

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
SENATE COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL AFFAIRS STANDING COMMITTEE

March 1, 2022

3:32 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Senator Shelley Hughes, Chair
Senator Robert Myers, Vice Chair
Senator David Wilson
Senator Elvi Gray-Jackson

MEMBERS ABSENT

Senator Lyman Hoffman

COMMITTEE CALENDAR

SENATE BILL NO. 144
"An Act relating to disaster emergencies."

- HEARD & HELD

PREVIOUS COMMITTEE ACTION

BILL: SB 144

SHORT TITLE: DISASTER EMERGENCY PROCLAMATIONS

SPONSOR(S): SENATOR(S) REINBOLD

01/18/22	(S)	PREFILE RELEASED 1/7/22
01/18/22	(S)	READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
01/18/22	(S)	CRA, JUD
03/01/22	(S)	CRA AT 3:30 PM BELTZ 105 (TSBldg)

WITNESS REGISTER

SENATOR LORA REINBOLD
Alaska State Legislature
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Sponsor of SB 144

KELLI TOTH, Staff
Senator Lora Reinbold
Alaska State Legislature
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Presented the sectional analysis for SB 144.

ALEX FOOTE, Legislative Counsel
Legislative Legal Services
Legislative Affairs Agency
Alaska State Legislature
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Answered legal questions during the hearing on SB 144.

NANCY MEADE, General Counsel
Alaska Court System
Anchorage, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Answered questions and provided information during the hearing on SB 144.

ACTION NARRATIVE

[3:32:50 PM](#)

CHAIR SHELLEY HUGHES called the Senate Community and Regional Affairs Standing Committee meeting to order at 3:32 p.m. Present at the call to order were Senators Myers, Gray-Jackson, Wilson, and Chair Hughes.

SB 144-DISASTER EMERGENCY PROCLAMATIONS

[3:33:39 PM](#)

CHAIR HUGHES announced the consideration of SENATE BILL NO. 144 "An Act relating to disaster emergencies."

[3:35:18 PM](#)

SENATOR LORA REINBOLD, Alaska State Legislature, Juneau, Alaska, sponsor of SB 144, introduced the bill by reading the sponsor statement:

[Original punctuation provided.]

SB 144 Disaster Emergencies seeks to restore the separation of powers between the executive and legislative branches. During such unprecedented times, the separation of powers is critical ensuring all three are involved. During the COVID19 pandemic, the executive branch took broad latitude declaring disasters consecutively for the same reason, usurping the legislature in the process. SB 144 seeks to ensure when another disaster occurs, if needed beyond 30

days, the legislature is included in the process of declaring a consecutive disaster.

[3:39:08 PM](#)

KELLI TOTH, Staff, Senator Lora Reinbold, Alaska State Legislature, Juneau, Alaska, paraphrased the following sectional analysis for SB 144:

[Original punctuation provided.]

Section 1: AS18.15.390 is amended to amended adding a new subsection, Before the department takes a public health measure, ensures the legislature approves.

Section 2: AS22.10.020 amended adding a new subsection the superior court is the court of original jurisdiction regarding local and state emergency orders, ensuring expedition of challenges heard within 72 hours. Inequality in the applicability or impact of emergency orders on analogous groups, situations, and circumstances is grounds for the superior court to invalidate or enjoin an emergency order on the basis that it is not narrowly tailored to serve a compelling public health service.

Section 3: AS 26.23.020 (c) A Proclamation of disaster emergency may not remain in effect longer than 30 days unless extended by the legislature. A proclamation to declare a condition of disaster emergency must state whether the governor proposed to expend state funds to respond. If the governor issues a subsequent proclamation that is substantially similar, the legislature must affirmatively pass with 2/3 vote approving adopting a concurrent resolution ratifying the proclamation of disaster emergency.

Section 4: Adds a new section Emergency orders that bind, curtail or infringe the rights of private parties must be narrowly tailored to serve a compelling public health or safety purpose. Each emergency order must be limited in duration, applicability and

scope in order to reduce infringement of individual liberty. Emergency orders that infringe on constitutional rights are limited to seven days unless legislature is in session and has 15 days to consider and vote to ratify the order with 2/3 affirmative vote. Or, if during interim, the governor may call the legislature into special session to consider and vote on emergency order. If the seven day expiration doesn't apply, the 30 day expiration date applies. Each house may vote to ratify or terminate the emergency order, may debate remote debate electronically or other means to the extent not prohibited by the presiding officer of each house. Emergency order means an emergency order, decree, proclamation, regulation or other mandate.

