officials from the **DOC** state Section 569.119 creates the offense of unauthorized possession of certain copper, brass, aluminum, fiber, or telecommunications material, which is a class E felony, unless it is shown that the material was unlawfully obtained from a critical infrastructure facility or the person has a prior offense for the same, in which case it is a class D felony.

As these are new crimes, there is little direct data on which to base an estimate, and as such, the department estimates an impact comparable to the creation of a new class E felony and class D felony.

For each new nonviolent class E felony, the department estimates one person could be sentenced to prison and two to probation. The average sentence for a nonviolent class E felony offense is 3.4 years, with 1.4 years to first release. The remaining 1.3 years will be on parole. Probation sentences will be 3 years.

The cumulative impact on the department is estimated to be 2 additional offenders in prison and 7 additional offenders on field supervision by FY 2029.

For each new nonviolent class D felony, the department estimates three people could be sentenced to prison and five to probation. The average sentence for a nonviolent class D felony offense is 5 years, with 1.7 years to first release. The remaining 2.2 years will be on parole. Probation sentences will be 3 years.

The cumulative impact on the department is estimated to be 8 additional offenders in prison and 16 additional offenders on field supervision by FY 2029.

In response to similar legislation, SCS for SB 903 (2026), officials from the **SPD** stated per the National Public Defense Workload Study, the new charge contemplated by Section 569.119 would take approximately thirty-five hours of SPD work for reasonably effective representation. If one hundred cases were filed under this section in a fiscal year, representation would result in a need for an additional one to two attorneys. Because the number of cases that will be filed under this statute is unknown, the exact additional number of attorneys necessary is unknown. Each case would also result in unknown increased costs in the need for core staff, travel, and litigation expenses.

Oversight assumes this proposal will not create the number of new cases required to request additional FTE for the SPD and that the SPD can absorb the additional caseload required by this proposal with current staff and resources. Therefore, Oversight will reflect no fiscal impact to the SPD for fiscal note purposes. However, if multiple bills pass which require additional staffing and duties, the SPD may request funding through the appropriation process.

In response to similar legislation, SCS for SB 903 (2026), officials from the **Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA)** stated there may be 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, SCS for SB 903 (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.

In response to similar legislation, SCS for SB 903 (2026), officials from the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services (MOPS)** assumed the proposal will have no measurable fiscal impact on MOPS. The enactment of new crimes creates additional responsibilities for county prosecutors and the circuit attorney which may, in turn, result in additional costs, which are difficult to determine.

In response to similar legislation, SCS for SB 903 (2026), officials from the **Department of Commerce and Insurance, Department of Natural Resources, Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol, Missouri Department of Transportation, Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District, South River Drainage District, and Wayne County PWSD #2** each assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

§§570.010 and 570.137 – Gift Card Fraud

Officials from the **DOC** state this proposal establishes the offense of gift card fraud.

Section 570.010 is modified to include §570.137 which defines the new crime of gift card fraud and the prescribed sentences for this conduct. Gift card fraud between \$750 and \$25,000 is a class D felony and if more than \$25,000 is a class C felony.

For each new nonviolent class D felony, the department estimates three people could be sentenced to prison and five to probation. The average sentence for a nonviolent class D felony offense is 5 years, of which 2.8 years could be served in prison with 1.7 years to first release. The remaining 2.2 years could be on parole. Probation sentences could be 3 years.

The cumulative impact on the department is estimated to be 8 additional offenders in prison and 16 additional offenders on field supervision by FY 2029.

For each new class C felony, the department estimates four people could be sentenced to prison and six to probation. The average sentence for a class C felony offense is 6.9 years, of which 3.7 years could be served in prison with 2.1 years to first release. The remaining 3.2 years could be on parole. Probation sentences could be 3 years.

The cumulative impact on the department is estimated to be 15 additional offenders in prison and 19 additional offenders on field supervision by FY 2030.

In response to similar legislation, HCS for HB 1990 (2026), officials from the **Office of the State Public Defender (SPD)** stated per the recently released National Public Defense Workload Study, the new charge contemplated by the change to Section 570.137 would take approximately thirty-five hours of SPD work for a C or D felonies and 13.8 hours for an A misdemeanor for reasonably effective representation. If one hundred cases were filed under this section in a fiscal year, representation would result in a need for an additional one to two attorneys. Because the number of cases that will be filed under this statute is unknown, the exact additional number of attorneys necessary is unknown. Each case would also result in unknown increased costs in the need for core staff, travel, and litigation expenses.

