

**MISSOURI STATE AUDITOR'S OFFICE
FISCAL NOTE (18-313)**

Subject

Initiative petition from Patricia Thomas regarding a proposed constitutional amendment to Article XIV. (Received December 8, 2017)

Date

December 28, 2017

Description

This proposal would amend Article XIV of the Missouri Constitution.

The amendment is to be voted on in November 2018.

Public comments and other input

The State Auditor's office requested input from the **Attorney General's office**, the **Department of Agriculture**, the **Department of Economic Development**, the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education**, the **Department of Higher Education**, the **Department of Health and Senior Services**, the **Department of Insurance**, **Financial Institutions and Professional Registration**, the **Department of Mental Health**, the **Department of Natural Resources**, the **Department of Corrections**, the **Department of Labor and Industrial Relations**, the **Department of Revenue**, the **Department of Public Safety**, the **Department of Social Services**, the **Governor's office**, the **Missouri House of Representatives**, the **Department of Conservation**, the **Department of Transportation**, the **Office of Administration**, the **Office of State Courts Administrator**, the **Missouri Senate**, the **Secretary of State's office**, the **Office of the State Public Defender**, the **State Treasurer's office**, **Adair County**, **Boone County**, **Callaway County**, **Cass County**, **Clay County**, **Cole County**, **Greene County**, **Jackson County**, **Jasper County**, **St. Charles County**, **St. Louis County**, **Taney County**, the **City of Cape Girardeau**, the **City of Columbia**, the **City of Jefferson**, the **City of Joplin**, the **City of Kansas City**, the **City of Kirksville**, the **City of Mexico**, the **City of Raymore**, the **City of St. Joseph**, the **City of St. Louis**, the **City of Springfield**, the **City of Union**, the **City of Wentzville**, the **City of West Plains**, **Cape Girardeau 63 School District**, **Hannibal 60 School District**, **State Technical College of Missouri**, **Metropolitan Community College**, **University of Missouri**, **St. Louis Community College**, **Public Service Commission**, the **Kansas City Boards of Police Commissioners**, the **Metropolitan Police Department - City of St. Louis**, **University of Central Missouri**, **Harris-Stowe State University**, **Lincoln University**, **Missouri State University**, **Missouri Southern State University**, **Missouri Western State University**, **Northwest Missouri State University**, **Southeast Missouri State University**, and **Truman State University**.

Assumptions

Officials from the **Attorney General's office** indicated they expect that, to the extent that the enactment of this proposal would result in increased litigation, their office can absorb the costs associated with that increased litigation using existing resources. However, if the enactment of this proposal were to result in substantial additional litigation, their office may request additional appropriations.

Officials from the **Department of Agriculture** indicated no fiscal impact on their department.

Officials from the **Department of Economic Development** indicated no impact to their department.

Officials from the **Department of Higher Education** indicated this initiative petition would not have a fiscal impact on their department.

Officials from the **Department of Health and Senior Services** indicated no fiscal impact on their department.

Officials from the **Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration** indicated this petition, if passed, will have no cost or savings to their department.

Officials from the **Department of Mental Health** indicated this proposal creates no direct obligations or requirements to their department that would result in a fiscal impact.

Officials from the **Department of Natural Resources** indicated they would not anticipate a direct fiscal impact from this proposal.

Officials from the **Department of Corrections** indicated no fiscal impact.

Officials from the **Department of Labor and Industrial Relations** indicated increased operating costs to the General Revenue Fund of \$972,614 in fiscal year 2019, \$677,889 in fiscal year 2020, and \$686,618 in fiscal year 2021. Of these costs, \$471,591 are initial and one-time costs in fiscal year 2020 for equipment and computer system development. These costs will be offset by additional biennial revenues to the General Revenue Fund of \$192,250 in fiscal year 2019, \$0 in fiscal year 2020, and \$192,250 in fiscal year 2021.