Section 5: Adds a new paragraph to read AS 29.20.650 (limitations on emergency orders that relate to the public.)

Section 6: AS 29.20 is amended adding a new section, a municipality may issue nonbinding recommendations and guidelines that do not include provisions for enforcement or surveillance. To the extent that a municipality issues emergency orders the orders may not infringe constitutional rights including rights to travel, work, assemble, and speak, the free exercise of religion, contract and property rights, freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures, and the freedom to purchase lawful firearms and ammunition.

[3:42:20 PM](#)

SENATOR D. WILSON read the text on page 2, lines 8-10:

A proclamation of disaster emergency may not remain in effect longer than 30 days unless extended by the legislature by law.

SENATOR D. WILSON then referred to the text on page 2, line 21 that talks about a concurrent resolution. He recalled a legal

memo that said that a concurrent resolution does not have the same effect as a statute and it does not have the effect of law. He asked if it would be a problem if the legislature were to ratify a proclamation of disaster emergency by adopting a concurrent resolution, given the language on page 2, lines 8-10.

SENATOR REINBOLD deferred the question to Legislative Legal Services.

[3:43:37 PM](#)

ALEX FOOTE, Legislative Counsel, Legislative Legal Services, Legislative Affairs Agency, Alaska State Legislature, Juneau, Alaska, responded that Senator Wilson's interpretation was correct. This would require a new bill.

SENATOR D. WILSON responded that this could be corrected with an amendment or committee substitute.

[3:44:00 PM](#)

CHAIR HUGHES advised that legislatures across the 50 states have expressed concern about their disaster statutes because [the COVID 19 pandemic] was the first real test of them over an extended period. Many legislators realized that governors were given extensive powers and that some retooling was in order to rebalance the powers so the legislature could weigh in. She expressed hope that the provisions in SB 144 would stand up in a court of law and work for Alaska in the future. She expressed her belief that an extended public health crisis was not a consideration when the disaster statutes were written. She emphasized that any questions she might ask were not intended to berate the bill; she simply wanted to make sure that it will work.

CHAIR HUGHES asked Mr. Foote how Section 1 of the bill changes the current process to extend an emergency disaster proclamation that lasts longer than 30 days.

[3:46:20 PM](#)

MR. FOOTE answered that it addresses the possibility that a governor could seek additional disaster declarations based on the same disaster condition. Section 1 explicitly states that the legislature must approve any extensions.

CHAIR HUGHES observed that a particular public health measure or requirement was not about a full-on disaster declaration. She offered her understanding that it would include something like the Department of Health and Social Services deciding to suspend

certain regulations for telehealth. She asked for confirmation that Section 1 was not an indication that the legislature would not have to convene to lift a regulation on telehealth. Rather, a governor could do that during the 30 days of the disaster declaration, and after that the regulation would expire unless the legislature extended the declaration.

[3:47:38 PM](#)

MR. FOOTE answered that his understanding was that it would expire absent express legislative action.

CHAIR HUGHES asked if Section 1 referred to the prohibition against consecutive orders that are substantially similar.

MR. FOOTE deferred to the sponsor to speak to the intent of Section 1.

SENATOR REINBOLD yielded the question to Ms. Toth.

[3:48:28 PM](#)

MS. TOTH stated that Section 1 says that the legislature must give its approval before the department takes action on a public health measure. To the question about whether Section 1 referred to consecutive orders, she said that is addressed in a 1/31/2021 legal memorandum from Andrew Dunmire with Legislative Legal Services. She read the following from page 2 of the memo:

Would a court find the governor's successive declarations to be a violation of AS 26.23.020(c)?

Yes, a court likely would find that the governor's executive orders declaring new disasters beyond November 15, 2020, violated AS 26.23.020(c). As discussed above, that statute gives the legislature, and only the legislature, authority to extend a disaster declaration.

