

HOUSE FINANCE COMMITTEE
April 24, 2024
9:03 a.m.

9:03:18 AM

CALL TO ORDER

Co-Chair Edgmon called the House Finance Committee meeting to order at 9:03 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Representative Bryce Edgmon, Co-Chair
Representative DeLena Johnson, Co-Chair
Representative Julie Coulombe
Representative Mike Cronk
Representative Alyse Galvin
Representative Sara Hannan
Representative Andy Josephson
Representative Dan Ortiz
Representative Will Stapp
Representative Frank Tomaszewski

MEMBERS ABSENT

Representative Neal Foster, Co-Chair

ALSO PRESENT

Representative Jamie Allard, Sponsor; Representative Stanley Wright, Sponsor; Rachael Gunn, Staff, Representative Stanley Wright; Dawn Hannasch, Division Operations Manager, Division of Banking and Securities, Department of Commerce, Community and Economic Development.

PRESENT VIA TELECONFERENCE

Deborah Riddle, Division Operations Manager, Department of Education; Graham Downey, Economic Justice Lead, Alaska Public Interest Research Group, Anchorage; Tracy Reno, Chief of Examination, Division of Banking and Securities, Department of Commerce, Community and Economic Development; Marge Stoneking, Advocacy Director, AARP Alaska, Anchorage; Trevor Storrs, President and CEO, Alaska Children's Trust, Anchorage; Andy Bartel, Reverend, Anchorage; Bob Carey,

Executive Director, National Defense Committee, Washington, DC; Tim Sullivan, President, The Alaska Credit Union League, Anchorage.

SUMMARY

HB 111 EDUCATION FOR DEAF & HEARING IMPAIRED

CSHB 111(EDC) was REPORTED OUT of committee with five "do pass" recommendations, one "amend" recommendation, and four "no recommendation" recommendations and with one new fiscal impact note from the Department of Education and Early Development.

HB 145 LOANS UNDER \$25,000; PAYDAY LOANS

HB 145 was HEARD and HELD in committee for further consideration.

Co-Chair Edgmon reviewed the meeting agenda.

#hb111

HOUSE BILL NO. 111

"An Act relating to public school students who are deaf or have a hearing impairment."

9:04:24 AM

REPRESENTATIVE JAMIE ALLARD, SPONSOR, explained that deaf and hard of hearing children wanted to be treated equally to other children and to have access to the same level of education. She encouraged members to vote in support of the bill.

Representative Stapp MOVED to REPORT CSHB 111(EDC) out of committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying fiscal note.

Co-Chair Edgmon OBJECTED for discussion.

Representative Josephson relayed that he viewed the bill as advisory rather than mandatory, but the bill read as mandatory because it used the term "shall" to require that deaf and hard of hearing children be provided services. He was not sure where the resources to support the bill would

come from. He asked how the school districts would pay for the bill.

Representative Allard responded that the resources and funding were already being provided. Children who were deaf received 13 times the standard Base Student Allocation (BSA) formula funding and children who were hard of hearing received 1.25 percent times the standard BSA formula funding. There were a variety of ways for the school districts to communicate and provide the necessary resources.

Representative Josephson wondered what would happen if he asked school districts if the funding was being used and the districts responded that all of the funding was used up on other resources for children with hearing difficulties.

Representative Allard responded that a representative from the Department of Education and Early Development (DEED) was available to offer more details. Federal law obligated districts to provide resources to children as well because districts would not receive funding unless the proper paperwork was submitted. If a hard of hearing child submitted the paperwork for the funding, the school was required to provide the funding. The BSA would not be amplified unless the child applied for the benefits. She stressed that the funding was already available.

[9:07:25 AM](#)

Representative Galvin appreciated Representative Allard for bringing the bill forward. She understood that 13 times the BSA amounted to around \$80,000 and that students who needed assistance were required to work with two American Sign Language (ASL) interpreters to allow the interpreters to alternate throughout the day. She was concerned about the cost of two interpreters as well as the cost that would be incurred if students were enrolled in boarding schools.

Representative Allard relayed that there was no [substantive] fiscal note because the funding was already available. She thought the committee was looking for a problem that was not there. She was unsure as to why an absence of funding was being discussed when the funding was already present. She relayed that a representative from DEED was available to answer questions in more detail.

Representative Galvin wanted to ensure that 13 times the BSA was a suitable amount and the federal government was covering the costs.

Representative Allard clarified that the funding was not only coming from the federal government. Federal law required that deaf and hard of hearing children were treated equally.

