

**ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
HOUSE STATE AFFAIRS STANDING COMMITTEE**

March 13, 2014

8:06 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Representative Bob Lynn, Chair
Representative Wes Keller, Vice Chair
Representative Lynn Gattis
Representative Shelley Hughes
Representative Doug Isaacson
Representative Jonathan Kreiss-Tomkins

MEMBERS ABSENT

Representative Charisse Millett

COMMITTEE CALENDAR

HOUSE BILL NO. 310

"An Act relating to the selection and duties of delegates to a United States constitutional convention."

- HEARD & HELD

PREVIOUS COMMITTEE ACTION

BILL: HB 310

SHORT TITLE: U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION DELEGATES

SPONSOR(S): REPRESENTATIVE(S) T.WILSON

02/17/14	(H)	READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
02/17/14	(H)	STA
03/13/14	(H)	STA AT 8:00 AM CAPITOL 106

WITNESS REGISTER

REPRESENTATIVE TAMMIE WILSON

Alaska State Legislature

Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: As prime sponsor, presented HB 310.

MIKE COONS, Regional Director

Citizen Initiatives

Palmer, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified during the hearing on HB 310.

ACTION NARRATIVE

8:06:28 AM

CHAIR BOB LYNN called the House State Affairs Standing Committee meeting to order at 8:06 a.m. Representatives Keller, Gattis, Isaacson, Hughes, Kreiss-Tomkins, and Lynn were present at the call to order.

HB 310-U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION DELEGATES

8:06:33 AM

CHAIR LYNN announced that the only order of business was HOUSE BILL NO. 310, "An Act relating to the selection and duties of delegates to a United States constitutional convention."

8:07:03 AM

REPRESENTATIVE TAMMIE WILSON, Alaska State Legislature, as prime sponsor, introduced HB 310. She indicated that the proposed legislation would address the calling of a convention of the states, based on three issues. She said she had been asked how she could prevent a runaway convention and how the issue of delegates could be addressed, and she said HB 310 outlines both issues.

REPRESENTATIVE T. WILSON said under HB 310, no matter how many delegates are sent, there would be only one vote for each state. Further, [the delegates] would not be paid for their service. The states would direct their delegates in what to do and could dismiss them for not following the directive.

8:08:38 AM

CHAIR LYNN asked if expenses the delegate incurred for hotel and transportation would be covered.

REPRESENTATIVE T. WILSON answered that that provision was not in the proposed legislation; however, she said that is something the committee could consider adding. She then brought attention to a handout [included in the committee packet], which shows examples of what other states have done. In response to a follow-up question from Chair Lynn, she confirmed that the matter of individual compensation would be up to individual states. She said the decision could be made at any time. She

pointed out that because HB 310 would not, as currently drafted, provide for compensation, the result would be a zero fiscal note. She emphasized that it would be completely up to the states what the delegates would be allowed to do. She said the violation penalty for a delegate who did not follow the state's directive could be a Class C felony. She said she was not sure the penalty should be so strict, since anyone convicted of a Class C felony would no longer be allowed to vote. She emphasized that the process for calling a convention would be taken seriously, with parameters set.

REPRESENTATIVE T. WILSON brought attention back to the aforementioned handout, and she pointed out that of the states listed, South Dakota and West Virginia only appear under the examples of limitation of authority of delegates, violation penalties, and compensation, because they do not have legislation related to delegate qualifications. For those states that do set out delegate qualifications, she said the qualifications are similar, especially when establishing what the states do not want to allow.

[8:11:13 AM](#)

CHAIR LYNN expressed concern that the lengthiness of a convention could preclude anyone who was not independently wealthy from serving. He opined that the state should not discriminate in choosing delegates based on how much money they are able to afford for travel and meals.

REPRESENTATIVE T. WILSON reiterated that the committee could include language in the proposed bill to allow decisions to be made at the time of the convention when more details about the convention would be available.

[8:12:24 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE ISAACSON asked if the bill sponsor was saying that language related to compensation could be added to page 2, line 18, which addresses the instructions that would be given to delegates.

REPRESENTATIVE T. WILSON responded, "I think what we might want to do is take it out and let that be determined at the time. If we don't address whether they're compensated or not, that would leave that discretion totally up to the legislature when they're doing that."

