

**MINUTES**  
**SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE**  
May 4, 2007  
9:23 a.m.

**CALL TO ORDER**

Co-Chair Bert Stedman convened the meeting at approximately [9:23:58 AM](#).

**PRESENT**

Senator Lyman Hoffman, Co-Chair  
Senator Bert Stedman, Co-Chair  
Senator Kim Elton  
Senator Donny Olson  
Senator Joe Thomas  
Senator Fred Dyson

**Also Attending:** SENATOR GARY STEVENS; REPRESENTATIVE ANNA FAIRCLOUGH; DOUG LETCH, Staff to Senator Gary Stevens

**Attending via Teleconference:** For an Offnet Location: DICK MYLIUS, Director, Division of Mining, Land and Water, Department of Natural Resources; From Kodiak: JEROME SELBY, Mayor, Kodiak Island Borough

**SUMMARY INFORMATION**

HB 215-TASK FORCE RE: COUNCIL ON DOM. VIOL.

The Committee heard from the bill's sponsor, adopted one amendment, and reported the bill from Committee.

SB 111-KODIAK NARROW CAPE PUBLIC USE AREA

The Committee heard from the bill's sponsor, the Department of Natural Resources, and took public testimony. The bill reported from Committee.

[9:25:12 AM](#)

#hb215

CS FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 215(HES)

"An Act relating to the establishment of a task force to review the Council on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault."

This was the first hearing for this bill in the Senate Finance Committee.

REPRESENTATIVE ANNA FAIRCLOUGH, the bill's sponsor, informed the Committee that this bill would establish a task force to review the Council on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault (the Council). Section 1 of the bill addresses the State's "unfortunate" distinction of being ranked number one in the nation for rape for the past 20 years and in the top five for the past 27 years. The State is also experiencing an increase in domestic violence, sexual assault, and interpersonal violence.

Representative Fairclough deemed this legislation as "an opportunity to bring together Legislative bodies to look at how the Council is functioning now" to address interpersonal violence" in Alaska. The bill is supported by the Council and the Alaska Network on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault (Alaska Network).

Representative Fairclough stated that the "seven distinct areas" depicted in Sec. 2 subsection (c)(1) through (c)(7), page 3 lines 9 through 15, have been identified in either Legislative Audit Division reports or by Legislators as issues of continuing concern. They have been points of contention each time the Council has been considered for reauthorization.

Representative Fairclough contended that the Council is burdened by having to comply with approximately 30 audit recommendations. This legislation would present an opportunity to "streamline" the Council's duties in "responding to crisis intervention" and "prevent or change the way that society looks at interpersonal violence".

[9:27:07 AM](#)

Senator Thomas agreed that a review of the Council was warranted, as, in a statistical sense, it has not appeared to have had much impact on interpersonal violence.

Senator Thomas asked how the make-up of the proposed task force was determined. Even though the individuals might represent pertinent entities, a 15 member task force might prove unwieldy.

[9:28:00 AM](#)

Representative Fairclough worked with the executive directors of the Council and the Alaska Network to determine the make up of the task force. The 21 member programs of the Alaska Network had also been conferred with about who should have "a seat at the table". All current members of the Council were deemed appropriate for inclusion on the task force. For example, the Department of Public Safety could provide hindsight as well as a look forward since they would be responding to domestic violence and sexual assault occurrences and the Department of Law would be involved in trying the cases.

Representative Fairclough advised that the only new entity on the task force beyond existing Council members would be the Department of Corrections.

Representative Fairclough advised that the executive directors of the Council and the Alaska Network would be designated ex officio members in order to avoid having "too much bias in the vote". The executive director of the Alaska Network represents victim services while the executive director of the Council represents the administrative side of equation. Their membership on the task force would provide insight to things such as criticism that grants have been inappropriately managed or the issue of internal turnover.

Representative Fairclough specified that the task force would address criticisms about the Council and assist in developing positive solutions to the issues.

[9:29:28 AM](#)

Senator Elton also supported a review of the Council's work. One area of concern identified in one of the audits, but not included in the list in Sec. 2 is the concern about "conflicts of interest in terms of having people who are going to benefit from decisions made by the Council"; specifically the Alaska Network member programs.

Senator Elton was also uncertain whether the seven identified issues addressed two other concerns he deemed important: one being "the number of State personnel who serve on the Council and the other is having representatives of Departments who also benefit from the dollars distributed by the Council".