[3:49:34 PM](#)

CHAIR HUGHES responded that she was seeking clarification about the application and meaning of Section 1. She posed a hypothetical example of a governor issuing an order during a 30-day disaster declaration to deliver clean bottled water to a community after an earthquake destroyed the potable water system. She asked for confirmation that Section 1 was not an indication that the legislature would have to meet in order for that water to be distributed.

[3:50:19 PM](#)

SENATOR REINBOLD answered that Section 1 is referring to extended disaster declarations. The general intent of the bill is to prevent the abuse of executive power and increase legislative sovereignty.

CHAIR HUGHES indicated she was still a little confused.

[3:51:39 PM](#)

SENATOR MYERS highlighted that the public health measures that are mentioned in AS 18.15.390(a) do not have a lot to do with what happened during the most recent disaster declaration. Subsection (a) addresses things such as evacuation of an area, decontamination, and disposal of human remains. He asked the sponsor how long she thought it would take for the legislature to convene and vote to authorize those sorts of things.

SENATOR REINBOLD said her reading is that the governor has emergency powers during the 30-days of the disaster declaration, but Section 1 clarifies that "unelected bureaucrats" in the department do not have emergency powers.

[3:53:09 PM](#)

CHAIR HUGHES asked Mr. Foote if he drafted SB 144.

MR. FOOTE answered no.

CHAIR HUGHES asked whether the drafter was available to answer questions, because Section 1 seems to say the same thing that's in current law.

MR. FOOTE said he'd check.

SENATOR MYERS commented it would be more straightforward to repeal AS 18.50.390 entirely, if the legislature has to give its approval before the governor or department can take any action. If the powers weren't delegated, the legislature would just need to pass a bill.

SENATOR REINBOLD reiterated that the goal in Section 1 is to restrict decision-making to elected officials. Generally, the bill clarifies that a disaster declaration lasts for just 30 days, and that the legislature must weigh in if there is need for any subsequent disaster declarations. She added that she was very receptive to suggestions.

CHAIR HUGHES pointed out that the Disaster Act exists in all 50 states so there can be a quick response in the event of a catastrophe. She expressed concern that requiring the legislature to convene for every measure could put Alaskans at risk.

CHAIR HUGHES asked Mr. Foote if the Alaska Disaster Act statutes provide that a commissioner who issues a mandate during a disaster is acting on the governor's behalf.

MR. FOOTE replied that was his understanding; the commissioner would be acting pursuant to the governor's power under the Alaska Disaster Act.

CHAIR HUGHES observed that the sponsor's interpretation was different than Mr. Foote's legal opinion. The sponsor talked about unelected officials issuing mandates and Mr. Foote's legal opinion was that the commissioner would be acting under the authority of the governor. She suggested the sponsor think about requiring the commissioner to go before the governor for authorization so the order truly is coming from an elected official.

[3:57:47 PM](#)

SENATOR REINBOLD responded that the ultimate goal was to ensure that orders come from an elected official and that the legislature makes the laws. She opined that a lot of legislative authority was usurped in the last two years and she was trying to reestablish the legislature's lane. She reiterated that she was very receptive to suggestions.

CHAIR HUGHES asked the sponsor if she would entertain the idea of broadening the scope to address all types of disasters, not just health disasters. For example, it would likely be the transportation commissioner who would be making decisions after a catastrophic earthquake.

SENATOR REINBOLD restated that elected officials should make the decisions; the 30-day period for a disaster declaration should be maintained; and the legislature should approve subsequent disasters.

CHAIR HUGHES said more clarification is needed because the bill appears to require the legislature to convene even during the 30-day period.

[4:01:11 PM](#)

SENATOR MYERS pointed out that all commissioners serve at the pleasure of the governor, and they'd likely be fired if they did something the governor didn't want them to do.

SENATOR REINBOLD said that's true, but the point is that power should not be given to "unelected bureaucrats." That's what the Alaska Supreme Court said and that's why she believes that SB 191 should be a companion to SB 144.

SENATOR MYERS asked whether the intent of the bill was for the governor to micro-manage the executive branch commissioners.

SENATOR REINBOLD answered that the intent is to ensure that a commissioner does not get the powers that reside with the governor.

CHAIR HUGHES asked Ms. Meade to give her thoughts on Section 2.

