

HOUSE FINANCE COMMITTEE  
February 12, 2013  
1:34 p.m.

1:34:30 PM

CALL TO ORDER

Co-Chair Stoltze called the House Finance Committee meeting to order at 1:34 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Representative Bill Stoltze, Co-Chair  
Representative Mark Neuman, Vice-Chair  
Representative Mia Costello  
Representative Bryce Edgmon  
Representative Les Gara  
Representative Lindsey Holmes  
Representative Scott Kawasaki, Alternate  
Representative Cathy Munoz  
Representative Steve Thompson  
Representative Tammie Wilson

MEMBERS ABSENT

Representative Alan Austerman, Co-Chair  
Representative David Guttenberg

ALSO PRESENT

Representative Mike Chenault, Sponsor; Representative Mike Hawker, Sponsor; Don Habegar, Director, Division of Corporations, Business, and Professional Licensing, Department of Commerce, Community and Economic Development; Anna Latham, Staff, Representative Kurt Olson.

PRESENT VIA TELECONFERENCE

Jeff Johnson, Certified Public Accountant, Chair, State Board of Accountancy, Fairbanks; David Artzt, Captain, Alaska Marine Pilots, Dutch Harbor; Paul Fuhs, Lobbyist, Southwest Alaska Pilots Association.

SUMMARY

HB 22 BOARD OF MARINE PILOTS

CSHB 22(L&C) was REPORTED out of committee with a "do pass" recommendation and with one new fiscal impact note from the Department of Commerce, Community and Economic Development.

HB 26 EXTEND BOARD OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTANCY

HB 26 was REPORTED out of committee with a "do pass" recommendation and with one previously published zero fiscal note: FN1 (CED).

HB 30 STATE AGENCY PERFORMANCE AUDITS

CSHB 30(FIN) was REPORTED out of Committee with a "do pass" recommendation and with one new fiscal impact note from the Division of Legislative Audit, one new zero fiscal note from Legislative Finance Division, and one new zero fiscal note from the Office of Management and Budget.

#hb30

HOUSE BILL NO. 30

"An Act relating to performance reviews, audits, and termination of executive and legislative branch agencies, the University of Alaska, and the Alaska Court System; and providing for an effective date."

[1:35:40 PM](#)

Co-Chair Stoltze discussed that a pending amendment for HB 30 had been discussed at the prior meeting. He MOVED Amendment 1 in Representative Gara's absence.

Representative Wilson OBJECTED.

Representative Kawasaki asked for an explanation of the amendment.

Co-Chair Stoltze remarked he was stalling for time and made several comments about the amendment. He believed the amendment recognized that cutting budgets was tough.

Representative Gara joined the meeting.

Co-Chair Stoltze asked Representative Gara to address the amendment.

1:38:11 PM

AT EASE

1:38:40 PM

RECONVENED

Representative Gara addressed Amendment 1:

Page 5, following line 21:

Insert a new subsection to read:

"(d) If the agency is not able to identify 10 percent of the general funds in the agency's budget appropriated from the general fund that could be reduced or eliminated using the criteria set out in (c)(2)(A) - (C) of this section, the agency shall identify which programs or elements of programs on the list required under (c)(2) of this section do not meet the criteria set out in (c)(2)(A) - (C) of this section."

Representative Gara directed attention to page 5 of the legislation. He explained that the amendment was intended to provide the public and other legislators with additional information that would enable them to understand the 10 percent budget cut suggestions required by the legislation. He considered the amendment to be friendly. He furthered that without the amendment people would receive a document listing a series of cuts totaling 10 percent of an agency's budget. He expounded that the bill asked agencies to identify items that (A) did not serve a current need, (B) were not authorized by the state's constitution, or (C) were non-essential to the agency's mission. He stated that if agencies could not find cuts under items (A) through (C) they were directed to find cuts in low priority services. The amendment specified that the report issued by consultants should identify which of the standards the cuts met. He referred to an opposition argument that the amendment was unnecessary because the report would already recognize which of the standards the proposed cuts met. He countered that it may or may not; the amendment would require it to do so. He emphasized that the amendment would allow the public to see why the cut had been recommended.

He added that the amendment would ensure that agencies knew why they had chosen the cuts they had.