Representative Fairclough thought that item (3) of the list, which was "the appointment process for members of the council", would partially address Senator Elton's concerns. The current appointment process had been altered to address the conflict of interest concern raised in the audit process. Names of non-State entity individuals proposed for membership on the Council are submitted to the governor for approval. The names of State personnel are forwarded to the Legislature for approval.

Representative Fairclough communicated her desire to be appointed a member of the task force if the legislation was adopted. She hoped to serve in a facilitator capacity rather than a voting capacity to avoid any chance her past service in victims' rights issues might be considered a conflict. The goal is to achieve the "appropriate" balance between "the people who direct the money" and the people who work on the issues.

[9:31:41 AM](#)

Representative Fairclough stated that in addition to enhancing services provided by the 21 member programs, there was a desire to uncover new funding sources and suggest ways to change and educate society to decrease interpersonal violence. These efforts might address some of Senator Elton's concern.

Representative Fairclough noted that the bill is supported by numerous House of Representative members, the Council and the Alaska Network. She could address the concern about the balance of State employees on the Council further if necessary. To that point, she shared having served on a committee that primarily consisted of private sector members. "That committee was not very functional..."

[9:32:29 AM](#)

Senator Elton appreciated the sponsor's remarks, but considered the language in Sec. 2(c)(3) to speak in general to the appointment process rather than to specify "who shall be appointed or who shall serve."

9:32:48 AM

Representative Fairclough stated, "for the record", that she was "happy to say that the intent, if I serve on that body, is to address the Alaska Network on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault's ability to move forward to the Governor a recommendation", as directed in a finding of a Legislative Audit Division report.

Representative Fairclough stated that if this intent was not sufficient, she would welcome a clarifying amendment.

9:33:10 AM

Senator Elton spoke to another item in the list of seven concerns, that being the geographic location of the council's office as addressed in Sec. 3(c)(4) page 3 line 12. This issue was of high interest to him, and, since it is seldom discussed, he wondered why it was deemed important enough to be included in the list.

9:33:45 AM

Representative Fairclough stated that the geographic location of the Council's office was added during the bill's progression in the House of Representatives in response to the issue of turnover raised in an audit report. There was an "unsubstantiated" allegation that the significant turnover in the executive director's position might be the result of not "drawing from the right employment pool".

Representative Fairclough considered the office's location in Juneau "appropriate"; however, agreed with those in the House who thought the issue was worthy of discussion. If she was appointed to the task force, she would continue to support the office remaining in Juneau since "the heart of the State is in Juneau as far as legislative action". Juneau is also the site of the Alaska Network office.

Representative Fairclough reiterated that this item was included due to concern in the House about the turnover in the executive director position. It was not an effort on her part to move the office out of Juneau.

[9:35:18 AM](#)

Senator Elton asked regarding the use of the word "shall" in Sec. 2 subsection (c) page 3 line 8. This language specifies that "the task force shall consider and develop recommendations that address" the seven items might "preclude" discussing other issues.

[9:35:52 AM](#)

Representative Fairclough did not consider the use of the word "shall" to be "confining". The endeavor was to create an environment in which the issues identified in the audits would be addressed. The size of the task force, as previously discussed, was an effort to include advocates from both sides of an issue, those in support of the recommendation and those against it, to engage in "a healthy debate" and ultimately present findings that would be supported by both the House and the Senate.

Representative Fairclough voiced that the Council has been conducting business in the same manner for at least ten years. Programs are operating with limited resources and are not keeping pace with inflation. Including three members from both the House and the Senate on the task force would further enhance the opportunity "for healthy discussion". The goal is that the State would consider different opportunities through which "to really start turning the tide on interpersonal violence".

[9:37:17 AM](#)

Co-Chair Hoffman agreed with the findings depicted in Section 1 of the bill. One issue not addressed is "the magnitude of the problem in rural areas of the State". While the seven issues identified in Sec. 2(c) have merit, consideration should be given to reallocating resources to rural areas as that is where the problem is most prevalent.

[9:38:39 AM](#)

Co-Chair Hoffman questioned why the problems being experienced in rural areas were not specifically identified as a focus item, since the problems experienced in Bethel, for example, have been documented in "newspapers and other agencies in the State".