[4:03:25 PM](#)

NANCY MEADE, General Counsel, Alaska Court System, Anchorage, Alaska, stated that Section 2 would be fairly unique in the court statutes in that it would require the court to expedite consideration of challenges to the lawfulness of these emergency orders. The statement on page 1, lines 12-13 that requires the court to hear these challenges within 72 hours of being filed would be challenging for the court to implement and apply. It is unclear whether they have to be decided or if the court still has to hold a hearing if all the parties have not fully briefed the issue. The fact that it says within 72 hours of being filed presents scheduling challenges. For example, if a challenge is filed on Friday afternoon, it's not clear how the court would act on a challenge in a meaningful manner in that timeframe.

CHAIR HUGHES asked if she had clarifying language to suggest.

MS. MEADE answered that she wasn't sure what the goal was, other than immediate resolution. No other statutes tell the court to prioritize certain cases at the appellate level, although there are several rules of appellate procedure about expedited appeals for things like election redistricting or cases involving children. She said she may be able to think of language that says the courts shall handle the challenge in the normal course, but it would be unusual for the statute to direct the court to hear a challenge of an order before it hears a children's case or another type of emergency case.

[4:06:11 PM](#)

CHAIR HUGHES acknowledged that child in need of aid (CINA) cases were high priority and shouldn't be bumped and that some sort of accommodation should be made for cases that are filed just before a weekend. With those exceptions in mind, she asked Ms. Meade to work on suggested language to ensure that these cases don't drag on for weeks.

[4:07:01 PM](#)

SENATOR REINBOLD said the 72 hour limit was a place-holder and she understood that holidays and weekends might need to be excluded. She then emphasized how important the bill is to prevent harm and unconstitutional restrictions on Alaskans during any future disaster declarations. She said she would be happy to work with Ms. Meade to make Section 2 more workable for the Court System.

CHAIR HUGHES asked Ms. Meade to describe the strict scrutiny standard of judicial review and if that was appropriate in this context. She also solicited any other comments on Section 2 from the court's perspective.

[4:09:09 PM](#)

MS. MEADE explained that strict scrutiny is the test the court applies when it looks at whether a government action that discriminated against a protected class (based on race, religion, or national origin) was acceptable. The government must have a compelling state interest to take that purportedly discriminatory action and action must be narrowly tailored to achieve the result.

[4:10:17 PM](#)

CHAIR HUGHES said she believes the strict scrutiny test would be appropriate when the court is considering government lockdowns and orders that churches can't meet. She asked Ms. Meade if she agreed.

[4:10:30 PM](#)

MS. MEADE answered that it depends on the challenge, but she knows that a challenge to the lawfulness of a state order would cover everything that order might require.

MS. MEADE highlighted an additional concern with Section 2, which was that it seemed that anybody could file a lawsuit challenging the lawfulness of a state emergency order, not just the legislature. She said it's a concern that there would be the potential for say 50 lawsuits to be filed in in 50 different

courts the day after a declaration, and all of those would need to be heard within 72 hours.

CHAIR HUGHES asked the sponsor if she would like to respond.

[4:12:53 PM](#)

SENATOR REINBOLD responded that anybody can file a lawsuit at any time, and she believes it would be highly unlikely that 50 lawsuits would be filed immediately.

CHAIR HUGHES asked Ms. Meade if same subject cases could be combined and heard as one, similar to what happened with the numerous filings related to redistricting.

MS. MEADE answered that can happen sometimes. She recalled that in the redistricting case all the parties agreed, they were all represented by attorneys, and the filings were all in an Anchorage court. The arguments differed a bit, but they had a common thread. That may not be the same in a statewide emergency declaration. Hypothetically, somebody in Sitka could sue about a vaccine problem, somebody in Palmer could sue about a church problem, and somebody in Barrow could sue about the inability to subsistence hunt. She said it would not be possible to combine such cases from different judicial districts. Further, it was also possible that some of the parties would be without representation, which would be much more time-consuming for the court.

[4:16:03 PM](#)

CHAIR HUGHES stated that Alaskans have the right to file challenges and the committee will be interested in hearing from Ms. Meade after she has had time to consider how to make Section 2 workable.

[4:16:23 PM](#)

SENATOR D. WILSON asked whether something similar to the 72-hour rule for how to engage that's in Title 47 might work.