REPRESENTATIVE ISAACSON directed attention to page 2, line 15, which read, "(e) Delegates and alternate delegates serve without compensation." He said that may be taken at face value, and the legislature may not determine compensation. He said he thinks "we need to change it somewhere." He directed attention to language in subsection (c), on page 3, lines [1-3], which read as follows:

(c) A delegate appointed under AS 15.50.120(a) or (c) who casts or attempts to cast a vote at a United States constitutional convention that is not authorized by the instructions the legislature provided".

REPRESENTATIVE ISAACSON asked, "So, is it our intent to, at that time, allow the legislature to allow any refinements, any clarifications of the language, because we know that they're not going to be able to exactly cast a vote?"

REPRESENTATIVE T. WILSON answered that it would be up to the legislature to decide how exacting to be and whether to allow the delegates to have discussions on one topic, but not another. In response to a question, she said some states have expressed that they would send two delegates, while others have not stated how many they would send. She said the decision to compensate a full per diem may influence how many delegates would be sent. She said some states plan to send sitting legislators, who already receive compensation. She said because only one vote per state would be allowed, it may be too difficult for delegates to come to a consensus if there are too many of them. She said she thinks Alaska would send a small number of delegates, but she wanted to leave that decision up to the legislature.

[8:16:31 AM](#)

CHAIR LYNN ventured that there should be more than one delegate, so that they could consult with each other.

REPRESENTATIVE T. WILSON concurred. She indicated that it would behoove the state to have a backup delegate who could be ready to fly to the convention if the delegate at the convention committed a violation and was sent home.

[8:17:04 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HUGHES asked if under HB 310, the state could pass a resolution to allow an added topic of discussion at the convention.

REPRESENTATIVE T. WILSON confirmed that is correct.

[8:18:52 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER indicated that he would like to delete the previously cited language of "subsection (e), on line 15, page 2," so that "the compensation question would be unstated rather than denied."

REPRESENTATIVE T. WILSON concurred. She stated her belief that taking the language out would generate a conversation about reimbursement.

[8:20:14 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE ISAACSON offered his understanding that the recommendation had been to delete all of [subsection] (e), and he made a suggestion as follows:

I like the words that you've got on page 3, and just use that again on page 2, line 15, where we say "compensation for delegates and alternate delegates shall be determined by joint resolution under 15.50.130(a)," which basically says: "Before the date established for convening a United States constitutional convention, the legislature shall, by joint resolution, provide instructions", et cetera. And so, at that time just lump it into that joint resolution.

REPRESENTATIVE ISAACSON asked if that would follow the sponsor's intent.

[8:21:07 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE T. WILSON answered that would work.

[8:21:19 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE T. WILSON, in response to Chair Lynn, offered a sectional analysis. She said Section 1(a) states that delegates and alternate delegates to a constitutional convention would have to be: qualified voters, residents of the state for at

least three years preceding the appointment, and not members of the U.S. House of Representatives or Senate. She indicated that Section 1(b) relates to a joint resolution [appointing and U.S. Representative or Senator to Alaska as observer of the constitutional convention], which she noted must be called by a two-thirds vote in order to happen. Section 1(c) would allow the legislature to recall and replace delegates or observers by joint resolution. Section 1(d) sets forth the procedures of a convention.

REPRESENTATIVE T. WILSON stated that starting on page 2, line 16, the duties of the delegates are listed, including that they would take an oath of office and could be charged with a felony if they do not abide by the rules. Subsection (c) states that under HB 310, a delegate who attempts to cast an unauthorized vote would be in violation of oath, voided as a delegate, and immediately removed and replaced. She said she left the felony language in the bill for the committee to see, but would be fine with it removed. She opined that a felony might be a harsh penalty for someone who has made the sacrifice to take part in the convention; however, it is a serious matter to hold such a convention to consider a change to the Constitution of the United States.

[8:24:00 AM](#)

CHAIR LYNN asked where most of the language of the bill originated.

