



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 2011		DATE: 2/17/2026	
COMMITTEE: Budget			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: CHRISTINA CHERRY		PHONE NUMBER: 816-505-4883	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: SYNERGY SERVICES		TITLE: DV OPERATIONS COORDINATOR	
ADDRESS: 400 E 6TH ST.			
CITY: PARKVILLE		STATE: MO	ZIP: 64152
EMAIL: ccherry@synergyservices.org	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 2/13/2026 11:41 AM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			

Synergy Services is urging the Missouri House of Representatives to restore the \$1 million that has been cut from the Domestic Violence Shelter Services (DVSS) program in the Governor’s proposed FY27 budget.

As the only domestic violence shelter operating in Kansas City’s Northland, Synergy Services provides direct support for approximately 1,500 adult and youth victims of domestic and sexual violence each year, and manages a crisis hotline that receives approximately 4,500 calls for assistance annually.

A 10% reduction in DVSS funding would have a direct and immediate impact on our ability to provide critical crisis services. These funds support shelter advocates who provide immediate access to emergency shelter, answer our 24-hour hotline, and assist survivors in obtaining emergency orders of protection. A cut of this magnitude would likely require cuts in staffing, resulting in a diminished ability to provide emergency services to victims, longer response times to hotline calls, and delays in critical safety planning. For survivors in crisis, even short delays in accessing shelter, legal protection, or emotional support can significantly increase risk.

Emergency shelters are already struggling to provide adequate services to our community members who are fleeing domestic violence. Please support the citizens of Missouri by requesting that General Revenue be restored to \$5 million for FY27.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 2011		DATE: 2/17/2026	
COMMITTEE: Budget			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
REGISTERED LOBBYIST:			
WITNESS NAME: DOUG MANN		PHONE NUMBER: 716-785-3396	
REPRESENTING: PLANNED PARENTHOOD GREAT RIVERS ACTION		TITLE: LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR	
ADDRESS: 4251 FOREST PARK AVE			
CITY: ST. LOUIS		STATE: MO	ZIP: 63108
EMAIL: doug.mann@ppgr.org	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 2/17/2026 6:59 PM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			

Planned Parenthood Great Rivers Action strongly opposes Sections 11.295, 11.300, and 11.305 of HB 2011.

Missourians deserve a budget that prioritizes evidence-based health care, respects personal autonomy, and uses public dollars responsibly. These sections do the opposite by taking away taxpayer funds from legitimate medical care and putting them into programs designed to influence private medical decisions.

Everyone deserves quality care and support, so we support funding diaper banks and related organizations, which we know will benefit Missouri families. However, Sections 11.300 and 11.305 also divert funding away from legitimate health care and into crisis pregnancy centers (CPCs). These entities are not licensed medical providers, are not regulated as health care facilities, and are not required to provide medically accurate information. Investigations across multiple states have documented that many of these centers provide misleading information about contraception, miscarriage, and abortion while delaying access to time-sensitive care. Public funding should never support organizations that operate without medical standards or accountability, while presenting themselves as health care providers. Missourians who are misled and delay necessary care will suffer the consequences.

Missouri faces serious gaps in maternal and reproductive health access, especially in rural communities and health care deserts. More than half of Missouri counties do not have access to prenatal care, cervical cancer screenings, STI testing and treatment, postpartum care, and contraception, meaning they either have to travel farther at their own expense to receive this care or delay it altogether. Instead of investing in comprehensive care that improves health outcomes, this budget expands funding for centers whose primary purpose is to discourage abortion using deception and pseudoscience, rather than fund full-spectrum medical services from licensed health care providers.

Section 11.295 is particularly concerning because it uses Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and other public funds to promote programs built around stigmatizing abortion and those who provide or receive that care. TANF helps families meet basic needs and achieve economic stability. Diverting those vital resources toward skewed ideological messaging undermines the purpose of TANF and fails the families the program was created to support.

Patients who seek abortion care are parents, workers, students, and members of our communities. They deserve respect, privacy, and access to medically accurate information, and lawmakers should not use funding streams designed to fight poverty to instead interfere with deeply personal health decisions.

If lawmakers want to strengthen Missouri families and improve health outcomes, state investments should expand access to comprehensive medical care and address our state's maternal health crisis rather than funding misinformation and stigma.