This proposal would affect any state agency or political subdivision that employs workers in a bargaining unit with exclusive bargaining representatives.

Additional space will be required for nine FTE (9 X 100 sq. ft. X \$14.00 = \$12,600) and 20 large file cabinets (20 X 18 X \$14.00 = \$5,040) at an estimated \$17,640.

Fiscal Note	0		ITSD - DOLIR		
Bill Number	IP 18-313				
Will a new system be required?	-		Yes	No	
Indicate fiscal year when fully implemented	FY				
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON STATE FUNDS					
Fund Affected			FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
General Revenue	-		441,838	139,999	143,499
Other	-		-	-	-
Federal Funds	-		-	-	-
Total	-		441,838	139,999	143,499
-					
It is assumed that every new IT project/system will be bid out because all ITSD resources are at full capacity.					
Bill Section(s)	0				-
			FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
New	Rate	Hours	\$	\$	\$
IT Consultants	75	4,947.48	371,061	76,068	77,970
Other Costs:					
Database Server License w/maint	4,812	1	4,010	4,932	5,055
Web Server License/w maint	1,656	1	1,380	1,697	1,739
Report Server License/w maint	11,904	1	9,920	12,202	12,507
PMO	2,000	1	2,000	-	-
RFP Writing	16,800	1	16,800	-	-
PB Spectrum License/w maint	44,000	1	36,667	45,100	46,228
0	-	0	-	-	-
0	-	0	-	-	-
Section Total Other Costs:			70,777	63,931	65,529
Section Total Expenditures:			441,838	139,999	143,499
Section Funding:					
	General Revenue		441,838	139,999	143,499
	Federal		-	-	-
	Other		-	-	-
	Total		441,838	139,999	143,499

Section 5. (D) 3. (1) of Article XIV indicates that the department shall, by regulation, provide copies of reports and documents filed upon payment of a charge based upon the cost of the service. The fees would be credited to General Revenue.

Section 5 of Article XIV also directs the department to assess and collect a fee from each labor organization participating in an election, based on the size of the bargaining unit, for the purpose of paying for elections. There is no specification as to these fees would be deposited, therefore it is assumed they would be credited to General Revenue.

Section 5. (B)-(D) require the following:

- all labor organizations to adopt constitutions and bylaws containing mandated information and file those documents with the department;
- all labor organizations to file annually, electronic financial reports containing mandated information with the department;
- the department to make the documents submitted under Section 5., publicly available online, in an electronic format;
- certain officers of labor organizations to file with the department personal financial reports containing mandated information annually;
- all of the information collected be designated as public record and the department maintain all documents and reports filed under this legislation and make all filed documents and reports available for examination/inspection;
- the department to provide copies of reports and documents filed upon payment of a charge based upon the cost of the service; and
- funds collected are to be set by regulation and deposited to General Revenue.

Section 5. specifies that the provisions of this legislation apply to all entities engaged in public sector collective bargaining. Currently, voluntarily recognized and statutorily excluded bargaining units are outside the department's jurisdiction. The department estimates there are currently approximately 250 voluntary recognitions, which would require in-person elections at the employer's location. It is physically impossible for the State Board of Mediation (SBM) Chairman to conduct that many elections in a year (normally do 20-30 per year) so additional authorized designees would be hired to oversee elections on a per diem basis, estimated at \$20,000. These staff would also require travel expenses, estimated at \$10,600.

Section 5. (I) 12. requires that all public sector bargaining units be recertified by the State Board of Mediation biennially through telephone or on-line elections. Currently, elections are conducted only in-person or by mailed ballot.

Section 5. (I) 15. directs the SBM to assess and collect fees from each labor organization participating in an election to defray election costs. They cannot provide a definitive amount, but estimate initially that there will be approximately 850 elections in the first two years after implementation, which would generate approximately \$192,250 over the two-year period. Since there is no mention of a separate fund for these fees, they assume any revenue will be deposited to General Revenue.