REPRESENTATIVE T. WILSON answered most of the language came from the State of Indiana. She pointed to a handout in the committee packet showing Indiana's legislation. She then related that the remaining portion of HB 310 contains the language that would allow the Class C felony as a penalty. She indicated that she has heard concern from other legislators about not allowing individuals to determine why they are at a convention, but instead ensuring that the delegate(s) chosen by the legislature represent that body's intent. She reminded the committee that "there has never been one of these called before," and one reason may be because of the difficulty of change itself. She talked about federal overreach coming into everyday life, to the point that her constituents are reaching out to her about the issue. She indicated that the overreach is not just happening in terms of resource development and the land owned by the federal government, but also regarding power plants, how the land is utilized, and water usage, among other issues. She said, "So, I think you're going to see a different motivation

that hasn't been there before." She opined that the Founding Fathers would not have put in place the means to call a constitutional convention if they had not wanted future governments to utilize it. At the same time, she emphasized, it is important for everyone to enter into a convention with the same intent and with the same parameters set.

[8:27:22 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE ISAACSON offered his understanding that "this is actually the ... forty-first time a convention of states has been called." He recounted that prior to the Constitution, there had been conventions of state, but the Commonwealth of Virginia was the first to call it a convention of states in 1789. He ventured that what the sponsor was saying was that none of the previous times have "never resulted in an actual convention." He said it would be instructive to learn "how did they in that time deal with those who did not vote?" He expressed concern with keeping the felony as punishment, because it could result from an "honest disagreement," and the delegate would probably serve time in jail, would lose his/her right to vote, and may have difficulty finding a job. He acknowledged that it is an important issue, but said he is not sure it deserves the consequence of calling it a felony.

REPRESENTATIVE T. WILSON reiterated she had no problem with changing the language to just removing the delegate, but wanted to show the gamut of possibilities. She said there had not been a convention of states since "the Article 5 portion has been put in." She said there have been resolutions that have been passed on various issues asking for [a convention], but not 34 states coming together to request one. She concluded, "This is much different than any other convention that many people have experienced."

[8:30:57 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE GATTIS questioned whether there is a penalty for those who cast electoral votes for President other than they have been directed.

REPRESENTATIVE T. WILSON said she does not know.

REPRESENTATIVE GATTIS opined that there should be severe consequences for someone who represents all Alaska and agrees to vote for the state but goes "off the reservation."

CHAIR LYNN said he thinks Representative Gattis' question about penalties related to electoral votes was a good one, and said he would like to know what the consequences are, because they could be a guideline.

8:32:52 AM

REPRESENTATIVE HUGHES said she believes it should be a severe consequence, because it could be one vote that makes a difference. She noted that other states have the felony penalty in place. She said she was having trouble picturing how one delegate "might go off" in voting if there were, for example, five delegates sent.

REPRESENTATIVE T. WILSON responded that it would be one vote, and all five people would be "giving that vote on that." Therefore, she said it would not be possible to distinguish "who went off the reservation," because "you couldn't judge it until the amendment was actually brought forward from that group as the one vote."

REPRESENTATIVE HUGHES asked if all five delegates would be punished with a felony for the single unauthorized vote.

REPRESENTATIVE T. WILSON answered yes, because there would not be a distinction unless the legislature set up one, for example, by appointing one of the five as the leader. She said the legislature might want to determine ahead of time that it would send only one or two delegates so there would not be the situation of someone in charge deviating from the plan who "gets someone to go a different direction."

REPRESENTATIVE HUGHES expressed concerned there may be five delegates and "two totally disagreed, but ... the three went and voted against, and then the two who weren't in agreement got a felony." She said that needs to be addressed. She noted that under HB 310, observers from Congress could be sent, and she questioned whether there could be some observers from the state sent, along with one or two delegates from Alaska.

REPRESENTATIVE T. WILSON answered as follows:

In most of the documents we've read, for whatever reason they were sending just one. Now, whether that is because they're already talking about a lot of people and there's no limit on how many delegates - that may have been why the one was there. I don't

think there's a number on alternates, you know, you might be able to do that versus observers on it, ... but I think you made a good point that limiting the number of delegates you have, especially if you want to keep what happens pretty severe, is a very good choice to go with.

REPRESENTATIVE HUGHES concluded that "all of that" would be decided at the point that the legislature put together a resolution with instructions. She pointed to language on page 2, beginning on line 10, which read as follows:

(d) If a rule or procedure established by a constitutional convention called by a two-thirds vote of the state legislatures under art. V, Constitution of the United States, is different than the procedure established under this section, selection of the delegates shall comply with the rule or procedure established by the constitutional convention, and the delegates shall comply with AS 15.50.130.