1:41:59 PM

Representative Wilson expressed opposition to Amendment 1 and noted it had also been heard in a subcommittee meeting. She was concerned that cuts may not always fit into one distinct category. She believed the point of the exercise was to identify proposed cuts based on the language outlined in the bill. She opined that providing further detail on why something had or had not been proposed for cuts could be confusing.

Representative Costello spoke against the amendment. She believed that the amendment weakened the legislation's intention to ask some very difficult questions. She stressed that the legislature, departments, agencies, and the public would all be asking tough questions. She was concerned that allowing the "out" would avoid the difficult conversation. She had learned there would be opportunities for public testimony. She stressed that working collectively would help determine ways to move forward in a less certain budget situation. She appreciated the amendment's recognition that the process would not be easy for anyone.

1:44:02 PM

Vice-Chair Neuman surmised that the amendment would allow an agency to opt out of recommending 10 percent cuts if it could not meet the criteria under (c)(2)(A). He believed that public notice had been addressed. He pointed to language that had been added in subcommittee (page 2, lines 5 through 8) related to the results of the review and providing information to the Legislative Budget and Audit Committee (LB&A). He stated that the public would be aware of the results when the audit was released.

Representative Gara asserted that Amendment 1 was not intended to have the result discussed by Vice-Chair Neuman. He explained that the amendment still required agencies to identify 10 percent cuts. He stated that under the legislation an agency would first look for items outlined in (c)(2)(A) through (C) on page 5; if cuts could not be found under the three categories the agency was required to find other cuts (page 5, lines 9 and 10). He stressed that

the amendment would only require the disclosure of where the cuts had come from; the disclosure would enable the public to understand how the cuts had been identified by auditors. He emphasized that the amendment would not change the 10 percent requirement in the legislation.

Representative Thompson referred to page 5, lines 20 and 21 and read from the bill: "...including agency mission, results-based measures, prioritization of core services, and all programs within the core services from the most important to the least important."

Representative Thompson concluded that the provision requiring the information to be submitted to the legislature [page 5, lines 18 through 21] would likely show where the proposed cuts had come from.

Co-Chair Stoltze opined that the amendment provided an "out" because it did not direct agencies to find the 10 percent cuts. He stated that the bill only required agencies to make a recommendation; it did not mandate that the legislature had to follow the recommendations. He saw nothing wrong with asking agencies to designate the cuts and noted that agencies could include a narrative if they believed the cuts were not efficacious. He reiterated that he was uncomfortable giving agencies an out from identifying the cuts.

[1:50:20 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE MIKE CHENAULT, SPONSOR, opposed the amendment. He clarified that the review committee did not make recommendations for agency cuts; departments would make recommendations to the committee. He believed that if department's could not locate the 10 percent cuts they would have the ability to provide a narrative explaining why they believed items were essential to their budget. He understood the concerns, but believed departments would provide commentary on the impact cuts would have on their current budgets.

Co-Chair Stoltze remarked that he agreed with the sentiment he had seen on a sign that stated: "if it's in the yellow pages why is government doing it?"

Representative Kawasaki voiced support for Amendment 1. He observed that if an agency was not able to make cuts

specified in (c)(2) (A) through (C) they would have to justify the remaining cuts. He believed the information would help the review team and the legislature to determine if the cuts were feasible.

Representative Gara agreed that Co-Chair Stoltze's concern was valid, but stressed that the amendment did not provide an out to agencies. He clarified that the amendment did not alter the bill's intent; it only had to do with the commentary included in the report. He elaborated that the amendment would require disclosure of where the cuts had come from (either from (c)(2) (A) through (C) or from the lowest priority services in the agency). He emphasized that the amendment would not change the consultants' proposals. He communicated that the amendment's purpose was to provide information to the public.

[1:55:36 PM](#)

Representative Chenault underscored that the review team would not be responsible for identifying the 10 percent cuts; agencies would be in charge of bringing cuts forward to the review team.

Representative Wilson MAINTAINED her OBJECTION.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion.

IN FAVOR: Gara, Kawasaki

OPPOSED: Costello, Edgmon, Holmes, Munoz, Neuman, Thompson, Wilson, Stoltze

The MOTION FAILED (8/2).

Representative Costello addressed the bill's three fiscal notes. The first was a zero note from the Office of Management and Budget. The second note from the Division of Legislative Audit included \$642,300 for three positions in FY 13, zero fiscal impact for FY 14, \$1,351,900 for three positions in FY 15, \$1,198,900 for three positions in FY 16, \$1,324,900 for three positions in FY 17, and \$1,177,900 per year for three positions in FY 18 and FY 19.