A new system will be developed by ITSD to implement these provisions.

Section 6 specifies that violation of provisions 1-5 are Class A misdemeanors. The department assumes that it will be charged with investigation of non-compliance of these sections and referral for prosecution if necessary. This will require two investigators and two processing technicians to assure compliance and assist Missouri citizens.

All of the additional duties will require nine additional FTE and associated expenses, as well as additional per diem payments for State Board of Mediation Members and expenses associated with additional elections, and development of a new computer system.

Ongoing expenses will be the same as those estimated for the fiscal note period.

REVENUE ESTIMATE

Section 5. directs the department set fees by regulation to provide copies of reports and documents filed upon payment of a charge based upon the cost of the service. Since these costs will be defined by regulation, they cannot provide an estimate of revenue for these activities.

Section 5. (I) 15. directs the SBM to collect fees from each labor organization to defray election costs. The fees are based on the number of members in each bargaining unit. Currently, the SBM is not notified of changes to the number of members in a bargaining unit once the election has concluded, nor does it have information on members voluntarily recognized or otherwise excluded bargaining units.

Section 5. (I) 15. directs the State Board of Mediation to assess and collect fees from each labor organization participating in an election to defray election costs. For the purposes of this response, they estimate 850 bargaining unit elections biennially. The majority of certified bargaining units at the time of election are made up of less than 100 members. Based on historical averages from FY 2010 through 2015, they estimate a total of \$192,250 from fees collected from labor organizations.

Estimated Revenue from Labor Organization Fees							
Total Voters	1-100	101-250	251-500	501-1000	1001-3000	3001+	TOTAL
Bargaining Units	748	84	12	3	2	1	850
Fee	\$200	\$350	\$500	\$750	\$1,500	\$2,000	
Total	\$149,600	\$29,400	\$6,000	\$2,250	\$3,000	\$2,000	\$192,250

They assume all revenue collected will be deposited into General Revenue. The SBM will be required to adopt procedures for assessing and collecting the fees, as well compliance with accepted accounting practices.

COST ESTIMATE

State Board of Mediation

They estimate that there are currently over 600 bargaining units that have been certified. This amendment requires that bargaining units made up of otherwise excluded employees (e.g., teachers and peace officers) and voluntarily recognized units be recertified. Because excluded and voluntarily recognized units are not required to notify the department of their existence, the department does not have the number of such units. For the purposes of this estimate, they assume there are 250 excluded and voluntarily recognized units, for a total of 850. The number of actual bargaining units and elections could be more or less depending upon the precision of the estimate used.

The proposed language requires all of the estimated 850 labor organizations to submit constitutions & bylaws to the department. It also requires all of the estimated labor organizations, as well as certain officers of those organizations, to submit annual financial reports to the

department. The submissions will be in electronic or paper document form. The subsections mandate information to be contained in those submissions. The department shall make each document filed under this section publicly available, online, in an electronic format. The SBM estimates it will require 4.00 Senior Office Support Assistants (Range 12, Step F) to verify that all labor organizations comply with the required submissions. They must process (review for compliance regarding mandated information), perform necessary electronic formatting and data entry to make the information available online, and properly file the documents and electronically submitted reports. These FTE would also field Chapter 610 requests and prepare the requested documents and reports for dissemination upon authorization as required.

All public sector bargaining units shall be recertified biennially through telephone or on-line elections conducted by the SBM. Currently, elections are conducted only in-person or by mailed ballot. The SBM's current staff will not be able to fulfill the new responsibilities required by the amendment. To facilitate the estimated 850 biennial recertification elections, the SBM would require 1.00 Executive II (Range 22, Step G). The SBM may opt to contract with a third party to conduct the recertification elections.

