



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 1182</b>		DATE: <b>2/24/2025</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Conservation and Natural Resources</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>ALLEN NOLTE</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: <b>allenmolte@msn.com</b>		ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>2/22/2025 4:10 PM</b>

**THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.**

It would seem to me that if tax payers paid to construct the GIS platform that there should be no fee to access it. This is an obvious example of Government double dipping into my pocket and I ask that you vote yes to this bill's passing.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 1182</b>		DATE: <b>2/24/2025</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Conservation and Natural Resources</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>CHRISTOPHER FERGUSON</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>573-259-3207</b>	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>HEARTLAND SURVEYORS LC</b>		TITLE:	
ADDRESS: <b>902 MAIN ST</b>			
CITY: <b>WAVERLY</b>		STATE: <b>MO</b>	ZIP: <b>64096</b>
EMAIL: <b>surveyor1322@hotmail.com</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>		SUBMIT DATE: <b>2/21/2025 5:33 PM</b>

**THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.**

I support Representative Nolte's bill. Read-only GIS databases are public record, and no fee or subscription should be demanded to view parcel data as such. Should a user request edits or desire macro data (ie: all water line layers for the county), then perhaps a charge is warranted. But viewing with limited printing should be free of charge to realtors, appraisers, surveyors and others servicing the public.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 1182</b>		DATE: <b>2/24/2025</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Conservation and Natural Resources</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>PRESTON V SMITH</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>816-224-3498</b>	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>BUSINESS INFORMATION SERVICES, LLC</b>		TITLE: <b>PRESIDENT/CEO</b>	
ADDRESS: <b>375 NW WESCHESTER DRIVE</b>			
CITY: <b>BLUE SPRINGS</b>		STATE: <b>MO</b>	ZIP: <b>64014</b>
EMAIL: <b>pvsmith@sbcglobal.net</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>		SUBMIT DATE: <b>2/20/2025 2:21 PM</b>

**THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.**

For more than 20 years I have requested GIS data from Missouri County Assessors. In Jackson County, GIS data that is available for free, online, in St. Louis and St. Charles counties would cost nearly \$20,000. This is a for two datafiles that can fit on a small flash drive. Similar data in Greene County, which cost \$100 for more than 15 years now costs \$6,000, simply because a new County Assessor wants to charge that much. Other counties refuse to give any data whatsoever, regardless of the price. The GIS data produced by the counties needs to fall under the same Sunshine act requirements as any other state data. It is simply wrong to permit County Assessors to charge whatever they want, on any given day, simply because they can. I use the GIS data in my business to help public school districts determine where new housing developments are occurring, and at what price points, and this helps with long-range planning and enrollment projections. The GIS data is essential for many businesses in our state and there should not be such a disparity from county-to-county in our state.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 1182</b>		DATE: <b>2/24/2025</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Conservation and Natural Resources</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>ARNIE C."HONEST-ABE" DIENOFF-STATE PUBLIC ADVOCATE</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: <b>arniedienoff@yahoo.com</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>In-Person</b>		SUBMIT DATE: <b>2/24/2025 11:12 PM</b>
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

I am Opposed to this Bill in its form. G.I.S. Systems shall be Open and Free to the Public to use, because they were built with our Tax-Dollars. The City of O' Fallon has 2.5- Full-Time Staff Members and does NOT allow the Public Access to the information, which is a Duplication of Services that are Free and Open to the Public from the County of Saint Charles.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 1182</b>		DATE: <b>2/24/2025</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Conservation and Natural Resources</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>BRENT JOHNSON</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>417-868-4101</b>	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>GREENE COUNTY ASSESSOR</b>		TITLE: <b>ASSESSOR</b>	
ADDRESS: <b>940 N. BOONVILLE AVENUE, ROOM 35</b>			
CITY: <b>SPRINGFIELD</b>		STATE: <b>MO</b>	ZIP: <b>65802</b>
EMAIL: <b>bjohnson@greencountymo.gov</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>2/21/2025 1:31 PM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