[1:58:35 PM](#)

Representative Costello relayed that the last note had zero fiscal impact and was from the Division of Legislative Audit.

Co-Chair Stoltze communicated that the fiscal notes had been discussed at the prior meeting. The notes addressed the issue of potential contracting.

Vice-Chair Neuman MOVED to report CSHB 30(FIN) out of Committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying fiscal notes. There being NO OBJECTION, it was so ordered.

CSHB 30(FIN) was REPORTED out of Committee with a "do pass" recommendation and with one new fiscal impact note from Division of Legislative Audit, one new zero fiscal note from Legislative Finance Division, and one new zero fiscal note from the Office of Management and Budget.

[1:59:52 PM](#)

AT EASE

[2:00:27 PM](#)

RECONVENED

#hb26

HOUSE BILL NO. 26

"An Act extending the termination date of the Board of Public Accountancy; and providing for an effective date."

[2:00:37 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE MIKE HAWKER, SPONSOR, relayed that HB 26 extended the termination date for the Board of Public Accountancy to June 30, 2021. He explained that the legislature routinely designated sunset dates for boards and commissions; prior to the sunset date the board or commission was reviewed through the legislative budget and audit process to ensure that its services continued to be needed. The bill was supported by legislative audit work conducted the prior summer; the auditor had determined that the board's termination date should be extended to June 30, 2021; that it was operating in the public's interest; and that it had exercised appropriate regulatory oversight of public accountants. He communicated that the audit

expressed one concern related to the overall operations of the case management system of the Division of Corporations, Business, and Professional Licensing (CBPL). The fiscal note would continue to fund the board at its current level with receipt supported services. He explained that the funds were taken from the regulated community for the purpose of administrating its professional licensing board.

[2:03:18 PM](#)

Co-Chair Stoltze asked CBPL to provide detail on the concerns from its perspective.

DON HABEGAR, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF CORPORATIONS, BUSINESS, AND PROFESSIONAL LICENSING, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, addressed the issue of concern outlined in the audit. He explained that a new database had been installed into investigations; the database had some issues in the installation and conversion process that had been caught by a 2011 special audit. The division had addressed the issue by generating a task-force including a database specialist and the division's own investigators and information technology staff. The task-force had come out with a number of recommendations to fix the issues. He elaborated that CBPL had asked the legislature for a special appropriation to pay for incurred costs related to the task-force. The division was currently implementing the fixes; the software writing was anticipated to be completed in draft form by April 1, 2013. The division would have 60-plus days of testing to ensure that the system was working correctly and the final fixes were scheduled for completion by the end of June 2013.

[2:06:08 PM](#)

Co-Chair Stoltze discussed that most boards were self-supporting, self-assessed, and that legislative affirmed board members set policies. He referred to discussions that the professional wishes had been side tracked related to the use of funds. He asked for clarification on the issue.

Mr. Habegar had heard from the boards that they wanted the increased ability to travel to out-of-state meetings. He shared that AS Title 8 included approximately 40 professional licensing programs; 20 of the programs had boards and 20 had department oversight. The boards generally belonged to national professional associations

that helped to steer the profession in various states. The Alaska boards liked to be part of the discussions, given that national associations set policies that had national and state impacts. The division had approximately \$400,000 in travel authority in FY 13 (the governor's proposed FY 13 request had been \$550,000). He had devised a system that included travel to all in-state meetings, which were statutorily required. He had carved out a portion of the funds for administrative purposes (e.g. his travel to Anchorage to "steer" staff). He communicated that out-of-state travel was parceled out of remaining funds.

[2:08:34 PM](#)

Representative Costello asked whether the division planned to provide licensees with online visibility in regards to how their fees were spent. She supported the idea.

Mr. Habegar answered that the division had been working on bringing its accounts up to speed; it had conducted a 10-year review of all the boards' revenue and expense reports and had reconciled the reports to the state accounting system. He furthered that quarterly reports were reconciled to the state accounting system and were provided to the boards. He believed putting the reports online was a good suggestion and the division would take it into consideration.