The occurrence of the elections will also result in an incentive for existing bargaining representatives or the public body employers to petition to clarify the makeup of their units or to amend their certifications to reflect changing circumstances. It is likely that some portion of these petitions will result in disagreements between public bodies and bargaining representatives, which will, in turn, result in a need for the SBM to conduct additional hearings. Each additional hearing will also result in briefing and the need for a written decision.

The SBM members are not compensated for their service; however, they do receive a per diem of up to \$50 for days they perform services for the board and reimbursement for any expenses incurred while performing those duties. The services include preparation for hearings and hearing and deciding cases. It is expected that board members will incur additional expenses for preparation and travel related to the additional hearings.

In addition to the standard expense and equipment for each FTE, additional expenses including a printer, file cabinets, and travel expenses will also be required because bargaining units are located throughout the state.

Division of Labor Standards

The Division of Labor Standards (DLS) assumes it will perform investigative duties regarding non-compliance with sections 1-5 of this amendment and referral for prosecution as set forth in Section 6. The division estimates it would receive 200 incidents of non-compliance annually. To review allegations and complete investigations, the division would require two Processing Technicians (Range 13, Step F) and two Wage and Hour Investigator IIs (Range 23, Step G). Standard per FTE expense and equipment, along with travel expense for investigators is also included in this estimate.

ITSD - DOLIR				TOTAL HOURS: 4,947			
Bill Number	IP 18-313	FN #					
Bill Section(s)							
Application Name:	New			FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	
IT Consultants	On-going Yes/No	Rate	Hours	\$	\$	\$	
Requirements Gathering		75	135	10,125	-	-	
Analysis		75	135	10,125	-	-	
Design		75	765	57,375	-	-	
Development		75	2,574	193,050	-	-	
Test		75	918	68,850	-	-	
Implementation		75	54	4,050	-	-	
Project Management		75	366.48	27,486	-	-	
On-going support	Yes	75		-	76,068	77,970	
Section Total IT Consultants:		75	4,947.48	371,061	76,068	77,970	
Other Costs:		Cost Per	Number	\$	\$	\$	
Database Server License w/maint	Yes	4,812	1	4,010	4,932	5,055	
Web Server License/w maint	Yes	1,656	1	1,380	1,697	1,739	
Report Server License/w maint	Yes	11,904	1	9,920	12,202	12,507	
PMO	No	2,000	1	2,000	-	-	
RFP Writing	No	16,800	1	16,800	-	-	
PB Spectrum License/w maint	Yes	44,000	1	36,667	45,100	46,228	
				-	-	-	
		-	-	-	-	-	
Section Total Other Costs:				70,777	63,931	65,529	
Section Total Expenditures:				441,838	139,999	143,499	
General Revenue				441,838	139,999	143,499	
Federal				-	-	-	
Other							
Section Funding:				441,838	139,999	143,499	
Should be \$0				-	-	-	
12. Assumptions and methodology used in arriving at state fiscal impact.							
DOLIR must retrieve the union bylaws and annual financial reports and make it available through a website for public access. The assumption is a RFP will be created and awarded. PMO oversight cost, cost to write an RFP, web server, PM Spectrum server, Report Server and database server cost included. To complete the fiscal note, security developed for the application and new web pages created to enter, update, and delete information reported defining the labor association were estimated. Additional web pages created for this bill version to obtain the required by laws and financial reports of the unions which contains a sizable amount of data used to display the information online for public access. The union elections will require history to be kept for prior elections. Reports created to share information and count election results. Setup a SAM II object code or grant code added for financial data tracking piece. The system will require a new database and services from the State Data Center.							

Information Technology Services Division

Officials from the **Department of Revenue** indicated this petition will have no fiscal impact on their department.

Officials from the **Department of Public Safety - Office of the Director** indicated they see no fiscal impact due to this initiative petition.

Officials from the **Department of Social Services** indicated no fiscal impact on their department. They defer to OA (Office of Administration) for response to this fiscal note request.

Officials from the **Governor's office** indicated there should be no added costs or savings to their office.