[9:09:32 AM](#)

DEBORAH RIDDLE, DIVISION OPERATIONS MANAGER, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (via teleconference), responded that in addition to the BSA, the department had an agreement with Arc [The Arc of Anchorage] to help students who had opted to enroll in a residential school in Anchorage.

Co-Chair Edgmon asked her to repeat the acronym.

Ms. Riddle responded "Arc." She was looking for the meaning of the acronym [she later corrected herself and explained that it was not an acronym].

Representative Coulombe understood that deaf and hard of hearing children received funding that was 13 times the BSA. She asked if a district would need to use the funding on deaf and hard of hearing students or if it could spend the funding elsewhere.

Representative Allard responded that when there was a request for funding for a child with special needs or intensive needs, the funding went straight to the child.

Representative Coulombe understood there was no discretion for the school districts. She asked for clarification that a district could not spend the money on anything other than a student's needs.

Representative Allard responded that districts were "not supposed to."

Representative Ortiz appreciated Representative Allard bringing forward the bill. Based on the line of questioning and the answers that had been provided thus far in the meeting, he understood that the funding was present and that districts could receive assistance with regulatory

compliance. He asked why the bill was necessary if the important components were already in place.

Representative Allard responded that there was an incident where a district pulled an interpreter from a child and the child could not continue in school without the interpreter. The intent of the bill was to ensure that the regulations would be enforced and districts could not discriminate against deaf or hard of hearing children.

Representative Ortiz asked Representative Allard if she viewed the content of the bill as compulsory and not advisory. He asked what would happen to communities in rural Alaska that wanted to comply but could not because there were not enough interpreters in the community to provide the services.

Representative Allard responded in the affirmative and explained that districts could not discriminate any longer after the bill was put into statute. Currently, a district could choose not to comply. If there was a deaf or hard of hearing child in a rural community who wanted to learn amongst other students, there was a system in place where an interpreter could be available via video call and interpret in real time in the classroom. She added that a family member or friend could also attend school with the child and interpret for the child.

[9:13:55 AM](#)

Representative Ortiz understood that Representative Allard had previously stated that the money went directly to the parents. He asked if she was certain that the funding went directly from the state to the parents.

Representative Allard responded that she meant to say the money went directly to the child. The cost of an interpreter and any other means of communication needed by the child would be covered by the funding and the district would be responsible for ensuring that the costs were covered.

Representative Hannan commented that she taught many students during her teaching career who were deaf or hard of hearing and the district tried to serve all of the students. She presumed that when Representative Allard used the term "the district" she was referring to the Anchorage

School District (ASD). She noted that Representative Allard had been assisted by a sign language interpreter who was new to Juneau during a previous committee hearing. Interpreters working in schools worked as a pair for the entire day and were therefore not available to interpret for events in the evening. She was concerned that the bill would communicate to deaf and hard of hearing children that available resources would be transformed, but there would be no changes or additional funding. She stressed that she did not think anything would change because the regulations were already in place and the money was already available. She asked if Representative Allard pursued details in the aforementioned case where an interpreter was pulled from a child. There were many possible reasons as to why the interpreter was pulled, such as if the interpreter were to be no longer employed by the district. She wanted to provide better services and not pass a bill that would not change anything.

Representative Allard responded that she did not say that the regulations were not currently mandatory. She explained that the purpose of the bill was to codify the regulations in statute. She added that she was not only referencing ASD when she spoke about "the district" because ASD already covered the resources for deaf and hard of hearing children well. She was more concerned about rural communities and children missing out on education due to lack of resources. The bill needed to pass because it would provide hope to the deaf and hard of hearing community. She expressed that she was offended that the committee did not feel that the bill was important and it seemed that members wanted to find reasons why the state could not enforce the bill due to fiscal issues. She argued that the actions in the bill were already occurring and there was no fiscal note. She wondered why members thought it was permissible to discriminate against children who were deaf and hard of hearing. She stressed that the bill was important and needed to become law. She was directly impacted by the bill and also knew children who were impacted.

[9:18:08 AM](#)

Representative Hannan understood that Representative Allard had stated that by questioning the bill, the committee was discriminating against the hard of hearing community, which she thought was impugning motives that were not present. She explained that the committee had specific

responsibilities which included determining the fiscal impacts of bills. She thought it was inappropriate to allege that the committee was discriminating against deaf and hard of hearing children by fulfilling its obligations.

