

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 2200-06
Bill No.: HCS #2 for HB 927
Subject: Agriculture and Animals; Agriculture Department
Type: Original
Date: April 24, 2013

Bill Summary: Changes the laws regarding agriculture.

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
General Revenue	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 20 pages.

Note: No fiscal impact is shown for § 348.521; however, changes to this section increases the state's overall financial exposure from \$20,000 to \$50,000 per loan if defaulted.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
Agriculture Protection*	\$0	\$0	\$0
Career and Technical Education Board *	\$0	\$0	\$0
School District Trust**	\$0	\$0	\$0
Conservation Commission	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)
Parks, and Soil and Water	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)	(Less than \$100,000)
Road Fund	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)

* Revenues and expenditures net to zero

** Reduced income and reduced transfers net to zero.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE	0	0	0

Estimated Total Net Effect on All funds expected to exceed \$100,000 savings or (cost).

Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund expected to exceed \$100,000 (cost).

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
Local Government	(More than \$200,000)	(More than \$200,000)	(More than \$200,000)

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

§ 144.527 - Farmers Market Sales Tax Exemption:

Officials from the **Office of Administration - Division of Budget and Planning (BAP)** assume this section of the proposal would not result in any additional costs or savings to their organization.

BAP officials noted this proposal would provide a tax exemption on sales at farmers markets. According to information on the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) website, Missouri has about 141 of the 7,175 national farmers markets, or about 2.0%. The same source estimates national sales at over \$1.2 billion annually. Using these figures suggests Missouri sales of about \$24 million annually. Some of these sales are probably already exempt, but the amount is unknown. A state sales tax exemption could reduce General and Total State Revenues by the following amounts:

General Revenue Fund	\$720,000
School District Trust Fund	\$240,000
Conservation Commission Fund	\$30,000
Parks, and Soil and Water Fund	\$20,000

Officials from the **Department of Natural Resources (DNR)** assume this section of the proposal removes from state and local sales and use taxes all sales of farm products sold at farmers markets from state and local sales and use tax. Exemption would not apply to any farmers with an estimated total annual sales of \$25,000 or more from participating in farmers' markets.

DNR states this section would decrease the amount of funding available in the Parks and Soils Sales Tax Funds. These funds have been used for the acquisition and development, maintenance and operation of state parks and historic sites and to assist agricultural landowners through voluntary programs.

DNR's Parks and Soils Sales Tax Funds are derived from one-tenth of one percent sales and use tax pursuant to Article IV Section 47(a) of the Missouri Constitution. Therefore, any additional sales tax exemption would be an unknown loss to the Parks and Soils Sales Tax Funds.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Officials from the **Department of Revenue (DOR)** assume this proposal would exempt all sales of farm products sold at a farmers' market from state and local sales and use taxes.

DOR states this section of the proposal would define "farm products" as any fresh fruits, vegetables, mushrooms, nuts, shell eggs, honey or other bee products, maple syrup or maple sugar, flowers, nursery stock and other horticultural commodities, livestock food products, including meat, milk, cheese, and other dairy products, food products of "aquaculture," including fish, oysters, clams, mussels, and other molluscan shellfish taken from the waters of the state. The definition would include products from any tree, vine, plant, flowers, or any of the products listed that were processed by the participating farmer, including, but not limited to, baked goods made with farm products.

DOR states this section of the proposal would define a "farmers' market" as a cooperative or nonprofit enterprise or association that operates principally as a common marketplace for a group of farmers to sell farm products directly to consumers, generating household income.

DOR states this section of the proposal does not apply to any farmer with estimated total annual sales of \$25,000 or more from participating in farmers' markets.

Fiscal impact

According to a study completed by the Missouri Department of Agriculture, estimated annual sales at Missouri farmers' markets are \$14.5 million. Most of the sales are food related and are currently taxed at the reduced food sales tax rate. The estimated state sales tax loss is \$177,625, and local governments would also have a negative impact.

DOR officials did not provide an estimate of costs to administer this proposal, and **Oversight** assumes any cost to DOR to implement this section of the proposal could be absorbed with existing resources.

Oversight assumes since a substantial but unknown part of the reported sales are food and food-related items, which are already not subject to the 3% sales tax for General Revenue, we will reflect an impact of under \$100,000 to General Revenue from this part of the proposal.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Oversight assumes the fiscal impact of this proposal, for other funds and entities, on \$14.5 million annual sales could be calculated as follows:

<u>Fund or entity</u>	<u>Sales Tax Rate</u>	<u>Revenue Reduction</u>	
		<u>Annual</u>	<u>Ten Months</u>
School District Trust	1.000%	\$145,000	\$120,833
Conservation Commission	0.125%	\$18,125	\$15,104
Parks, and Soil and Water	0.100%	\$14,500	\$12,083
Local Governments *	3.800%	\$551,000	\$459,167

* The 3.8% average rate for local governments was computed by Oversight based on collections reported by the Department of Revenue.

