

HCS HB 2145 -- OUTDOOR ADVERTISING

SPONSOR: Kalberloh

COMMITTEE ACTION: Voted "Do Pass with HCS" by the Standing Committee on Transportation by a vote of 11 to 0, with 2 members voting present. Voted "Do Pass" by the Standing Committee on Rules-Administrative by a vote of 9 to 0 with 1 member voting present.

The following is a summary of the House Committee Substitute for HB 2145.

CITY POPULATION SIGNS (Section 71.025)

This bill requires city populations to be included on city limit signs on state highways beginning August 28, 2026.

SIGNS ON ATHLETIC FIELD FENCES (Section 226.510)

The bill excludes from the definition of "outdoor advertising" any outdoor sign or other device that is attached to or part of the fencing or walls of an athletic field owned by a school or other 501(c)(3) entity. Such signs will not require a permit from the Department of Transportation as long as the intended audience of the signs is the patrons, participants, or attendees of an event occurring at the athletic field.

ADVERTISING ON LAND ACROSS FROM A BUSINESS (Section 226.550)

This bill allows businesses to erect certain highway signs and waives the current \$200 outdoor advertising fee and biennial inspection fee for such highway signs under Section 226.550, RSMo, when displayed by a landowner who also is the permit holder and owner of the business advertised on the sign if the business has a physical location within 750 feet of the sign.

This bill is similar to HB 272 (2025).

The following is a summary of the public testimony from the committee hearing. The testimony was based on the introduced version of the bill.

PROPOSERS: Supporters say that our current zoning laws prevent certain businesses from building signs on land that they own unless it is on the same side of a highway as their business.

Sometimes, only one side of the highway is possible to put a sign on due to the geography of the land, hills, curves, or other features can make it impractical to always advertise on the same side as your building, so this would help some small businesses, while still keeping other, sufficient constraints in place.

Testifying in person for the bill was Representative Kalberloh.

OPPONENTS: Those who oppose the bill say that this presents a liability issue if the signs fall and we should not waive the \$200 inspection fee, because protecting the signs is important; businesses should be treated the same to avoid picking winners and losers, so this degrades the integrity of the process.

Testifying in person against the bill was Arnie Dienoff.

Written testimony has been submitted for this bill. The full written testimony and witnesses testifying online can be found under Testimony on the bill page on the House website.