

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
HOUSE LABOR AND COMMERCE STANDING COMMITTEE

February 20, 2008

3:06 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Representative Kurt Olson, Chair
Representative Mark Neuman, Vice Chair
Representative Carl Gatto
Representative Gabrielle LeDoux
Representative Jay Ramras
Representative Robert L. "Bob" Buch
Representative Berta Gardner

MEMBERS ABSENT

All members present

COMMITTEE CALENDAR

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 32

Supporting open and free competition within the broadcasting industry.

- MOVED HJR 32 OUT OF COMMITTEE

HOUSE BILL NO. 331

"An Act relating to mandatory motor vehicle insurance, license suspensions, mandatory impoundments of vehicles used in certain offenses, and notices relating to motor vehicles and driver's licenses."

- MOVED CSHB 331(L&C) OUT OF COMMITTEE

PREVIOUS COMMITTEE ACTION

BILL: HJR 32

SHORT TITLE: BROADCASTING INDUSTRY

SPONSOR(S): REPRESENTATIVE(S) STOLTZE

| | | |
|----------|-----|---------------------------------|
| 02/06/08 | (H) | READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS |
| 02/06/08 | (H) | L&C |
| 02/20/08 | (H) | L&C AT 3:00 PM CAPITOL 17 |

BILL: HB 331

SHORT TITLE: MOTOR VEHICLES:INS/LICENSES/IMPOUNDMENTS

SPONSOR(S): REPRESENTATIVE(S) ROSES

01/18/08 (H) READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
01/18/08 (H) L&C, JUD
02/20/08 (H) L&C AT 3:00 PM CAPITOL 17

WITNESS REGISTER

REPRESENTATIVE BILL STOLTZE
Alaska State Legislature
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Presented the resolution and answered questions as prime sponsor of HJR 32.

CRYSTAL KOENEMAN, Staff
to Representative Bob Roses, Alaska State Legislature
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Presented HB 331 on behalf of the sponsor.

REPRESENTATIVE LES GARA
Alaska State Legislature
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified as cosponsor of HB 331.

WHITNEY BREWSTER, Director
Director's Office
Division of Motor Vehicles (DMV)
Department of Administration (DOA)
Anchorage, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Answered questions on HB 331.

ACTION NARRATIVE

CHAIR KURT OLSON called the House Labor and Commerce Standing Committee meeting to order at [3:06:26 PM](#). Representatives Neuman, Gatto, Buch, and Olson were present at the call to order. Representatives LeDoux, Ramras, and Gardner arrived as the meeting was in progress.

HJR 32-BROADCASTING INDUSTRY

[3:06:56 PM](#)

CHAIR OLSON announced that the first order of business would be HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 32, Supporting open and free competition within the broadcasting industry.

REPRESENTATIVE BILL STOLTZE, Alaska State Legislature, as prime sponsor, explained that HJR 32 supports robust and competitive airwaves by opposing federal action that would reverse or inhibit open and free competition within the broadcasting industry. [The fairness doctrine is a policy of the United States Federal Communications Commission (FCC), which was passed by Congress in 1987, but vetoed by President Reagan.] Since the lifting of what is "mislabeled" as the "fairness doctrine," the public has had unfiltered publicly accessible airwaves. [In 1987, when the courts declared that the doctrine was not mandated by Congress and the FCC did not have to enforce it, the FCC dissolved the doctrine.] While Representative Stoltze suggested he does not always agree with what is broadcast on the airwaves, he supports open, free airwaves.

[3:09:25 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE NEUMAN inquired as to what brought this matter to Representative Stoltze's attention.

REPRESENTATIVE STOLTZE answered that ongoing legislation in Congress would reenact the fairness doctrine and curb open unfiltered talk radio. In further response to Representative Neuman, Representative Stoltze explained that under the fairness doctrine, if you put forth one controversial idea, you must provide equal air time for a competing idea.

REPRESENTATIVE STOLTZE, in response to Representative Neuman, answered that this resolution is offered as a courtesy to the federal delegation and to allow all ideas to enter the marketplace.

REPRESENTATIVE STOLTZE, in response to Representative Neuman, offered to find out whether HJR 32 would affect public radio.

