

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
HOUSE STATE AFFAIRS STANDING COMMITTEE

April 11, 2017

3:10 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Representative Jonathan Kreiss-Tomkins, Chair
Representative Gabrielle LeDoux, Vice Chair
Representative Adam Wool
Representative Chris Birch
Representative DeLena Johnson
Representative Gary Knopp

MEMBERS ABSENT

Representative Chris Tuck
Representative Andy Josephson (alternate)
Representative Chuck Kopp (alternate)

COMMITTEE CALENDAR

HOUSE BILL NO. 190

"An Act relating to the presentation of oral comments on the proposed adoption, amendment, or repeal of regulations."

- HEARD & HELD

HOUSE BILL NO. 163

"An Act authorizing the Department of Public Safety to enter into agreements with nonprofit regional corporations and federal, tribal, and local government agencies to provide law enforcement services; authorizing the Department of Public Safety to collect fees for certain law enforcement services; and providing for an effective date."

- HEARD & HELD

PREVIOUS COMMITTEE ACTION

BILL: HB 190

SHORT TITLE: REGULATION ADOPTION/ORAL COMMENT

SPONSOR(s): REPRESENTATIVE(s) TALERICO

03/22/17	(H)	READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
03/22/17	(H)	STA

03/28/17 (H) STA AT 5:30 PM GRUENBERG 120
 03/28/17 (H) Heard & Held
 03/28/17 (H) MINUTE(STA)
 04/04/17 (H) STA AT 3:00 PM GRUENBERG 120
 04/04/17 (H) Heard & Held
 04/04/17 (H) MINUTE(STA)
 04/06/17 (H) STA AT 3:00 PM GRUENBERG 120
 04/06/17 (H) Scheduled but Not Heard
 04/11/17 (H) STA AT 3:00 PM GRUENBERG 120

BILL: HB 163

SHORT TITLE: DPS LAW ENFORCE. SVCS: AGREEMENTS/FEES

SPONSOR(s): RULES BY REQUEST OF THE GOVERNOR

03/08/17 (H) READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
 03/08/17 (H) STA, FIN
 03/16/17 (H) STA AT 3:00 PM GRUENBERG 120
 03/16/17 (H) <Bill Hearing Canceled>
 03/21/17 (H) STA AT 3:00 PM GRUENBERG 120
 03/21/17 (H) Heard & Held
 03/21/17 (H) MINUTE(STA)
 03/28/17 (H) STA AT 5:30 PM GRUENBERG 120
 03/28/17 (H) Heard & Held
 03/28/17 (H) MINUTE(STA)
 03/30/17 (H) STA AT 3:00 PM GRUENBERG 120
 03/30/17 (H) Scheduled but Not Heard
 04/04/17 (H) STA AT 3:00 PM GRUENBERG 120
 04/04/17 (H) Heard & Held
 04/04/17 (H) MINUTE(STA)
 04/06/17 (H) STA AT 3:00 PM GRUENBERG 120
 04/06/17 (H) Scheduled but Not Heard
 04/11/17 (H) STA AT 3:00 PM GRUENBERG 120

WITNESS REGISTER

JULIE MORRIS, Staff
 Representative Dave Talerico
 Alaska State Legislature
 Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Explained Amendment 1 and Amendment 2 to HB 190 and answered questions on behalf of Representative Talerico, prime sponsor.

MICAELA FOWLER, Special Assistant
 Department of Commerce, Community & Economic Development (DCCED)
 Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Answered questions during the hearing on HB 190.

SUSAN POLLARD, Chief Assistant Attorney General - Statewide
Section Supervisor
Legislation & Regulations Sections
Civil Division (Juneau)
Department of Law (DOL)

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified and answered questions during the hearing on HB 190.

ACTION NARRATIVE

[3:10:26 PM](#)

CHAIR JONATHAN KREISS-TOMKINS called the House State Affairs Standing Committee meeting to order at 3:10 p.m. Representatives Wool, Birch, Johnson, Knopp, and Kreiss-Tomkins were present at the call to order. Representative LeDoux arrived as the meeting was in progress.