Oversight will include a revenue reduction less than \$100,000 per year for the Conservation Commission Fund and the Parks, and Soil and Water Fund. Oversight notes that the revenue reduction for the School District Trust Fund would result in reduced transfers to local school districts in addition to the direct revenue reduction greater than \$100,000 per year for local governments.

§ 178.550 - Career and Technical Education Advisory Council:

Officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education** state that it is not possible to calculate a fiscal impact for this due to uncertainty as to whether or not the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education would continue to be regarded by the U.S. Office of Education as the “eligible agency” responsible for the administration of career and technical education under the “Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Improvement Act of 2006,” as is currently the case. The loss of the determination of “eligible agency” would result in the reduction of \$26 million in federal funding now provided through this act. To maintain career technical funding at the current level would require an additional \$26 million of state revenue.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Oversight notes that the Carl D Perkins Vocation and Technical Education Act (Perkins Act) was first authorized by the federal government in 1984 and reauthorized in 1998. In 2006, the act was reauthorized through 2012, after passing almost unanimously in Congress. The Perkins Act provided \$1.14 billion in federal support for career and technical education programs in all 50 states in 2012. According to the Arne Duncan, U.S. Secretary of Education, the Perkins Act will be reformed and updated prior to reauthorization.

Oversight assumes the board to be created by this section of the proposal would be an avenue to align with current recommendations for reform of the Perkins Act. Even if the Perkins Act is not reauthorized, the board would be in place to oversee and coordinate career and technical education. Administrative costs of the board are not expected to exceed \$100,000 per year.

§ 196.311 - Eggs:

Officials from the **Department of Agriculture** and **Department of Health and Senior Services** each assume this section of the proposal would not fiscally impact their respective agencies.

Oversight assumes there is no direct fiscal impact from this section of the proposal on state or local government funds.

§ 261.100 - Funding for operating animal export inspection facilities:

In response to similar legislation from 2013 (SB 371), officials from the **Department of Agriculture (AGR)** stated the export inspections in this proposal would be conducted by the United States Department of Agriculture. The proposal as written would have no fiscal impact on AGR.

Oversight assumes this section of the proposal will have no direct fiscal impact on state or local government funds.

§ 262.598 - University of Missouri Extension Councils

In response to similar legislation from 2013 (HCS for HB 202), officials from the **Platte County Board of Election Commissioners** assumed there would be costs for an election for any county conducting an election. Costs per election would range from \$50,000 to \$60,000, depending upon the number of other participants involved in any specific election, as costs would be prorated based upon the number of registered voters within each district.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

In response to similar legislation from 2013 (HCS for HB 202), officials from the **Kansas City Election Board (KCEB)** stated the cost to conduct a city-wide general municipal election can range up to \$350,000 depending on the number of entities participating and the number of registered voters in each jurisdiction requesting the election. The KCEB would need more information about the size and locations of these "districts" before they could give a more accurate estimate of these costs.

Oversight assumes this section of the proposal is discretionary and would have no local fiscal impact without action by the governing body.

§ 262.750 - Rodeos:

Officials from the **Department of Agriculture** assume this section of the proposal would not fiscally impact their agency.

Oversight assumes there is no direct fiscal impact from this section of the proposal on state or local government funds.

§ 262.795 - Children Working on Family Farms:

Officials from the **Department of Agriculture** and **Department of Labor and Industrial Relations** each assume this section of the proposal would not fiscally impact their respective agencies.

Oversight assumes there is no fiscal impact from this section of the proposal on state or local government funds.

§§ 304.180 and 304.184 - Vehicles Hauling Recyclable Waste for Animal Feed and Hauling of Livestock:

Officials from the **Department of Transportation (MODOT)** state these sections of the proposal would increase weight allowances and result in increased damage to bridges. Additionally, it would reduce the life expectancy of some of MODOT's bridges.

Officials from the **Department of Natural Resources (DNR)** assume this section of the proposed legislation is not intended to result in the permitting of recycling centers managing source separated or commingled recyclable materials which are currently permit exempt.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

DNR anticipates no fiscal impact to the department resulting from this section of the proposal.

Since there is no way to quantify the dollar amount of this section of the proposal, **Oversight** will assume an unknown negative impact to the Road Fund.