[3:12:53 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE GATTO applauded the fact that the resolution is directed only to the Alaska delegation and not the entire Congress. He inquired as to whether HJR 32 would affect talk show hosts who are also legislators by requiring them to provide equal air time to their opponents.

REPRESENTATIVE STOLTZE responded that the resolution supports equal time for competing ideas so the station would probably air music if air time was not marketplace viable.

[3:15:16 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE STOLTZE, in response to Representative Buch, answered that the resolution does not condemn an act, but strongly discourages passage of an act.

[3:15:45 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE BUCH referred to a page 2 of a handout in the committee packet, titled "CNSNews.Com, Cybercast News Service" which read: "The U.S. Supreme Court ruled in 1969 that the doctrine did not violate the First Amendment because the airwaves belonged to the public and thus could face government regulation to which print media were not subjected." He inquired as to whether the resolution affects what has already been affirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court.

REPRESENTATIVE STOLTZE conveyed that the U.S. Supreme Court interpreted that it was legal to invoke the Fairness Doctrine, but it did not mandate it. Instead, an administrative decision was issued in 1987. The Fairness Doctrine does not violate the first amendment, but it violates the principle of the free marketplace, he opined.

REPRESENTATIVE BUCH referred to a committee handout labeled, "MSNBC.com" which read: "According to researchers, more than 85 percent of talk-radio programming leans to the right - at least by the researchers' definition." He voiced that if that were the case, it would seem that the information currently being broadcast is one sided by 85 percent. In essence, the U.S. Supreme Court affirmed that the Fairness Doctrine does not violate the first amendment.

REPRESENTATIVE STOLTZE pointed out that it would not be hard to search for another quote to demonstrate that the three major network stations also broadcast information that is predominately slanted in another way. He offered that the packet includes pro and con comments on the Fairness Doctrine so the committee members will have a wide spectrum of ideas to consider. You cannot force people to listen to specific programs, he opined. Thus, he prefers to support the concept of the marketplace ultimately deciding what programs are viable.

[3:20:49 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE LEDOUX inquired as to whether the Fairness Doctrine was repealed in 1987 and is not currently in effect.

REPRESENTATIVE STOLTZE agreed that is correct.

REPRESENTATIVE LEDOUX further inquired as to the effect of reinstating the Fairness Doctrine on radio stations in Anchorage and how it would affect political candidates.

REPRESENTATIVE STOLTZE replied that the principle is based on the premise that anyone could demand equal time. If the Fairness Doctrine is reinstated the result would be that the format of programs such as those on talk radio would disappear since people would not want to give equal time to their opponents, he opined.

REPRESENTATIVE STOLTZE, in response to Representative LeDoux, explained that the time must be made available as a public service.

REPRESENTATIVE LEDOUX further inquired if the opponent would be required to pay for the equal time.

REPRESENTATIVE STOLTZE answered that the equal time would be provided as a public service. He offered that lifting the Fairness Doctrine by President Reagan's administration removed an artificial barrier which allowed talk radio to blossom. He explained that programs such as the Rush Limbaugh Show and other hosted talk radio programs did not exist prior to the lift of the Fairness Doctrine, since stations were required to provide free air time for responses to any controversial opinions that were broadcast. Talk radio programs cropped up because stations could broadcast editorial commentary without having to present opposing views, he opined. Therefore, while talk radio shows were not prohibited, these programs didn't happen due to the natural restrictions in the marketplace.

[3:24:13 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE NEUMAN pointed out that broadcasting companies are for-profit businesses. He inquired as to whether the state or any government has the right to restrict free enterprise businesses on news media they can broadcast.

REPRESENTATIVE STOLTZE explained that is exactly his premise for introducing HJR 32. He noted that he has heard most of the committee members on talk radio since Alaska radio stations are open, accessible, and air competing ideas. Further, Alaska

radio stations want to keep their listeners, so stations tend to internally balance views, he opined.

[3:26:44 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE GATTO surmised that perhaps entities such as universities, newspapers, and art museums should also be required to divide evenly between viewpoints. If government is going to control society, perhaps it should control all of society, or else none at all.