REPRESENTATIVE HUGHES next pointed to the language on page 3, which states that the vote would be voided if the delegate voted against instructions. She asked, "What would happen if, at the convention, they would make a rule that said no votes would be voided? Or could they ... make that rule at the convention?"

REPRESENTATIVE T. WILSON said she thinks they could make any rules they want at the convention; however, the delegates would still be under the rules that were set up for them in Alaska. If there was a conflict between the two, it could result in their not being able to do anything at the convention. She emphasized that the state's instructions would be "first and foremost."

REPRESENTATIVE HUGHES offered her understanding that that is not what is stated on the aforementioned language on page 2, beginning on line 10.

REPRESENTATIVE T. WILSON responded as follows:

Let's just say that we were given a specific amendment; this amendment was something different that the convention brought up, and the delegate decided to say yes when the instruction was no. They would break what they were sent for. But you're right, I think that's why the Class C felony is, is because it could

count. The vote could count if they did, and if it was that vote that got to 34. Again, that's why you would want to make sure there was something harsh, so that people knew that if they went down that road what would happen.

The other portion of it is that if that got passed because that happened - because that happened to be the one vote that ... killed it, the scale - those amendments still have to come back to the state, where 38 would have to ratify it; Alaska would already be a no at that point, because they had sent a portion of it. So, I don't think you could void out their vote on the convention, because you are not in control of the convention; you're in control of the delegate. And again, that's why you want to make sure the delegates are very clear on what can happen if they - as Representative Gattis said - go "off the reservation."

REPRESENTATIVE HUGHES said it is difficult to imagine how it would all play out. She questioned whether there should be a plan in place to remove Alaska from participation if something happened at the constitutional convention that Alaska did not support.

REPRESENTATIVE T. WILSON said Alaska could pull out at any point. She indicated that the main concern is the choosing of delegates, as well as clarifying that the delegates could go to the convention with "these amendments, versus these issues." She said breaking it down to an issue can go a lot further. She talked about clarity having impact. She cautioned against [just] pulling out one person from the convention, instead of replacing the person, because the state would no longer be part of the discussion. She said there are a lot of "what-ifs," and she understands the concern is real. She stated, "But at the same time, sometimes you have to ... take those, to go down that road, because without it you can't make change."

REPRESENTATIVE HUGHES suggested there may be a circumstance in which Alaska would want to pull out of the convention, if it did not agree with the course of the convention and its one vote would make the difference in the two-thirds vote requirement. She offered her understanding that the sponsor was saying that Alaska could pull out at any time.

REPRESENTATIVE T. WILSON confirmed Representative Hughes' understanding was correct. She said a resolution was passed yesterday that states that Alaska wants to participate in a convention, if one is called; however, she said Alaska could choose instead, for any reason, not to participate.

[8:44:23 AM](#)

CHAIR LYNN offered his understanding that the original constitutional convention was closed to the public, and he asked if a new constitutional convention would be closed to the public. He asked if anyone outside of official observers and delegates would be allowed into the convention.

REPRESENTATIVE T. WILSON offered her understanding that the observers would be officially designated. She said she does not know if the convention would be open to the public, but ventured that Congress might determine the parameters. She said there would be a large number of people coming from the minimum 34 states that would be necessary to have called for the convention, and other states could send people, as well.

CHAIR LYNN recollected that news of the original constitutional convention had been "a huge surprise."

REPRESENTATIVE T. WILSON reiterated that Congress would most likely decide the level of privacy, not the states. She expressed dubiousness at the possibility in current times of a convention being held without the public knowing about it.

[8:46:48 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER said there is a huge body of law related to this issue. He said he worked on a similar bill with Doug Gardner, a bill drafter in Legislative Legal and Research Services, and he recommended Mr. Gardner as a source for answering questions. Further, he said there is an attorney, [Robert G.] Natelson, who has written a history of conventions. Representative Keller said [a state] can pull out up to the point of a ratification, but after that there may be guiding rules as to whether [a state could pull out], "because of the work that's gone into it." He said, "The two-thirds just gets us to a drafting convention, and that is ... the one that we're guiding here in this process."