[4:16:44 PM](#)

MS. MEADE clarified that he was referring to an involuntary mental commitment under Title 47 and the requirement for the court to have an initial hearing within 72 hours. She said those generally are handled by magistrates who work nights and weekends to handle emergency cases and she'd need to think about whether a case that, per Section 2, is supposed to be handled in superior court could be delegated to a magistrate and handled on an emergency basis. She highlighted that one difference is that

emergency mental commitments typically involve a number of professionals at the hearings and the hearings under Section 2 probably would not involve parties that do this sort of thing daily.

SENATOR REINBOLD commented on the profound impact the health mandates had on people's lives and said she would welcome a massive number of lawsuits if similar mandates were imposed during any future disaster declaration.

[4:20:02 PM](#)

CHAIR HUGHES turned to Section 3 relating to consecutive disaster declarations. She asked Mr. Foote whether he agreed with the sponsor that it was illegal for the governor to issue consecutive proclamations.

MR. FOOTE answered that he did not agree.

CHAIR HUGHES asked him to elaborate.

MR. FOOTE offered his understanding that the governor's declarations followed current laws.

CHAIR HUGHES asked if the proclamations were legal because they related to different COVID strains

MR. FOOTE answered that it is the opinion of his office that those emergency declarations were lawful under AS 26.23.020.

CHAIR HUGHES expressed surprise because she recalled seeing a legal opinion that said they were not lawful.

[4:21:43 PM](#)

SENATOR D. WILSON asked if that opinion was before or after the legislature codified those reauthorizations by passing the Disaster Declaration statute.

MR. FOOTE answered that he didn't know.

[4:22:01 PM](#)

CHAIR HUGHES referred to a question and answer in a memo from Legal Services dated January 30, 2021. It read:

Would a court find the governor's successive declarations to be a violation of AS 26.23.020(c)?

Yes, a court likely would find that the governor's executive orders declaring new disasters beyond November 15, 2020, violated AS 26.23.020(c). As discussed above, that statute gives the legislature, and only the legislature, authority to extend a disaster declaration.

She asked Mr. Foote to forward any additional written opinion to her office and she would distribute it to the members.

SENATOR REINBOLD added that the legal memo was written by Andrew Dunmire. She read the answer in full.

[4:23:11 PM](#)

SENATOR MYERS agreed with the chair and sponsor that the Disaster Declarations were illegal under the current statute. He added that if they were in fact illegal, that should have been addressed either through a vote of the legislature disapproving the subsequent declarations or with a lawsuit, but neither happened. He opined that Section 3 doesn't help because it would also require a vote of the legislature or a court challenge.

[4:24:00 PM](#)

SENATOR D. WILSON commented that the effective date for SB 56 was retroactive so the authorizations were legal once the legislature passed that bill.

CHAIR HUGHES said she had some question about that because the declarations were illegal before the bill passed. She asked Mr. Foote if there was a statutory definition for "substantially similar."

MR. FOOTE answered not to his knowledge.

CHAIR HUGHES asked if the term was used elsewhere in statute.

MR. FOOTE answered that it is legal language, but his understanding was it is not used in this context.

CHAIR HUGHES said people argue both ways about whether or not the various strains of COVID-19 are substantially similar, and she believes that will need to be sorted out.

CHAIR HUGHES noted the possibility of a disaster overlapping two governors. She asked Mr. Foote if the bill referred to one individual governor and if the incoming governor could also issue a declaration, so there could be two different

declarations for the same emergency disaster. She cited the COVID-19 health disaster as an example.

MR. FOOTE replied he couldn't answer that without doing some reading.

CHAIR HUGHES opined that if one governor can't issue multiple substantially similar emergency proclamations, she didn't think a new governor should have the ability to issue a repeat proclamation without legislative approval. She asked the sponsor if that was her intent.

[4:26:53 PM](#)

SENATOR REINBOLD answered yes. She said Section 3 is intended to prevent the abuse of power; she is not a fan of ex post facto law; and current law says that a disaster may be declared for 30 days.

CHAIR HUGHES said that the problem is that the capital is separated from so much of the state that it is difficult for the legislature to convene. She articulated her wish that the legislature have the ability to vote electronically. She acknowledged that it couldn't be written into the bill because the Uniform Rules would have to be suspended. She asked the sponsor if she or her staff had looked at what other states have done when the legislature had to reauthorize something when it wasn't in session. Specifically, did their uniform rules have to be suspended or was it done statutorily.