[3:27:52 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE STOLTZE, in response to Representative LeDoux, replied regulations govern what can be broadcast on airwaves. This resolution is limited to open and free access of airwaves and does not address program content or any laws against pornography.

[3:31:00 PM](#)

CHAIR OLSON, after first determining no one else wished to testify, closed public testimony on HJR 32.

[3:31:07 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE NEUMAN moved to report HJR 32 out of committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying fiscal notes.

REPRESENTATIVE BUCH objected.

[3:31:26 PM](#)

A roll call vote was taken. Representatives Gatto, LeDoux, Ramras, Gardner, Neuman, and Olson voted in favor of moving HJR 32 from committee. Representative Buch voted against it. Therefore, HJR 32 was reported out of the House Labor and Commerce Standing Committee by a vote of 6-1.

The committee took an at-ease from 3:32 p.m. to 3:35 p.m.

HB 331-MOTOR VEHICLES:INS/LICENSES/IMPOUNDMENTS

[3:35:06 PM](#)

CHAIR OLSON announced that the next order of business would be HOUSE BILL NO. 331, "An Act relating to mandatory motor vehicle insurance, license suspensions, mandatory impoundments of vehicles used in certain offenses, and notices relating to motor vehicles and driver's licenses."

3:35:25 PM

CRYSTAL KOENEMAN, Staff to Representative Bob Roses, Alaska State Legislature, presented HB 331 on behalf of the prime sponsor, Representative Bob Roses. She explained that HB 331 would address a problem in the Division of Motor Vehicles (DMV) statutes with respect to the address of record. Currently if someone is involved in a motor vehicle accident but does not have proof of liability insurance, the law enforcement officer provides the driver with a form to fill out and submit to the DMV with proof of liability insurance. The DMV currently mails any notice to the driver's address of record. When the driver's address has changed, the mail is often returned as undeliverable and the party never receives the notice. If that happens, the division does not have proof of mandatory insurance and subsequently suspends the driver's license. Under HB 331, the DMV would be required to send the notice to the driver's last known address, not to the address of record. This bill would also change failure to notify the DMV of address changes from a misdemeanor to a violation; would institute a class B misdemeanor for driving without liability insurance, punishable by a minimum fine of \$500; and would allow law enforcement to impound vehicles for certain crimes such as driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs.

3:38:05 PM

REPRESENTATIVE NEUMAN referred to proposed AS 28.05.071 of HB 331. He inquired as to whether the \$300 fine for not notifying the DMV of an address change is set too high. He further inquired as to the number of drivers that do not have proof of insurance in the vehicle at the time of an accident.

MS. KOENEMAN stated that HB 331 provides a defense if the person has insurance and provides proof of insurance to the court.

REPRESENTATIVE NEUMAN expressed concern that the driver would incur expenses in order to appear in court. He inquired as to whether it would be easier for the driver to provide the proof of insurance directly to the DMV.

MS. KOENEMAN offered that when a driver provides proof of insurance with his insurance card at the time of an accident that does not necessarily prove that the driver has insurance since the policy may have lapsed. Until the DMV contacts the insurance company, there is no way to know for certain that the driver has maintained the insurance policy.

MS. KOENEMAN, in response to Representative Neuman, explained that currently the DMV checks insurance at the time of renewal. However, the policy may have lapsed at the time of the accident so requiring that the proof of insurance upon renewal of a driver's license or for vehicle registration would not remedy the problem.

[3:42:49 PM](#)

MS. KOENEMAN, in response to Representative Gardner, related that currently DMV maintains an address of record. However, failure to notify the DMV within 30 days of moving would result in a fine under HB 331.

[3:43:39 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE LEDOUX offered that HB 331 is written in a confusing or convoluted manner. She related that Section 2 provides an affirmative defense that the party provides proof of insurance to the court. She inquired as to whether there was some other way to provide proof of insurance.

