

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
HOUSE LABOR AND COMMERCE STANDING COMMITTEE

March 27, 2023

3:15 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Representative Jesse Sumner, Chair
Representative Justin Ruffridge, Vice Chair
Representative Mike Prax
Representative Dan Saddler
Representative Stanley Wright
Representative Ashley Carrick
Representative Zack Fields

MEMBERS ABSENT

All members present

COMMITTEE CALENDAR

HOUSE BILL NO. 17

"An Act relating to insurance coverage for contraceptives and related services; relating to medical assistance coverage for contraceptives and related services; and providing for an effective date."

- HEARD & HELD

HOUSE BILL NO. 99

"An Act relating to and prohibiting discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity or expression."

- MOVED HB 99 OUT OF COMMITTEE

PREVIOUS COMMITTEE ACTION

BILL: HB 17

SHORT TITLE: CONTRACEPTIVES COVERAGE;INSURE;MED ASSIST

SPONSOR(S): REPRESENTATIVE(S) CARRICK

01/19/23	(H)	PREFILE RELEASED 1/9/23
01/19/23	(H)	READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
01/19/23	(H)	HSS, CRA, L&C, FIN
02/07/23	(H)	HSS AT 3:00 PM DAVIS 106
02/07/23	(H)	Heard & Held
02/07/23	(H)	MINUTE(HSS)

02/18/23 (H) HSS AT 3:00 PM DAVIS 106
02/18/23 (H) -- MEETING CANCELED --
03/02/23 (H) HSS AT 3:00 PM DAVIS 106
03/02/23 (H) Moved CSHB 17(HSS) Out of Committee
03/02/23 (H) MINUTE(HSS)
03/07/23 (H) HSS AT 3:00 PM DAVIS 106
03/07/23 (H) Moved CSHB 17(HSS) Out of Committee
03/07/23 (H) MINUTE(HSS)
03/08/23 (H) HSS RPT CS(HSS) 3DP 2NR
03/08/23 (H) DP: RUFFRIDGE, SUMNER, MINA
03/08/23 (H) NR: SADDLER, PRAX
03/16/23 (H) CRA AT 8:00 AM BARNES 124
03/16/23 (H) Heard & Held
03/16/23 (H) MINUTE(CRA)
03/17/23 (H) FIN REFERRAL REMOVED
03/17/23 (H) BILL REPRINTED
03/21/23 (H) CRA AT 8:00 AM BARNES 124
03/21/23 (H) Moved CSHB 17(HSS) Out of Committee
03/21/23 (H) MINUTE(CRA)
03/22/23 (H) CRA RPT CS(HSS) 5DP 1NR
03/22/23 (H) DP: HIMSCHOOT, MEARS, MCKAY, RUFFRIDGE,
MCCORMICK
03/22/23 (H) NR: MCCABE
03/27/23 (H) L&C AT 3:15 PM BARNES 124

BILL: HB 99

SHORT TITLE: DISCRIMINATION: GENDER ID.;SEXUAL ORIENT.

SPONSOR(s): REPRESENTATIVE(s) ARMSTRONG

03/08/23 (H) READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
03/08/23 (H) L&C, CRA, JUD
03/15/23 (H) L&C AT 3:15 PM BARNES 124
03/15/23 (H) <Bill Hearing Canceled>
03/17/23 (H) L&C AT 3:15 PM BARNES 124
03/17/23 (H) Heard & Held
03/17/23 (H) MINUTE(L&C)
03/20/23 (H) L&C AT 3:15 PM BARNES 124
03/20/23 (H) Heard & Held
03/20/23 (H) MINUTE(L&C)
03/27/23 (H) L&C AT 3:15 PM BARNES 124

WITNESS REGISTER

CHERIE BOWMAN, Staff
Representative Ashley Carrick
Alaska State Legislature
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: On behalf of Representative Carrick, prime sponsor, gave the sectional analysis of HB 17.

SARAH BAILEY, Insurance Specialist
Division of Insurance
Department of Commerce, Community, and Economic Development
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Answered questions on HB 17.

ROBERT CORBISIER, Executive Director
Alaska State Commission for Human Rights
Anchorage, Alaska,

POSITION STATEMENT: Answered questions on HB 99.

MARGRET BERGERUD, Legislative Council
Legislative Legal Services
Legislative Affairs Agency
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Answered questions on HB 99.

REPRESENTATIVE JENNIE ARMSTRONG
Alaska State Legislature
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: As prime sponsor, answered questions on HB 99.

TRISTAN WALSH, Staff
Representative Jennie Armstrong
Alaska State Legislature

POSITION STATEMENT: On behalf of Representative Armstrong, prime sponsor, answered questions on HB 99.

