



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 3479		DATE: 4/1/2026
COMMITTEE: Pensions		
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: STEVE CARROLL		PHONE NUMBER:
REPRESENTING: KANSAS CITY POLICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM		TITLE:
ADDRESS: 215 E. CAPITOL AVE.		
CITY: JEFFERSON CITY		STATE: MO
		ZIP: 65101
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 4/1/2026 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 3479		DATE: 4/1/2026	
COMMITTEE: Pensions			
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:	
ADDRESS: P.O. BOX #1535			
CITY: O' FALLON		STATE: MO	ZIP: 63366
EMAIL: ArnieDienoff@Mail.Com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 4/1/2026 11:55 PM	

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.
I am Opposed to this Bill as this Change has ramifications on the Kansas City Police Pension Fund.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 3479		DATE: 4/1/2026	
COMMITTEE: Pensions			
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: 4/1/2026 8:20 AM	

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

HB 3479 modifies employment provisions for the Kansas City Police Department, including mandatory separation from service upon reaching either sixty-five years of age or thirty-five years of service, whichever occurs first, raising significant constitutional concerns regarding equal protection, due process, and arbitrary employment restrictions.

The bill establishes a mandatory termination framework based on age and years of service, without requiring an individualized assessment of an officer’s capability, performance, or fitness for duty. This raises concerns under equal protection principles, as individuals are subjected to categorical employment termination based on generalized assumptions rather than objective, individualized criteria.

While the legislation references efficiency and public safety, it does not provide a narrowly tailored justification for imposing a rigid cutoff that applies regardless of an officer’s demonstrated ability to perform essential job functions. The absence of individualized review mechanisms creates a risk that qualified and capable individuals will be excluded from continued employment solely due to age or tenure.

This structure also raises concerns under federal employment protections governing age-based classifications, particularly where mandatory separation is imposed without clear evidence that such classification is necessary to the safe and effective performance of the role.

Blanket age thresholds, when not supported by individualized assessment, have historically been subject to heightened scrutiny.

HB 3479 further raises due process concerns, as it mandates separation without clearly defined procedural safeguards or mechanisms for review, appeal, or exception. Where a protected employment interest exists, the absence of meaningful procedural protections may result in arbitrary deprivation of that interest.

Additionally, the restructuring of the separation requirement—from “whichever occurs later” to “whichever occurs first”—materially accelerates forced retirement, potentially altering existing expectations and employment trajectories for current officers. This shift raises concerns regarding fair notice and reliance interests, particularly for individuals who may have structured their careers based on prior statutory language.

The bill also grants broad authority to the board to determine conditions of employment, which, when combined with mandatory separation provisions, raises concerns regarding the concentration of discretion without clearly defined limiting standards, further implicating due process considerations.

Bottom line:

HB 3479 imposes a rigid, classification-based employment cutoff that may result in arbitrary exclusion of qualified individuals and insufficient procedural protections.

The General Assembly is hereby placed on notice that enactment of this provision may give rise to constitutional challenges, including but not limited to violations of equal protection, due process, and potential conflicts with federal protections governing age-based employment actions.