Officials from the **Missouri House of Representatives** indicated no fiscal impact to their office.

Officials from the **Department of Conservation** indicated that no adverse fiscal impact to their department would be expected as a result of the proposal. They would anticipate annual savings over \$100,000.

Officials from the **Department of Transportation** indicated their department has maintained a zero to unknown fiscal impact on labor issues. No known direct effects would stem from this, but it may have indirect effects on their department.

Officials from the **Office of Administration** indicated this proposal adds Article XIV to the MO Constitution and would:

- Prohibit employers from requiring employees to become, remain or refrain from becoming a member of a labor organization or to pay any union dues, as a condition of employment.
- Require annual informed, written, notarized authorization from public employees to withhold any earnings for the purpose of paying dues to a public labor organization or a designee thereof.
- Allow any public body engaged in construction, alteration, repair, or maintenance of public works to opt out of prevailing wage requirements.
- Require public labor organizations to adopt a constitution and bylaws and file a copy with the Missouri Department of Labor and Industrial Relations.
- Require public labor organizations to file an annual financial report with the Missouri Department of Labor and Industrial Relations in an electronic, readily and easily accessible format.
- Require the Missouri Department of Labor and Industrial Relations to make each report publicly available online and in an electronic format.
- Require biennial recertification for labor organizations through an election process.

The Office of Administration, Division of Personnel estimates this will have an unknown negative fiscal impact on the division. There is no way to estimate the amount of additional staff time that will be needed to fulfill the provisions of this proposal as the time needed for each negotiation varies. They would anticipate possibly needing to hire additional employees. The Department of Labor and Industrial Relations (DOLIR) will also be impacted. Budget and Planning defers to the DOLIR for the specific impact to that agency.

The Division of Personnel (DOP) notes the following issues with the proposed language:

Section 3(A): "...except upon the annual informed, written, notarized authorization of the public employee". Currently, there are no provisions in the state's labor contracts that reference this requirement. Provisions in the labor agreements will need to be revised to reflect this requirement.

Section 3(A)(B): "...withdraw at any time written or electronic notification, and no sum shall be withheld from the earnings of any such public employee, effective as of the time such notification is sent." This language is in both subsection B and C. Depending on the amount of time it takes to get the notification from the employee to the employee's HR or Payroll office for revocation from the employee's payroll deductions, due to restrictions in the statewide Payroll system, there may not be enough time to withdraw this deduction from the employee's next paycheck. Reimbursement of the deduction may need to be made manually either by the Union or the Employer.

Section 5(I)1. "...Voluntary recognition by any public body shall be prohibited." The language is unclear as if this prohibition is to be implemented going forward and the state could "grandfather" in those previously recognized voluntarily, or if would the DOP need to research bargaining units to ensure no classes of employees were voluntarily recognized, and if there were voluntarily recognized classes, who would be responsible for filing unit clarification petitions or recertification elections with the Department of Labor's State Board of Mediation.

Section 5(I)12. "Employees shall vote by telephone or online every two years during a two-week period beginning on the anniversary of the initial certification." It is unclear whether this would allow employees to use state resources and work time to vote for recertification. There could be costs associated with this language as there were, as of June 30, 2017, 4,286 state members who would be eligible to vote in these recertification elections.

Section 5(J)1. "Within eight weeks after a labor organization is certified as the exclusive bargaining representative...shall meet and begin bargaining for an agreement..." DOP would need to ensure that labor negotiations for any new bargaining units begin negotiations as required by this language. DOP would also need to ensure that agencies are meeting this obligation. Also, depending on the number of new bargaining units established, it may cause some manpower issues if the division was negotiating multiple new labor agreements close in proximity (time wise). DOP may

have to pull additional staff from their normal duties to assist with the additional workload, possibly even hiring temporary staff to cover manpower shortages.