[9:18:59 AM](#)

AT EASE

[9:19:16 AM](#)

RECONVENED

Representative Allard responded that she did not mean to imply that Representative Hannan was bigoted. She meant to relay that there was no fiscal note and no reason why the committee should be concerned with the finances. The funding would only be necessary if a child had intensive needs or special needs. She wanted to ensure that all children with special needs received the necessary resources, including deaf or hard of hearing children.

Co-Chair Johnson returned to Representative Allard's presentation [titled "HB 111 Deaf and Hard of Hearing" dated March 4, 2024, (copy on file), presented to the House Finance Committee on April 16, 2024] and referred to slide 2. She felt like the bill was even more critical than she previously realized because it appeared that deaf and hard of hearing students were not presently being provided with enough resources. She noted that according to the slide, there were areas in Alaska where there were no deaf or hard of hearing children, which she knew was not true. She thought the screening process should be improved and the state was undercounting students, which meant it was also underserving students. She appreciated that the bill was brought forward.

Representative Allard relayed that the bill was an incentive for families who had children in the deaf or hard of hearing community and felt like the children were not properly supported. The bill would codify the regulations into law and ensure that deaf and hard of hearing children would learn amongst their peers.

[9:22:22 AM](#)

Representative Galvin commented that she was familiar with underfunded early intervention programs as well as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), which

was a federal law that mandated that the government must provide funding and resources for all students to learn in an equal manner. She was concerned that the state was not sufficiently identifying students in need of additional resources. She was concerned that \$80,000, which was the result of multiplying the BSA by 13, was not enough to provide sufficient resources to students in need if the students were identified. There had been research around broadband opportunities, but broadband was still not sufficient in rural areas of the state. She had experienced video calling with interpreters but the broadband was often not strong enough to support the software even in urban areas like Anchorage. She did not think the legislature had passed a law that ensured that broadband was sufficient to for a reliable connection with interpreters. She asked what the needs were, what could be done to better identify the needs, what were the laws that ensured that the needs were identified, and whether the state was properly funding the laws.

Representative Allard responded that she was worried about children who were deaf and hard of hearing in rural communities of the state. She thought that parents needed to be incentivized to bring deaf and hard of hearing children to school and she hoped that the bill would act as an incentive. The BSA formula that was already in place was presently the only method for determining funding amounts. There were families who sent their children to Anchorage because there were more resources for deaf or hard of hearing children in urban areas. She understood that it was a large issue, but she argued that there would be a substantive impact if the legislature was able to act in small ways every year.

Representative Josephson was confused by the fiscal note [prepared by Department of Education and Early Development with the control code yAGml]. He understood that the bill proposed that the program "must provide residential services." The bill stated that if a district wanted to provide services, it could do so, but if a district did not want to provide services, the state would provide the services. He understood that the state "must" provide the services, but the fiscal note said that the statewide program that included residential services could be offered by school districts with the resources and capacity to do so. He thought that "finance 101" knowledge was that the state provided the fiscal notes, not the districts. He

wanted to know what the impact on the school districts would be.

Representative Allard replied that Representative Josephson was correct but not every district could provide a suitable school; therefore, children were brought to the deaf and hard of hearing school in Anchorage. She thought the term "must" provided some flexibility and ensured that bringing children to Anchorage was an acceptable alternative to there being a school with resources in every district. She noted that children in the Mat-Su needed to commute to Anchorage. She suggested bringing Ms. Riddle into the conversation to provide additional clarity.

Co-Chair Edgmon asked Ms. Riddle to comment.

[9:28:19 AM](#)

Ms. Riddle responded that the department provided some funding to the school for deaf and hard of hearing children. The department also worked with Arc in Anchorage to help with the residential portion of the schools. She clarified that "Arc" was the name of the organization and was not an acronym. She explained that the reason for there not being a fiscal note was because the department was already providing the necessary resources to students who needed to come to Anchorage. She asked Representative Josephson if his question had been properly addressed.

Representative Josephson asked if the bill was largely a set of regulations that would be codified in statute.

Ms. Riddle responded that she believed so but needed to confirm the information.

Representative Ortiz relayed that he would like to return to Co-Chair Johnson's comments on the need for the bill as stated in the PowerPoint presentation. He thought Co-Chair Johnson made a good point in that the state was likely under-identifying the population of people who could use the services. He asked how the bill would specifically facilitate the identification of individuals with needs at a higher level.

