



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 1885</b>		DATE: <b>2/10/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Agriculture</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>JAY HOSKINS</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>314-436-8757</b>	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>METROPOLITAN ST. LOUIS SEWER DISTRICT</b>		TITLE: <b>ASSISTANT DIRECTOR</b>	
ADDRESS: <b>2350 MARKET STREET</b>			
CITY: <b>ST. LOUIS</b>		STATE: <b>MO</b>	ZIP: <b>63103</b>
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: <b>2/10/2026 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 1885</b>		DATE: <b>2/10/2026</b>
COMMITTEE: <b>Agriculture</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>INDIVIDUAL:</b>		
WITNESS NAME: <b>JUDITH DASOVICH, MD</b>		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE:                  ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>2/10/2026 6:57 AM</b>
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>		

I am a physician. Our bodies are 60% water. If we poison our water, we poison ourselves. It is imperative we have knowledgeable people on the Clean Water Commission who will protect our most precious resource in the face of corporations who put profit before public health.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 1885</b>		DATE: <b>2/10/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Agriculture</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>REGISTERED LOBBYIST:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>LACEY HIRSCHVOGEL</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>573-418-8298</b>	
REPRESENTING: <b>MISSOURI ASSOCIATION MUNICIPAL UTILITIES</b>		TITLE:	
ADDRESS: <b>2200 MAGUIRE BOULEVARD</b>			
CITY: <b>COLUMBIA</b>		STATE: <b>MO</b>	ZIP: <b>65201</b>
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: <b>2/10/2026 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 1885</b>		DATE: <b>2/10/2026</b>
COMMITTEE: <b>Agriculture</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>MARY CULLER</b>		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>MISSOURI STREAM TEAM WATERSHED COALITION</b>		TITLE: <b>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR</b>
ADDRESS: <b>1923 SHELBY 149</b>		
CITY: <b>SHELBYVILLE</b>		STATE: <b>MO</b>
		ZIP: <b>63469</b>
EMAIL: <b>mary@streamteamsunited.org</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>2/10/2026 7:18 AM</b>

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

The Missouri Stream Team Watershed Coalition supports this bill. Our organization is made up of Missourians who volunteer their time to take care of our state's rivers and streams through litter pick-up activities and water education. We support the addition of wording related to members exempting themselves from discussions and voting if they have a conflict of interest. We support allowing more than one commission member representing publicly owned treatment works. Wastewater facilities and their operating permits are complex, and it would be beneficial to have more than one member knowledgeable about these systems on the commission.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 1885</b>		DATE: <b>2/10/2026</b>
COMMITTEE: <b>Agriculture</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>ABIGAIL HERNDON</b>		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE:      ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>2/5/2026 7:05 PM</b>
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>		

No member shall receive, or have 13 received during the previous two years, a significant portion of his or her income directly or indirectly from permit holders or applicants for a permit pursuant to any federal water pollution control act as amended and as applicable to this state should not be repealed. This is the rule for establishing conflict of interest. The committee should not be in charge of setting up new rules for conflicts of interest if they repeal Section 644.021, RSMo, only add to it



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 1885</b>		DATE: <b>2/10/2026</b>
COMMITTEE: <b>Agriculture</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>2/10/2026 12:30 AM</b>
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>		

I have to oppose this Bill because of the Repeal that a "Clean Water Commissioner Member" not receive the majority of their Income from a Water Entity or Provider in the past two (2)-Years, prior to their Appointment. I highly believe in Ethics, No Conflicts-Of-Interest and Transparency.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 1885</b>		DATE: <b>2/10/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Agriculture</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>KORTNIE HUDDLESTON</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>2/10/2026 11:01 PM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

This proposed amendment to the Clean Water Commission’s structure weakens essential conflict-of-interest safeguards, threatening the integrity of environmental governance in Missouri. This bill prioritizes polluter access over public and ecological health.

The critical deletion is the provision that currently bars individuals who have recently derived significant income from permit holders or applicants from serving on the Commission. This safeguard exists to prevent regulated industries from directly influencing the regulatory body meant to oversee them. Its removal creates a pathway for appointees with direct financial ties to polluting industries to shape water quality standards, enforcement, and permit approvals. This fundamentally corrupts the Commission’s role as a protector of a public good—clean water.