For these reasons, we urge the committee to reallocate the funds found in Sections 11.295, 11.300, and 11.305 in HB 2011 and ensure support for real health care for Missourians.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 2011		DATE: 2/17/2026	
COMMITTEE: Budget			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: JESSICA HILL		PHONE NUMBER: 573-469-7814	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: MISSOURI COALITION AGAINST DOMESTIC & SEXUAL VIOLENCE		TITLE: CHIEF PUBLIC AFFAIRS OFFICER	
ADDRESS: 217 OSCAR DR, STE A			
CITY: JEFFERSON CITY		STATE: MO	ZIP: 65101
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 2/17/2026 12:00 AM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 2011		DATE: 2/17/2026	
COMMITTEE: Budget			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: JESSICA WOOLBRIGHT		PHONE NUMBER: 314-779-4712	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: SAINT MARTHA'S		TITLE: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR	
ADDRESS: PO BOX 4950			
CITY: ST. LOUIS		STATE: MO	ZIP: 63108
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 2/17/2026 12:00 AM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 2011		DATE: 2/17/2026	
COMMITTEE: Budget			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: MARIA MORRISSEY		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: PLANNED PARENTHOOD GREAT PLAINS VOTES		TITLE:	
ADDRESS: 4425 LARSON AVENUE			
CITY: KANSAS CITY		STATE: MO	ZIP: 64133
EMAIL: maria.morrissey@ppgreatplains.org	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 2/17/2026 7:37 PM	

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

Planned Parenthood Great Plains Votes (PPGPV) opposes the anti-abortion funding proposals contained in HB 2011, as they support unregulated crisis pregnancy centers, known to have provided pregnant people and minors with biased and inaccurate information and purposely misled them into thinking that they were obtaining health care, and explicitly excludes clinics that provide abortion care from accessing state family planning funding.

Crisis Pregnancy Centers (CPCs) are widely considered to be unethical by healthcare professionals, including by groups like the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG) and the American Medical Association (AMA).¹ ACOG has found, despite the fact that abortion is a safe medical intervention backed by decades of robust data, CPCs use manipulative tactics and delays to divert pregnant people from accessing comprehensive and timely care from patient-centered, appropriately trained, and licensed medical professionals.² Some of these tactics include asserting false risks of abortion, falsely suggesting high complication rates associated with abortion, intentionally overestimating a person's gestational age, and using disturbing visuals to emotionally manipulate and shame pregnant people under the guise of informing or diagnosing them.³

While CPCs oppose abortion and contraception and therefore will not provide comprehensive counseling or referrals, their advertising and outward appearances are frequently calculated to trick pregnant people into believing they will get comprehensive reproductive healthcare, or at least comprehensive information about their options. Through funding and programs, Missouri is cosigning operations that falsely advertise to vulnerable populations. Instead of criminalizing this activity, the state funds it.

Rather than Missouri funding medically licensed and regulated clinics that provide accurate information and actual health care, the state continues to support unregulated CPCs with religious or ideological missions diverting limited public resources from medically proven support services and other essential social services. Supporting these organizations that use false and misleading advertising and service tactics, is not only unethical and unconscionable but is a blatant disregard of the separation of church and state.

The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant provides federal funds to states, territories, and tribes to support low-income families with children through cash assistance, job training, childcare, and other services. This bill would allow Missouri to continue to divert these funds to the Alternative to Abortion program which funds CPC's, rather than actually funding the programs

necessary to assist low-income families with children.

For the reason's we ask that this appropriations bill be amended to divert the following funds back to essential services for the most vulnerable Missourian's:

- \$12,933,561 appropriated for Alternatives to Abortion Services and the Alternatives to Abortion Public Awareness Program; \$10,300,000 coming from TANF funds.
- \$2,000,000 Grants for Crisis Pregnancy Organizations.
- \$500,000 Direct Grant to a Crisis Pregnancy Center; \$250,000 coming from TANF funds.

Moreover, clinics that provide lifesaving abortion care should not be explicitly excluded from state funding provided for family planning and family-related services. Planned Parenthood clinics across the country are leading providers of reproductive health care and family planning services, offering comprehensive services including birth control, STI testing, and cancer screenings. We ask that this appropriation bill be amended to remove such restrictive language; to allow one of the leading family planning service providers to access state funding to ensure low-income people get the best services and health care possible.

