



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 3092		DATE: 2/10/2026
COMMITTEE: Legislative Review		
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: ABIGAIL HERNDON		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 2/5/2026 7:30 PM

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

This shortness of the bill summary is unethical and confusing for the public. The bill text is 9 pages long. The bill also repeals the Missouri Economic Diversification and Afforestation Act of 1990 along with so much else. Again another replacement for SB 22 let politicians lie act, by attacking the citizens initiative petition, which is the people's power and tool of direct democracy!



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 3092		DATE: 2/10/2026	
COMMITTEE: Legislative Review			
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: 2/5/2026 4:53 PM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			

HB 3092 is not a “technical cleanup” bill.

It is a 184-page omnibus statute rewrite that repeals, reenacts, and substantively alters dozens of laws across campaign finance, tax credits, retirement systems, education, charter schools, public benefits, and administrative governance—all under the misleading label of “expired, terminated, sunset, and obsolete statutes.”

This bill represents textbook legislative abuse of process.

1. HB 3092 Violates the Single-Subject Rule

The Missouri Constitution exists precisely to prevent bills like this.

HB 3092 spans dozens of unrelated chapters and policy domains with no single unifying subject beyond convenience. Campaign finance rules, tax credit definitions, health plans, charter school governance, retirement systems, and local government authorities are not one subject.

They are separate bodies of law with separate stakeholders, fiscal impacts, and constitutional implications.

Omnibus packaging of this scale deprives legislators and the public of informed consent and is exactly what the single-subject requirement was designed to stop.

2. Substantive Policy Changes Are Being Smuggled as “Cleanup”

This bill does not merely repeal dead statutes. It creates new legal effects.

For example, HB 3092 modifies campaign finance law by imposing liquidity and investment restrictions on candidate, campaign, debt service, and exploratory committees.

That is not “obsolete repeal.” That is active policymaking with constitutional and electoral implications—inserted without a standalone bill, fiscal analysis, or focused testimony.

The same pattern repeats throughout the bill: repeals paired with reenactments that quietly change operational rules, legal definitions, and enforcement mechanisms.

3. The Bill Is Structurally Unreviewable

No legislator—no matter how diligent—can reasonably be expected to fully vet: cross-chapter legal conflicts, unintended repeals, downstream regulatory impacts, and loss of statutory protections across 184 pages of dense statutory cross-references during a single committee cycle.

Passing a bill this large under the guise of “cleanup” guarantees errors, litigation, and public harm.

4. This Bill Undermines Public Transparency and Due Process

Citizens cannot meaningfully oppose or support a bill they cannot reasonably understand.

HB 3092 denies the public: clear notice of what rights or programs are being altered, the ability to testify on discrete issues that affect them, and transparency in how policy decisions are made.

Legislation that cannot be meaningfully reviewed does not meet the standard of democratic governance.

5. If Repeals Are Truly Necessary, They Must Be Done Properly

If statutes are truly expired or obsolete, they should be: grouped by single subject, introduced as narrow bills, accompanied by agency verification, and debated with stakeholder-specific testimony.

HB 3092 does none of that.

Instead, it relies on legislative fatigue, time pressure, and the assumption that “cleanup” bills are harmless. This one is not.

Conclusion

HB 3092 is procedurally reckless, constitutionally suspect, and structurally hostile to transparency.

It should be rejected outright or returned to the sponsor to be dismantled into single-subject bills that can be lawfully and ethically considered.

Legislative efficiency does not justify legislative opacity.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the committee to VOTE NO on HB 3092.

CONSTITUTIONAL & LEGAL FOOTNOTES (for the record)

Missouri Constitution, Article III, §23 — Single-Subject Rule

(“No bill shall contain more than one subject which shall be clearly expressed in its title.”)

Missouri Constitution, Article I, §8 — Due Process

(Legislation that deprives notice or meaningful opportunity to be heard raises due-process concerns.)

Missouri Constitution, Article III, §21 — Transparency in Legislation

(Bills must be sufficiently clear to allow informed legislative and public review.)

Hammerschmidt v. Boone County, 877 S.W.2d 98 (Mo. banc 1994)

(Single-subject violations evaluated based on whether provisions are “germane” to one subject.)

Missouri Roundtable for Life v. State, 396 S.W.3d 348 (Mo. banc 2013)

(Omnibus legislation invalid where provisions are not naturally or logically connected.)