Oversight assumes this proposal will create a minimal number of new cases and that the SPD can absorb the additional caseload required by this proposal with current staff and resources. Therefore, Oversight will reflect no fiscal impact to the SPD for fiscal note purposes. However, if multiple bills pass which require additional staffing and duties, the SPD may request funding through the appropriation process.

In response to similar legislation, HCS for HB 1990 (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.

In response to similar legislation, HCS for HB 1990 (2026), officials from the **Department of Commerce and Insurance, Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol,** and

Office of the State Courts Administrator each assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

§571.030 – Carrying of Weapons by the Attorney General

In response to similar legislation, SB 1205 (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.

§§577.800, 589.900 & 589.902 – Interception of Unmanned Aircraft Systems

Officials from the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol (MHP)** state this legislation involves combatting the unlawful use of unmanned aircraft systems that pose a threat to the safety and security of communities and institutions in the State of Missouri. The Patrol would need to purchase unmanned aircraft system (UAS) detection, identifying, monitoring, tracking, and mitigation (DIMIT-M) technologies to support public safety officials in the protection of the public and critical infrastructure from nefarious or unlawful use of UAS. The Patrol's primary objective is to ensure the MHP has the resources, training, and operational capacity to detect, track, identify, and—where authorized—mitigate UAS threats. The Patrol's goals are to strengthen their preparedness, protect critical infrastructure, mass gatherings, and sensitive government operations from UAS threats and support the deployment of fixed or portable systems for UAS detection, tracking, identification, and—where authorized—mitigation, consistent with applicable laws. Two (2) additional FTE and all associated equipment would be needed.

Oversight notes, in response to the previous version, MHP noted a cost for Counter Drone Equipment estimated at \$1.7M in FY27 with a continued cost of approximately \$190,000 per year.

Upon further inquiry, **MHP** stated that the Patrol recently received a grant to cover the associated costs of the counter drone equipment. The Patrol will still require the costs of required FTE and all assigned personal equipment.

Oversight does not have any information contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect the impact as provided by MHP for fiscal note purposes.

Officials from the **DOC** state section 577.800 modifies provisions relating to law enforcement interception of unmanned aircraft systems.

Section 577.800 expands the offense of unlawful use of unmanned aircraft over an open-air facility to include a critical infrastructure facility. The penalty is an infraction, unless it is used to deliver a weapon, in which case it is a class B felony, or to deliver a controlled substance, in which case it is a class D felony.

As these are new crimes, there is little direct data on which to base an estimate, and as such, the department estimates an impact comparable to the creation of a new class D felony and a new class B felony.

For each new nonviolent class D felony, the department estimates three people could be sentenced to prison and five to probation. The average sentence for a nonviolent class D felony offense is 5 years, 1.7 years to first release. The remaining 2.2 years will be on parole. Probation sentences will be 3 years.

The cumulative impact on the department is estimated to be 8 additional offenders in prison and 16 additional offenders on field supervision by FY 2029.

Given the seriousness of class B felony offenses and that the introduction of a completely new class B felony offense is a rare event, the department assumes the admission of one person per year to prison following the passage of the legislative proposal.

Offenders committed to prison with a class B felony as their most serious sentence, have an average sentence length of 9.0 years and serve on average, 3.4 years in prison prior to first release. The department assumes one third of the remaining sentence length will be served in prison as a parole return, and the rest of the sentence will be served on supervision in the community.

The cumulative impact on the department is estimated to be 5 additional offenders in prison and 0 additional offenders on field supervision by FY 2031.

In response to similar legislation, HB 2587 (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.

In response to a previous version, officials from the **Missouri Department of Transportation, Department of Mental Health** and **Kansas City Police Department** each assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

In response to a previous version, officials from the **Office of the State Courts Administrator, Office of the State Public Defender, Phelps County Sheriff's Department, St. Louis County Police Department, Branson Police Department and Blue Springs Police Department** each assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

In response to similar legislation, HB 2587 (2026), officials from the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services** assumed the proposal will have no measurable fiscal impact.

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for this agency.

This proposal has an emergency clause.

§579.022 – Delivery of a Controlled Substance

Officials from the **DOC** state that currently, DOC has no one incarcerated under §579.022 with an A felony. Therefore, DOC assumes a no impact to this section.