ACTION NARRATIVE

[3:15:33 PM](#)

CHAIR JESSE SUMNER called the House Labor and Commerce Standing Committee meeting to order at 3:15 p.m. Representatives Prax, Wright, Fields, Ruffridge, Carrick, and Sumner were present at the call to order. Representative Saddler arrived as the meeting was in progress.

HB 17-CONTRACEPTIVES COVERAGE:INSURE;MED ASSIST

[3:16:15 PM](#)

CHAIR SUMNER announced that the first order of business would be HOUSE BILL NO. 17, "An Act relating to insurance coverage for contraceptives and related services; relating to medical assistance coverage for contraceptives and related services; and providing for an effective date."

[3:16:35 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE CARRICK introduced HB 17. She stated that currently there are 28 states which require health insurance plans regulated by the state to cover contraceptive prescription drugs and devices, as laid out in the 2010 federal Affordable Care Act. Furthermore, 22 states and the District of Columbia ensure women can receive at one time a 12-month extended supply of contraception. She stated that HB 17 would put language into statute which aligns with the federal contraceptive coverage guarantee. It also allows up to a 12-month supply of prescription contraceptives. She explained that this would allow women in rural communities and those who work extended shifts in remote locations a continuous supply of contraception.

REPRESENTATIVE CARRICK stated that studies show that providing a one-year supply of prescription contraceptives compared to a 3-month supply reduces unintended pregnancies by 30 percent and drops the likelihood of abortion by 46 percent. She argued that the proposed legislation would also save the state money and pointed out a prior fiscal note had estimated an annual savings of \$1.35 million because of the reduction in unplanned pregnancies. She pointed out the three, zero fiscal notes attached to the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE CARRICK pointed out that currently obtaining contraception can be time consuming; however, she maintained that improved access would mean improved health for women and families. She stated that the proposed legislation would take away insurance coverage as a barrier to access. She added that the bill could also protect women in the presence of domestic violence, in terms of contraceptive cohesion. She argued the benefits of contraception for family and societal health and urged support for the bill. She advised that the emergency contraception language has been removed from the bill.

[3:20:54 PM](#)

CHERIE BOWMAN, Staff, Representative Ashley Carrick, Alaska State Legislature, on behalf of Representative Carrick, prime sponsor, paraphrased the sectional analysis of HB 17 [copy

included in the committee packet] which read as follows [original punctuation provided]:

Section 1

AS 21.42.427. Coverage for contraceptives.

Amends AS 21.42 by adding a new section which (1) requires a health care insurer to provide coverage for prescription contraceptives and medical services necessary for those products or devices; (2) requires reimbursement to a health care provider or dispensing entity for dispensing prescription contraceptives intended to last for a 12-month period for subsequent dispensing; (3) prevents an insurer from offsetting the costs of compliance; (4) prevents an insurer from restricting or delaying coverage for contraceptives; (5) if the provider recommends a particular service or FDA-approved item based on a determination of medical necessity, the plan or issuer must cover that service or item without cost sharing; and (6) exempts religious employers if certain criteria are met.

MS. BOWMAN added that subsection (d) [in paragraph (B)] would set out cost containment incentives, promoting the use of generic, low-cost medication and health care providers who offer services at a lower rate. As a cost containment strategy, she said that this gives insurers the ability to direct patients towards generics. She stated that when the lower cost contraception is not available, subsection (f) would allow an alternative or equivalent version of the contraceptive be given to the insured, and subsection (h) would allow a religious exemption.

MS. BOWMAN continued paraphrasing the sectional analysis, which read as follows [original punctuation provided]:

Section 2

AS 29.10.200. Limitation of home rule powers.

Amends AS 29.10.200 by adding a provision applying to home rule municipalities.

Section 3

AS 29.20.420. Health insurance policies.

Amends AS 29.20 by adding a new section clarifying that municipal health care insurance plans that are self-insured are subject to the requirements of sec. 1.

[3:23:19 PM](#)

MS. BOWMAN continued paraphrasing the sectional analysis, which read as follows [original punctuation provided]:

Section 4

AS 39.30.090. Procurement of group insurance.

Clarifies that a group health insurance policy covering employees of a participating governmental unit is subject to the requirements of sec. 1.

Section 5

AS 39.30.091. Authorization for self-insurance and excess loss insurance.

Clarifies that a self-insured group medical plan covering active state employees provided under this section is subject to the requirements of sec. 1.

Section 6

AS 47.07.065. Payment for prescribed drugs.