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER said he thinks it is appropriate to keep the language regarding the Class C felony, but he pointed out

that the standard of "knowingly" is a high standard of proof that is important in criminal law.

8:49:21 AM

REPRESENTATIVE GATTIS indicated that her experience taking part as a delegate in other types of conventions has shown her that it is not unusual for alternate delegates to be appointed. She said the state would tell the delegate what they can and cannot do, just as electoral delegates are told. She suggested that the committee may be "worrying about what-ifs that are not there yet."

8:51:21 AM

REPRESENTATIVE ISAACSON, to the sponsor, offered his understanding that "the questions that you were dealing with were more in the instructions that a future legislature, by joint resolution, is going to ... determine," especially in terms of how changes would be made at the convention. He said the aforementioned portions of language in the bill, on pages 2 and 3, look contradictory, but the proposed bill would instruct future legislatures in "how to accommodate that type of a scenario." He said he was a delegate to a 2004 National Republican convention, and there were multiple delegates who chose which one would "pass the vote for the state." He said he imagines that if that person had gone against the wishes of the group, he/she "would probably be lynched." That person would shoulder the most liability in criminal complaint. He ventured that that would be determined by joint resolution later.

REPRESENTATIVE ISAACSON said Ben Franklin and John Adams took part during the treaty of Paris, and they had to communicate back to the states and wait for clear instructions. He referred to Representative Keller's comments and said there is a body of legal precedent that the committee needs to investigate and, perhaps, require. He stated, "And so, by intent, I'm saying, 'Let's do it.' I'm agreeing. Let's make sure that this is incorporated into the discussion of a future legislature when they make this joint resolution."

REPRESENTATIVE ISAACSON, regarding observers, noted that even the Arctic Council has observers who are not geographically located in the Arctic and are non-voters, which may include countries such as China and Portugal, for example, who want to be part of the discussion. He ventured that if members of Congress are chosen as observers, they may serve as a reference

source to the delegates by giving them professional advice related to how Congress might receive the proposed amendment to the constitution. He expressed confidence that a future joint resolution will refine the purpose of observers and alternate delegates.

REPRESENTATIVE T. WILSON said the observer also could be a legislator, who could give advice. She said the proposed legislation is general on purpose to allow for unforeseen circumstances to be addressed as they arise. She said limiting the scope now may result in missing out on a discussion that may result in the biggest impact for Alaska.

[8:56:23 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HUGHES, referring to Representative Keller's comment about "knowingly" being a high standard of proof for a felony, pointed out that the person who takes the oath would be saying he/she would be following the instructions and authorizations, which she said she thinks "would probably fit the test for the knowingly." She said if Legislative Legal and Research Services has a differing opinion on that, she would like to know.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER remarked that proving "knowingly" might be difficult, which is why it is a high standard.

REPRESENTATIVE HUGHES reiterated that when a delegate takes the oath, he/she is agreeing to follow instructions, so, not following them would be done knowingly; therefore, even though "knowingly is a high standard," it would be "clearly shown to be that they knew what they were doing."

REPRESENTATIVE T. WILSON said if five delegates are sent, but just one votes, then the one who votes may be the one who took the oath; thus, it would be clear on the record who was responsible for casting the vote. Observers who do not vote would not have taken the oath. She clarified that the felony would be attached to taking the oath.

[8:58:35 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE ISAACSON directed attention to the language beginning on page 2, line 21, which states that both delegates and alternate delegates would take the oath.

REPRESENTATIVE T. WILSON stated that Representative Isaacson was correct.

[8:59:02 AM](#)

MIKE COONS, Regional Director, Citizen Initiatives, in response to Chair Lynn, said the Citizen Initiatives in Alaska is a grassroots organization advocating the proper interstate use of Article 5 of the Constitution of the United States. He said state legislators must not abdicate their Article 5 sovereignty to the delegates at the convention. He said the deliberative body is the state legislature; it is not the delegates. He mentioned the felony aspect of HB 310, and noted that the proposed legislation would have to be signed by the governor. He questioned if, once a constitutional convention was called for, a delegate resolution would be created more specific to how the convention would be run. He asked, "Can we do that just prior to going to the convention or can that be done in a near future aspect?"