HB 190-REGULATION ADOPTION/ORAL COMMENT

[3:11:38 PM](#)

CHAIR KREISS-TOMKINS announced that the first order of business would be HOUSE BILL NO. 190, "An Act relating to the presentation of oral comments on the proposed adoption, amendment, or repeal of regulations." [Before the committee, adopted as a work draft on 4/4/17, was the committee substitute (CS) for HB 190, Version 30-LS0732\J, Banister, 3/31/17, referred to as "Version J."]

[3:12:52 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE BIRCH referred to the proposed Amendment 1 to Version J, which read:

Page 1, line 1, following "**Act**":

Insert "**relating to the adoption, amendment, or repeal of regulations;**"

Page 1, line 2:

Delete "**and**"

Page 1, line 3, following "**regulations**":

Insert "; and relating to the consideration of the cost to the state of the proposed adoption, amendment, or repeal of regulations"

Page 3, line 9, following "persons":

Insert "and to the state"

Page 3, following line 9:

Insert a new bill section to read:

"* **Sec. 4.** AS 44.62.210 is amended by adding a new subsection to read:

(c) If an agency has taken both written and oral testimony under this section, the agency shall limit extensions to one extension in 45 days."

Renumber the following bill sections accordingly.

REPRESENTATIVE BIRCH explained the proposed changes to Version J under Amendment 1: inserts "the consideration of cost to the state of the proposed adoption, amendment, or repeal of regulations" to the title [page 1, line 1]; and inserts a new subsection (c) to Section 4 [page 3, following line 9], which would place a limitation on extensions for taking testimony.

[3:14:04 PM](#)

JULIE MORRIS, Staff, Representative Dave Talerico, Alaska State Legislature, on behalf of Representative Talerico, prime sponsor of HB 190, relayed that the intent of Amendment 1 is to ensure that the cost to the state also would be considered whenever there was a proposal to change regulations. She explained that the intent of subsection (c) is to limit requests for extensions [for taking testimony] if the agency has already taken both written and oral testimony. She maintained that extensions can be costly for the state.

CHAIR KREISS-TOMKINS asked for an explanation of "extensions" and how they work.

MS. MORRIS stated that an extension is a "re-notice." After the process of posting a notice [of a regulation change] and collecting comments, an agency then may decide to re-notice [the change]. She conceded that she could not comment on why an agency would choose to re-notice and at what point it might do so.

[3:16:33 PM](#)

MICAELA FOWLER, Special Assistant, Department of Commerce, Community & Economic Development (DCCED), responded that there are a variety of circumstances in which DCCED would re-notice a regulations project. She gave two situations: there is significant public interest in a project, and DCCED wants to provide additional time to comment; and a large group of people who are interested parties of a project are unavailable during the comment period.

CHAIR KREISS-TOMKINS asked how frequent it is that regulations projects are re-noticed or the [opportunity to] comment is extended.

MS. FOWLER answered that DCCED extends [the opportunity to] comment on about two or three projects per year.

[3:18:02 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE KNOPP referred to page 1, line 1, of Version J, which read in part, "An Act relating to giving notice" and pointed out that the language in Amendment 1 does not mention "giving notice". He asked if Amendment 1 would change substantially the intent of Version J.

MS. FOWLER responded that Amendment 1 would insert additional language but does not delete any language from page 1, line 1, of Version J.

[3:19:09 PM](#)

SUSAN POLLARD, Chief Assistant Attorney General - Statewide Section Supervisor, Legislation & Regulations Sections, Civil Division (Juneau), referred to the language in the new subsection (c) under Amendment 1, and she stated, "Our discussion here is focused on what we would call 'supplemental notice.'" She said that it appears that the amendment is addressing the extension of a hearing time. She asked if that is the intent.

REPRESENTATIVE BIRCH expressed his understanding that the intent is to limit multiple extensions of oral testimony.

MS. POLLARD asked if Amendment 1 addresses the notice that is posted for proposed regulations. She relayed that there are steps the agency needs to take and a statute relating to public proceedings; and that statute appears to be the one that would

be amended under Amendment 1. She stated that the statute relates to when agencies may have the public proceeding on a regulations project in addition to a written notice. She expressed her understanding that the focus of Amendment 1 is on supplemental notice; an agency would be allowed no more than 45 days of an extended supplemental notice.