Requires the Department of Health to pay for prescription contraceptives intended to last for a 12 month period for subsequent dispensing for eligible recipients of medical assistance, if prescribed to and requested by the recipient, as well as medical services necessary for those products or devices.

Section 7

Uncodified law - applicability

Requires the Department of Health to immediately amend and submit for federal approval a state plan for medical assistance coverage consistent with sec. 6 of this Act.

Section 8

Uncodified law - applicability

Makes sec. 6 of the Act conditional on the approval required under sec. 7 of the Act.

Section 9

If, under sec. 8 of this Act, sec. 6 of this Act takes effect, it takes effect on the day after the date the revisor of statutes receives notice from the commissioner of health under sec. 8 of this Act.

[3:25:08 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PRAX questioned whether this would not prevent insurers from including the cost of compliance in their general insurance rates.

REPRESENTATIVE CARRICK expressed the understanding that this is correct. She deferred the question to the Division of Insurance.

[3:26:12 PM](#)

SARAH BAILEY, Insurance Specialist, Division of Insurance, Department of Commerce, Community, and Economic Development, expressed the understanding that the proposed legislation would not allow insurers to adjust cost shares, such as deductibles and copayments; therefore, the expectation is it would be applied to the premium, with some cost bidding. She notified the committee that under federal law currently insurers cannot apply deductibles or cost sharing on contraceptives.

REPRESENTATIVE PRAX, with a follow up for clarification, expressed the opinion that Section 5 of the proposed legislation would not affect any additional insurance coverage.

MS. BAILEY expressed agreement that this would be highly unlikely.

REPRESENTATIVE CARRICK concurred.

[3:29:23 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SADDLER, concerning remote work, questioned whether individuals seeking contraception would be away [from a doctor or pharmacist] for this extensive amount of time.

REPRESENTATIVE CARRICK responded that one of the major challenges the legislation seeks to address for Alaskan women is that prescription pick-up time is limited. There is also the challenge of having a doctor's appointment or making a visit to a pharmacist within short timeframes. She pointed out that this would be considering the time for travel back and forth to work, especially when women do not have access to a pharmacy on a regular basis. She expressed the opinion that this access should be as smooth as possible.

REPRESENTATIVE SADDLER questioned whether women in rural Alaska would have to travel to pick up any prescription drugs.

REPRESENTATIVE CARRICK responded that before receiving any prescription drugs, women would need access to a provider. She stated that some prescriptions can be delivered in the mail; however, in rural Alaska mail service is known to be unreliable. In response to a follow-up question concerning the justification for a prescription for a full year's worth of contraception, she expressed the opinion that a year is a reasonable amount of time and deferred to a pharmacist to confirm that the contraceptives would be safe in this dosage. She added that Alaskan women have requested this. In response to a follow-up question, she answered that a prescription of three months or six months would be better than the current situation; however, unless there is a strong medical reason, she suggested that there should not be a limitation.

[3:33:52 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE CARRICK, in response to a question from Representative Wright, stated that the proposed legislation would address women who come and go from rural areas of the state. She added that women in urban parts of the state also need these prescriptions to help control medical conditions, such as endometriosis.

[3:35:46 PM](#)

CHAIR SUMNER announced that HB 17 was held over.

[3:36:03 PM](#)

The committee took an at-ease from 3:36 p.m. to 3:37 p.m.

HB 99-DISCRIMINATION: GENDER ID.;SEXUAL ORIENT.

[3:37:16 PM](#)

CHAIR SUMNER announced that the final order of business would be HOUSE BILL NO. 99, "An Act relating to and prohibiting discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity or expression."

[3:38:41 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PRAX questioned whether the proposed legislation would allow the Alaska State Commission for Human Rights (ASCHR) to hear new cases.

[3:39:21 PM](#)

ROBERT CORBISIER, Executive Director, Alaska State Commission for Human Rights, responded that this is partially correct. Referring to Bostock v. Clayton County, 590 U.S. 644 (2020), he stated that when the Supreme Court of the United States first issued this decision, ASCHR immediately began taking employment cases. He stated that the Alaska Department of Law (DOL) gave guidance that all five subject matters could be addressed by ASCHR, until [Alaska's] attorney general (AG) provided an update August of last year. After this ASCHR did not stop taking employment cases, but it stopped taking cases in the other four areas. He stated that the proposed legislation would align state law with the Supreme Court's decision, allowing ASCHR to take cases in all five subject matters again.

REPRESENTATIVE PRAX, with a follow-up question, expressed uncertainty concerning the sequence of events. He questioned why Alaska's AG first agreed, and then did not.

MR. CORBISIER expressed uncertainty concerning this, as he was only briefly informed of the AG's decision.