[9:01:07 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE T. WILSON responded that the State of Alaska won't determine what is done at the convention; Congress calls the convention once there are a minimum of 34 states requesting a convention. The State of Alaska puts the parameters around only its delegates.

MR. COONS, referencing Representative Hughes' previous comment about one state/one vote, stated that Article 5 of the U.S. Constitution says nothing about that. He continued as follows:

In our resolution, the very first "whereas" is that Article 5, Section 4, of the Constitution of the United States guarantees each state a Republican-formed government that gives each state equal standing when calling for a federal amendment convention. Article 5 of the Constitution of the United States reserves the state legislatures the right to call for a federal convention with the purpose of proposing amendments to the United States Constitution when Congress, court, and executive branch refuse to address the egregious wrongs suffered by the people.

That puts it one state/one vote. Right now there really isn't anything that ... does this as far as the convention.

MR. COONS, in response to the comment of the sponsor, said if the State of Alaska and a number of other states all draw up a similar type of resolution where it not only binds the delegates, as HB 310 would do, but also sets out how the committees would be done, as well as "a whole series of things," then there would be a majority of states going to the convention; therefore, there would be "a sure and safe aspect, because that means the vast majority of states that go into that convention have all said this is the way this convention is going to be run." Mr. Coons said Congress has no say in that; once the required number of states call for the convention, Congress names the date and time, but then is "completely out of the scope on that."

MR. COONS, regarding the issue of the felony aspect of the bill, concurred with Representative Keller that "this is basically, knowingly violating that oath." He offered an example. He indicated that he had sent out a delegate resolution, which, if adopted, would be a safe convention for all states. He indicated that Representative Isaacson had talked about the ability to do a more general delegate resolution.

MR. COONS said he read HJR 22, which was sponsored by Representative T. Wilson, and he noted the joint resolution was a call for a convention of states for topics. He further noted that during the current meeting, Representative T. Wilson had said that "these would be amendments that the states would be sending down ... with the delegates to the convention, not issues." He questioned how that would work with what already passed under HJR 22.

[9:06:19 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE T. WILSON said there are two ways of doing it: tell the delegates what topics to address or, more specifically, provide amendments already written for the delegates to support at the convention. She said the amendments would still have to match the topics; they could not go outside of them. It would be up to the legislature at the time to decide how specific it wants to get, she said.

MR. COONS said he would advocate for the amendments, because it would provide clarity when states come together to work on an amendment. He said 51 percent have to ratify the amendment.

REPRESENTATIVE T. WILSON corrected Mr. Coons by stating that it would take a two-thirds vote to pass an amendment and a three-quarters vote to ratify it, so it is higher than 51 percent. She said she appreciates Mr. Coons' testimony. She requested that Chair Lynn allow her to incorporate all the tweaks suggested by the committee into a committee substitute to bring back before the committee. She said some factors she would like to mull over would be regarding the number of delegates, compensation, and the issue brought up by Representative Gattis about the rules of the Electoral College.

[9:09:44 AM](#)

MR. COONS said he would like to see language added reflecting the aspect of Article 5, Section 4, of the Constitution of the United States, so that it is clearly stated that each state will get only one vote at the convention, so that no one can try to get one vote per delegate.

[9:11:24 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE GATTIS opined that [HB 310] is the "perfect next step" following the passage of [HJR 22 on the House floor] the prior day. She said she thinks the legislature is moving in the right direction to state that it wants the federal government to pull back and listen to the states.

[9:11:59 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE T. WILSON thanked the committee and recapped the concerns the committee had expressed throughout the meeting. She cautioned not to get so specific that the legislature ties the hands of future legislatures. She said hopefully the federal government will see that there is a movement afoot, and take advantage of the opportunity to make changes before a convention is called. In response to Chair Lynn, she said she could have a committee substitute ready by the upcoming Tuesday.

[9:13:45 AM](#)

CHAIR LYNN closed public testimony. In response to Representative Hughes, he let it be known that he was okay with committee members communicating with the bill sponsor as further ideas come to mind for HB 310.

[9:14:38 AM](#)

CHAIR LYNN announced that HB 310 was held over.

9:14:54 AM

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the committee, the House State Affairs Standing Committee meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.