MS. MORRIS offered that the extensions are not just to the hearing, but to the whole regulation process. She said that the intent of Amendment 1 is to limit taking testimony to one more time after an agency has collected all oral and written comments. She suggested, instead, the wording, "extensions of re-notice". She expressed her belief that the intent of Amendment 1 is clear; she offered support for amending the amendment to ensure that the wording is acceptable to DOL in expressing that intent.

CHAIR KREISS-TOMKINS asked Ms. Pollard if the wording in the new subsection (c) achieves the intent as described or if it would benefit from revision.

MS. POLLARD responded that DOL staff would need time to review and discuss the wording. She maintained that the intent of what is desired is clear: that an agency, board, or commission could do a supplemental notice but only provide the public 45 more days in which to submit additional comments.

[3:23:42 PM](#)

CHAIR KREISS-TOMKINS asked if Amendment 1 has been proposed to address a specific problem: Are there particular board and commissions for which there have been multiple extensions?

REPRESENTATIVE BIRCH offered that the proposed legislation would benefit boards and commissions "across the board."

MS. MORRIS, in response to Representative Kreiss-Tomkins, said certainly. She relayed that the state wants to avoid "doing regulations" repeatedly. She said she understands the situation where a regulations package fails to accomplish what is intended; there are negative comments; and the regulation package is re-worked and re-noticed. She maintained that in that situation, it would be a completely different regulation package; not the same regulations "rolled out again." She said that the intent of Amendment 1 is to avoid spending more money on the same regulations "being rolled out again and again and again."

[3:25:34 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE KNOPP referred to discussion during a previous committee meeting [4/4/17] and expressed his understanding that it was decided that when a board has the option of accepting oral and written testimony, it is not necessary to continue offering extensions to testimony.

REPRESENTATIVE BIRCH responded yes.

MS. MORRIS answered, "You have it absolutely right." She added that the inclusion of oral comment in Version J allows for that extra testimony, and the intent of the proposed legislation is that the testimony not "continue on." She maintained that the sponsor of HB 190 supports Amendment 1.

[3:27:16 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE KNOPP asked Ms. Pollard if Legislative Legal and Research Services, when drafting the amendment, considers the concern [regarding intent and wording] that Ms. Pollard brought forward.

MS. POLLARD responded that she could not give an exact answer to the question. She said Legislative Legal and Research Services drafts amendments as requested using general language from the sponsor or more specific language. She stated that she looks at it in the context of the statute in which it would be inserted; the statute relates to hearings; and she has questions regarding the word "extensions" and at what point the 45-day period begins. She offered that DOL would review the language.

[3:29:12 PM](#)

CHAIR KREISS-TOMKINS suggested revising the amendment with the assistance of DOL.

REPRESENTATIVE BIRCH pointed out that DOL has not had much time to review the amendment; he maintained that Amendment 1 proposes a straightforward change; and he asked what the downside would be of adopting Amendment 1 and making a revision "down the road."

CHAIR KREISS-TOMKINS mentioned that the House State Affairs Standing Committee is the only committee of referral for the proposed legislation.

REPRESENTATIVE BIRCH asked the time line for doing the necessary legal review of Amendment 1.

REPRESENTATIVE KNOPP asked if it would be appropriate to adopt the proposed amendments, introduce a forthcoming CS, and make amendments after DOL has reviewed the CS.

CHAIR KREISS-TOMKINS answered that he thought that was a good suggestion, and the intent of Amendment 1 is clearly understood by the committee.

[3:32:42 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE BIRCH moved to adopt Amendment 1, labeled 30-LS0732\J.2, Bannister, 4/7/17. There being no objection, Amendment 1 was adopted.

[3:33:16 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE BIRCH referred to the proposed Amendment 2 to Version J, which read:

Page 1, line 2:
Delete "**and**"

Page 1, line 3, following "**regulations**":
Insert "**; and relating to the identification of a person who comments on the proposed adoption, amendment, or repeal of regulations**"

Page 3, line 4, following "**orally.**":
Insert "**The agency shall require a person who presents a statement, argument, or contention in writing or orally to give the person's name and, unless acting on the person's own behalf, the person's affiliation.**"

REPRESENTATIVE BIRCH relayed that the Amendment 2 would revise the title of the proposed legislation. It also would assist in avoiding outside interests when implementing or reviewing proposed regulations; currently there is no way of verifying if people influencing [regulations] changes through testimony are Alaska residents. Amendment 2 proposes a process whereby the agency requires a person presenting a statement, argument, or

contention in writing or orally to give his/her name and if not speaking on one's own behalf, to give his/her affiliation.