Oversight assumes other provisions in statutes are relatively similar and could already be charged; therefore, Oversight will reflect DOC's no impact for fiscal note purposes.

In response to similar legislation, HB 2889 (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.

In response to similar legislation, HB 2889 (2026), officials from the **Office of the State Courts Administrator, Office of the State Public Defender, and Missouri Office of Prosecution Services** each assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

§§579.065 and 579.068 – Offenses Involving the Trafficking of Drugs (House Amendment 12)

Officials from the **DOC** state this proposal modifies the offenses of trafficking of drugs in the first and second degree. The bill modifies sections 579.065 and 579.068 by adjusting the

amounts of fentanyl and carfentanil associated with the definitions and penalties for drug trafficking in the first degree and drug trafficking in the second degree.

Section 579.065 changes the minimum amount of fentanyl from ten to three milligrams, and any amount of carfentanil, a class B felony. It changes the minimum amount of fentanyl from twenty to fourteen milligrams, and more than five hundredths of a milligram of carfentanil, a class A felony.

Section 579.068 changes the minimum amount of fentanyl from ten to three milligrams, and any amount of carfentanil, a class C felony. It changes the minimum amount of fentanyl from twenty to fourteen milligrams, and more than five hundredths of a milligram of carfentanil, a class B felony.

Regarding section 579.065, in FY 2025, the department totaled 20 new prison admissions and 20 new probation cases for sentences of trafficking drugs in the first degree.

Regarding section 579.068, in FY 2025, the department totaled 144 new prison admissions and 196 new probation cases for sentences of trafficking drugs in the second degree.

When an offender is sentenced to imprisonment the department receives a sentence and judgement form which contains information on the conviction(s) and sentence(s). Most sentence and judgement forms for drug related offenses do not notate the type or amount of the drug associated with the conviction. Given that the drug associated with the offense, and any amount associated with the drug, is unknown in the majority of cases, the department is unable to estimate the number of new admissions related to the possession and or distribution of fentanyl or carfentanil. Therefore, the DOC will assume an **unknown impact** to this legislation.

Oversight does not have any information contrary to that provided by DOC. Therefore, Oversight will reflect DOC's estimated (unknown) impact for fiscal note purposes.

In response to similar legislation, HB 1625 (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.

In response to similar legislation, HB 1625 (2026), officials from the **Office of the State Courts Administrator** and **Office of the State Public Defender** each assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

In response to similar legislation, Perfected HB 49 (2025), officials from the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services** 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 these agencies.

Responses Regarding §§579.065 & 579.068 As a Whole

In response to similar legislation, HB 1625 (2026), officials from the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol** 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.

§590.1300 – Training Program for Missouri Rangers

In response to similar legislation, SS for SCS for SB 905) (2026), officials from the **Department of Public Safety – Director’s Office (DPS-DO)** assumed this proposal requires the POST Commission to establish a training program for the Missouri Rangers. POST will need at least one (1) FTE to manage this process (screen applicants, approve lesson plans and training providers, process applications, etc.)

DPS-DO notes the Senate Substitute adds that each person completing a training program shall receive a certificate and badge.

The proposal also requires clothing to say RANGERS and a certain level holster when on duty. There is no indication of who pays for or who provides the clothing and holster.

Oversight notes the DPS-DO will need one FTE, a Program Coordinator. DPS-DO also will require a one-time ITSD cost of \$2,000. Oversight does not have information to the contrary and therefore, Oversight will reflect the estimates as provided by the Department of Public Safety – Director’s Office.

In response to similar legislation, SS for SCS for SB 905) (2026), officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Phelps County Sheriff, Branson Police Department** and **Kansas City Police Department** each assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

§§610.141, 610.143, and 610.144 – Expungement

Officials from the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol** assume these provisions will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

Officials from the **Office of State Courts Administrator (OSCA)** state the fiscal impact on Show-Me Courts and possibly other systems would be approximately \$2,250,000, appropriated over three years (\$750,000 per year), and thereafter, \$500,000 annually to manage the system.

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

Officials from the **DOC** state this legislation creates provisions relating to expungement. Expunging these records for the specified offenses in §610.141, through destruction, or removal will result in an increase in workload for the Department's Institutional Records Officers, as they are the custodian of records for DOC's offender files. This may also affect records kept at Probation and Parole Offices.