REPRESENTATIVE STEVE THOMPSON, SPONSOR pointed to a reconciliation showing excess funds carried forward by the Board of Accountancy, which showed \$147,000 accumulated in its account. He observed that the board's request to send two CPAs to the national conference had been denied because it had not fit in the budget; however, there was \$147,000 in the board's account. He asked if there should be two line items in the budget for department travel and for pre-paid professional board travel. He thought the distinction may prevent the misconception that general funds were being saved when the travel budget was cut. He discussed that other boards had used state travel funds for national conferences; subsequently, the funds were reimbursed, but instead of going back into the board's travel account, the funds were deposited into the state's general fund. He was concerned that the issue was creating a problem and wondered about a solution.

[2:11:41 PM](#)

Mr. Habegar replied that he had spoken with all 20 boards about the issue at some point in time. He felt that the \$400,000 provided by the legislature could not be overspent even if the division collected other revenue sources. For example, professionals paid licensing fees on a biennial basis; two years of revenue was typically collected in advance of two years of expenses; therefore, a program could have a surplus at any one time. He expounded that programs may have a carryover if expenses came in as less than revenue; after analysis by the division, the carryover may be used to reduce fees or to pay for additional anticipated expenses (i.e. for a court case or other).

Mr. Habegar addressed the second part of Representative Thompson's question related to third-party reimbursement for travel. He relayed that state policy required the division to show the costs on revenue expense reports. He agreed that the incurred expenses records should be public; therefore the division paid for the travel up front. He confirmed that when third-parties (e.g. national organizations) reimbursed for travel expenses the money was deposited into the general fund.

[2:14:36 PM](#)

Representative Thompson found it hard to believe that board members paying into a travel account were denied out-of-state travel and that instead the division recommended reducing fees when excess revenue accrued from licensing fees. He saw confusion arising because licensees were not able to use the money designated for travel. He asserted that pre-paid professional travel fees should be separated from the department's general fund expenditures.

Representative Hawker had met with members of the Corporations Board who claimed that they had been granted insufficient spending authority for the receipt supported services (RSS) funds collected in aggregate for all of the state's boards and commissions. The issue resulted in the agency's need to ration the amount of RSS funds that were collected from each of the boards. Additionally, boards or commissions (paying their own way through RSS) were prevented from accessing all of the money that was assessed and taken by the state. He asserted that the practice was "confiscation and impoundment" of money paid by self-supporting organizations into the state's custody who

expected it to be available for the operation of their boards and commissions. He agreed that the practice was tantamount to theft if the agency did not have authority to spend its money. He noted that the issue was scheduled to be discussed in subcommittee. He emphasized that the funds came from RSS and not the general fund.

Representative Hawker recommended that in the case of third-party reimbursement for travel, the operating budget language section should specify that an appropriation for RSS includes the monetary appropriation and any reimbursement of funds from national organizations. He stressed that the solution was very simple. He asked the committee to consider ensuring that the legislature authorized the spending of all money taken from Alaska's citizens and that the state was not stealing travel money from the organizations.

[2:19:18 PM](#)

Co-Chair Stoltze believed the discussion point was appropriate.

Representative Hawker noted that the conversation pertained to an operation of the board of corporations and public licensing; it had nothing to do with HB 26 and the reauthorization of the Board of Accountancy.

Representative Gara asked for verification that the Board of Accountancy's operations were paid for by membership fees and not with general fund dollars. Mr. Habegar replied in the affirmative.

Representative Gara asked if travel money had been held back due to a dispute (within the profession) that more money should be spent on investigation and less on travel. Mr. Habegar answered in the negative. He furthered that investigations were fully funded with fee supported services. The issue pertained to travel authorization.

Representative Gara asked how long the proposed extension was.

Co-Chair Stoltze responded that the audit recommendation was for an eight-year extension.

Representative Gara read the last sentence of a one-page Division of Legislative Audit document (copy on file): "The noted deficiencies hamper the division's ability to provide adequate investigative support to the board." He believed the statement warranted concern. He wondered if the deficiency should be fixed prior to granting the extension.

2:22:03 PM

Representative Hawker argued that waiting to grant the extension would be "punishing the innocent and letting the guilty go free." He stated that AS 08.03.020(c) allowed the legislature to extend the board's termination date for up to eight years. He accentuated that the problem noted in the Division of Legislative Audit document had nothing to do with the operation of the Board of Public Accountancy; it had to do with a larger unsolved problem within CBPL. He relayed that the time and work put into the sunset authorizations by the legislative auditor was significant; the authorizations additionally were expensive and required substantial "man power" that took away from the division's ability to pursue other requests (particularly special audits requested by legislators). He believed the Board of Public Accountancy had sufficiently demonstrated that it merited the 8-year extension. He stated that the problem identified lay with CBPL; a special audit related to the problems had been released by the Legislative Budget and Audit Committee on June 29, 2011. He acknowledged that CBPL had been working diligently to resolve the issues. He believed the division needed to be working with the legislature to resolve the budget issues and to continue work with legislative oversight to remedy its internal operation problems.