**Opposition to HB 1182:**As the elected Assessor for Greene County, Missouri, I strongly oppose HB 1182, which seeks to prohibit public entities from charging licensing fees for geographic information system (GIS) data. This bill undermines the financial sustainability of GIS programs, places an undue burden on local governments, and enables commercial exploitation of taxpayer-funded data without contribution to its creation or maintenance.As a Certified GIS Professional (GISP) with a degree in Cartographic and Geospatial Sciences from Missouri State University, and over 20 years of experience as a consultant in both the public and private sectors, I recognize the critical role GIS plays in property assessment, public safety, emergency response, urban planning, and infrastructure management. The ability to charge licensing fees for access to GIS data is essential for maintaining the accuracy, accessibility, and technological advancement of these systems.Impact on GIS Development and Public Services1. Unrestricted Access Enables Commercial ExploitationThe primary entities requesting GIS data from my office are private corporations that profit from reselling publicly funded data. Companies such as Zillow, Redfin, Black Knight, and others have historically paid licensing fees without issue, understanding that such costs are a standard part of doing business. These same companies generate millions in revenue by leveraging GIS data, while public offices operate on constrained budgets. Removing our ability to charge fees would shift the financial burden from well-funded corporations to taxpayers.2. Loss of Critical GIS FundingThe licensing fees generated from GIS data access directly support:• Software, servers, and infrastructure needed to maintain GIS platforms.• Aerial photography acquisitions, which are vital for emergency services, public safety, planning and zoning, and other government operations.• Public web access to GIS data. Without funding from licensing fees, we would be forced to discontinue or severely limit our public-facing GIS platforms.The bill also states:"No fee shall be assessed for access to a geographic information system or any platforms or databases prepared by a community."If enacted, this provision would eliminate subscription-based funding, forcing our office to shut down public GIS services due to lack of financial resources. The fees currently collected allow us to provide basic data access at no cost to taxpayers while ensuring that advanced users—such as real estate, banking, insurance, and title companies—pay their fair share.Missouri Assessors Already Operate Under Financial ConstraintsMany Assessors' Offices in Missouri receive little to no funding from the County General Revenue. Instead, we rely on state reimbursements—which have been cut in half over the years—while facing rising costs from private data vendors such as JD Power, NADA, ESRI, and aerial photography providers. Licensing fees help offset these expenses, allowing our office to maintain high-quality assessments, fund training for staff, and ensure public access to vital geographic data.Consequences of HB 1182If passed, this bill will:• Jeopardize the accuracy and availability of GIS data used by government agencies, emergency responders, and the public.• Eliminate funding for aerial imagery, which

supports public safety, disaster response, and infrastructure planning. • Force the reduction or shutdown of public GIS platforms, cutting off access to valuable property and mapping resources. •

Shift the financial burden from corporations to taxpayers, as public agencies will have to seek alternative funding sources. Conclusion HB 1182 is a direct threat to the sustainability of GIS programs across Missouri. It benefits private, for-profit entities at the expense of local governments and taxpayers. The ability to charge fair and reasonable licensing fees ensures that GIS systems remain operational, accurate, and accessible to those who rely on them most. I urge lawmakers to reject HB 1182 and protect the financial integrity of GIS programs that serve the public good. In closing again I am a Certified GIS Professional (GISP) and elected County Assessor, I believe HB 1182 will have a direct and detrimental impact on our ability to maintain public accessibility to GIS data while sustaining funding for our existing GIS program. Without the necessary revenue from licensing fees to offset operational costs, we may be forced to outsource GIS services to private entities. This would result in commercial firms gaining control over the data, allowing them to sell and profit from taxpayer-funded GIS resources—effectively privatizing a public asset. Furthermore, this bill creates a market where corporations can exploit public investments. Missouri's local governments and taxpayers have made significant financial commitments to develop and maintain GIS systems, ensuring accurate and accessible geographic data for public use. Under this legislation, corporations would receive this taxpayer-funded data for free, turn it into commercial products, and generate millions in profits—all while local governments lose a critical funding source. This is an unjust transfer of public resources to private entities and should be unacceptable to every taxpayer in Missouri. Sincerely, Brent Johnson, GISP Greene County Assessor Certified GIS Professional