While the department assumes a \$0 - Unknown impact, there is some concern for tracking previous medical, mental health, substance use treatment, and education records should the offender return to supervision by the DOC. The DOC anticipates the unknown impact will exceed \$250,000 annually.

If there should be a significant number of additional requests for expungement or a significant expansion in the number of offenses that could be expunged, it could result in additional costs to the DOC.

Oversight does not have any information contrary to that provided by DOC. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a \$0 (can absorb) to DOC's (unknown) impact to General Revenue beginning FY30 since §610.141 provides that records will be closed starting no later than January 1, 2028.

Officials from the **Missouri Department of Transportation (MoDOT)** state the bill does not exclude offenses while operating a commercial motor vehicle. This could result in a variance with Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations (FMCSRs). 49 CFR 391.15 addresses disqualification of drivers (CDL and non-CDL CMV drivers). A driver who is convicted of a disqualifying offense is disqualified for one year from the date of conviction for first offenders and 3 years after the date of conviction if during the previous 3 years preceding the conviction date the driver was convicted of a disqualifying offense possessing or using a Schedule 1 substance while on duty. A CMV driver convicted of possession of marijuana while on duty is a disqualified driver. If prior non-violent possessions of marijuana convictions are wholly expunged from the criminal records, CMV drivers who would be disqualified under the FMCSRs would be allowed to drive.

In addition, 49 CFR 392.4 prohibits possession or use of any Schedule 1 substance. With marijuana being a Schedule 1 substance at the federal level, commercial motor vehicle drivers are prohibited from possessing and using marijuana in a CMV while on duty.

If a variance with federal law is found, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) Program funding (MCSAP) could be withheld. Missouri's FY26 MCSAP award is anticipated to be around \$11,117,529.

The penalty imposed upon states found to be in non-compliance can be as harsh as withholding all MCSAP funding, or potential withholding amounts are as follows:

YEAR 0 (during the FY that FMCSA notifies Missouri of its noncompliance): up to 5%	\$555,876
YEAR 1 (next full fiscal year): up to 10%	\$1,111,753
YEAR 2 (2nd full fiscal year): up to 25%	\$2,779,382
YEAR 3+ (ongoing until variance resolved): not more than 50%.	\$5,558,765

Oversight does not have information to the contrary and, therefore, Oversight will reflect the potential loss of federal funding as provided by MoDOT. Oversight will reflect the fiscal impact as \$0 (Missouri is not found to be out of compliance) up to the amounts listed above (Missouri is found to be out of compliance with federal rules).

In response to similar legislation, SCS for SB 854 (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.

In response to similar legislation, SCS for SB 854 (2026), officials from the **Department of Revenue (DOR)** stated §610.141.2(2) provides that records pertaining to juvenile adjudications or offenses involving the operation of a motor vehicle are not eligible for automated expungement. The department anticipates that it would continue to receive court orders of expungement for any conviction or action related to these sections to be reviewed and processed manually by the department; §610.141.3(10) states the DOR has thirty (30) days to expunge the records once the order is received from the court; and §610.141.6 states that the provisions of this section shall apply retroactively.

DOR officials provide that with the statutory requirement of thirty (30) days to process the expungement, and the provisions applying retroactively, the department is concerned that its existing staff may not be able to process the volume of orders in the mandated timeframe. There is no data to assist in determining the volume of orders the DOR will receive. If the increase is more than anticipated, and is unable to be absorbed by existing staff, additional FTE may be requested through the appropriations process.

Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect no fiscal impact for this agency.

In response to similar legislation, SCS for SB 854 (2026), officials from the **Office of Administration (OA)** stated from the plain language of this bill (§610.143), it appears that a state agency obtaining a credit report could be a “user of information”.

This has the potential to increase costs to the state Legal Expense Fund (LEF) for actions alleging violation by a state employee in connection with their official duties on behalf of the state. This would be subject to judicial interpretation; therefore, potential costs to the state are unknown.

Because this bill creates a possible new cause of action, **Oversight** will show a net \$0 direct fiscal impact for the LEF, and a possible \$0 to (unknown) fiscal impact to General Revenue and other state funds. Oversight notes this possible litigation exposure as described by OA could also apply to colleges and universities, federal funds, as well as local political subdivisions. It is further assumed the unknown litigation fiscal impact could exceed \$250,000 annually.

In response to similar legislation, SCS for SB 854 (2026), officials from the **St. Louis County Police Department** stated the proposed legislation would make certain offenses that meet outlined criteria eligible for automatic expungement which may incur a significant cost the Department.