MS. MORRIS stated that the sponsor is in total agreement with Amendment 2.

MS. POLLARD expressed her concern that the agency may want to consider an anonymous comment.

[3:34:57 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE WOOL asked if it occurs that someone submitting written testimony does not want to disclose his/her identity.

MS. POLLARD responded that agencies are best able to describe how many comments they receive; most agencies let the public know in the notice that written comments are considered a public record - not published - but a public record.

[3:35:42 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE BIRCH maintained that if 50 people testify, it is germane to him if they are constituents, Alaskans, or out-of-state residents. He asserted that knowing who is testifying is relevant information and asking for name and affiliation is minimal.

CHAIR KREISS-TOMKINS asked if agencies receive anonymous comments on regulations currently, and how agencies respond.

MS. FOWLER replied that she cannot recall any recent occurrence of the submission of an anonymous comment, but she conceded that she would need to review the records to determine if that has occurred.

REPRESENTATIVE BIRCH suggested that if a testifier had a reason to be anonymous, the person presiding over a hearing would have the discretion to allow anonymity. He maintained that it is a reasonable expectation for most people who testify to identify themselves and their affiliations.

[3:38:03 PM](#)

CHAIR KREISS-TOMKINS agreed that it would be in the commenter's best interest to identify himself/herself. He expressed his concern that requiring a person to identify himself/herself would preclude anyone wishing to remain anonymous.

REPRESENTATIVE LEDOUX pointed out that anyone testifying before the House State Affairs Standing Committee is asked to identify himself/herself and state his/her affiliation for the record. She asserted that it does not seem unreasonable to require that of someone testifying on an agency regulation.

REPRESENTATIVE KNOPP expressed that identifying oneself is appropriate and common practice; however, anonymous written testimony could be noted as such. He offered reasons for an anonymous telephonic testimony - someone with involvement in a crime or violation or someone not wanting his/her affiliation to be known. He maintained that it is reasonable to request a name and affiliation; it goes to the credibility of the testimony; and those not offering name and affiliation may state the reason. He stated that he supports the proposed Amendment 2.

3:41:29 PM

REPRESENTATIVE BIRCH moved to adopt Amendment 2, labeled 30-LS0732\J.3, Bannister, 4/10/17. There being no objection, Amendment 2 was adopted.

CHAIR KREISS-TOMKINS announced that HB 190 would be held over.

3:42:50 PM

REPRESENTATIVE WOOL expressed his concern with the proposed legislation - the elimination of newspaper [publication of notice] requirement. He stated that in smaller communities, newspapers may be the main source of news; not everyone living in a cabin in rural Alaska uses a phone to read agency websites. He asserted that for some people, not having notices published in a generally accessible medium may not be optimal.

REPRESENTATIVE BIRCH responded that the proposed legislation does not prohibit the publication of a notification in the newspaper; a notice could be published in a community newspaper, if the regulation were specific to that community. He stated that the proposed legislation would eliminate publishing in a newspaper as a requirement.

REPRESENTATIVE WOOL conceded that he understands that, but if it is not required, agencies would be less inclined to do it. He reiterated that for some people, the newspaper may be their source of public notice.

[3:45:21 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE KNOPP mentioned that Title 29 requires municipalities to advertise for public notice; he asked if there would be conflicting requirements in statute if the requirement is deleted from this title [Title 44].

MS. POLLARD reminded the committee that she is speaking as someone from DOL who advises executive branch agencies on regulations issues; her comments are limited to the legislatively mandated steps that an agency, which includes boards and commissions, must perform to validly adopt a regulation under the Administrative Procedures Act (APA). She stated that other agencies that need to advertise public notice - for example for land use decisions - may have different considerations.