Representative Allard responded that the bill passing on its own was not enough. She thought that legislators would need to promote the program to families and school

districts. The Senate had passed a committee substitute (CS) to enforce federal law which would be eventually combined with the bill. There was nothing in the bill that would necessarily promote the availability of the resources and another bill would likely be needed in order to do so. She reiterated that legislators would be responsible for promoting the program.

[9:31:47 AM](#)

Representative Stapp recalled that there was a motion on the table to report the bill out of committee.

Co-Chair Edgmon clarified that the Arc of Anchorage was a private nonprofit serving children and adults with mental health issues or disabilities.

Co-Chair Edgmon WITHDREW the OBJECTION. There being NO further OBJECTION, it was so ordered.

CSHB 111(EDC) was REPORTED OUT of committee with five "do pass" recommendations, one "amend" recommendation, and four "no recommendation" recommendations and with one new fiscal impact note from the Department of Education and Early Development.

[9:32:41 AM](#)

AT EASE

[9:33:43 AM](#)

RECONVENED

#hb145

HOUSE BILL NO. 145

"An Act relating to loans in an amount of \$25,000 or less; relating to deferred deposit advances; and providing for an effective date."

[9:34:11 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE STANLEY WRIGHT, SPONSOR, gave an overview of HB 145. He explained that the bill would protect consumers by capping the annual percentage rate at 36 percent for all loans under \$25,000. The cap would be a significant step towards preventing predatory lending practices that exploited financial desperation and trapped individuals in

a perpetual cycle of debt by eliminating special exemptions and allowing for annual percentage rates (APRs) as high as 521 percent. The bill aimed to promote fair lending practices and enhance financial security for all citizens.

RACHAEL GUNN, STAFF, REPRESENTATIVE STANLEY WRIGHT, added that almost 70 percent of payday loans in Alaska were taken out online and the vast majority of the loans were from out-of-state businesses. The arguments for historically astronomical APRs were rooted in the idea that loans were inherently risky and payback was not guaranteed, which required that there be a high interest rate. She argued that Alaska was unique in that the Permanent Fund Dividend (PFD) was garnished by lenders and it became a guaranteed loan. Every major payday lender had left a legacy of tens of thousands of small claims court cases viewable on CourtView in which lenders had garnished the PFD. She shared that within the last couple of months, Representative Wright's office had been contacted by a handful of out-of-state lobbyists speaking in opposition to the bill and representing banking interests. Almost every lobbyist with whom she had a conversation decided to cease engagement in Alaska after the lobbyists understood Alaska's unique situation due to the PFD.

Co-Chair Edgmon noted that there were several invited testifiers and public testifiers online but due to time constraints, he requested that testifiers keep comments concise.

[9:37:27 AM](#)

GRAHAM DOWNEY, ECONOMIC JUSTICE LEAD, ALASKA PUBLIC INTEREST RESEARCH GROUP, ANCHORAGE (via teleconference), explained that in 2023, the Alaska Public Interest Research Group (AKPIRG) helped 25 Alaskan families escape payday debt traps by paying down the families' loans. He had heard many stories about how everyday Alaskans were impacted. He emphasized that payday loans were immediately harmful to Alaskan families and trapped families in financial insecurity and debt for years. He relayed that AKPIRG was helping families who had been struggling to pay off loans for over two years and had at least \$80 of interest payments per month. The group had polled individuals across the state and individuals universally advised against taking out payday loans and thought that people would be worse off by taking out the loans. The polled individuals

universally supported the bill and supported the availability of repayable loans as opposed to non-repayable loans.

[9:39:03 AM](#)

TRACY RENO, CHIEF OF EXAMINATION, DIVISION OF BANKING AND SECURITIES, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (via teleconference), supported the proposed amendments to the bill that she thought would be heard in the near future. She understood that there was an amendment that would provide additional clarity for the exemptions given to small loans and was consistent with language used for other programs that were already administered by the Division of Banking and Securities (DBS). Due to the intense review that was required to obtain bank or credit union charters, the increased regulatory oversight and continued exemption was appropriate for national banks and federal credit unions.

Representative Galvin asked for more information about how the bill would impact the average Alaskan. Many Alaskans did not know the difference between banks and credit unions. She shared that she took out a payday loan when she was 24 years old and had three children and the experience was terrible. She explained that when she took out the loan, she was not paying attention to the type of institution.