[3:44:15 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE LES GARA, Alaska State Legislature, as cosponsor, offered that HB 331 corrects frustrating parts of the motor vehicle law. Currently, if a person drives without liability insurance it is a crime, which it should be, he opined. However, a person with valid insurance can be charged if he/she cannot provide proof of insurance. If that happens, the driver currently would provide proof during his/her court appearance. Proposed Section 2 of HB 331 removes the burden of a court appearance by allowing the party to either provide proof to the DMV or the law enforcement officer at the time of the accident. Not only is it burdensome to appear at the court hearing, but while the case is pending, the driver "has the matter hanging over his/her head." Under HB 331, the driver would know that once he/she provides proof to the court, since the outcome will be that the district attorney will drop the case. He reiterated that once the DMV sends a notice to the address of record

requesting that the driver provide proof of insurance and the driver is non-responsive, the DMV will suspend the person's driver's license. In the event that the driver is subsequently stopped by a police officer, either routinely or due to an accident, the driver would be charged with driving with a suspended or revoked license, which is a crime. Under HB 331, the penalty for failure to maintain a current address would change from a class B misdemeanor to an infraction punishable by a fine of up to \$300. He offered that the committee may wish to consider removing the fine. He offered that the only reason to impose a fine is to provide DMV with an incentive for people to keep their address current.

[3:47:15 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE LEDOUX argued that proposed Section 2 of HB 331 may not provide relief to the driver, since it requires an affirmative defense. Therefore, the driver must still go to court to provide proof of insurance.

REPRESENTATIVE GARA answered that under current statute, a person who drives without a license commits a crime, even though the driver's license was revoked for lack of proof of liability insurance; and even though the driver had maintained liability insurance. He offered that HB 331 would provide a valid affirmative defense.

REPRESENTATIVE LEDOUX pointed out that the statutory language seems overly complicated.

REPRESENTATIVE GARA acknowledged that HB 331 is complex. He noted that the DMV currently is aware of the loophole, that the language contained in the bill passed the body last year in HB 184, sponsored by Representative Roses, although the provision was later removed in the other body. Thus, HB 184 passed the legislature without the driver's address of record issue addressed.

[3:48:39 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE GATTO pointed out that driving without proof of liability insurance is a six point deduction on a person's record. He inquired as to the total points allowed before the DMV would suspend a person's license.

MS. KOENEMAN offered to provide the driver's license point system.

REPRESENTATIVE GATTO expressed concern that the current process complicates the process for driver who was legitimately insured.

[3:50:44 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE GARDNER acknowledged the importance of requiring liability insurance. She related concern that the driver would lose six points on his/her license for simply not having proof of liability insurance. She inquired as to the reason that the DMV would use the old address to provide notification since the officer obtained updated address information at the time of the accident or traffic stop. She suggested that DMV use the most current address as the driver's address of record.

[3:52:12 PM](#)

WHITNEY BREWSTER, Director, Director's Office, Division of Motor Vehicles (DMV), Department of Administration (DOA), began by answering questions previously raised. She stated that a driver is allowed 12 points in one year or 18 points in 24 months before a license is suspended. However, she noted that points are placed on the driver's record upon conviction. She noted that a judge also has the authority to dismiss a violation. The DMV supports the flexibility to send notices to the address of record or to an address acquired at the time of an accident. She estimated that 10 percent of mail that DMV sends to the driver's address of record is undeliverable. She stressed that the DMV desires to notify parties of the DMV's requirements.

[3:53:40 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE LEDOUX maintained concern that Section 2 of HB 331 seems convoluted.

REPRESENTATIVE GARA acknowledged that the current law is also complex. He explained that under the bill, proposed subsection (d) allows for an affirmative defense, but he/she still has to prove it.

REPRESENTATIVE LEDOUX pointed out that the driver has the burden of proof, which means that person must appear in court to present an affirmative defense.

REPRESENTATIVE GARA reiterated an earlier scenario in which a driver cannot provide proof of his/her liability insurance. The DMV would mail a notice to the driver's address of record

requesting proof of liability insurance. The form is undeliverable so the DMV revokes his/her license. The person continues to drive since he/she is unaware of the administrative revocation. The driver gets pulled over again and is subsequently arrested for driving without a license. The only recourse the driver has is to go to court and hope that the district attorney will not prosecute the case. Meanwhile, he/she cannot drive and has no assurance that the matter will be appropriately handled in court. This bill would provide the driver with an affirmative defense.