MS. POLLARD asserted that it is true that what the government is doing is considered by most to be a core function of government; and it is also correct that throughout the statutes there are many references to newspaper notice. She said that the goal of notice in a regulatory context, which includes a broad spectrum of issues of all executive agencies, is to reach as many Alaskans as potentially might be affected by a regulatory package of an agency action.

[3:49:07 PM](#)

MS. POLLARD stated that for many years there has been a requirement to publish notice in newspapers of general circulation. She mentioned that people have brought up the possibility of less costly notification. She said that the notice of regulations is required by the legislature, and the three main avenues of publication are: notice in a newspaper of general circulation or trade or industry publication; notice on the online notice system; and notice sent to legislators and interested parties. She said that APA, in Title 44, Chapter 62, references publication in newspapers; newspaper publication has been the main avenue of notice for many years. It gives as many people as possible easy access to the information and avoids a "digital divide" - allowing some people better access than others.

CHAIR KREISS-TOMKINS, referring to Representative Knopp's question, asked if there would be different standards for municipal governments than for the state government for noticing regulations.

REPRESENTATIVE KNOPP added that his question concerned not only the notice requirement but the terms of notice - length and number of times. He offered that when the statute was written, before electronic media, newspapers were what existed. He asserted that there are many statutes that address notices, and improperly giving notice is always a concern for municipalities.

[3:52:19 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE BIRCH relayed his experience at the municipal level, which was to choose the publication that targets the interested parties.

MS. POLLARD stated that statutory agencies are required to take the procedural steps when doing regulations projects; these are "good" steps that allow the public to understand and participate in the regulatory process. She maintained that DOL has a selection of forms that it requests agencies to use in the regulations process so that a record of the steps taken can be filed with the Office of the Lieutenant Governor; therefore, if there is a challenge to a regulation, there is always a package showing that all the steps were taken. She relayed that in the package is an affidavit related to public comment and a copy or other proof of the newspaper notice. She suggested that the committee consider what constitutes a good record of the process.

[3:55:25 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE KNOPP suggested language on page 1, line 8-9, to say "may publish in the newspaper of general circulation or trade or industry publication". He asked if that language would leave it to the agency to decide the method of notification and give flexibility to the agency. He offered that the decision may be on a case-by-case basis depending on the regulation or where the hearings are held; the state would not be restricting but providing options. An agency may explore one avenue, find that it is not adequate, and opt for another.

MS. MORRIS reminded the committee that they are the lawmakers, and from those laws, regulations are written. The APA offers "or" and not "and"; therefore, notice may be in a newspaper or trade or industry publication. She maintained that it is important to pay attention to the "ors" and the "ands" when considering proposed legislation; the agency does not have to notice regulations by all the methods listed. She reiterated

that through notification, the agency must reach the group of people most impacted by the regulations.

MS. MORRIS expressed that she understands the determination of the state to reach as many people as possible and maintained it does that. She pointed out page 1, line 10, [of Version J], which read in part, "and the state agency's Internet website"; this would allow the public to comment online with a name and email address. She offered that sometimes the process "feels like it's on autopilot" and her intent is to take it off autopilot. She maintained that "we need to be more in control what happens in our state, how much money we're spending on regulations, and who is influencing our regulations"; that is the intent of the proposed legislation, and the sponsor is open to doing that the best way possible.

REPRESENTATIVE KNOPP responded that his concern was for notification, not regulation. He pointed out that on page 1, lines 8-9, "newspaper of general circulation or" is bracketed, therefore, would be deleted, which leaves "trade or industry publication". He maintained that including the language, "may publish in newspaper of general circulation" would avoid requiring it but would provide the option.

[3:59:38 PM](#)

CHAIR KREISS-TOMKINS asked how agencies currently have used their discretion in deciding the avenue of notification; which regulation notices are published in a newspaper of general circulation and which are published in a trade or industry publication? He asked for specific examples demonstrating how the decisions regarding publication of notices are made.

MS. FOWLER replied that typically DCCED chooses to publish in a newspaper over a trade or industry publication due to cost. She said that the cost of publishing in most of the trade and industry publications is greater than publishing in some of the newspapers of general circulation; however, there is great variety among publishing costs. She offered as examples: advertising in the Anchorage Dispatch News (ADN) often costs \$750; and the Juneau Empire is more expensive. She maintained that the decisions are driven by the situations, programs, and populations of interest. She stated that the Division of Banking and Securities (DBS) [DCCED] revises Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA) regulations relating to proxy solicitations about once per year; the [revised] regulations are published in approximately nine different newspapers to reach

the greatest number of affected individuals. She maintained that DCCED is making determinations based on the population, the location of the population, and the best method of reaching them.