The amount of requests provided to the police record room would significantly increase, although, it would be unknown by how much. In order to process these requests at least two additional full-time police record clerks would need to be hired. The cost of one full-time police record clerk with fringe benefits is \$65,273 annually which with two new employees would amount to at least \$130,546 annually. It should be noted that this does not include additional costs that would be incurred by current employees who would be responsible for training the new record clerks on how to process expungements. Additionally, it should also be considered that record clerks receive an annual pay raise so each year the cost will continue to increase annually.

Oversight notes the cost of additional personnel and other costs required by the St. Louis County Police Department to implement the provisions of this proposal. Oversight is unable to project a statewide cost. Therefore, the impact to local governments will be presented as (Unknown, greater than \$130,546).

In response to similar legislation, SCS for SB 854 (2026), officials from the **Department of Commerce and Insurance, Department of Labor and Industrial Relations, Department of Public Safety – Director’s Office and Missouri Highway Patrol, Department of Social Services, Office of the Governor, Office of the State Public Defender, Office of the State Treasurer, City of Kansas City, Phelps County Sheriff, Kansas City Police Department, and Missouri Lottery Commission** each assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations. **Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

In response to similar legislation, SB 19 (2025), officials from the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services** 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.

§610.144 – Establishes “Missouri Expungement Fund”

In response to similar legislation, HCS for HB 2967 (2026), officials from the **Office of the State Courts Administrator (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, there will be unknown contributions as well as a general revenue transfer coming into the fund with the expenses noted by OSCA for section 610.141; income and expenses will net to \$0.

In response to similar legislation, HCS for HB 2967 (2026), officials from the **Department of Public Safety – Director’s Office, Department of Public Safety-Missouri Highway Patrol, Office of Administration, and Office of the State Treasurer** each assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations. **Oversight** does not have any information

to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

Responses regarding the proposed legislation as a whole

Officials from **Department of Corrections** state:

Combined Cumulative Estimated Impact for DOC

The combined cumulative estimated impact on the department is 130 additional offenders in prison and 255 additional offenders on field supervision by FY 2033.

	# to prison	Cost per year	Total Costs for prison	Change in probation & parole officers	Total cost for probation and parole	# to probation & parole	Grand Total - Prison and Probation (includes 2% inflation)
Year 1	39	(\$11,123)	(\$368,913)	1	(\$84,732)	52	(\$453,645)
Year 2	78	(\$11,123)	(\$884,946)	2	(\$202,395)	104	(\$1,087,341)
Year 3	111	(\$11,123)	(\$1,284,533)	3	(\$307,283)	162	(\$1,591,816)
Year 4	129	(\$11,123)	(\$1,522,692)	3	(\$284,986)	191	(\$1,807,679)
Year 5	130	(\$11,123)	(\$1,565,186)	4	(\$419,763)	223	(\$1,984,950)
Year 6	130	(\$11,123)	(\$1,596,490)	4	(\$388,076)	242	(\$1,984,566)
Year 7	130	(\$11,123)	(\$1,628,420)	5	(\$537,656)	255	(\$2,166,074)
Year 8	130	(\$11,123)	(\$1,660,988)	5	(\$495,443)	256	(\$2,156,431)
Year 9	130	(\$11,123)	(\$1,694,208)	5	(\$500,711)	257	(\$2,194,919)
Year 10	130	(\$11,123)	(\$1,728,092)	5	(\$506,029)	257	(\$2,234,121)

The department will assume a marginal cost (multiplied by number of offenders) for any projected increase or decrease in the incarcerated population. Marginal cost is \$30.47 per day or an annual cost of \$11,123 per offender which includes costs such as medical, food, wages and operational E&E. The unknown amount is a result of the uncertainty in the growth of the underlying offender population. The impact of any new legislation combined with the growth of the underlying population could result in the tiered approach below in order to meet the population demands.

1. Fully staffing the current capacity (27,368) which is habitable, but DOC does not have the staffing resources for all bed space.
2. Rehabilitating current space that is not currently habitable and obtaining staffing resources for that space (requires capital improvements).

3. Expanding new capacity by adding housing units or wings to existing prisons and obtaining staffing resources for that space (requires capital improvements).
4. Constructing a new prison and obtaining staffing resources. Based on current construction projects in other Midwest states, the department estimates the cost of constructing a new 1,500-bed maximum security prison at approximately \$825 million to \$900 million plus annual operating costs of approximately \$50 million (requires capital improvements).