While the bill adds a requirement for the Commission to establish recusal procedures, this is a poor substitute for a clear statutory prohibition. Internal rules can be weakened or poorly enforced. Relying on recusal places the burden on a potentially conflicted member to voluntarily step aside, rather than preventing the conflict from existing in the first place. The current law establishes a necessary bright line that this bill erases.

Additionally, the Commission’s mandate to balance public water protection with agricultural, industrial, and mining interests already risks dilution of environmental priorities. Adding members potentially financed by these very industries shifts that balance decisively toward corporate profits. It disregards the disproportionate impact of water contamination on vulnerable communities and future generations.

In conclusion, this bill undermines democratic accountability by inviting regulated entities into the regulator’s seat. From a progressive perspective, we must strengthen, not dismantle, barriers against corporate capture of our environmental agencies. We oppose this bill and urge the maintenance of strong, statutory conflict-of-interest standards to ensure the Clean Water Commission serves all Missourians, not private polluters.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 1885</b>		DATE: <b>2/10/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Agriculture</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>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>MELISSA VATTEROTT</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>314-727-0600</b>	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>MISSOURI COALITION FOR THE ENVIRONMENT</b>		TITLE: <b>DIRECTOR OF POLICY AND STRATEGY</b>	
ADDRESS: <b>725 KINGSLAND AVE SUITE 100, ST. LOUIS, MO 63130</b>			
CITY: <b>ST. LOUIS</b>		STATE: <b>MO</b>	ZIP: <b>63130</b>
EMAIL: <b>mvatterott@moenvironment.org</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>2/10/2026 9:34 AM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

February 10, 2026

Chairman Justus Doyle  
 Committee on Agriculture  
 MO House of Representatives  
 201 West Capitol Avenue  
 Room 114-C  
 Jefferson City MO 65101

Dear Chairman Doyle and Members of the Committee,

Missouri Coalition for the Environment (MCE) is a statewide, advocacy nonprofit organization that works to empower Missourians to protect their environment and health. Our mission is to educate, organize, and advocate in defense of Missouri’s people and their environment. Given the importance of balancing considerations of all entities impacted by water pollution permits and rules, MCE urges this committee to oppose SB 1009 unless it is amended to reflect concerns for fair and public representation.

Of the seven seats on the commission currently in statute, three must be occupied by industry. SB 1009 would repeal certain requirements regarding sources of funding and affiliations for commissioners, potentially opening the door to even greater industry influence. For forty-four years, prior to industrial interests pressuring a reconstruction of the CWC makeup in 2016, the statute required four seats be occupied by members of the public. The removal of that public majority has led to decisions that disproportionately favor industry, despite the Commission’s mandate to enforce Missouri’s Clean Water Law in the interest of all Missourians. From the example we share below, I hope you will see the reason that if any change of the Clean Water Commission is warranted, it is to have more individuals concerned about the health and safety of the public and Missouri’s environment, not individuals connected to industry.

In the spring of 2023, the Clean Water Commission denied the Department of Natural Resources’ (DNR) request to promulgate a new rule governing cyanotoxins produced by algal blooms. MCE had petitioned DNR in November 2021 to promulgate a new rule given the impacts of Harmful Algal Blooms on people and wildlife. The petition was specifically tailored to addressing two types of cyanotoxins

and the scope limited to lakes and reservoirs used for recreation in the state. Cyanotoxins associated with Harmful Algal Blooms can cause a variety of human health harms including “gastrointestinal issues, headaches, respiratory issues, and even liver and kidney damage”(1). The petition asked the DNR to adopt the EPA’s already existing criteria for these two cyanotoxins - microcystin and cylindrospermopsin. DNR hosted a public stakeholder meeting to discuss the criteria for the proposed rulemaking in June 2022 and also held an educational workshop about the petition in July 2022. DNR issued a regulatory impact report on the proposed rule and provided a sixty (60) day comment period (2). Four months after the comment period ended, DNR Water Protection Program held one last stakeholder meeting to discuss the proposed amendments to 10 CSR 20-7.031 to include water quality criteria for two cyanotoxins to protect recreational use of Missouri’s lakes and reservoirs. It was evidence that DNR was taking this petition seriously and made multiple opportunities available to interested parties to share their thoughts. Three weeks later on April 12, 2023, the proposed rulemaking was brought before the Clean Water Commission. Despite support from MCE, a permitted entity, and a concerned citizen, the CWC rejected the proposed rule with a 5-1 vote. Only one person opposed the rule of multiple industrial agriculture industry associations.

