

MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1527				DATE: 3/10/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues			·	
TESTIFYING:	✓ IN SUPPORT OF	☐ IN OPPOSITION TO		ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
REGISTERED LO	DBBYIST:			
WITNESS NAME: CADE TREMAIN			PHONE NUME 573-634-3	
REPRESENTING: MISSOURI CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY TITLE:				
ADDRESS: 428 EAST CAPITOL AVENUE				
CITY: JEFFERSON CITY			STATE: MO	ZIP: 65101
EMAIL:		ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 3/10/2025 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 1527				DATE: 3/10/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues			·	
TESTIFYING:	☑ IN SUPPORT OF	☐ IN OPPOSITION TO		ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
REGISTERED LO	OBBYIST:			
WITNESS NAME: PAUL WAGNER			PHONE NUME 529-7195	ER:
REPRESENTING: COUNCIL ON PUB	LIC HIGHER ED		TITLE:	
ADDRESS: 717 WESTPORT DRIVE				
CITY: COLUMBIA			STATE: MO	ZIP: 65203
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: SUBMIT DATE: 3/10/2025 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 1527				DATE: 3/10/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues				
TESTIFYING:	☑ IN SUPPORT OF	☐ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
REGISTERED LO	OBBYIST:			
WITNESS NAME: TOM DEMPSEY			PHONE NUME 636-288-7	
REPRESENTING: MO ASSOCIATION	I OF CAREER FIRE PR	OTECTION DISTRICTS	TITLE:	
ADDRESS: 3103 BUCKSKIN P	ATH			
CITY: ST. CHARLES			STATE: MO	ZIP: 63301
EMAIL:		ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 3/10/2025 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 1527				DA ⁻	TE: 10/2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues				•	
TESTIFYING:	\square IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	□FOR	INFORMATIO	NAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:					
WITNESS NAME: ANTHONY STEMATZ-BREITLING PHONE NUMBER:					
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: TITLE:					
ADDRESS:			•		
CITY:			S	TATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: stembreit@gmail.o	com	ATTENDANCE: Written	•	SUBMIT DATE: 3/9/2025 10	:04 PM

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

I am writing to express my strong opposition to HB 1514, HB 1525, & HB 1527, which would use taxpayer dollars to cover college tuition for public safety personnel and their dependents without income restrictions. While I recognize the vital role that law enforcement and public safety personnel play in our communities, these bills are an unfair and HB 1527 is a fiscally irresponsible expansion of the "Fast Track Workforce Incentive Grant."1. Unfair Advantage Over Other Hardworking FamiliesThe current "Fast Track Workforce Incentive Grant" is designed to provide financial aid to students based on eligibility and income requirements, ensuring that those with the greatest need receive assistance. By adding public safety personnel and their dependents without income restrictions, these bills prioritize one group over other hardworking families who also struggle to afford college tuition. There are countless middle-class families who do not qualify for need-based aid yet still face significant financial hardship when paying for higher education. Why should public safety personnel receive this special privilege at the expense of other taxpayers?2. Lack of Justification for Expanding BenefitsThere is no compelling evidence that public safety personnel and their dependents face greater financial barriers to higher education than other Missouri residents. Many law enforcement officers already have access to competitive salaries, pension benefits, and existing tuition assistance programs. Providing tuition coverage without an income cap creates an inequitable system where higher-earning families in law enforcement benefit at the expense of lower-income families who may be excluded from similar financial aid opportunities.4. Alternative Solutions for Supporting Public Safety PersonnelThe idea of incentivizing workers to come to Missouri by offering college tuition benefits is worth considering. However, if Missouri wants to attract and retain valuable professionals, why not extend these benefits to scientists, healthcare workers, and educators—fields that are also critical to public welfare? Instead of prioritizing law enforcement alone, the state could design a more inclusive program that supports a wider range of essential workers.5. A Better Use of Public FundsRather than funding tuition exclusively for law enforcement families, Missouri should consider making community college free for all residents. Expanding access to higher education for everyone, regardless of occupation, would be a more equitable and forward-thinking investment in Missouri's workforce and economic future. Furthermore, I firmly believe that increasing the number of police officers will not stop or reduce violent crime in Missouri, Crime is often driven by systemic poverty, lack of access to quality education, and economic disparity. Pouring money into law enforcement recruitment without addressing the root causes of crime is an ineffective and short-sighted approach. If Missouri is serious about reducing crime, it should invest in community programs, education, job training, and economic opportunities rather than simply expanding the police force. Additionally, while I don't mind taxpayer dollars being used to support tuition for individuals moving to Missouri to become police officers and perhaps their spouses, I strongly oppose funding tuition for their dependent children. Providing benefits to an entire family based solely on a parent's profession is an overreach of public funding and