1. Any G Bryant, MD, Why Crisis Pregnancy Centers are Legal but Unethical, AMA Journal of Ethics (2018); <https://journalofethics.ama-assn.org/article/why-crisis-pregnancy-centers-are-legal-unethical/2018-03>; ACOG Government Affairs, Issue Brief: Crisis Pregnancy Centers, ACOG (2022); <https://www.acog.org/advocacy/abortion-is-essential/trending-issues/issue-brief-crisis-pregnancy-centers>
2. ACOG Government Affairs, Issue Brief: Crisis Pregnancy Centers, ACOG (2022); <https://www.acog.org/advocacy/abortion-is-essential/trending-issues/issue-brief-crisis-pregnancy-centers>
3. Id.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 2011		DATE: 2/17/2026
COMMITTEE: Budget		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:		
WITNESS NAME: RACHEL BRAY		PHONE NUMBER: 618-972-1721
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN ST. LOUIS		TITLE: MS.
ADDRESS: 605 LYNN HAVEN LANE		
CITY: HAZELWOOD		STATE: MO
		ZIP: 63042
EMAIL: rbray@ncjwstl.org	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 2/17/2026 10:26 AM

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

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you for allowing me to submit testimony in opposition of House Bill 2011. My name is Rachel Bray and I am the Advocacy Manager for the National Council of Jewish Women, based in St. Louis (NCJWSTL). NCJWSTL is a non-profit organization in metropolitan St. Louis, representing over 5,000 members and supporters throughout the state. We focus our work on community service, advocacy, education and philanthropy to improve the quality of life for women, children and families while supporting individual and civil rights, and have been doing so since 1895.

NCJWSTL opposes House Bill 2011 as currently written due to the proposed \$1 million cut in funding for Domestic Violence Shelter Services.

This proposed cut would have serious consequences for survivors of domestic violence across Missouri. Lifesaving domestic violence shelter funding supports emergency stays, safety planning, job assistance, and services that help survivors and their children move from crisis toward stability.

Through our Domestic Violence Court Watch program, NCJWSTL has seen the growing need for domestic violence service assistance. Reducing funding at this moment would further burden an already stretched system and place survivors at greater risk.

We urge you to vote NO on HB 2011 unless full funding for Domestic Violence Shelter Services is restored.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 2011		DATE: 2/17/2026	
COMMITTEE: Budget			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: SARAH BERRY		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 2/13/2026 10:57 AM	

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

This bill is bloated, structurally evasive, and contains policy-like direction and earmark behavior that should not be smuggled through a budget vehicle.

1) This bill is too long on purpose

Let me “explain it like you’re five,” since apparently that’s the level of respect being shown to taxpayers:

When something is 66 pages, it’s not because it’s “complicated.”

It’s because someone wants to make sure nobody reads it end-to-end, nobody tracks the patterns, and nobody connects the money to the behavior.

Appropriations should be readable enough that a normal person can understand where the money goes without needing a finance degree and a therapist.

2) “Flexibility” = discretion + laundering accountability

This bill repeatedly authorizes percentage-based “flexibility” transfers between sections and spending categories.

That sounds harmless until you translate it:

“Personal Service” vs “Expense & Equipment” shifts = staffing vs contracts/technology.

“Flexibility between sections” = the ability to move money around after the vote.

So the legislature gets to say:

“We funded X.”

And then the agency gets to do:

“Cool. We spent it on Y.”

If the intent is control, write it narrowly. If the intent is transparency, stop writing blank checks with percentages.

3) Quiet transfers to OA IT funds = consolidation-by-budget

Section 11.015 is a giant tell:

\$27,157,127 transferred out to OA Information Technology Federal Fund.

That is the state budget version of:

“Don’t worry about it, we moved it to the other bucket.”

Once money is pooled, the legislative record becomes less specific, less traceable, and harder to audit in plain terms.

If you want centralized IT governance, own it openly—don’t do it through transfers most people will never notice.

4) The “citizen engagement platform” and “unified health data standard” language is policy-like

Section 11.020 funds:

a “Medicaid application” with “two-way communication,” “data collection,” and “transparency”

and a “unified statewide health data standard and governance approach”

That is not neutral bookkeeping. That is program direction and architecture direction inside a spending bill.

If you’re redesigning state health data governance, that belongs in substantive policy legislation with:
defined scope
privacy standards
security requirements
procurement guardrails
audit/reporting requirements
retention limits
independent oversight

Right now it reads like: “Build the system first; argue about rights later.”

5) Medicaid “fraud detection” systems: fine goal, but this is a procurement-and-surveillance blank slate

Sections 11.040–11.045 are heavy tech spend:

“case management, provider enrollment, fraud abuse detection”

“provider enrollment system”

big GR + federal matches

I’m not opposing program integrity. I’m opposing building high-impact systems with vague guardrails inside an appropriations shell.

Where are the mandatory deliverables?

performance metrics
false positive controls
appeal process for providers
due process timelines

independent validation requirements tied to release gates (not just “IV&V exists somewhere”)

6) The earmarks are dressed up in population-bracket riddles

Section 11.095 is a perfect example: it reads like a scavenger hunt of counties by population and county-seat size.