DNR continues to have information about HABs on their website, warning citizens to be careful in Missouri waterbodies in the summer months due to the harms that can come from exposure to them (3).

The example described above is just one example of a CWC decision in the last several years that was contrary to science, public outcry, and/or DNR support. In 2024, sixty organizations, farms, and businesses signed a letter in support of this legislative effort (4). The bills addressing such desires received broad support in both the House and Senate before ultimately being shut down behind closed doors. SB 1009 attempts to revive reform discussions, but it omits key provisions that would meaningfully strengthen public representation and accountability.

Missourians deserve a Clean Water Commission made up of individuals who can live up to the mandate of having “a general interest in the public and . . . an interest and knowledge of conservation and the effects and control of water contaminants.” While the current Commissioners may have this knowledge, they are often not voting in alignment with this knowledge; they are voting in alignment with other interests.

Please respond to the public outcry seeking to reinstate a public majority on the Clean Water Commission, to have the Governor be limited to appointees who do not have a substantial interest in companies permitted by the CWC, and to have a process for Commissioners to abstain from voting when they have a conflict of interest. As such, Missouri Coalition for the Environment asks that you vote “no” on SB 1009. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Melissa Vatterott, JD  
Director of Policy and Strategy  
Missouri Coalition for the Environment  
mvatterott@moenvironment.org  
(314) 727-0600, ext. 111

(1) Background on Water Quality Standards Petition, Mo. Dep’t of Natural Res., November 4, 2022. See also Petition for Rulemaking Under the Clean Water Act: Cyanotoxin Criteria for Missouri Lakes and Reservoirs, Mo. Coalition for the Env., Nov. 16, 2021, available at <https://dnr.mo.gov/document-search/petition-rulemaking-under-clean-water-act-cyanotoxin-criteria-missouri-lakes-reservoirs-nov-16-2021>

(2) See Summary and Response to Comments on Regulatory Impact Report for Proposed Amendments to 10 CSR 20-.031 Water Quality Standards, Dep’t of Natural Res., last revised Feb. 3, 2023, Summary and Response to Comments on Regulatory Impact Report for Proposed Amendments to 10 CSR 20-7.031 Water Quality Standards



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 1885</b>		DATE: <b>2/10/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Agriculture</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>MICHAEL DREYER</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>2/10/2026 11:00 PM</b>	

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

This proposed amendment to the Clean Water Commission’s structure weakens essential conflict-of-interest safeguards, threatening the integrity of environmental governance in Missouri. This bill prioritizes polluter access over public and ecological health.

The critical deletion is the provision that currently bars individuals who have recently derived significant income from permit holders or applicants from serving on the Commission. This safeguard exists to prevent regulated industries from directly influencing the regulatory body meant to oversee them. Its removal creates a pathway for appointees with direct financial ties to polluting industries to shape water quality standards, enforcement, and permit approvals. This fundamentally corrupts the Commission’s role as a protector of a public good—clean water.

While the bill adds a requirement for the Commission to establish recusal procedures, this is a poor substitute for a clear statutory prohibition. Internal rules can be weakened or poorly enforced. Relying on recusal places the burden on a potentially conflicted member to voluntarily step aside, rather than preventing the conflict from existing in the first place. The current law establishes a necessary bright line that this bill erases.

Additionally, the Commission’s mandate to balance public water protection with agricultural, industrial, and mining interests already risks dilution of environmental priorities. Adding members potentially financed by these very industries shifts that balance decisively toward corporate profits. It disregards the disproportionate impact of water contamination on vulnerable communities and future generations.