9:39:10 AM

Representative Fairclough agreed with Co-Chair Hoffman's point. Alaska Native women are "disproportionately over represented in a population for rape". She was unsure whether that was also the case for domestic violence incidences. However, she was uncertain whether a "consensus" could be reached about increasing funding to address such issues in rural Alaska. She encouraged Co-Chair Hoffman to develop and provide language specific to his concern for consideration.

Representative Fairclough informed the Committee that Council resources are limited. To that point, she noted that a representative from rural Alaska who is on the Council has been "very influential in the funding process". There is awareness on the Council about the difficulty experienced in delivering services to rural areas.

Representative Fairclough disclosed that an individual in the City of Fairbanks is more likely to be raped than anywhere else in the nation. Anchorage is number six on that list. The reporting of assaults in these higher population bases tends to lead to increased levels of funding. Thus, while more funding is desired in rural Alaska, the Council is challenged by the limited resources that are available to the support programs throughout the State.

Representative Fairclough communicated that alternative funding opportunities would be welcome. This was the reason grants and grants management issues were included in the list. In her opinion, the Council was "leaving a lot of money on the table at a nationwide level, specifically with the Center for Disease Control and looking at bringing education dollars and prevention dollars into our State."

Representative Fairclough clarified however, that her primary focus when developing this legislation was the task force. The funding issue could be more extensively addressed if the Committee desired. The programs were "certainly under-funded".

9:41:05 AM

Co-Chair Hoffman pointed out that the language in Sec. 2(c)(6), page 3 line 14, simply referenced "compliance to grant

management"; there was no reference to grant allocation. That was his concern.

[9:41:29 AM](#)

Representative Fairclough was unsure whether the task force "could bring more money to the table". They could ask that the Council "be managed and formed in a way that provides the opportunity" for the State, including rural Alaska, to receive more funding. An amendment in this regard would be welcome.

Representative Fairclough considered the issues identified in the bill to be those she "could bring to the House and the Senate with a list of criteria that you could look at to say that this is why we support doing things this way".

Representative Fairclough believed "the funding issue will get politicized". Addressing the funding issue would add complexities, but would not be "inappropriate". While she was willing "to look at making recommendations in regards to allocation", she worried it "might expand" the scope of the bill beyond where she thought success could be achieved in a one year time period.

Representative Fairclough, as the facilitator of the bill, thought success could be achieved were the discussion limited to the seven focus areas identified in the bill.

[9:42:41 AM](#)

Co-Chair Hoffman reminded Representative Fairclough she had "alluded to addressing hard issues". The allocation issue "is one of the hardest and that is not being addressed".

[9:42:55 AM](#)

Senator Dyson considered the issues raised by the Committee and the bill's sponsor to be "valid". In consideration of the approaching adjournment of this Legislative Session, he asked whether not passing the legislation this year would have any detrimental affects.

Representative Fairclough thought that, absent this legislation, the "same fights" would ensue when the issue of reauthorizing the Council came before the Legislature again. The Legislature

would likely reauthorize the Council "for a shorter period of time" based on their position that the Council has not reacted how each body or each individual representative of our State believed that they should do".

Representative Fairclough deemed moving this legislation forward to be important. The fiscal impact of the bill was small in comparison to the benefits that would be gained. Having the support of both the House and the Senate in this effort could allow the funding issue to be addressed. A lack of support from either body would negate the effort to have the task force provide recommendations in one year's time that could be debated for the good of the State.

Representative Fairclough identified her impetus for advancing this legislation, even this late in the Legislative Session, as being the desire to educate the Legislature about the issue, particularly as 25 percent of the people in the House of Representatives this year were new. Even were this legislation not passed this year, it would still put us "ahead of the curve".

[9:45:15 AM](#)

Senator Dyson asked when the Council would next be considered for reauthorization.

Representative Fairclough thought the next reauthorization date was 2010.

Senator Dyson concluded that the intent of this bill was "to empower and direct the Council" to address "issues that have not been adequately dealt with". He asked whether the Council could accomplish that without this legislation.

Representative Fairclough clarified that the goal of this legislation was to generate "buy-in from the political body that reauthorizes" the Council. The task force would develop recommendations that would be debated by both the House and the Senate. The outcome of that effort would be that the Legislature would be advocating the Council "to do the right thing".