REPRESENTATIVE GARA, in response to Representative LeDoux, pointed out that he has known several people who have undergone the stress of being arrested, posting bail, and having a criminal charge pending until the court date. In further response to Representative LeDoux, Representative Gara explained that under HB 331, the driver has the knowledge that he/she has a legitimate defense that is very easy to prove.

[3:58:37 PM](#)

MS. BREWSTER, in response to Representative Gardner, answered that while the driver must show proof of insurance in court, cases such as the one described by Representative Gara are ultimately dismissed.

REPRESENTATIVE GARDNER inquired as to whether a person would be cited for not having proof of insurance in his/her vehicle.

MS. BREWSTER answered that the driver would be cited for failure to provide insurance, but that the points would not be applied to the driver's record unless the driver was actually convicted.

REPRESENTATIVE GARA explained that the issue of whether the driver has proof of insurance in the car is not addressed in bill. He suggested a possible solution might be for DMV to offer a waiver once the party provides the proof of liability insurance.

[4:01:02 PM](#)

MS. BREWSTER, in response to Chair Olson, answered that the DMV supports proposed Section 4 of HB 331, which addresses the ability of the division to send notification to the current address on file, or the address given on the accident report. However, the division is neutral on other sections of HB 331.

4:01:42 PM

REPRESENTATIVE NEUMAN inquired as to whether the driver who does not send in the paperwork would be considered a criminal.

REPRESENTATIVE GARA explained the process again. He emphasized that the process is not fixable under current law, which is the reason that proposed Sections 2 and 4 are important. He noted that the requirement for liability insurance is currently mandatory and HB 331 does not affect insurance. Driving without liability insurance currently is a class B misdemeanor, punishable by fine of as little as zero dollars. Proposed Section 3 would impose a minimum fine of \$500 as a disincentive for people to drive without liability insurance.

REPRESENTATIVE NEUMAN expressed support for some sections of the bill.

4:04:22 PM

REPRESENTATIVE GARDNER spoke against proposed Section 1. She made a motion to adopt Conceptual Amendment 1 as follows:

On page 1, lines 5-7,
Delete Section 1.

REPRESENTATIVE LEDOUX inquired as to whether DMV could send out the form to both the address of record and the address provided to the law enforcement officer at the time of the accident.

MS. BREWSTER acknowledged that DMV does receive all accident reports. However, the cost to mail certified letters to a driver is \$4 per letter. In further response to Representative LeDoux, Ms. Brewster said she was not aware of any law that would prevent the division from mailing letters to additional addresses, but the law only specifies notices be sent to the address of record. Given the number of accident reports, the DMV would incur substantial costs to mail out two notices to each driver, she surmised.

4:08:49 PM

REPRESENTATIVE GARDNER withdrew her motion.

REPRESENTATIVE GATTO expressed concern that everyone who changes residence must remember to notify the DMV of their address change.

4:10:18 PM

MS. KOENEMAN, in response to Representative Neuman, noted subsection (a) which read:

A person who has applied for or been issued a certificate, registration, title, license, permit or other form under this title shall notify the appropriate department in writing of the change of name or address within 30 days ...

MS. KOENEMAN added that subsection (b) adds the penalty provision.

MS. KOENEMAN, in response to Representative Neuman, referred to on page 2, lines 14-15 of HB 331, and offered that AS 28.33.030 relates to controlled substances, AS 28.33.031 refers to the failure to submit to breathalyzer, AS 28.35.030 and AS 28.35.032 refers to refusal to submit to chemical testing.

4:13:09 PM

REPRESENTATIVE GARA offered that when a penalty provision is not set by statute, the penalty automatically defaults to a class B misdemeanor. Thus, proposed AS 28.15.071(b) was added to HB 331 to indicate that the infraction is punishable only by a fine. He offered that the committee might consider reducing the fine "not to exceed \$50" which would mean that the fine could also be zero. He further explained that Section 5 was added to the bill since impoundment is not automatic in driving while under the influence crimes. An owner who loaned their car to someone who later drives while under the influence of alcohol while using the loaned vehicle, could pay the impound fees to obtain his/her car.

