



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 2717		DATE: 2/4/2026	
COMMITTEE: Commerce			
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: ALEX T. ERBS		PHONE NUMBER: 314-223-4453	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: MO SELF STORAGE OWNERS ASSOCIATION		TITLE: PRESIDENT	
ADDRESS: 10386 BADGLEY DR			
CITY: ST LOUIS		STATE: MO	ZIP: 63126
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 2/4/2026 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 2717		DATE: 2/4/2026	
COMMITTEE: Commerce			
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: CHRIS HOLLAWAY		PHONE NUMBER: 573-301-9195	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: PRO STORAGE GROUP		TITLE: OWNER	
ADDRESS: 2003 MIDLAND CT			
CITY: JEFFERSON CITY		STATE: MO	ZIP: 65101
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 2/4/2026 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 2717		DATE: 2/4/2026	
COMMITTEE: Commerce			
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
REGISTERED LOBBYIST:			
WITNESS NAME: RANDY SCHERR		PHONE NUMBER: 573-636-6200	
REPRESENTING: SELF STORAGE ASSOCIATION MISSOURI		TITLE:	
ADDRESS: 101 E. HIGH			
CITY: JEFFERSON CITY		STATE: MO	ZIP: 65101
EMAIL: rjscherr@swllc.us.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 2/3/2026 4:50 PM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 2717		DATE: 2/4/2026
COMMITTEE: Commerce		
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: ARNIE C. AC DIENOFF-STATE PUBLIC ADVOCATE		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: In-Person	SUBMIT DATE: 2/4/2026 11:23 PM

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

I am very Opposed to this Proposed Bill. This Bill takes away rights to Notify the Buyer of lack of payment to store their property and valuables, This is a bad Bill!



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 2717		DATE: 2/4/2026	
COMMITTEE: Commerce			
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: CHAD STEBBINS		PHONE NUMBER: 417-438-2181	
REPRESENTING: MISSOURI PRESS ASSOCIATION		TITLE:	
ADDRESS: 802 LOCUST			
CITY: COLUMBIA		STATE: MO	ZIP: 65201
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 2/4/2026 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 2717		DATE: 2/4/2026	
COMMITTEE: Commerce			
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: 2/2/2026 3:25 PM	

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

House Bill 2717 is not a modernization of self-storage law; it is a systematic reallocation of property rights away from occupants and toward operators, accomplished through shortened timelines, weakened notice requirements, and expanded disposal authority with reduced judicial and public oversight.

First, HB 2717 materially weakens due process protections by expanding the use of electronic notice and eliminating traditional public-sale advertising requirements.

The removal of mandatory newspaper publication for lien sales significantly reduces transparency and increases the risk that occupants—particularly elderly, low-income, or displaced individuals—will lose property without meaningful notice or opportunity to cure.

Property deprivation without robust notice is not a procedural convenience; it is a constitutional defect.

Second, the bill dramatically broadens operators’ unilateral authority to dispose of property, including the power to deem items as having “no commercial value” and discard them without sale.

This standard is vague, unreviewable, and invites abuse. There is no independent valuation requirement, no appeal mechanism, and no safeguard against operators misclassifying property to avoid sale procedures altogether.

Third, HB 2717 accelerates forfeiture timelines while limiting occupant access, allowing operators to restrict entry and dispose of remaining property shortly after termination notices expire.

These provisions effectively convert self-storage agreements into quasi-summary forfeiture mechanisms, stripping occupants of practical redemption opportunities while insulating operators from liability.

Fourth, the bill caps operator liability to net sale proceeds, even where loss results from operator discretion or procedural deficiencies.

This creates a perverse incentive structure: operators face minimal downside risk for aggressive enforcement while occupants bear the full burden of error, miscommunication, or wrongful disposal.

Finally, HB 2717 continues a troubling legislative pattern of privatizing enforcement power without judicial oversight. Lien enforcement traditionally demands heightened procedural rigor precisely because it involves non-consensual loss of property.

This bill moves in the opposite direction—less notice, less transparency, less accountability—while expanding private actors' authority to seize and destroy personal property.

Efficiency does not justify erosion of due process.

Convenience does not excuse the elimination of safeguards.

HB 2717 prioritizes operator expediency over fundamental property rights and should be rejected.

Footnotes:

Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co., 339 U.S. 306, 314 (1950).

(Notice must be reasonably calculated to apprise interested parties of deprivation of property.)

Mo. Const. art. I, § 10.

(No person shall be deprived of property without due process of law.)

Fuentes v. Shevin, 407 U.S. 67, 80–81 (1972).

(Procedural safeguards are required before significant property interests are taken.)

State ex rel. Nixon v. American Tobacco Co., 34 S.W.3d 122, 130 (Mo. banc 2000).

(Statutes affecting property rights are strictly construed against forfeiture.)

U.C.C. § 9-627.

(Commercial reasonableness requires objective standards and good faith—not unilateral discretion.)