



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 3277		DATE: 4/8/2026
COMMITTEE: Local Government		
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: MAYOR SHARON PACE		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 4/7/2026 11:08 PM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.
I, Sharon Pace, Mayor of Northwoods would like to go on record in support of HB 3277. Thank you!



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 3277		DATE: 4/8/2026
COMMITTEE: Local Government		
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: PAT KELLY		PHONE NUMBER: 314-726-4747
REPRESENTING: MUNICIPAL LEAGUE OF METRO STL		TITLE: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
ADDRESS: 11911 DORSETT RD		
CITY: MARYLAND HEIGHTS		STATE: MO
		ZIP: 63304
EMAIL: pkelly@stlmuni.org	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 4/7/2026 8:35 PM

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

The municipal League of Metro St Louis is in support of HB 3277. The bill allow The City of Northwoods in St Louis County to ask the voters for a public safety sales tax to support the accredited police department.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 3277		DATE: 4/8/2026	
COMMITTEE: Local Government			
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: ARNIE C. AC "HONEST-ABE" DIENOFF		PHONE NUMBER: 314-440-9000	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: STATE PUBLIC ADVOCACY		TITLE: STATE PUBLIC ADVOCATE	
ADDRESS: P.O. BOX #1535			
CITY: O' FALLON		STATE: MO	ZIP: 63366
EMAIL: ArnieDienoff@Mail.Com	ATTENDANCE: In-Person	SUBMIT DATE: 4/8/2026 11:53 PM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			
I am Opposed to New Taxes!			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 3277		DATE: 4/8/2026	
COMMITTEE: Local Government			
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: 4/8/2026 7:00 AM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			

This bill cannot be evaluated in isolation.

On its face, it authorizes certain cities to impose a sales tax for public safety. But the mechanism used to do so—highly specific population brackets tied to narrow county classifications—is not neutral policy design. It is selective.

When government authority is distributed through tightly tailored classifications rather than uniform standards, it raises a fundamental question:

Who is this really written for—and why?

This is not an isolated drafting choice. This committee has now seen multiple bills this session that follow the same structural pattern: narrowly defined eligibility criteria, selective delegation of authority, and expansion of governmental power without equally distributed application or enforceable accountability.

That pattern matters.

Because when you combine:
 targeted statutory eligibility,
 discretionary expansion of taxing authority, and
 loosely enforced financial safeguards,

you create a system where outcomes can be shaped in advance while maintaining the appearance of general law.

The voter approval requirement does not cure that defect. Voters are only given the choice after the legislature has already determined which communities are allowed to ask.

Additionally, while the bill claims the tax will “supplement, not replace” public safety funding, there is no defined enforcement mechanism, no audit trigger, and no consequence for noncompliance. That turns a safeguard into a statement of intent—not a guarantee.

This creates clear risks:

unequal access to taxing authority across similarly situated municipalities, potential redirection of funds into baseline obligations, and no verifiable way to ensure compliance with the bill's stated protections.

So I am placing this clearly on the record:

When legislation consistently uses narrow classifications to direct authority, limits who can participate in that authority, and pairs it with weak enforcement mechanisms, it establishes a repeatable structural pathway for preferential policy outcomes.

And when that pattern appears across multiple bills, involving allocation of power, control of funding streams, and restriction of access— that is the point at which it must be examined as coordinated legislative design rather than neutral policymaking.

Public safety funding deserves clean, uniform, and accountable policy.

This bill does not deliver that.

For those reasons, I stand in opposition.