The department's population projections indicate current physical capacity will be met by July 2029; however recent trends indicate that capacity could be met much sooner. Should new construction be the result of the increasing offender population, the full cost per day per offender would be used which is \$106.96 or an annual cost of \$39,040. This includes all items in the marginal cost calculation plus fringe, personal service, utilities, etc.

DOC's cost of probation or parole is determined by the number of P&P Officer II positions that are needed to cover its caseload. The DOC average district caseload across the state is 51 offender cases per officer. An increase/decrease of 51 cases would result in a cost/cost avoidance equal to the salary, fringe, and equipment and expenses of one P&P Officer II. Increases/decreases smaller than 51 offender cases are assumed to be absorbable.

In instances where the proposed legislation would only affect a specific caseload, such as sex offenders, the DOC will use the average caseload figure for that specific type of offender to calculate cost increases/decreases.

* If this impact statement has changed from statements submitted in previous years, it could be due to an increase/decrease in the number of offenders, a change in the cost per day for institutional offenders, and/or an increase in staff salaries.

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

Rule Promulgation

In response to similar legislation, HCS for HB 3111 (2026), officials from the **Joint Committee on Administrative Rules** assumed this proposal is not anticipated to cause a fiscal impact beyond its current appropriation.

In response to similar legislation, HCS for HB 3111 (2026), 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 local political subdivisions, law enforcement agencies, utilities, and schools 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	FY 2028	FY 2029	Fully Implemented (FY 2033)
GENERAL REVENUE				
<u>Cost – DPS-MHP</u> (§§217.850, 577.800, and 632.575)				Could exceed...
Personal Service	(\$221,808)	(\$226,244)	(\$230,769)	(\$240,092)
Fringe Benefits	(\$195,391)	(\$199,298)	(\$203,284)	(\$211,497)
Expense and Equipment	(\$206,839)	(\$53,784)	(\$53,784)	(\$55,957)
<u>Total Costs – MHP</u>	<u>(\$624,038)</u>	<u>(\$479,326)</u>	<u>(\$487,837)</u>	<u>(\$507,546)</u>
FTE Change – MHP	2 FTE	2 FTE	2 FTE	2 FTE
<u>Cost – DPS-MHP</u> (§§217.850, 577.800, and 632.575)	\$0	(\$190,000)	(\$190,000)	(\$190,000)
<u>Cost – DOR</u> (§§160.3300, 302.302 & 304.070) FUSION	(\$56,250)	\$0	\$0	\$0
<u>Cost – DPS-DO</u> (§590.1300)				Could exceed...
Personal Service	(\$44,429)	(\$54,381)	(\$55,469)	(\$57,710)
Fringe Benefits	(\$31,483)	(\$38,208)	(\$38,646)	(\$40,207)
Expense and Equipment	(\$13,583)	(\$11,730)	(\$11,965)	(\$12,448)
<u>Total Costs – DPS-DO</u>	<u>(\$89,495)</u>	<u>(\$104,319)</u>	<u>(\$106,080)</u>	<u>(\$110,365)</u>
FTE Change – DPS-DO	1 FTE	1 FTE	1 FTE	1 FTE
<u>Cost – DOC</u> (§610.141) Expungement of records	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0 to (Unknown)
<u>Cost –</u> (§610.143) Potential increase in Legal Expense Fund payments for increase in claims	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
<u>Transfer Out – To the Missouri Expungement Fund</u>	(\$750,000)	(\$750,000)	(\$750,000)	(\$500,000)