2:25:15 PM

Co-Chair Stoltze remarked that the Professional Licensing Board had done a good job making improvements over the past several years. He added that in the past there had been some "wild audit reports" that had been highly frustrating.

Vice-Chair Neuman asked whether there were any repetitive issues brought to the Board of Public Accountancy by its members. Mr. Habegar replied that there were issues, but they were part of the normal course of business for a professional board (e.g. granting licenses, determining whether licensing violations had occurred, regulation of

the profession, and other); the board handled the issues on a quarterly basis. He furthered that the board was busy with routine business. He did not see any anomalies before the board.

Co-Chair Stoltze OPENED public testimony.

JEFF JOHNSON, CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANT and CHAIR, STATE BOARD of ACCOUNTANCY, FAIRBANKS (via teleconference), appreciated the discussion. He had been on the board for several years and had learned from other members that the investigative process had been greatly improved in the past couple of years. He believed the board was headed in the right direction and mentioned the improved reporting system that should be operational in the spring of 2013. He stated that in the past there had been a problem with the timeliness of investigations and protection of the public's interest. He reiterated that the board felt it was headed in the right direction.

[2:28:40 PM](#)

Co-Chair Stoltze asked if Mr. Johnson supported the legislation. Mr. Johnson replied in the affirmative.

Co-Chair Stoltze CLOSED public testimony.

Representative Costello discussed the fiscal note from the Department of Commerce, Community and Economic Development for receipt services in the annual amount of \$161,700 for FY 14 through FY 19 and one full-time position.

Vice-Chair Neuman MOVED to REPORT HB 26 out of committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying fiscal note.

Representative Gara OBJECTED for discussion. He made a remark about an "attorney barb" and WITHDREW his OBJECTION.

Representative Hawker commented that he would come before the committee during session with an Alaska Bar Association reauthorization bill.

There being NO further OBJECTION, HB 26 was REPORTED out of committee with a "do pass" recommendation and with one previously published zero fiscal note: FN1 (CED).

2:31:11 PM

AT EASE

2:33:11 PM

RECONVENED

#hb22

HOUSE BILL NO. 22

"An Act extending the termination date of the Board of Marine Pilots; and providing for an effective date."

2:33:15 PM

ANNA LATHAM, STAFF, REPRESENTATIVE KURT OLSON, discussed that HB 22 would extend the termination date of the Board of Marine Pilots (BMP) to June 30, 2019. She stated that in accordance with AS Titles 24 and 44 the board was set to expire on June 30, 2013. She relayed that the Legislative Budget and Audit Committee had determined that the board should be extended because its activities demonstrated a public need and it operated in an efficient manner. She stated that regulating and licensing qualified marine pilots benefited the public's safety and welfare and protected the marine environment. She explained that HB 22 had been pre-filed with an estimated extension date of June 30, 2018. She furthered that after reviewing the audit Representative Olson had requested a CS to align the termination date with the date suggested in the audit.

Vice-Chair Neuman MOVED to ADOPT the Labor and Commerce Committee CS. There being NO OBJECTION, it was so ordered.

Representative Thompson referred to a Division of Legislative Audit document (copy on file) and read its recommendation: "While the board has successfully resolved many of the issues identified in the prior sunset audit, current analysis of BMP operational activities showed administrative deficiencies regarding public meeting notifications, licensing documentation, and oversight of the pilot associations' drug and alcohol programs." He wondered whether measures had been taken to rectify the issues.

Ms. Latham replied that at the time of the audit in November 2011 the marine pilot coordinator who oversees the mentioned issues had been in his position for under one

year; he had been unaware of the operational deficiencies noted in the audit. Subsequently, the board was developing a desk manual and written procedure to codify needed primary functions. She detailed that the coordinator was developing appropriate documentation and checklists to ensure that an adequate oversight process was in place.

2:37:02 PM

Co-Chair Stoltze asked about the length of the board's prior sunset extension. Ms. Latham responded that the board had been extended in 2007.