§§ 323.100 and 413.225 - Propane Meters and Metrology Lab Fees:

Oversight assumes this section of the proposal will increase propane meter fees from \$10/meter to \$25/meter on January 1, 2014 and from \$25 to \$50/meter on January 1, 2015 and from \$50 to \$75/meter on January 1, 2016. The propane meter testing fee will be set at \$75 thereafter.

Officials from the **Department of Agriculture (AGR)** assume the propane meter and metrology laboratory programs will become more self sufficient from fees collected and deposited to the Agriculture Protection Fund (APF) as a result of this section of the proposal. AGR assumes a savings to General Revenue in the amount of the increased fee revenues.

AGR assumes the following changes to propane meter and metrology lab fees.

Propane Meters:

Estimated FY14 revenue increase for APF = 433 propane meters (one-third of total will be inspected in the first 6 months) X \$15/meter additional revenue = \$6,495

- **Total FY14 additional revenues = \$6,495**

Estimated FY15 revenue increase for APF:

- 867 propane meters (two-thirds of total will be inspected at the \$25/meter rate in the first 6 months of the FY) X \$15/meter additional revenue = \$13,005
- 433 propane meters at the \$50/meter rate (one-third of total will be inspected in the last 6 months of the FY) X \$40/meter additional revenue = \$17,320
- **Total FY15 additional revenues = \$30,325**

Estimated FY16 revenue increase for APF:

- 867 propane meters (two-thirds of total will be inspected at the \$50/meter rate in the first 6 months of the FY) X \$40/meter additional revenue = \$34,680
- 433 propane meters at the \$75/meter rate (one-third of total will be inspected in the last 6 months of the FY) X \$65/meter additional revenue = \$28,145
- **Total FY16 additional revenues = \$62,825**

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Metrology Laboratory:

Metrology calibration fees will increase from \$60/hour to \$120/hour on January 1, 2014.

Estimated **FY14** revenue increase for APF = 350 hours X \$60/hour additional revenue = **\$21,000.**

FY 15 and **FY16** revenues = 700 hours X \$60/hour additional revenue = **\$42,000.**

AGR state General Revenue funds used by the metrology laboratory program will decline by the same amounts.

Table 1: Total Revenue Changes for Propane Meter and Metrology Laboratory Programs

	Propane	Metrology	Total
FY 14	\$6,495	\$21,000	\$27,495
FY 15	\$30,325	\$42,000	\$72,325
FY 16	\$62,825	\$42,000	\$104,825

Source: Department of Agriculture

These increased fee revenues will replace General Revenue currently used by AGR to operate these programs.

Officials from the **Office of Administration - Division of Budget and Planning (BAP)** assume this section of the proposal would allow the Department of Agriculture Director to adjust certain weights and measures fees annually based on the total expenses for administering the programs so that fees will cover the expenses for the following year. This section would have no impact on BAP, but could have an unknown fiscal impact on the 18e calculation and total state revenues.

Oversight assumes the increased fee rates of the propane meter and metrology lab programs will result in a savings to general revenue equal to the increased fee revenue received by the Agriculture Protection Fund.

This section of the proposal could increase Total State Revenues.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

§ 348.521 - Livestock Feed and Crop Loan Guarantee:

Officials from the **Department of Agriculture** and **Department of Economic Development** each assume this section of the proposal would not fiscally impact their respective agencies.

Officials from the **Office of Administration - Division of Budget and Planning (BAP)** assume this section of the proposal would increase the maximum loan amount for the Livestock Feed and Crop Input Loan Guarantee Program and could impact general revenue if loans are defaulted.

BAP assumes the section does not change current statutory caps limiting the amount to be spent on loan guarantees at \$4 million.

Oversight assumes this section of the proposal permits the Missouri Agricultural and Small Business Development Authority to increase the maximum livestock feed and crop input loan guarantees from \$40,000 to \$100,000.

Oversight assumes in the event of a default on a livestock feed and crop input loan, the State of Missouri will provide a 50% first loss guarantee for the purchase of livestock feed used to produce livestock or inputs used to produce livestock feed. Currently the state liability is \$20,000 per loan and this section of the proposal will increase the state's liability to \$50,000 per loan.

Oversight assumes any livestock feed and crop input loan default would have a direct impact on the state General Revenue Fund. However, since the program's inception, no loan default has occurred. Therefore, **Oversight** assumes no direct fiscal impact on state or local government funds, but this section of the proposal would increase the state's overall financial exposure.

