

**MISSOURI STATE AUDITOR'S OFFICE
FISCAL NOTE (18-314)**

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 no fiscal impact on their department.

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 with five sections 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.
- Allow any public body engaged in construction, alteration, repair, or maintenance of public works to opt out of prevailing wage requirements.

Section 3 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.

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 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 the petition removes the requirement of prevailing wage for workers employed by a public body engaged in the construction, repair, alteration or maintenance of public works. The financial impact would be indirect to their university through contractors and service contracts awarded through the procurement process. Estimated savings are indeterminable as pricing would be determined by the contractors at the time of procurement bid response.

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 no additional revenues, but estimate annual cost savings of over \$100,000. Local government entities estimate no additional revenues and estimate cost savings of an unknown amount.