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 1182</b>		DATE: <b>2/24/2025</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Conservation and Natural Resources</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>BUSTER SCHRAGE</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:		SUBMIT DATE: <b>2/24/2025 12:00 AM</b>
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 1182</b>		DATE: <b>2/24/2025</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Conservation and Natural Resources</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>REGISTERED LOBBYIST:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>CHARLES ANDY ARNOLD</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>314-971-1000</b>	
REPRESENTING: <b>MISSOURI STATE ASSESSORS ASSOCIATION</b>		TITLE: <b>LOBBYIST</b>	
ADDRESS: <b>PO BOX 161</b>			
CITY: <b>WRIGHT CITY</b>		STATE: <b>MO</b>	ZIP: <b>63390</b>
EMAIL: <b>caarnold@arnoldlobby.com</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>In-Person</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>2/24/2025 9:42 AM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

This bill makes information regarding GIS free of charge to the public. In most cases there is a cost for the information requested that is recouped from the asker. If this bill passes, county taxpayers will absorb this cost. Also under this bill a commercial operator could glean all of a counties GIS data and then charge for the data. This is a really bad bill that requires taxpayers to foot the bill for private enterprise use.





MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 1182</b>		DATE: <b>2/24/2025</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Conservation and Natural Resources</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>CHARLES TRILLER</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>573-547-5211</b>	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>PERRY COUNTY</b>		TITLE: <b>PERRY COUNTY ASSESSOR</b>	
ADDRESS: <b>321 N MAIN ST STE 5</b>			
CITY: <b>PERRYVILLE</b>		STATE: <b>MO</b>	ZIP: <b>63775</b>
EMAIL: <b>ctriller@perrycountymo.gov</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>		SUBMIT DATE: <b>2/21/2025 11:08 AM</b>

**THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.**

**As the Assessor of Perry County, MO I am in opposition to this bill which will negatively impact many of our offices throughout the State. The current fees charged with providing this data help offset the cost incurred to maintain our maps, data and software. The companies, such as CoreLogic, that purchase this data are using/reselling the data for their profits.**



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 1182</b>		DATE: <b>2/24/2025</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Conservation and Natural Resources</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>CLINT BAKER</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>417-745-6346</b>	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>HICKORY COUNTY ASSESSOR</b>		TITLE: <b>ASSESSOR</b>	
ADDRESS: <b>P.O. BOX 97</b>			
CITY: <b>HERMITAGE</b>		STATE: <b>MO</b>	ZIP: <b>65668</b>
EMAIL: <b>assessor@hickorycountymo.org</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>		SUBMIT DATE: <b>2/24/2025 9:46 AM</b>

**THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.**

I am opposed to this bill. County assessor's offices spend thousands of dollars to maintain and keep updated information on our GIS. Our information is intended for "taxing purposes". Those who request exports of data for commercial purposes and financial gain should be expected to pay a reasonable fee for that data. This helps our office recoup costs incurred for providing the data, and I do not expect local taxpayers to "foot the bill" for those that profit from our data.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 1182</b>		DATE: <b>2/24/2025</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Conservation and Natural Resources</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>GAYLE LINNEMAN</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>660-621-0441</b>	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>COOPER COUNTY ASSESSORS OFFICE</b>		TITLE: <b>COOPER COUNTY ASSESSOR</b>	
ADDRESS: <b>8870 LAMINE RD</b>			
CITY: <b>BLACKWATER</b>		STATE: <b>MO</b>	ZIP: <b>65322</b>
EMAIL: <b>assessor@coopercountymo.gov</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>		SUBMIT DATE: <b>2/20/2025 5:49 PM</b>

**THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.**

I believe the Assessors office who handles all GIS information should be purchased from organizations requesting it for their benefit. Individuals wanting to look up information should be free but not businesses that use the information for their business.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 1182</b>		DATE: <b>2/24/2025</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Conservation and Natural Resources</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>HEATHER ECKHOFF</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>573-438-4992</b>	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>WASHINGTON COUNTY ASSESSOR</b>		TITLE: <b>ASSESSOR</b>	
ADDRESS: <b>102 N. MISSOURI ST.</b>			
CITY: <b>POTOSI</b>		STATE: <b>MO</b>	ZIP: <b>63664</b>
EMAIL: <b>heckhoff@washcomo.us</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>		SUBMIT DATE: <b>2/21/2025 8:32 AM</b>

**THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.**

The Assessor's office has to pay for equipment, software, and licensing in order to provide these services. For companies like Black Knight, Corelogic, etc. they resell our information to places like Realtor.com, Zillow.com, hunting apps so they are making money doing reselling our product. I oppose this bill because the fees we charge help pay for everything it takes to make these services available. We don't get enough reimbursement from the State to help cover everything it takes to run our offices.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 1182</b>		DATE: <b>2/24/2025</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Conservation and Natural Resources</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>JODY PASCHAL</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: <b>jpaschal@callawaycounty.org</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>		SUBMIT DATE: <b>2/21/2025 10:51 AM</b>
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

I am Jody Paschal, Callaway County Assessor. I am opposed to this HB 1182. We do not generate a profit from the sell of our data. We are charged a fee by our third party vendor, which then is passed on to the person requesting the data. It would a hardship for my office to have to pay the fees associated with getting that information. The people buying this data are real estate businesses or a business that is similar, that then resale our data for a profit.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 1182</b>		DATE: <b>2/24/2025</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Conservation and Natural Resources</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>KENNETH MOHR</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>573-886-4266</b>	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>MISSOURI STATE ASSESSOR's ASSN.</b>		TITLE: <b>ASSESSOR</b>	
ADDRESS: <b>801 E. WALNUT ST.</b>			
CITY: <b>COLUMBIA</b>		STATE: <b>MO</b>	ZIP: <b>65201</b>
EMAIL: <b>kmohr@boonecountymmo.org</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>2/24/2025 9:05 AM</b>	

**THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.**

1. Fees currently generated using any GIS data is strictly a function to maintain the GIS system. 2. Many smaller rural counties require a vendor to maintain their GIS system. Anytime there is a request for data the smaller county must pay the vendor to provide that data. In doing so the vendor charges the county. Without the ability to charge a fee to recoup the cost would place additional burden on already limited budget. 3. This bill if passed will force many Assessors to stop providing their web-based GIS systems online. 4. Most Assessors currently change the fee for access to their online system. This fee is charged to cover the cost the vendor charges the Assessor for maintenance.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 1182</b>		DATE: <b>2/24/2025</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Conservation and Natural Resources</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>LINDA WAGNER</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>573-883-2333</b>	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>STE GENEVIEVE COUNTY ASSESSOR</b>		TITLE: <b>STE GENEVIEVE COUNTY ASSESSOR</b>	
ADDRESS: <b>55 SOUTH 3RD ST. RPP, 4</b>			
CITY: <b>STE GENEVIEVE</b>		STATE: <b>MO</b>	ZIP: <b>63670</b>
EMAIL: <b>lwagner@stegencounty.org</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>		SUBMIT DATE: <b>2/23/2025 9:35 PM</b>
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

As the County Assessor of Ste Genevieve County, I oppose HB 1182 which would eliminate the charge of GIS information to the public. Annually I receive requests from private companies, including but not limited to Zillow and Corelogic. They have no problem with paying for the shape files which include several layers of data and signing a licensed agreement annually. It is my understanding that by purchasing the county data, that assists these private corporations in using publicly funded data to their financial benefit. My Assessment Fund does not receive funding from General Revenue. Any revenues collected to help offset the cost to maintain a GIS mapping system, pay for hardware and tech support, and assist with the salary expenses associated with our inhouse mapper, greatly help balance my annual budget. The Assessment Fund has already suffered a nearly 50% loss in revenue from the State of MO on the parcel count reimbursement. The additional loss of revenues in HB 1182 can negatively affect the efficiency of the assessment process, which is to create fair and equitable assessments throughout the County. Staff salaries and all expenses related to the assessment operation are paid for from the Assessment Fund. A step backward would be to have to eliminate the GIS system and operate using paper blue-line maps once again because we couldn't afford the technology.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 1182</b>		DATE: <b>2/24/2025</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Conservation and Natural Resources</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>MARCY OERLY</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>573-796-4637</b>	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>MONITEAU COUNTY ASSESSOR's OFFICE</b>		TITLE: <b>MONITEAU COUNTY ASSESSOR</b>	
ADDRESS: <b>200 E MAIN ST</b>			
CITY: <b>CALIFORNIA</b>		STATE: <b>MO</b>	ZIP: <b>65018</b>
EMAIL: <b>assessor@moniteaucountymo.gov</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>2/21/2025 1:38 PM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