Section 5(J)5. “...The Public body may approve...” Many of the State’s bargaining units are horizontal bargaining units covering multiple agencies. This language is problematic to horizontal units as it would be much more difficult to reach agreement on articles in the labor agreement that may affect one agency and not so much another agency. It may create prolonged negotiation sessions that would possibly make it difficult for DOP to reach a new agreement between the union(s) with the time constraints listed in this proposal.

Section 5(J)7. Entire section. It is understood labor negotiations for new agreements should take place annually; however, the completion date is ambiguous, as it does not take into consideration the date the bargaining unit was adopted or when the first labor agreement was adopted. If a labor agreement was adopted May 1st for a new bargaining unit, it would only have 30 days but with the requirement that the bargaining was to be completed by July 31st of each year, there would be a difference in the number of days a new labor agreement is to be negotiated. For instance, if a first labor agreement was completed on May 1, 2017, the state would be required to begin negotiations on May 1, 2018 and be completed with the negotiations by May 31st of 2018, allowing for only one month of negotiation sessions. This short timeframe would place extraordinary time restraints on agency staff who participate in negotiations as many negotiations normally take several months to complete. It also provides concessions to negotiate economic conditions separately but does not provide a deadline for these conditions. These conditions typically take the largest percentage of time to negotiate.

Section 5(J) 7 and 8. These two sections are incongruent to each other. The state is required to negotiate annually but the labor contract is in effect for 2 years.

Section 5(K) 1-3. Entire sections. These sections do not explicitly provide that actual negotiation sessions are considered public records or whether they are to be closed, which has historically been decided in past labor negotiations. If they are considered public meetings, there are additional time parameters that the state would need to be cognizant of in regard to public notice, which may cause negotiations to be more time consuming.

Section 5(O) 1 and 6. As it relates to definition of public body. The definition of public body does not include a grouping of agencies, which occurs under a horizontal bargaining unit. DOP is unsure whether this definition would prohibit the state from having horizontal bargaining units. If horizontal bargaining units were prohibited, then the state would possibly need to renegotiate current horizontal bargaining units to make them singular units. In that case, each agency would have their own unit, which would mean a drastic increase in negotiations, with the possibility that employees in separate agencies, but identical job classifications, would have differing labor contracts.

Section 4 of this petition would prohibit the Division of Facilities Management, Design and Construction (FMDC) from requiring that its contractors pay prevailing wage to their

employees. This petition could potentially impact OA-FMDC's costs for construction projects. However, FMDC cannot calculate the impact for the reasons set forth below.

A review of scholarly articles shows that there is no generally accepted methodology for determining the cost savings, if any, that may result from legislation such as this. A number of factors would affect FMDC's cost savings, if any, from this petition, including, but not limited to, how much contractors choose to pay their employees in the absence of prevailing wage and whether contractors choose to pass on any labor costs savings to FMDC. Any Facilities Maintenance Reserve Fund (FMRF) savings will be used to decrease other deferred maintenance projects.

In addition to contract costs, this petition could potentially affect the rental rates for future leases and improvements at facilities leased by FMDC, as property owners are presently obligated to pay prevailing wage for alterations or improvements made to properties leased by the State. However, FMDC cannot calculate the impact of this legislation on rental rates for the reasons discussed above. Any savings from the elimination of prevailing wage will be used to offset increased costs for rental rates because of increases by the Lessor, or increases in janitorial and utilities.

The other sections of this petition would not result in any fiscal impact to FMDC.

Officials from the **Office of State Courts Administrator** indicated there is no fiscal impact on the courts.

Officials from the **Missouri Senate** indicated they anticipate no fiscal impact.

Officials from the **Secretary of State's office** indicated each year, a number of joint resolutions that would refer to a vote of the people a constitutional amendment and bills that would refer to a vote of the people the statutory issue in the legislation may be considered by the General Assembly.