Senator Elton asked why there was no client representation on the 15 member Task Force.

Representative Fairclough pointed out that the Task Force would include two members of the private sector appointed by the governor: one would represent a rural community and the other an urban community. One of those individuals would represent victims.

[9:46:41 AM](#)

Senator Elton expressed that the language in question, Sec. 2 subsection (a)(3) page 2 lines 23 through 26, specifies that these individuals must "either be involved with, or have a history of involvement in, the delivery of services to victims of domestic violence and sexual assault". "It doesn't say the acceptance of services."

Representative Fairclough appreciated the observation. The intent is that these individuals either be a victim or someone who receives services. "It can be both." It is common that a person working in this field "had a personal experience" with domestic violence or sexual assault. The language was not intended "to preclude a victim".

[9:47:34 AM](#)

Senator Thomas corrected previous information regarding the next reauthorization date for the Council. It would be in 2011.

Senator Thomas suggested that, in order to better understand reasons for the turnover in the executive director position, previous executive directors should be interviewed.

Representative Fairclough acknowledged that such input would be welcome.

[9:48:19 AM](#)

Senator Olson, noting that the task force would be required to provide a report to the Legislature by March 1, 2008, asked what might occur were the report not provided by April 16, 2008 when the Act establishing the task force would be repealed.

Representative Fairclough asserted that the report would be provided by the date specified in the bill.

Representative Fairclough noted that even if the Task Force was dismantled and the report was incomplete, it would still be presented.

[9:48:51 AM](#)

Co-Chair Stedman directed attention to the five fiscal notes accompanying the bill. The fiscal notes from the Department of Health and Social Services, the Department of Law, and the Legislative Affairs Agency reflect no fiscal impact. The Department of Public Safety and the Department of Corrections reflect fiscal impacts of \$8,000 and \$3,000 respectfully.

[9:49:26 AM](#)

Representative Fairclough informed the Committee that each of the affected departments has agreed "to internalize" travel costs. In order to avoid penalizing the budgets of the Council and the Alaska Network, the expenses for their executive directors would be assumed by the Department of Public Safety.

[9:50:04 AM](#)

Co-Chair Stedman suggested that the costs associated with this effort be revisited in a year, particularly as the cost of traveling to rural communities might increase expenses.

Representative Fairclough clarified that the location of the Task Force meetings would rotate to specific communities in the State. The rural community that would host one of the meetings has not been identified, as the desire is that the task force would make that determination.

Representative Fairclough stated that this bill would provide "a framework" through which the task force could develop recommendations, including those acknowledging the "unique challenge" of providing services to rural Alaska.

[9:51:31 AM](#)

Amendment #1: This amendment deletes language directing the Task Force to consider and make recommendations regarding the geographic location of the council's office, as specified in Sec. 2 subsection (c)(4) on page 3 line 12.

Senator Elton moved Amendment #1.

Co-Chair Stedman objected for purpose of discussion.

Senator Elton repeated his concern that the inclusion of the word "shall" in the language in Sec. 2 subsection (C) tended to mandate the Task Force to address the seven focus items. He would be more comfortable had the word "may" been utilized.

Senator Elton has never heard anyone attribute the Council's employee turnover to the location of the office. Furthermore, concern about the location of the office has never been raised in any audit or by any Council client.

Senator Elton also shared the "philosophical problem" he had with things like this. Recalling that the bill's sponsor had suggested that a change of venue might "expand the pool of potential applicants", he voiced being sensitive "to the notion that we hire people and we do it based on the convenience of those people who may be willing to serve". He was unsure whether that should be "a threshold issue in the hiring of somebody". For these reasons, and specifically because "no one has demonstrated that the location of the office" was a detriment to the Council, he was offering the amendment.

[9:53:31 AM](#)

In response to a question from Co-Chair Stedman, Senator Elton stated that the Council's office was currently located in Juneau.

[9:53:44 AM](#)

Senator Dyson advised that he would be objecting to the amendment because he "trusted" that the task force, with their "expertise and perspective", would conduct "a rational and fair discussion" on the issue.

Co-Chair Stedman removed his objection.

Senator Dyson objected.

[9:54:24 AM](#)

Senator Olson asked whether "a more centralized executive office" location might provide "better coverage and certainly a greater sensitivity" to some of the issues being experienced in the State.