[4:29:12 PM](#)

MS. TOTH answered that she would do some research and follow up with the committee.

CHAIR HUGHES opined that there probably should be a rule in the Uniform Rules pertaining to disasters. She reminded members that the Senate voted to suspend the rules during the emergency disaster, but the House did not.

SENATOR REINBOLD stressed the importance of having the ability to vote electronically and reiterated her wish that more lawsuits had been filed challenging the recent emergency health declarations. She also offered her views on the aspirations and motives of lawyers in the state. She said she was trying to make Alaska the freest state in the nation to further an economic boom.

[4:33:48 PM](#)

CHAIR HUGHES said this bill will have long term effects on future governors and legislatures, and it will impact lives. It's important to get it right and that means the bill will not be rushed.

CHAIR HUGHES referred to page 3, line 10 that says:

- (1) An emergency order expires in seven days unless

She noted that this new section was talking about an emergency order that binds, curtails, or infringes the rights of private parties. She asked Mr. Foote how this differs from the emergency orders that last for 30 days.

[4:35:36 PM](#)

Mr. Foote advised that the governor's power to declare emergency mandates comes the legislature, so it is within the legislature's purview to narrow the scope of that power through legislation such as SB 144. It would be up to the courts to determine whether the government interest was sufficient to infringe on individual rights.

[4:36:12 PM](#)

CHAIR HUGHES asked for examples of measures that would have a 30-day limit and orders that would expire in seven-days.

MR. FOOTE said he would respond to the request in writing.

CHAIR HUGHES asked the sponsor if she could give examples of the orders that would fall under the 30-day declaration and what would fall under the seven-day orders.

[4:38:02 PM](#)

SENATOR REINBOLD paraphrased all but the first sentence in the new Sec 26.23.023(c)(1), Limitations on emergency orders that regulate the public, in Section 4:

... Emergency orders that bind, curtail, or infringe the rights of private parties must be narrowly tailored to serve a compelling public health or safety purpose. Each emergency order must be limited in duration, applicability, and scope in order to reduce any infringement of individual liberty. Only the governor may issue an emergency order that infringes constitutional rights, including the right to travel, work, assemble, and speak, the free exercise of religion, contract and property rights, freedom from

unreasonable searches and seizures, and the freedom to purchase lawful firearms and ammunition in a nontrivial manner. Emergency orders that infringe on constitutional rights are further limited as follows:

- (1) An emergency order expires in seven days unless

SENATOR REINBOLD acknowledged that the language in this subsection needed to be cleaned up but stressed that these infringements on constitutional rights technically are only allowed during Marshall Law. She emphasized that the limitation on attending church has impacted people's right to assemble, businesses were shut down, people were told who was essential and who was not, and people lost their livelihoods. She said she imposed a seven-day limit on these types of emergency orders because they had such dramatic and life altering consequences.

SENATOR REINBOLD stated that SB 144 is vitally important because it empowers the legislative branch, gets the courts involved quickly, and keeps the executive branch in check.

[4:40:28 PM](#)

SENATOR HUGHES asked the sponsor to provide a list at the next hearing of the various orders or requirements that were issued during the past two years and categorize them according to the 30-day and seven-day duration. She commented on the challenge of assembling the legislature in Juneau on short notice. She asked the members to comb through the bill before the next meeting, because emergency declarations need to work for the state, it's not a partisan issue. The Disaster statutes need to be reworked because they were written to apply to short-term emergencies, not over an extended term.

[4:42:53 PM](#)

SENATOR REINBOLD stated that she was happy to provide the list of the 18 mandates and health alerts as examples of how large and broad they were. She also highlighted that on page 3, subsection (d) in Section 4 states that each house may vote to ratify or terminate an emergency order by meeting remotely as established by or in the absence of the uniform rules. She acknowledged that the uniform rules needed to be addressed separately in statute, but SB 144 does address the applicability. She concluded that it is the legislature's duty to protect and defend individual liberties and prevent an out-of-control executive branch.

CHAIR HUGHES held SB 144 in committee.

4:45:15 PM

There being no further business to come before the committee, Chair Hughes adjourned the Senate Community and Regional Affairs Standing Committee meeting at 4:45 p.m.