

**MISSOURI STATE AUDITOR'S OFFICE
FISCAL NOTE (18-HJR 59)**

Subject

Truly Agreed To and Finally Passed House Joint Resolution No. 59. (Received June 1, 2018)

Date

June 21, 2018

Description

This proposal would amend Article III of the Constitution of Missouri.

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**, the **Missouri Lottery**, and the **Missouri Gaming Commission**.

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 they anticipate no impact.

Officials from the **Department of Higher Education** indicated no cost or impact for 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 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 legislation.

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

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 this proposal.

Officials from the **Department of Transportation** indicated no fiscal impact on MoDOT/MHTC.

Officials from the **Office of Administration** indicated:

House Joint Resolution 59 proposes a constitutional amendment to reduce the amount of time a person is required to be a member of a licensed organization in order to participate in the management, conduct, or operation of a bingo game. It also removes the current prohibition against bingo advertising except on the premises of the organization or through ordinary communications between the organization and its members. There could be an unknown positive impact to the Bingo Proceeds for Education Fund as a result of the removal of the prohibition on bingo advertising. House Joint Resolution 59 will not impact Total State Revenues or the calculation under Article X, Section 18(e). This should not impact their office.

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:

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, their office reserves 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 House Joint Resolution No. 59 regarding bingo will not have any significant impact on their office.

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

Officials from **Greene County** indicated there are no estimated costs or savings to report from their county for House Joint Resolution No. 59 proposing to amend Article III.

Officials from the **City of Columbia** indicated they expect no fiscal impact to their city.

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

Officials from the **Missouri Lottery** indicated no fiscal impact to their office.

Officials from the **Missouri Gaming Commission** indicated this legislation has no fiscal impact on the operations of their office.

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 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, University of Missouri, and St. Louis Community College.**

Fiscal Note Summary

State and local governmental entities estimate no costs or savings from this proposal.