Senator Elton responded that while this might be a legitimate observation in some circumstances, it did not apply in this case "as the Council's function is bureaucratic" rather than one of delivering services to clients. The Council consists of government public servants, most of who currently reside in Juneau, "who are making a decision on the allocation of dollars".

[9:55:33 AM](#)

Senator Olson observed that the majority of the expenses depicted in the fiscal notes were travel related. A more central location might reduce those costs.

[9:55:54 AM](#)

Senator Elton clarified that the expenses depicted in the fiscal notes accompanying the bill were for travel associated with the task force. The location of the Council office would not affect this bill's fiscal notes.

A roll call was taken on the motion.

IN FAVOR: Senator Thomas, Senator Elton, Senator Olson, and Co-Chair Hoffman

OPPOSED: Senator Dyson and Co-Chair Stedman

ABSENT: Senator Huggins

The motion PASSED (4-2-1)

AT EASE: 9:57:06 AM / 9:58:51 AM

Amendment 1 was ADOPTED.

Co-Chair Hoffman moved to report the bill, as amended, from Committee with individual recommendations and accompanying fiscal notes.

Senator Elton objected to thank the bill's sponsor for presenting the bill. He has worked on similar issues for quite some time and appreciated Representative Fairclough's effort to codify such issues in this bill.

Senator Olson, who as a medical professional has worked in hospitals and witnessed the adverse affects of interpersonal violence, also objected to thank the bill's sponsor for presenting the bill.

Both objections were removed.

Without objection, SCS HB 215(FIN) was REPORTED from Committee with five previous fiscal notes: zero fiscal note #1 from Department of Health and Social Services; zero fiscal note #2 from the Department of Law; zero fiscal note #5 from the Legislative Affairs Agency; \$3,000 fiscal note #6 from the Department of Corrections; and \$8,000 fiscal note #7 from the Department of Public Safety.

[10:00:25 AM](#)

#sb111

CS FOR SENATE BILL NO. 111(RES)

"An Act creating the Kodiak Narrow Cape Public Use Area."

This was the first hearing for this bill in the Senate Finance Committee.

Co-Chair Stedman, who previously heard this bill in the Senate Resources Committee, announced that, absent any unexpected issues, the intent today would be to report the bill from Committee.

[10:00:45 AM](#)

DOUG LETCH, Staff to Senator Gary Stevens, the bill's sponsor, displayed a map [copy on file] depicting the location of the 46,000 acre Narrow Cape Public Use Area this legislation would establish on Kodiak Island. This is a popular recreational area in the vicinity of the Alaska Aerospace Development Corporation's Kodiak Island Rocket Launch Facility and a buffalo

range that offers beachcombing, surfing, and numerous other activities.

Mr. Letch stated that the reason for designating this site as a public use area is to preserve it in its current form. This designation would also ensure that the Legislature would be involved in any future decision regarding State land in the area. He reminded the Committee that a few years prior, a University of Alaska lands bill considered State land in the Narrow Cape area. That legislation raised Kodiak Island residents' concern about Legislative decisions about the area and was, in essence, "the impetus" for this bill.

Mr. Letch clarified that the creation of the Narrow Cape Public Use Area would not curtail activities currently being conducted in the vicinity; specifically those associated with the Kodiak Launch Site.

Mr. Letch informed that the bill's sponsor "worked extensively" with the Department of Natural Resources and the Kodiak Island Borough to develop the bill. It is supported by the City of Kodiak, the Kodiak Island Borough, the Alaska Aerospace Development Corporation, and the Department of Natural Resources.

Mr. Letch stated that the bill is accompanied by a zero fiscal note from Department of Natural Resources.

Mr. Letch also noted that Senator Dyson was familiar with the area since he had attended the first rocket launch at the nearby rocket launch site.

Mr. Letch considered this a good bill. The members of the Senate Resources Committee, which included Senator Huggins and Co-Chair Stedman, recognized the intent of the bill.

[10:04:29 AM](#)

SENATOR GARY STEVENS, the bill's sponsor, spoke in favor of the bill. It is supported by the residents of Kodiak Island.

Senator Stevens qualified that even though Kodiak Island is the largest island in the United States, it had limited public use areas. Furthermore, two-thirds of the island has been designated a bear refuge.