REPRESENTATIVE NEUMAN expressed concern with proposed Section 5.

REPRESENTATIVE GARDNER recalled the discussion during the action last session on the previous bill, HB 184. She recollected the rationale used and the sponsor's intent to not only take the driver off the road, but to also remove the vehicle.

REPRESENTATIVE GARA, in response to Representative Gatto, agreed that rental cars would be affected by the impound provision of the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE GARDNER pointed out that drivers sign an agreement at the time they rent a car. Thus, a car rental agency would apply any additional costs incurred during the rental directly on the driver's credit card.

[4:17:06 PM](#)

CHAIR OLSON, after first determining no one else wished to testify, closed public testimony on HB 331.

[4:17:20 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE GARDNER made a motion to adopt new Conceptual Amendment 1, as follows:

On page 1, line 7
Delete "\$300"
Insert "\$25"

REPRESENTATIVE GARDNER explained new Conceptual Amendment 1. She offered that someone who fails to notify the DMV of his/her current residential address would only be subject to a fine of \$25.

[4:17:47 PM](#)

CHAIR OLSON objected. He warned members that reducing the fine would weaken the need for people to keep their address current with the DMV.

REPRESENTATIVE LEDOUX pointed out that most people are not aware of the need to notify DMV of their address change.

[4:18:48 PM](#)

A roll call vote was taken. Representatives Gatto, LeDoux, Buch, Gardner, and Neuman voted in favor of new Conceptual Amendment 1. Representatives Ramras and Olson voted against it. Therefore, new Conceptual Amendment 1 was adopted by a vote of 5-2.

[4:19:48 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE NEUMAN made a motion to adopt Conceptual Amendment 2, as follows:

On page 2, lines 12-20,

Delete Section 5

[4:20:31 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE GARDNER objected.

[4:20:40 PM](#)

MS. KOENEMAN expressed concern about impounding another person's car, although she acknowledged it is up to the committee to decide.

REPRESENTATIVE GARDNER recalled that Representative Seaton wanted law enforcement officers to have the authority to impound vehicles for certain crimes. However, the owner could have the vehicle returned.

[4:22:11 PM](#)

MS. KOENEMAN, in response to Representative LeDoux, reminded members that Representative Gara testified that the language contained in Section 5 of HB 331 was added as a floor amendment to HB 184 in 2007, but the bill was later amended in the other body and the language was removed.

REPRESENTATIVE GARA noted his ambivalence as to whether or not to retain proposed Section 5 of HB 331, but he assured members that Representative Seaton supports proposed Section 5.

[4:23:42 PM](#)

CHAIR OLSON offered that he supports Conceptual Amendment 2 on the basis that Representative Seaton could work with the sponsor of the bill prior to the next committee of referral to determine whether the additional language is necessary.

REPRESENTATIVE GARDNER withdrew her objection.

There being no objection, Conceptual Amendment 2 was adopted.

[4:24:45 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE GARA expressed concern that the title was too broad since two items had been deleted, so portions of the title no longer apply. This bill does not relate to changes of mandatory motor vehicle insurance, so "mandatory" could be deleted, he suggested. He further noted that this bill relates

to motor vehicle insurance, but that the last portion, which read, "Notices relating to motor vehicles and drivers' licenses" should be narrowed to read, "notices relating to motor vehicles and notices relating to drivers' licenses".

REPRESENTATIVE LEDOUX made a motion to adopt Conceptual Amendment 3 which is a title change to incorporate the changes Representative Gara suggested. The new title under Conceptual Amendment 3, would read:

An Act relating to motor vehicle insurance, license suspensions, and notices relating to motor vehicles and notices relating to driver's licenses.

There being no objection, Conceptual Amendment 3 was adopted.

[4:26:05 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE LEDOUX moved to report HB 331, as amended, out of committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying fiscal notes.

There being no objection, CSHB 331(L&C) was reported from the House Labor and Commerce Standing Committee.

[4:26:23 PM](#)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the committee, the House Labor and Commerce Standing Committee meeting was adjourned at 4:26 p.m.