[4:01:38 PM](#)

CHAIR KREISS-TOMKINS referred to Version J beginning on page 1, line 13, and ending on page 2, line 3, which read in part, "when broadcasting the notice, an agency may use an abbreviated form of the notice ... the Internet address of the Alaska Online Public Notice System where the full text of the notice can be found". He maintained that with that provision, it is not necessary to publish "essays" of regulatory language in the newspaper, but a short description and the link to more information on the Internet. He asked how often that scenario occurs.

MS. FOWLER replied that she will provide that information.

REPRESENTATIVE LEDOUX asked for the cost of a typical advertisement in the smaller newspapers, such as in Homer and Kodiak.

MS. FOWLER responded that she will provide that information.

[4:03:03 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE WOOL mentioned that the frequency of an advertisement is another variable in cost. He agreed that reaching "non-digital" people is important.

[4:03:52 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE BIRCH asked what the duty and obligation is to advertise [regulations] anywhere. He maintained that online advertising is so ubiquitous, and advertising by print media is almost obsolete. He asked if the state has a continuing duty to advertise in a newspaper, trade, or industry publication. He stated that he would also like to know what the budget is for advertising and what the savings would be without print advertising.

MS. FOWLER replied that DCCED puts forward between 30 and 40 regulations packages per year; she would need to calculate the cost based on those numbers.

4:05:40 PM

REPRESENTATIVE BIRCH suggested that it might be 30-40 times \$1,000. He asked if the proposed legislation would result in savings in other state departments; he relayed that he did not have a sense of the savings that would be involved. He suggested that the state could be creative and flexible in encouraging people to do what is commonly done in private life: consulting craigslist and electronic media for advertising.

MS. FOWLER stated that she can speak only to DCCED's regulations; she said she knew that all the departments are assessing the impact of the proposed legislation and that information will be forthcoming from the executive branch.

REPRESENTATIVE BIRCH asked if the state has a sense of what is adequate for advertising from a legal standpoint.

MS. POLLARD said that she would follow up on that request. She offered to provide the committee with "shorthand sentences" reflecting pertinent Alaska Supreme Court decisions. She said that the purpose of notice is to spur potentially affected people into taking a closer look.

4:08:05 PM

MS. MORRIS relayed that she and the sponsor know that it is a legal imperative that everyone affected by a regulation is reached. She stated that the committee has not received all the fiscal notes yet from the administration; they are in review; and that information would provide information on the impact of the proposed legislation. She maintained that the proposed legislation will be revised to address the concerns of Representatives Knopp and LeDoux regarding reaching people in small communities.

4:09:10 PM

REPRESENTATIVE KNOPP stated that he supports the proposed legislation; he is aware that newspaper advertising will be obsolete soon. He maintained that he dealt with the cost of advertising at the local level and believes that \$750 is inexpensive. He recommended inserting "may" [page 1, line 8] to give the departments options for the best method of giving notice, in lieu of a mandate.

4:10:04 PM

CHAIR KREISS-TOMKINS announced that HB 190 would be held over.

HB 163-DPS LAW ENFORCE. SVCS: AGREEMENTS/FEES

[4:10:12 PM](#)

CHAIR KREISS-TOMKINS announced that the final order of business would be HOUSE BILL NO. 163, "An Act authorizing the Department of Public Safety to enter into agreements with nonprofit regional corporations and federal, tribal, and local government agencies to provide law enforcement services; authorizing the Department of Public Safety to collect fees for certain law enforcement services; and providing for an effective date."

CHAIR KREISS-TOMKINS opened public testimony on HB 163. After ascertaining that there was no one who wished to testify, he closed public testimony.

[4:10:44 PM](#)

CHAIR KREISS-TOMKINS announced that HB 163 would be held over.

[4:11:15 PM](#)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the committee, the House State Affairs Standing Committee meeting was adjourned at 4:11 p.m.