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029	Fully Implemented (FY 2033)
<u>Cost – DOC (§§304.070, 557.035, 565.097, 569.117, 569.119, 570.137, 577.800)</u>				
Personal Service	(\$42,932)	(\$104,066)	(\$157,662)	(\$273,435)
Fringe Benefits	(\$30,881)	(\$74,854)	(\$113,405)	(\$196,681)
Exp. & Equip.	(\$10,919)	(\$23,475)	(\$36,216)	(\$67,540)
<u>Total Costs - DOC</u>	<u>(\$84,732)</u>	<u>(\$202,395)</u>	<u>(\$307,283)</u>	<u>(\$537,656)</u>
FTE Change - DOC	1 FTE	2 FTE	3 FTE	5 FTE
<u>Cost – DOC (§§304.070, 557.035, 565.097, 569.117, 569.119, 570.137, 577.800)</u> Increased incarceration costs	(\$368,913 to Unknown)	(\$884,946 to Unknown)	(\$1,284,533 to Unknown)	(\$1,628,420 to Unknown)
<u>Cost – OSCA (various sections) Increase in potential court costs</u>	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
<u>Cost – DOC (§§579.065 and 579.068) Changes to trafficking drugs felony charges relating to fentanyl/carfentanil</u>	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
<u>Cost – (§56.265) To counties to supplement 3rd and 4th class counties salaries for prosecuting attorneys</u>	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
<u>Cost – DOR (§301.287) FUSION</u>	(\$225,000)	\$0	\$0	\$0
<u>Cost – OSCA (§454.1050) New child support module</u>	(\$500,000 to \$1,000,000)	\$0	\$0	\$0

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029	Fully Implemented (FY 2033)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE	Could exceed (\$2,698,428 to <u>\$3,198,428</u>)	Could exceed (<u>\$2,610,986</u>)	Could exceed (<u>\$3,125,733</u>)	Could exceed (<u>\$3,473,987</u>)
Estimated Net FTE Change on General Revenue	4 FTE	5 FTE	6 FTE	8 FTE
BOARD OF PRIVATE INVESTIGATOR EXAMINERS FUND (1802)				
<u>Transfer Out –</u> (§§324.2100 - 374.051) to Board of Private Investigators, Private Fire Investigators and Professional Surety Bail Bonds Agent Fund	<u>(\$83,396)</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
ETIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE BOARD OF PRIVATE INVESTIGATOR EXAMINERS FUND (1802)	<u>(\$83,396)</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
BOARD OF PRIVATE INVESTIGATORS, PRIVATE FIRE INVESTIGATORS AND PROFESSIONAL SURETY BAIL BONDS AGENTS FUND				
<u>Revenue Gain – DCI</u> (§§324.2100 - 374.051) licensing fee	\$0	\$244,200	\$1,650	\$0

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029	Fully Implemented (FY 2033)
<u>Transfer In</u> – (§§324.2100 - 374.051) from Board of Private Investigators Examiners Fund (1802)	\$83,396	\$0	\$0	\$0
<u>Transfer Out</u> – to PR Fees Fund (0689) (§§324.2100 - 374.051)	(\$77,805)	(\$89,629)	(\$83,268)	\$0
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE BOARD OF PRIVATE INVESTIGATORS, PRIVATE FIRE INVESTIGATORS AND PROFESSIONAL SURETY BAIL BONDS AGENTS FUND	<u>\$5,591</u>	<u>\$154,571</u>	<u>(\$81,618)</u>	<u>\$0</u>
INSURANCE DEDICATED FUND (1566)				
<u>Savings</u> – DCI (§§324.2100 - 374.051)				
Personal Service	\$56,078	\$68,639	\$70,012	\$70,712
Fringe Benefits	\$36,168	\$43,943	\$44,495	\$44,940
Equipment and Expense	\$6,313	\$7,728	\$7,882	\$7,961
<u>Total Savings</u> – DCI	<u>\$98,559</u>	<u>\$120,310</u>	<u>\$122,389</u>	<u>\$123,613</u>
FTE Change – DCI	(1 FTE)	(1 FTE)	(1 FTE)	(1 FTE)
<u>Loss</u> – DCI (§§324.2100 - 374.051)				
Licensing Fee	\$0	(\$600)	(\$87,284)	\$0

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029	Fully Implemented (FY 2033)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE INSURANCE DEDICATED FUND	<u>\$98,559</u>	<u>\$119,710</u>	<u>\$35,105</u>	<u>\$123,613</u>
Estimated Net FTE Change on Insurance Dedicated Fund (1566)	(1 FTE)	(1 FTE)	(1 FTE)	(1 FTE)
PR FEES FUND (1689)				
<u>Transfer In</u> – (§§324.2100 - 374.051) from Board of Private Investigators, Private Fire Investigators and Professional Surety Bail Bonds Agent Fund	\$77,805	\$89,629	\$85,268	\$86,121
<u>Cost – DCI</u> (§§324.2100 - 374.051)				
Personal Service	(\$32,689)	(\$40,012)	(\$40,812)	(\$41,220)
Fringe Benefits	(\$26,761)	(\$32,429)	(\$32,750)	(\$33,078)
Equipment and Expense	(\$18,355)	(\$17,189)	(\$11,706)	(\$11,823)
<u>Total Cost – DCI</u>	<u>(\$77,805)</u>	<u>(\$89,629)</u>	<u>(\$85,268)</u>	<u>(\$86,121)</u>
FTE Change – DCI	1 FTE	1 FTE	1 FTE	1 FTE
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON PR FEES FUND (1689)	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
Estimated Net FTE Change on PR Fees Fund (1689)	1 FTE	1 FTE	1 FTE	1 FTE