Senator Stevens noted that the site being considered in this legislation is a popular recreational area located approximately 50 miles from the City of Kodiak. In addition to the Kodiak Island Rocket Launch site, other nearby special use designations include a buffalo ranch and grazing leases.

10:06:04 AM

Senator Thomas asked the intent of language in Section 1 subsection Sec. 41.23.260(f) page 3 lines 15 -21 regarding "incompatible" use with the area. While understanding there being no intent to curtail current users' activities in the area, some activities must have been deemed incompatible with the area in order for this language to be included.

10:06:46 AM

Mr. Letch deferred to Dick Mylius with the Department of Natural Resources.

10:07:03 AM

DICK MYLIUS, Director, Division of Mining, Land and Water, Department of Natural Resources, testified via teleconference from an offnet location and informed the Committee that at this time, no incompatibility activities have been identified. This language was simply included in the bill in anticipation of future issues or conflicts that might arise.

Mr. Mylius also noted that the bill contained language that provided the Department the option to develop a management plan for the area if deemed necessary. An earlier version of the bill specified that as a mandatory rather than optional provision. The Department does not anticipate any immediate need to develop a land management plan for the area since they had recently completed a Kodiak Area Plan which provided direction on how the island's State land would be managed. This legislation is consistent with the findings in that plan.

10:08:41 AM

Senator Olson asked who would be responsible for maintaining the area were this legislation approved.

Senator Stevens again deferred to Mr. Mylius.

[10:08:52 AM](#)

Mr. Mylius responded that this legislation would not affect how the land would be managed; it would continue to be maintained by the Division of Mining, Land and Water. The bill would simply assure that the land would remain "in public ownership" and that it could "not be disposed of" without Legislative approval.

[10:09:27 AM](#)

Co-Chair Stedman noted the bill was accompanied by a zero fiscal note from Department of Natural Resources.

[10:09:36 AM](#)

Senator Olson asked whether this land designation would affect any private property owners in the area.

Senator Stevens understood there were no private property holdings in the area.

Mr. Letch thought that the land in the area belonged to either the State or the federal government. The nearby buffalo ranch operated on land leased from those entities. Mr. Mylius could confirm the status of the land holdings.

[10:10:18 AM](#)

Mr. Mylius corrected the information. Mr. Burton, the operator of the buffalo ranch, owned a 160 acre parcel of land within the boundaries of the proposed public use area. His land had been purchased from the federal government and was located near the airstrip north of the rocket launch facility, depicted on the map. This land would be unaffected by this legislation since it was considered "an in-holding" and as such would not be included in "the definition of what's included in the public use area". Only State-owned land is subject to this legislation.

[10:10:54 AM](#)

Co-Chair Hoffman inquired how language in Section 1, subsection Sec. 41.23.240(4) page 1 lines 14 and 15, which gave the responsibility of managing surface and subsurface land

activities to the commissioner of the Department of Natural Resources, would affect the public use area; specifically in regards to exploration and mining activities.

Mr. Mylius expressed that mining claims could be staked, explored, and developed in the area and oil and gas leases could be granted. However, the Department did not believe this area held "much potential for minerals" and no oil and gas fields have been identified in the area.

[10:11:54 AM](#)

JEROME SELBY, Mayor, Kodiak Island Borough, testified via teleconference from Kodiak and identified this as being "an important bill for Kodiak, primarily because most of the land adjacent to the Kodiak road system is privately owned. This is the only significant portion of land that's publicly owned that is available for recreation. The area is easily accessible and is heavily used for a variety of recreation activities including berry picking, fishing, surfing, and hiking.

Mr. Selby urged the Committee to recognize the value of this land as a recreational area and support the bill. The community desired to protect this land and not be surprised to learn about potential development plans for it, as was the case a few years prior, when the community read about a proposed State land transfer to the University in the newspaper. This land designation would ensure that any future discussion about land use changes in this area would undergo a public debate within the Legislature.

Co-Chair Hoffman moved to report the bill from Committee with individual recommendations and accompanying fiscal notes.

Without objection, CS SB 111(RES) was REPORTED from Committee with previous zero fiscal note #1 from the Department of Natural Resources.

#

[10:15:16 AM](#)

Co-Chair Stedman conducted housekeeping pertaining to the Committee's afternoon meeting schedule.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Co-Chair Bert Stedman adjourned the meeting at [10:15:44 AM](#).