Ms. Gunn responded that the amendment to which Ms. Reno was referring had not yet been made public or introduced to the committee. She explained that Representative Wright's office had been working with DBS to clean-up the Small Loans Act (SLA), which would not have any impact on the consumer. She noted that SLA operated under a three-tiered structure and the future amendment would flatten the interest rate across the \$25,000 in lieu of utilizing three separate tiers. She assured the committee that there would be more clarification once the amendment was finalized.

[9:41:42 AM](#)

MARGE STONEKING, ADVOCACY DIRECTOR, AARP ALASKA, ANCHORAGE (via teleconference), shared that AARP had a strong commitment to protecting financial resilience in older adults, including fighting for consumer protection. She relayed that AARP was requesting the support of the

committee to provide the same 36 percent maximum interest rate protection to veterans and older Alaskans that was afforded to active duty military members under the federal Military Lending Act (MLA). For older and vulnerable adults, costly installment loans were more likely to be a hinderance than a help. Vulnerable individuals who fell into a cycle of debt had few options to address the debt and return to a sound financial situation without depleting their limited assets. Some individuals may try to take on additional jobs or work more hours while being physically unprepared for the increased demand. She stressed that older adults were attractive targets for lenders. She appreciated the committee's time.

[9:43:32 AM](#)

TREVOR STORRS, PRESIDENT AND CEO, ALASKA CHILDREN'S TRUST, ANCHORAGE (via teleconference), relayed that the Alaska Children's Trust (ACT) strongly supported HB 145. He argued that the bill would prevent long-term negative impacts on families that could result from high interest payday loans. The harmful impact on families was widely recognized as a major risk factor of abuse and neglect. Parents were faced with increased difficulty in providing for their children's basic needs, such as food and housing. The scarcity of resources and the pressure to become financially solvent could lead to increased parental stress, which increased the risk for abuse and neglect. To alleviate short term financial hardships, families turned to payday loans because of the appeal of "quick and easy cash," but the loans could come with an interest rate of over 500 percent and did not build any credit for the families. Payday loans trapped many Alaskans in a cycle of debt and poverty and caused worse credit.

Mr. Storrs understood that some testifiers in opposition to the bill might say that payday loans helped families. He argued that payday loans helped families like a glass of salt water helped someone who was thirsty. He thought that HB 145 would ensure responsible lending by requiring that payday loans be subject to a reasonable maximum interest rate of 36 percent. He emphasized that that no one should be profiting off of the state's poorest and most vulnerable families.

[9:45:26 AM](#)

Co-Chair Edgmon OPENED public testimony.

[9:45:48 AM](#)

ANDY BARTEL, REVEREND, ANCHORAGE (via teleconference), testified in support of HB 145. He shared that the Alaska United Methodist Conference, which comprised of all methodists churches across the state and included people of all political affiliations, unanimously adopted a resolution in support of HB 145. He drew attention to the fact that the resolution was passed unanimously and added that the bill did not favor a particular political leaning. The churches believed that financial institutions served a vital role in society and must guard against abusive and deceptive lending practices that took advantage of vulnerable citizens for the gain of the richest citizens. Banking regulations needed to prevent practices that kept people in cycles of debt, which would be accomplished through HB 145. Payday lending in Alaska was a predatory practice and extracted millions of dollars from the most impoverished citizens and the local economy.

Mr. Bartel understood that some people in opposition to the bill would argue that payday loans were the only option for some people, but he argued that was simply not true. There were multiple credit unions in the state that had small-dollar-amount short-term loan products that came in below the proposed 36 percent cap. He thought that payday loans were a scourge on society and legislators had the opportunity to fix the problem. Before moving to Alaska, he was a pastor in South Dakota. Although South Dakota was a conservative state, it had enacted a similar cap on payday loans. Subsequent studies had only shown that the economy had only benefited from the cap. He relayed that South Dakotans were saving \$81 million per year on average as a result of the legislation. Instead of being used for interest payments on payday loans, the \$81 million could be used for housing, food, transportation, medicine, or other necessities. He thought that the legislature had an opportunity to make a real difference in the lives of the most vulnerable Alaskans and he implored the committee to pass the bill.