That is not “neutral.” That is earmarking while pretending not to earmark.

If the legislature is funding a specific organization or set of local programs, it should be explicit and transparent:

- who
- where
- why them
- what outcome metrics
- what oversight

Instead, we get demographic Mad Libs that are nearly impossible for a citizen to follow.

7) “Revenue maximization contractors” should set off alarms

Section 11.070 funds contractor fees for “revenue maximization projects ... on behalf of DSS and the General Assembly.”

Translated:

“We are paying people to squeeze federal dollars.”

Maybe appropriate, maybe not—but this needs hard transparency conditions:

- contract terms
- contingency fee limits
- conflict rules
- full public reporting of recovered amounts and methods used

Otherwise it becomes incentive-driven behavior with minimal sunlight.

8) “Implement H.R. 1” is vague-to-the-point-of-unacceptable

Section 11.170 references “additional resources to implement H.R. 1.”

Which H.R. 1? Which Congress? Which provisions? Which obligations? Which implementation scope?

This is appropriations by nickname. If it’s real, cite it precisely and specify:

- the required state actions
- deadlines
- systems impacted
- expected costs and federal match assumptions

Vagueness is not a drafting style. It’s a liability strategy.

9) The “alternatives to abortion” section includes an Internet grievance clause
Section 11.295 includes:

- funding for “alternatives to abortion”
- plus a “public awareness” program to help agencies reach women when they are “blocked or suppressed by any search engine, social media platform, or digital advertising network”

That is not budget language. That’s a political narrative embedded into appropriations with an implied platform-complaint premise.

Also: it tees up predictable pressure campaigns against private platforms and invites viewpoint-style disputes—again, in a spending bill.

That is not transparency. That is camouflage.

Legislative Notice:

By advancing a 66-page appropriations vehicle with broad flexibility, opaque transfers, system-architecture direction, and disguised earmarks, the General Assembly is creating foreseeable audit risk, oversight risk, and accountability disputes because the public record will not clearly reflect what was intended versus what was ultimately executed.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 2011		DATE: 2/17/2026	
COMMITTEE: Budget			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: TYLER RIEKE		PHONE NUMBER: 573-634-8346	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: JEFFERSON CITY RAPE AND ABUSE CRISIS SERVICE		TITLE: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR	
ADDRESS:			
CITY: JEFFERSON CITY		STATE: MO	ZIP: 65102
EMAIL: trieke@racsjc.org	ATTENDANCE: Written		SUBMIT DATE: 2/17/2026 3:16 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			

My name is Tyler Rieke, and I serve as Executive Director of Rape & Abuse Crisis Service, which provides 24-hour crisis response, shelter, advocacy, and counseling to survivors of domestic and sexual violence across nine counties in Central Missouri, including many rural communities with limited resources. Every day, we see survivors making the difficult decision to seek safety, often with children in tow and nowhere else to go. Funding through the Domestic Violence Shelter Services program is not abstract to us. It keeps our doors open, staff available, and beds safe for families in crisis.

In our nine-county service area, demand continues to grow while resources are stretched thinner each year. Survivors are staying in shelter longer because affordable housing is scarce, and we are responding to increasingly complex violence. At the same time, reductions in federal funding like VOCA have already strained local programs. DVSS funding supports the core services that make immediate safety possible, including shelter, crisis response, and advocacy, and allows us to respond when law enforcement, hospitals, and courts call because someone needs protection. At RACS, these funds go directly to frontline shelter staff and the basic operations that keep our shelter functioning. In January alone, DVSS supported nearly 18 percent of our payroll for direct service staff and about 17 percent of essential costs like utilities, facility operations, and the systems we rely on to serve survivors safely. A reduction in this funding cannot be absorbed without consequence. It will mean fewer services and fewer options for survivors seeking safety.

For the families we serve in Cole, Osage, Miller, Moniteau, Morgan, Gasconade, Maries, and surrounding counties, there is no backup system if local programs are forced to scale back. When funding is reduced, survivors do not disappear. They simply have fewer safe places to turn. I respectfully urge the committee to restore DVSS funding and recognize that this investment is essential to maintaining safety, supporting families, and preventing greater costs to our communities in the long run. Thank you for your consideration.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 2011		DATE: 2/17/2026	
COMMITTEE: Budget			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: ARNIE "HONEST-ABE" DIENOFF-STATE PUBLIC ADVOCATE		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: In-Person		SUBMIT DATE: 2/17/2026 11:29 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			

Cut all unnecessary expenses and waste.