In conclusion, this bill undermines democratic accountability by inviting regulated entities into the regulator’s seat. From a progressive perspective, we must strengthen, not dismantle, barriers against corporate capture of our environmental agencies. We oppose this bill and urge the maintenance of strong, statutory conflict-of-interest standards to ensure the Clean Water Commission serves all Missourians, not private polluters.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 1885</b>		DATE: <b>2/10/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Agriculture</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 4:28 PM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			

**HB 1885 removes an essential statutory conflict-of-interest safeguard governing membership on the Clean Water Commission by eliminating the prohibition on members receiving income from permit holders or applicants under federal and state water pollution control laws.**

**This change fundamentally weakens the independence, credibility, and constitutional integrity of Missouri’s water contaminant regulatory framework.**

**Elimination of a Critical Conflict-of-Interest Protection**

**The bill strikes existing language that barred commission members from deriving a significant portion of their income from entities regulated by the Commission. In its place, HB 1885 relies solely on internal, self-created recusal rules.**

**That substitution is inadequate.**

**A statutory prohibition is objective, enforceable, and reviewable. A self-policing recusal framework is subjective, discretionary, and largely unenforceable. The removal of this safeguard creates an environment where regulated industries may directly or indirectly influence regulatory outcomes through commission appointments.**

**This is not a hypothetical concern — it is a well-documented regulatory capture mechanism.**

**Due Process & Public Trust Concerns**

**The Clean Water Commission exercises quasi-judicial authority, including rulemaking, permitting, and enforcement decisions that directly affect:**  
**public drinking water,**  
**environmental health,**  
**property values,**  
**agricultural viability, and**  
**downstream communities.**

**Allowing individuals with current or recent financial ties to permit holders to sit on such a body raises serious procedural due process concerns, particularly where affected citizens must rely on the Commission for impartial adjudication.**

**Justice must not only be done — it must be seen to be done. HB 1885 undermines both.**

#### **Federal Program Compatibility Risk**

**Missouri administers delegated federal clean water programs under the Clean Water Act.**

**Those delegations depend on maintaining regulatory independence, transparency, and avoidance of conflicts of interest.**

**Weakening statutory ethics protections risks:  
increased federal scrutiny,  
potential delegation challenges, and  
loss of public confidence in Missouri's ability to regulate water contamination without industry bias.**

**This bill invites unnecessary federal and judicial intervention.**

#### **Regulatory Capture Is Not “Balance”**

**The bill's justification appears to rest on the notion that industry representation equates to balance. Missouri already accommodates industry expertise without allowing financial entanglement. Expertise does not require conflicted income streams.**

**A regulator who depends financially on the regulated entity is not “balanced” — they are compromised.**

#### **Conclusion**

**HB 1885 removes a clear, objective, and necessary ethical firewall protecting Missouri's water oversight system. In a state with ongoing rural water contamination concerns, aging wastewater infrastructure, and significant agricultural and industrial runoff challenges, this is the exact wrong direction.**

**If reform is needed, it should strengthen transparency and independence — not dilute it.**

**Clean water regulation cannot be entrusted to those who profit from what is being regulated.**

**For these reasons, HB 1885 should be rejected.**

#### **Constitutional & Legal Footnotes**

**Mo. Const. art. I, § 10 — Due process requires impartial decision-makers in quasi-judicial proceedings.  
Tumey v. Ohio, 273 U.S. 510 (1927) — Financial interest in adjudicatory outcomes violates due process.  
Ward v. Village of Monroeville, 409 U.S. 57 (1972) — Even indirect financial incentives undermine neutrality.**

**Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1251 et seq. — Requires state programs to maintain independent enforcement authority to retain federal delegation.**



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 1885</b>		DATE: <b>2/10/2026</b>
COMMITTEE: <b>Agriculture</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>TAMARA SZABO</b>		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE:                  ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>2/10/2026 6:36 AM</b>
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>		

**Please vote NO. The added conflict-of-interest language is a positive step, but the bill overall would increase industry influence on a Commission that already reserves three of seven seats for industry representatives.**