[9:48:40 AM](#)

BOB CAREY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NATIONAL DEFENSE COMMITTEE, WASHINGTON, DC (via teleconference), shared that he was a

retired naval officer and combat veteran. He represented a veteran's service organization committed to the civil and legal rights of military and veteran personnel. He understood the motivations of the bill, but argued that the data consistently showed that MLA had not served the military well and placed members in greater financial distress by denying access to necessary credit. He thought that veterans would be disproportionately impacted by the legislation. Military members did not establish significant credit and had significant periods of unemployment. He understood that much of the data showed that a rate cap had not helped the military. He had provided a letter to the committee (copy on file) in which he referenced a West Point study that showed that rate caps did not help the military, in addition to other polls that showed that military members were worse off after MLA than before the act. There was an additional poll mentioned in the letter that showed that half of all military personnel were denied credit due to MLA. He argued that the only thing rate caps did was cause military members to be denied credit. He did not think that the \$81 million saved in South Dakota was due to individuals receiving lower-rate loans, but because individuals were not receiving any loans at all. He added that half of all Americans had less than \$400 in the bank and could not remain afloat in the case of an emergency. He thought that a loan cap for veterans meant that the public no longer trusted veterans to make decisions for themselves once they were out of active duty. He reiterated his opposition to HB 145.

[9:52:09 AM](#)

Representative Ortiz asked for the testifier to repeat his name.

Mr. Carey responded with his name.

Representative Ortiz asked if Mr. Carey was the author of a letter dated April 23, 2024 (copy on file) that was not signed.

Mr. Carey responded that he had contributed to the letter from the National Defense Committee and four other groups, but he was not the sole author.

Representative Ortiz understood that Mr. Carey thought that by adopting HB 145, there would be individuals who would

not be able to access credit. He did not understand why he should not support the bill. He asked if Mr. Carey thought that the legislature would prevent people from accessing necessary credit and money if the bill were to pass.

Mr. Carey responded in the affirmative. The interest rates were not set by an arbitrary measure and were necessary in order to make a loan to a particular person. He thought the narrative about interest rates was false. Military members were already underpaid and were often young with children and needed to figure out how to pay their bills.

[9:54:39 AM](#)

AT EASE

[9:55:33 AM](#)

RECONVENED

Co-Chair Edgmon explained that the plan was to keep public testimony open and revisit it later.

Representative Josephson thought that the tone of Mr. Carey's comments suggested that the situation would either continue on in its current form or the bill would pass. He asked Mr. Carey if he found that there was no foundation for the claim that current same day payday loans were usurious.

Mr. Carey responded that he was not a banker and suggested that Representative Josephson consult with the industry to talk about the issue. He clarified that there was a narrative that if there were caps on loans, loan rates would magically come down. After MLA was enacted, lenders left the market and left the military "high and dry." Half of military members were denied credit due to MLA and he did not think it was a good practice. He could not say whether the system was usurious and suggested that Representative Josephson speak to bankers.

[9:57:48 AM](#)

TIM SULLIVAN, PRESIDENT, THE ALASKA CREDIT UNION LEAGUE, ANCHORAGE (via teleconference), relayed that the Alaska Credit Union League (ACUL) represented ten credit unions, nine of which were based in Alaska. The league supported the bill and thought it was a great action to take to protect consumers. The one concern that the league had was

about Section 9 which included loan insurance in the calculation for the lending percentage and was an additional product that was not required by federal law. He thought it should be stated that loan insurance was not required in order to garner a loan and was protected under the Fair Credit Reporting Act.

[9:59:06 AM](#)

Co-Chair Edgmon clarified that he planned to close public testimony and reopen it at the next hearing of the bill to include any additional testifiers.

Co-Chair Edgmon CLOSED public testimony.

[9:59:27 AM](#)

DAWN HANNASCH, DIVISION OPERATIONS MANAGER, DIVISION OF BANKING AND SECURITIES, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, reviewed the previously published fiscal impact note from the Department of Commerce, Community, and Economic Development (DCCED) with the control code znqFK. She explained that the department would not need to add anything to its budget as it had seen that similar licenses had declined over the last decade by 78 percent. There would be 19 licenses that would be impacted if the bill were to pass. The department anticipated that the Division of Banking and Securities would see a loss of about \$28,500 annually due to the loss of the biannual renewal license fee of \$3,000. She explained that licensees would then have the opportunity to apply for the Alaska Small Loans Act which had an annual renewal fee of \$1,000. The projected income from the licensees was not yet determined.

[10:01:09 AM](#)

Co-Chair Edgmon set an amendment deadline for Monday, April 29, 2024, at 5:00 p.m.

HB 145 was HEARD and HELD in committee for further consideration.

Co-Chair Johnson moved that Mr. Brodie Anderson, staff to Co-Chair Foster, be wished a happy birthday.

Co-Chair Edgmon reviewed the agenda for the afternoon meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

[10:02:51 AM](#)

The meeting was adjourned at 10:02 a.m.