§ 578.011 - Stealing of Livestock, Animal Abuse, and Animal Trespassing:

Officials from the **Office of Administration - Division of Budget and Planning (BAP)** assume this section creates the crime of animal trespass as an infraction upon the first conviction and for each additional offense punishable by a fine not to exceed \$200, and a class C misdemeanor by imprisonment or a fine not to exceed \$500. This section of the proposal impacts the total state revenues by an unknown amount.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** assume an unknown cost expected to be less than \$100,000 for DOC each year.

Oversight notes DOC responded to the previous version of this proposal (HCS for HB 927) with a response of \$0 or minimal which can be absorbed by DOC.

Oversight assumes DOC can absorb any costs related to this section of the proposal.

Oversight assumes the number of cases resulting in additional fine revenue impacting total state revenue would be minimal and therefore show no direct fiscal impact from this section of the proposal.

Bill as a Whole:

In response to similar legislation from 2013 (HB 342), officials from the **Office of the Secretary of State (SOS)** assumed 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 Secretary of State's Office for Administrative Rules is less than \$2,500. The SOS recognizes that this is a small amount and does not expect that additional funding would be required to meet these costs. However, we also recognize 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 our office can sustain with our core budget. Therefore, we reserve 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 assumes the SOS could absorb the costs of printing and distributing regulations related to this proposal. If multiple bills pass which require the printing and distribution of regulations at substantial costs, the SOS could request funding through the appropriation process.

In response to similar legislation from 2013 (HB 342), officials from the **Joint Committee on Administrative Rules** assume that this proposal would not have a fiscal impact to their organization in excess of existing resources.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

Officials at the **Office of State Public Defender (SPD)** cannot assume that existing staff will provide effective representation for any new cases arising where indigent clients are charged with the proposed new crime of animal trespassing a new class C misdemeanor or stealing of any animal considered livestock, a new Class B felony.

SPD assumes while the number of new cases may be too few or uncertain to request additional funding for this specific bill, the SPD will continue to request sufficient appropriations to provide effective representation.

Oversight assumes the SPD can absorb the additional caseload that may result from this proposal.

In response to similar legislation from 2013 (HB 564), officials from the **Office of Prosecution Services (OPS)** assumed the proposal would not have a fiscal impact on their agency. The creation of a new crime creates additional responsibilities for county prosecutors which may, in turn, result in additional costs which are difficult to determine.

Oversight assumes county prosecutors can absorb the additional caseload that may result from this proposal.

Officials from the **Office of Governor** assume there should be no added cost to the Governor's Office as a result of this measure. However, if additional duties are placed on the office related to appointments in other TAFP legislation, there may be the need for additional staff resources in future years.

Officials from the **Department of Health and Senior Services, Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Higher Education, Department of Public Safety - Missouri State Highway Patrol, Department of Economic Development, Office of State Courts Administrator, Linn State Technical College, Northwest Missouri State University** each assume the proposal would not fiscally impact their respective agencies.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2014 (10 Mo.)	FY 2015	FY 2016
GENERAL REVENUE FUND			
<u>Savings - AGR</u>			
§§ 323.100 and 413.225 - Reduced general revenue appropriation for weights and measures programs	\$27,495	\$72,325	\$104,825
<u>Transfer Out</u> - To the Career and Technical Education Board Fund (§178.550)	(Expected to be less than \$100,000)	(Expected to be less than \$100,000)	(Expected to be less than \$100,000)
<u>Revenue reduction</u> - DOR § 144.527 -Sales Tax exemption	<u>(Less than \$100,000)</u>	<u>(Less than \$100,000)</u>	<u>(Less than \$100,000)</u>
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND	<u>(Less than \$100,000)</u>	<u>(Less than \$100,000)</u>	<u>(Less than \$100,000)</u>
 AGRICULTURE PROTECTION FUND			
<u>Revenue - AGR</u>			
§§ 323.100 and 413.225 - Increased fee revenue for Propane Meters and Metrology lab programs	\$27,495	\$72,325	\$104,825
<u>Cost - AGR</u>			
§§ 323.100 and 413.225 - Operating expense of Propane Meters and Metrology lab programs	<u>(\$27,495)</u>	<u>(\$72,325)</u>	<u>(\$104,825)</u>
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE AGRICULTURE PROTECTION FUND	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u> (continued)	FY 2014 (10 Mo.)	FY 2015	FY 2016
--	---------------------	---------	---------

SCHOOL DISTRICT TRUST FUND

Revenue reduction - DOR

§ 144.527 -Sales Tax exemption	(More than \$100,000)	(More than \$100,000)	(More than \$100,000)
--------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Savings - School Districts

§ 144.527 - Less money transferred to schools from sales tax revenue	More than <u>\$100,000</u>	More than <u>\$100,000</u>	More than <u>\$100,000</u>
---	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------

**ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON
SCHOOL DISTRICT TRUST FUND**

<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
------------	------------	------------

ROAD FUND

Income - MoDOT - Fee Income
(§304.184)

Unknown - Expected to be less than \$100,000	Unknown - Expected to be less than \$100,000	Unknown - Expected to be less than \$100,000
---	---	---

Cost - MoDOT

§§ 304.180, 304.184 - Expense of upkeep on damaged bridges	<u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>
---	------------------	------------------	------------------

**ESTIMATED NET EFFECT TO THE
ROAD FUND**

<u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>	<u>(Unknown)</u>
------------------	------------------	------------------

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2014 (10 Mo.)	FY 2015	FY 2016
LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS			
<u>Loss</u> - School Districts	(More than	(More than	(More than
§ 144.527 - Reductions from sales tax exemption - from State's School District Trust Fund	\$100,000)	\$100,000)	\$100,000)
<u>Revenue reduction</u> - DOR	(More than	(More than	(More than
§ 144.527 - Sales Tax exemption	\$100,000)	\$100,000)	\$100,000)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS	(More than <u>\$200,000</u>)	(More than <u>\$200,000</u>)	(More than <u>\$200,000</u>)

FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

§ 144.527 - Farmers Market Sales Tax Exemption:

This section of the proposal would have a direct fiscal impact to small businesses which operate farmers' markets or sell specified items at farmers' markets.

§ 196.311 - Eggs:

Small business farmers that sell such eggs could be positively impacted as a result of this section of the proposal.

§ 262.750 - Rodeos:

Direct fiscal impact to small business rodeos could result from this section of the proposal.

§ 304.184 - Vehicles Hauling Recyclable Waste for Animal Feed:

This section of the proposal could assist small business recyclers and haulers. However, increased weight restrictions on bridges as well as wear and tear on the state's highway and bridge systems could have a negative impact on small businesses delivering or receiving goods.

FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business (continued)

§§ 323.100 and 413.225 - Propane Meters and Metrology Lab Fees:

Small businesses that pay metrology and propane meter fees will now pay these fees at a higher rate.

§ 348.521 - Livestock Feed and Crop Loan Guarantee:

Direct fiscal impact to small business farmers could result from this section of the proposal.

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

§ 144.527 - Farmers Market Sales Tax Exemption:

This section of the proposal would create an exemption from state and local sales and use taxes for specific farm products sold at farmers' markets.

§ 178.550 - Career and Technical Education Advisory Council:

This section of the proposal establishes the Career and Technical Education Student Protection Act and the Career and Technical Education Board to oversee and coordinate career and technical education and student organizations' activities in Missouri, replacing the State Advisory Committee for Vocational Education.

§ 304.184 - Vehicles Hauling Recyclable Waste for Animal Feed:

This section of the proposal extends the current allowance permitting vehicles hauling solid waste to exceed weight limitations to vehicles hauling recyclable waste for use in the production of animal feed.

§§ 323.100 and 413.225 - Propane Meters and Metrology Lab Fees:

This section of the proposal sets the testing fees of all meters used for the measurement and sale of liquefied petroleum gas at \$10. On January 1, 2014, the fee will increase to \$25, and the fee will increase to \$50 on January 1, 2015. On January 1, 2016, and thereafter, the fee will be set at \$75. The Director must also publish any change to the testing fee schedule on the departmental website within 30 days of a change.

FISCAL DESCRIPTION (continued)

This section of the proposal also allows fees collected for registration, inspection, and calibration to be deposited into the Agriculture Protection Fund as set forth in section 261.200. Laboratory fees for metrology calibrations will be increased from \$25 to \$60 beginning August 28, 2013 and will be computed to the nearest 1/4 hour. On January 1, 2014, and thereafter, the Director of Agriculture shall fix a fee schedule for the ensuing year at a rate per hour that will not yield revenue greater than the total cost of operation.

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

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Department of Agriculture
Department of Economic Development
Department of Revenue
Department of Health and Senior Services
Office of Administration - Division of Budget and Planning
Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Department of Higher Education
Department of Public Safety -
 Missouri State Highway Patrol
Department of Natural Resources
Office of Governor
Department of Labor and Industrial Relations
Department of Transportation
Department of Corrections
Office of Secretary of State
Office of State Courts Administrator
Office of Prosecution Services
State Public Defender's Office
Northwest Missouri State University
Linn State Technical College



L.R. No. 2200-06
Bill No. HCS #2 for HB 927
Page 20 of 20
April 24, 2013

Ross Strobe
Acting Director
April 24, 2013

KB:LR:OD