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029	Fully Implemented (FY 2033)
STATE LEGAL EXPENSE FUND (1692)				
<u>Transfer In - (\$610.143)</u> From GR, Federal, and Other State Funds - potential increase in claims	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown
<u>Transfer Out - (\$610.143)</u> Payment of discrimination claims	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE LEGAL EXPENSE FUND	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY FUNDS				
<u>Cost – Colleges & Universities (\$610.143)</u> Potential increase in claims	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY FUNDS	<u>\$0 or (Unknown)</u>	<u>\$0 or (Unknown)</u>	<u>\$0 or (Unknown)</u>	<u>\$0 or (Unknown)</u>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029	Fully Implemented (FY 2033)
OTHER/VARIOUS STATE FUNDS				
<u>Cost</u> – (§610.143) Potential increase in payments of claims to the Legal Expense Fund	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER/VARIOUS STATE FUNDS	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
MISSOURI EXPUNGEMENT FUND				
<u>Revenue Gain</u> – (§610.144) Gifts, grants, donations	\$0	\$0	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown
<u>Transfer In</u> – (§§610.141 - 610.144) From General Revenue	\$750,000	\$750,000	\$750,000	\$500,000
<u>Cost</u> - OSCA (§§610.141 - 610.144) Show-Me Courts & Other System updates and maintenance	(\$750,000)	(\$750,000)	(\$750,000)	(\$500,000)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE MISSOURI EXPUNGEMENT FUND	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029	Fully Implemented (FY 2033)
FEDERAL FUNDS				
<u>Revenue Loss – MODOT (§§610.141) Non-compliance with Federal rules</u>	\$0 or (Up to \$555,876)	\$0 or (Up to \$1,111,753)	\$0 or (Up to \$2,779,382)	\$0 or (Up to \$5,558,765)
<u>Cost – (§610.143) Potential increase in payments of claims to the Legal Expense Fund</u>	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS	\$0 or (Could exceed \$555,876)	\$0 or (Could exceed \$1,111,753)	\$0 or (Could exceed \$2,779,382)	\$0 or (Could exceed \$5,558,765)

<u>FISCAL IMPACT – Local Government</u>	FY 2027	FY 2028	FY 2029	Fully Implemented (FY 2033)
LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS				
<u>Cost – Community Colleges (§610.143) Potential increase in claims</u>	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
<u>Cost – Local Political Subdivisions (§610.144.2) To expunge records</u>	\$0	\$0	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)

FISCAL IMPACT – Small Business

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

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

This proposal modifies provisions relating to public safety.

This act contains an emergency clause.

This legislation is not federally mandated, would not duplicate any other program and may require additional capital improvements or rental space.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Attorney General's Office
Department of Corrections
Missouri Lottery Commission
Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development
Department of Social Services
Missouri Department of Conservation
Office of Administration
Office of the State Courts Administrator
Office of the Secretary of State
Department of Health and Senior Services
Office of the Governor
Department of Commerce and Insurance
Office of the State Treasurer
Joint Committee on Administrative Rules
Missouri Department of Transportation
Office of the State Public Defender
Missouri Office of Prosecution Services
Department of Mental Health
Department of Natural Resources
Department of Labor and Industrial Relations
Department of Public Safety
 Missouri Highway Patrol
 Capitol Police
 Division of Fire Safety
 Director's Office
City of Kansas City
Phelps County Sheriff's Department
Kansas City Police Department
St. Louis County Police Department
Blue Springs Police Department
University of Missouri
Northwest Missouri State University

L.R. No. 5940S.07S
Bill No. CCS for SS for SB 1421
Page **41** of **41**
May 14, 2026

University of Central Missouri
Branson Police Department
High Point R-III



Julie Morff
Director
May 14, 2026



Jessica Harris
Assistant Director
May 14, 2026