Co-Chair Stoltze asked Mr. Habegar for any comments on the audit conclusions. Mr. Habegar answered that the previous marine pilot coordinator had departed from the position with little notice; it had put the board in a bind and subsequently items had been noted in the audit that occurred while the new coordinator had been in training. He believed the recommendation was appropriate. As a result, the board was implementing administrative backstops. For example, one of the issues involved providing ample public notice for board meetings.

Co-Chair Stoltze asked whether was any challenge getting board members together. Mr. Habegar replied that the only challenge had to do with meeting during the height of the summer maritime season when special issues arose (e.g. investigative issues requiring board input). He communicated that teleconferencing normally solved the issue.

Co-Chair Stoltze wondered if Alaska's entry into Arctic waters and the role of marine pilots had been a board discussion point. Mr. Habegar affirmed that the board had discussed Arctic access, but he had not seen any final conclusions.

2:40:13 PM

Representative Munoz asked for an explanation of yacht fees that appeared in the revenues and expenditures budget breakdown from 2007 to 2012. Mr. Habegar replied that foreign pleasure crafts of a certain tonnage or length were statutorily required to have a pilot. A waiver was possible, but certain fees payable to the state were required.

Representative Munoz asked if the yacht fees were applicable to vessels of a certain size. Mr. Habegar believed the requirement applied to foreign pleasure craft vessels between 75 feet and 150 feet.

Representative Munoz asked for verification that the fee structure was biennial. Mr. Habegar answered in the affirmative. He noted that all of the state's professional licensing programs were biennial.

Representative Munoz asked for the fee amount. Mr. Habegar replied that the biennial pilot fee was \$2,500 and the ship agent fee was \$800.

Representative Gara asked what percentage of marine pilots were Alaskans. Mr. Habegar responded that he would follow up on the question.

Representative Gara observed that the board oversaw trainings and approved training programs for marine pilots. He wondered if the board had considered doing anything that would increase the number of Alaskan pilots. Mr. Habegar was not aware of any board action that would require Alaska hire of pilots.

Representative Gara noted that Alaska hire would probably be illegal. He surmised the training function would be the only avenue to explore that could increase the number of Alaskan pilots; he asked for the department to follow up with the board on the issue. He requested the percentage of Alaskan and non-Alaskan marine pilots. He would like to see the positions filled with more Alaskans, given that the jobs were good and high paying.

Co-Chair Stoltze remarked that it would also be good to know how many marine pilots were Alaskans who had moved out-of-state.

[2:44:49 PM](#)

DAVID ARTZT, CAPTAIN, ALASKA MARINE PILOTS, DUTCH HARBOR (via teleconference), described his marine pilot service region. He was happy to answer any questions.

Co-Chair Stoltze asked about Alaska's entry into Arctic waters and the role of marine pilots in safety issues. He

wondered about federal government requirement. Mr. Artzt replied that currently statutes required state-licensed pilots onboard specific vessels within the state's boundaries (typically within three miles of the coastline). Federal waters were overseen by the U.S. Coast Guard. He stated that any activity within state water boundaries fell under current regulations requiring pilots on vessels.

[2:47:17 PM](#)

Representative Edgmon referred to the Northern Waters Task-Force that had provided its report to the legislature the prior year. He noted that marine pilots had not been included in the final report; however, members had been supportive of marine pilots' involvement in areas like the Arctic.

PAUL FUHS, LOBBYIST, SOUTHWEST ALASKA PILOTS ASSOCIATION (via teleconference), voiced support for the bill.

Co-Chair Stoltze CLOSED public testimony. He asked if there were any amendments.

Representative Costello pointed out that the first line on page 2 of the DCCED fiscal note should be corrected to read June 30, 2019 instead of 2018. The fiscal note included receipt services in the annual amount of \$151,200 for FY 14 through FY 19 and one full-time position.

[2:50:49 PM](#)

Vice-Chair Neuman MOVED to REPORT CSHB 22(L&C) out of committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying fiscal note. There being NO OBJECTION, it was so ordered.

CSHB 22(L&C) was REPORTED out of committee with a "do pass" recommendation and with one new fiscal impact note from the Department of Commerce, Community and Economic Development.

Co-Chair Stoltze discussed the schedule for the following day.

#  
ADJOURNMENT

[2:52:17 PM](#)

The meeting was adjourned at 2:52 p.m.