



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2885</b>		DATE: <b>2/9/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Corrections and Public Institutions</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>"ALEX" ALEXANDER VIVAS</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>816-896-9931</b>	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>MISSOURI STATE HIGHWAY PATROL</b>		TITLE: <b>CHIEF OF STAFF</b>	
ADDRESS: <b>1510 E. ELM ST.</b>			
CITY: <b>JEFFERSON CITY</b>		STATE: <b>MO</b>	ZIP: <b>65101</b>
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: <b>2/9/2026 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 2885</b>		DATE: <b>2/9/2026</b>
COMMITTEE: <b>Corrections and Public Institutions</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 "HONEST-ABE" DIENOFF-STATE PUBLIC ADVOCATE</b>		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE:      ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>In-Person</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>2/9/2026 1:26 PM</b>
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>		

I am Opposed to this Bill. The "Vessel Registration Fees" in the Department of Public Safety and Division Funds should be Self-Sufficient Enterprise Funds with expenses and staff being Appropriated Annually by the Budget Committee and General-Assembly. If there is overage after two (2) Years, that money shall be returned to the State General Fund.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 2885</b>		DATE: <b>2/9/2026</b>
COMMITTEE: <b>Corrections and Public Institutions</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>SARAH BERRY</b>		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:	STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>2/5/2026 11:46 AM</b>

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

**HB 2885 should be opposed because it quietly reroutes a statewide revenue stream away from General Revenue and locks it into a single enforcement division without future legislative review.**

**While framed as a technical vessel registration update, the bill functions as a dedicated-fund capture mechanism that mirrors a growing cross-bill pattern this body should not ignore.**

**Core Objection**

**Beginning July 1, 2026, HB 2885 eliminates the General Revenue share of vessel registration fees entirely and directs 100% of all collections into the Water Patrol Division Fund, permanently. This is not a neutral policy change.**

**It is a structural budget decision embedded inside an otherwise administrative statute.**

**Why This Is a Problem**

**1. This bill bypasses normal appropriations discipline**

**General Revenue allocations force agencies to justify funding needs through the appropriations process.**

**By eliminating the General Revenue deposit entirely, HB 2885 allows an enforcement division to:**

**Receive automatic funding increases tied to fee volume**

**Expand operations without renewed legislative scrutiny**

**Operate insulated from statewide fiscal balancing**

**That is not fiscal stewardship—it is self-funding enforcement.**

**2. Fee-based enforcement creates perverse incentives**

**When enforcement divisions are directly funded by the volume of registrations and fees they administer, the legislature risks creating incentives that prioritize revenue protection over proportional**

regulation, especially in rural and recreational contexts where compliance already burdens ordinary citizens.

Missouri has historically avoided this model for a reason.

3. This follows a troubling cross-bill pattern

HB 2885 does not stand alone.

This session has seen multiple bills:

Wall off fee-generated funds

Remove reversion or General Revenue offsets

Permanently earmark collections for a single agency

Individually, these bills appear technical.

Collectively, they represent a systematic erosion of legislative budget control.

4. The General Revenue Fund is not “excess”—it is the public interest

General Revenue supports courts, education, public health, rural infrastructure, and constitutional obligations statewide.

Redirecting all vessel registration revenue away from GR after 2026 reduces flexibility precisely when fiscal conditions tighten.

There has been no demonstrated necessity for this shift.

Constitutional and Fiscal Concerns

Missouri’s budget framework depends on:

Legislative control of appropriations

Periodic reassessment of agency funding needs

Avoidance of permanent revenue silos

HB 2885 undermines these principles by statute, without requiring future review.

Bottom Line

This bill is not about boats.

It is about who controls public money—and whether that control remains with the Legislature.

If the Water Patrol Division requires additional funding, it should be debated transparently through appropriations, not hard-wired through fee diversion.

Legislators who genuinely intend to serve in future General Assemblies may wish to begin by voting “No” on bills that erode legislative authority, obscure accountability, and trade transparency for administrative convenience. Governance is not measured by how much passes—but by how well the people can see what was done in their name.

For these reasons, I strongly urge a NO vote on HB 2885.

Constitutional & Statutory Footnotes (for the Record)

Mo. Const. art. III, § 36 — Legislative authority over appropriations.

Mo. Const. art. IV, § 28 — Money drawn from the treasury only by lawful appropriation.

Mo. Const. art. II, § 1 — Separation of powers; fiscal authority may not be delegated by statute.

**§ 33.080, RSMo — Reflects legislative policy favoring revenue reversion and periodic review.**