**Opposition to HB 1182**As the elected Assessor for Moniteau County, Missouri, I strongly oppose HB 1182, which seeks to prohibit public entities from charging licensing fees for geographic information system (GIS) data. This bill undermines the financial sustainability of GIS programs, places an undue burden on local governments, and enables commercial exploitation of taxpayer-funded data without contribution to its creation or maintenance. GIS plays a critical role in property assessment, public safety, emergency response, planning, and infrastructure management. The ability to charge licensing fees for access to GIS data is essential for maintaining the accuracy, accessibility, and technological advancement of these systems. Impact on GIS Development and Public Services1. Unrestricted Access Enables Commercial Exploitation Companies such as Zillow, Redfin, Black Knight, and others have historically paid licensing fees without issue, understanding that such costs are a standard part of doing business. These same companies generate millions in revenue by leveraging GIS data, while public offices operate on constrained budgets. Removing our ability to charge fees would shift the financial burden from well-funded corporations to taxpayers. 2. Loss of Critical GIS Funding The licensing fees generated from GIS data access directly support:

- Software, servers, and infrastructure needed to maintain GIS platforms.
- Aerial photography acquisitions, which are vital for emergency services, public safety, planning and zoning, and other government operations.
- Public web access to GIS data. Without funding from licensing fees, we would be forced to discontinue or severely limit our public-facing GIS platforms. The bill also states: "No fee shall be assessed for access to a geographic information system or any platforms or databases prepared by a community." If enacted, this provision would eliminate subscription-based funding, forcing our office to shut down public GIS services due to lack of financial resources. The fees currently collected allow us to provide basic data access at no cost to taxpayers while ensuring that advanced users—such as real estate, banking, insurance, and title companies—pay their fair share.

**Missouri Assessors Already Operate Under Financial Constraints** Many Assessors' Offices in Missouri receive little to no funding from the County General Revenue. Instead, we rely on state reimbursements—which have been cut in half over the years—while facing rising costs from private data vendors such as JD Power, NADA, ESRI, and aerial photography providers. Licensing fees help offset these expenses, allowing our office to maintain high-quality assessments, fund training for staff, and ensure public access to vital geographic data. Consequences of HB 1182 If passed, this bill will:

- Jeopardize the accuracy and availability of GIS data used by government agencies, emergency responders, and the public.
- Eliminate funding for aerial imagery, which supports public safety, disaster response, and infrastructure planning.
- Force the reduction or shutdown of public GIS platforms, cutting off access to valuable property and mapping resources.
- Shift the financial burden from corporations to



taxpayers, as public agencies will have to seek alternative funding sources. Conclusion HB 1182 is a direct threat to the sustainability of GIS programs across Missouri. It benefits private, for-profit entities at the expense of local governments and taxpayers. The ability to charge fair and reasonable licensing fees ensures that GIS systems remain operational, accurate, and accessible to those who rely on them most. I urge lawmakers to reject HB 1182 and protect the financial integrity of GIS programs that serve the public good. As an elected County Assessor, I believe HB 1182 will have a direct and detrimental impact on our ability to maintain public accessibility to GIS data while sustaining funding for our existing GIS program. Without the necessary revenue from licensing fees to offset operational costs, we may be forced to outsource GIS services to private entities. This would result in commercial firms gaining control over the data, allowing them to sell and profit from taxpayer-funded GIS resources—effectively privatizing a public asset. Furthermore, this bill creates a market where corporations can exploit public investments. Missouri's local governments and taxpayers have made significant financial commitments to develop and maintain GIS systems, ensuring accurate and accessible geographic data for public use. Under this legislation, corporations would receive this taxpayer-funded data for free, turn it into commercial products, and generate millions in profits—all while local governments lose a critical funding source. This is an unjust transfer of public resources to private entities and should be unacceptable to every taxpayer in Missouri. Sincerely, Marcy Oerly  
Moniteau County Assessor