Unless a special election is called for the purpose, Referendums are submitted to the people at the next general election. Article III section 52(b) of the Missouri Constitution authorizes the general assembly to order a special election for measures referred to the people. If a special election is called to submit a Referendum to a vote of the people, Section 115.063.2 RSMo. requires the state to pay the costs. The cost of the special election has been estimated to be \$7.8 million based on the cost of the 2016 Presidential Preference Primary.

Their office is required to pay for publishing in local newspapers the full text of each statewide ballot measure as directed by Article XII, Section 2(b) of the Missouri Constitution and Section 116.230-116.290, RSMo. Their office is provided with core funding to handle a certain amount of normal activity resulting from each year's legislative session. Funding for this item is adjusted each year depending upon the election cycle with \$1.3 million historically appropriated in odd numbered fiscal years and \$100,000 appropriated in even numbered fiscal years to meet these requirements.

Through FY (fiscal year) 2013, the appropriation had historically been an estimated appropriation because the final cost is dependent upon the number of ballot measures approved by the General Assembly and the initiative petitions certified for the ballot. In FY 2015, the General Assembly changed the appropriation so that it was no longer an estimated appropriation. In FY 2017 their office was appropriated \$2.6 million to publish the full text of the measures. In FY 2017, at the August and November elections, there were 6 statewide Constitutional Amendments or ballot propositions that cost \$2.4 million to publish (an average of \$400,000 per issue). Their office will continue to assume, for the purposes of this fiscal note, that it should have the full appropriation authority it needs to meet the publishing requirements. Because these requirements are mandatory, they reserve the right to request funding to meet the cost of their publishing requirements if the Governor and the General Assembly again change the amount or continue to not designate it as an estimated appropriation.

Officials from the **Office of the State Public Defender** indicated this initiative petition will not have any impact on their office.

Officials from the **State Treasurer's office** indicated this proposal would have no fiscal impact upon their office.

Officials from **Greene County** indicated there is no quantifiable information to submit regarding estimated costs or savings to report from their county for this initiative petition. It is ascertainable that regarding Section 4 of this initiative petition, that for any building project commenced by the County of Greene that there would be savings in the overall cost of the project when there is no longer a prevailing wage requirement that limits how low a bidder can bid wages for the labor portion of the bid.

Officials from the **City of Kansas City** indicated this amendment will have no fiscal impact on their city.

Officials from **University of Missouri** indicated they have reviewed this proposed legislation and have determined there would be no significant financial impact on their university.

Officials from **Missouri Public Service Commission** indicated no fiscal impact on their office.

Officials from **University of Central Missouri** indicated there would not be a fiscal impact for their university.

Officials from **Missouri State University** indicated this will have a positive fiscal impact of an undetermined amount for their university. This would significantly decrease the costs associated with projects on their campus.

Officials from **Missouri Western State University** indicated this initiative petition will not have a fiscal impact to their university.

The State Auditor's office did not receive a response from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Adair County, Boone County, Callaway County, Cass County, Clay County, Cole County, Jackson County, Jasper County, St. Charles County, St. Louis County, Taney County, the City of Cape Girardeau, the City of Columbia, the City of Jefferson, the City of Joplin, the City of Kirksville, the City of Mexico, the City of Raymore, the City of St. Joseph, the City of St. Louis, the City of Springfield, the City of Union, the City of Wentzville, the City of West Plains, Cape Girardeau 63 School District, Hannibal 60 School District, State Technical College of Missouri, Metropolitan Community College, St. Louis Community College, Kansas City Board of Police Commissioners, The Metropolitan Police Department - City of St. Louis, Harris-Stowe State University, Lincoln University, Missouri Southern State University, Northwest Missouri State University, Southeast Missouri State University, and Truman State University.**

Fiscal Note Summary

State government entities estimate initial and one-time costs of \$470,000 and annual costs of at least \$600,000, but total potential costs are unknown. State government entities estimate additional biennial revenues of \$193,000. Local government entities estimate no additional revenues and estimate cost savings of an unknown amount.