lacks fairness for other Missouri families who receive no such advantage. Conclusion Missouri should prioritize fairness and fiscal responsibility in allocating taxpayer-funded grants. Expanding tuition benefits to public safety personnel and their dependents without income restrictions is neither fair nor financially prudent. I urge you to oppose Bills HB 1514, HB 1525, & HB 1527 and instead consider solutions that ensure all hardworking Missouri families have equal access to higher education assistance based on need, not occupation.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1527				DATE: 3/10/2025	
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues					
TESTIFYING:	☐ IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES	
WITNESS NAME					
INDIVIDUAL:					
WITNESS NAME: ARNIE C."HONEST-ABE" DIENOFF-STATE PUBLIC ADVOCATE			PHONE NUMB	PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:			TITLE:		
ADDRESS:			·		
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:	
EMAIL: arniedienoff@yahoo.com		ATTENDANCE: In-Person	SUBMIT D 3/10/20	ATE: 25 11:56 PM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.					

I am Opposed to this Bill. We are Picking Winners and Losers. This is unfair to other groups like Teachers, Nurses, Pharmacists, Doctors, Dentists, Road Crews, and I could go on and on. If we are going to offer this benefit, then it should be offered to ALL Missourians.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1527			3/10	: / 2025
COMMITTEE: Emerging Issues			·	
TESTIFYING: IN SUPPO	ORT OF ☑IN OPPOSIT	ION TO FOR INF	ORMATION	IAL PURPOSES
	WITNESS NA	ME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: MICHAEL DREYER		PHON	E NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: TITLE:				
ADDRESS:				
CITY:		STATE	Ξ:	ZIP:
EMAIL: mdreyer93@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SI 3	UBMIT DATE: /10/2025 9:2	20 PM

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

I urge you to oppose the inclusion of police officers in the tuition waiver program outlined in the Public Safety Recruitment and Retention Act. While I commend efforts to support public safety personnel, extending this benefit to law enforcement raises significant concerns about equity, fiscal responsibility, and community priorities. 1. Redundant Benefits: Many police departments already offer tuition assistance programs, unlike underfunded roles such as EMTs and paramedics, Expanding this waiver duplicates existing incentives for law enforcement while diverting limited resources from personnel who lack comparable educational support. 2. Misallocation of Limited Funds: The bill's success hinges on unpredictable appropriations. Prioritizing police officers—a large workforce—risks exhausting funds, leaving fewer opportunities for firefighters, EMTs, and dispatchers, who face lower wages and higher turnover. This contradicts the bill's goal of broad recruitment and retention. 3. Equity and Community Trust: Police accountability remains a pressing concern. Awarding tuition waivers to law enforcement without addressing systemic issues—such as biased policing or misconduct—undermines public trust. Investments in education should prioritize professions that align with community-building and holistic public safety, such as emergency medical services. 4. Disproportionate Compensation: Police officers generally receive higher salaries and benefits than EMTs, firefighters, and dispatchers. Tuition waivers for their dependents exacerbate inequities, offering additional privileges to a group already better positioned to afford education. Amend the bill to exclude police officers, focusing instead on personnel with demonstrably lower compensation and fewer existing benefits. Redirecting resources to EMTs, paramedics, and dispatchers would address critical staffing shortages while fostering equitable access to education. This bill has laudable intentions but fails to balance fiscal and social priorities. By narrowing eligibility, we can ensure it serves those most in need and aligns with community values. Thank you.