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 1182</b>		DATE: <b>2/24/2025</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Conservation and Natural Resources</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>MELISSA JOHNSON</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: <b>mjohnson@colecounty.org</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>		SUBMIT DATE: <b>2/24/2025 11:29 AM</b>
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

My name is Melissa Johnson and I am the GIS Manager for Cole County. I would like to submit testimony regarding concerns I have with HB 1182. The bill states under item #2., that no person should render the investment in the geographic information system (GIS) a special benefit to that person, and not to the public, yet in item #6., the bill specifically calls out a number of businesses that do get special benefit from that very same system. Costs do go up when it is provided to businesses and the public. One example, is the increase in web traffic and bandwidth, the more people you have accessing these systems, the more expensive it is. Another is time involved in maintaining login access to the system. I am sure there are more examples. The bill says that communities can license the use of the system, but I am unsure of what the point is of doing that if we are supposed to give free access. The reason we license our imagery, is to ensure that the entity that is receiving it, is not turning around and selling it to someone else. Communities put a lot of resources into creating, and maintaining their GIS, and they should be able to charge a fee for providing the service when needed. I feel like some communities may be unable to provide these services if they aren't able to charge a reasonable fee for access. There are many costs both direct and indirect that go into maintaining such a system. I also have concerns about #4, no fee shall be assessed for access to a geographic information system or any platforms or databases prepared by a community. This to me reads that any office in any community that has a system or database, even if it isn't directly used in the GIS, is subject to providing free access to their system under this bill. I assume by "platform" you mean online data access system, but that language is not clear as to what those platforms are and what databases are included. Does this include any offices data in the community? In closing, and as I have testified with the previous bill that was introduced last year, I don't believe this bill works in the best interest of communities, or the taxpayers who have paid for the development of these systems. We do not charge for much of our data, but we have discussed it as costs continue to rise. I believe that as technology changes and gets more expensive, we may have to revisit charging some of our services in the future. Thank you for your time, Melissa Johnson



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 1182</b>		DATE: <b>2/24/2025</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Conservation and Natural Resources</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>STEVEN E. WEIBLE</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: <b>atnhayseed@outlook.com</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>		SUBMIT DATE: <b>2/24/2025 10:58 PM</b>
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Committee - Thank you for this opportunity to offer written testimony on HB 1182. I think Section 67.1850 RSMo should remain as it now exists and that the proposed changes should not be enacted. First of all, it should be noted that Chapter 67 RSMo pertains to local governments and not to state government. Therefore, the proposed changes would affect local governments only. Next, I want to acknowledge the great utility and convenience that geographic information systems have provided for organizing and graphically representing land related information. These systems have made retrieval of this information much faster and much more convenient, not only for the local governments that have developed them, but also for those who are consumers of this information. As pointed out in existing subsection 2, development of these systems is an enormous undertaking that has not been attempted by private enterprise in a useful way. That means the cost is significant and the potential for profit is not assured; otherwise, private enterprise would have thoroughly developed it for profit. The information contained in these geographic information systems is public information and should be made available for public access. Local governments, however, should have the opportunity to recover their costs for investing in these systems and providing a more convenient medium for access by the public. The Section as it now exists provides for the services at cost without profit. This makes it possible for local governments to continue to provide the service and make it publicly available. If local governments are unable to recover their costs, they may be unable to maintain and continue to provide the convenience of the service, which would lead to a discontinuance of the convenience and a return to a more manual and less convenient means of access. The changes proposed by HB 1182 would not allow local governments to recovery any of their costs related to geographic information systems, except fees charged for hard copy maps. These proposed changes cannot be anything but detrimental to these local governments. The idea that everything has already been paid for and should be free is simply unrealistic. Costs for software licenses and maintenance and system maintenance are ongoing and recovery of those costs is critical to the continuance of providing the service and the convenience. Section 67.1850 RSMo is adequate as it now stands. These changes proposed by HB 1182 should not be made.