[3:42:53 PM](#)

MARGRET BERGERUD, Legislative Council, Legislative Legal Services, Legislative Affairs Agency, stated that she could not add to the point per the internal decision-making process.

REPRESENTATIVE PRAX, with a follow-up question, asked whether there was a written redaction by DOL or whether the decision was based on a phone call.

MS. BERGERUD expressed the understanding that there was an email between the AG's office and ASCHR, but it was not an official opinion, and the redacted version was released after this.

REPRESENTATIVE PRAX questioned whether the redacted correspondence is available.

[3:44:34 PM](#)

The committee took an at-ease from 3:44 p.m. to 3:45 p.m.

[3:45:17 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE JENNIE ARMSTRONG, Alaska State Legislature, as prime sponsor of HB 99, expressed the understanding that Bostock v. Clayton County was limited to employment discrimination based on sex orientation or gender identity; therefore, it is inherently based on sex. She stated that some states had decided that any place [in the law] with language concerning sex should encompass this. Furthermore, sex is in the ASCHR's language, but it was communicated [from the AG's office] that no other areas beside employment should be covered. If other areas are to be covered, this would need to be in statute.

REPRESENTATIVE PRAX, with a follow-up question, asked whether there is another federal law, other than Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 ("Title VII"), that ASCHR relies on.

[3:46:24 PM](#)

MR. CORBISIER responded that the ASCHR looks at Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) for disability claims and the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Council (EEOC) for employment claims. He stated that the Supreme Court of Alaska has repeatedly affirmed that the interpretation of the statute should be based on the framework of Title VII. He stated that ASCHR has a contract with EEOC to investigate Title VII cases in Alaska, as these cases are considered co-jurisdictional. He added that federal funding is being received for each case that is resolved.

MR. CORBISIER, in response to a series of follow up questions, stated that [not all] cases involving EEOC are reimbursed by the federal government; however, he clarified that 80 percent of ASCHR's cases are employment related, [which are reimbursable by the federal government]. In regard to the proposed legislation, he answered that ASCHR would not be reimbursed by the federal government for any public accommodation cases. He continued that Title IX of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 ("Title IX"), which concerns education, is outside of ASCHR's jurisdiction. He stated that ASCHER would have jurisdiction over some educational institutions, but the commission has not had any Title IX cases.

[3:50:45 PM](#)

MS. BERGERUD added that Title IX addresses education institutions that receive federal funding. She continued that in regard to schools being an employer, ASCHR would have jurisdiction under Title VII.

[3:51:47 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PRAX asked whether ASCHR would have jurisdiction in a discrimination case if a member of the general public came into a school building, unrelated to education or sports.

MR. CORBISIER answered that it would have jurisdiction; however, it would depend on the facts of the individual case.

[3:52:48 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE CARRICK, concerning the fiscal note, questioned whether ASCHR would be able to handle the new mandates in the proposed legislation with existing staff and financial resources.

MR. CORBISIER responded in the affirmative. He stated that ASCHR had already been doing all of these cases from December 2020 until August 2022. In response to a follow-up question, he expressed uncertainty concerning the number of cases during this period because the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer or questioning (LGBTQ) cases were not independently tracked. He added that these cases all fell under "sex discrimination."

[3:54:06 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE RUFFRIDGE, concerning putting LGTBQ discrimination cases under the general heading of "sex," questioned whether the proposed legislation would ensure that this perspective would continue.

MR. CORBISIER responded that this is an accurate assessment.

REPRESENTATIVE RUFFRIDGE, with a follow-up question, referred to the definitions HB 99 would put into statute linked with Title VII. He expressed uncertainty on the linkage and questioned how it would be connected to "blockbusting."

MS. BERGERUD responded that the proposed language in Section 1 would add "sex discrimination" to the protected classes listed under blockbusting, as the current law does not prohibit this. In response to a follow-up question, she stated that there is not a link to Title VII, but the intention of the proposed legislation is to take the language from the federal judge's decision and codify the definition in state statute, and by doing this, it would closely match federal regulation. She

added that when the legislation for human rights was enacted in Alaska, it was written to follow the format based on Title VII, and this is the connection.

[3:58:53 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PRAX, referring to deleted language from Section 1 of the proposed legislation, questioned how this would narrow the application of this section. He questioned the reasoning behind this decision.

[3:59:33 PM](#)

TRISTAN WALSH, Staff, Representative Jennie Armstrong, Alaska State Legislature, on behalf of Representative Armstrong, prime sponsor, answered that the referenced change is a conforming change from the version of the bill from the prior session. He expressed the understanding that the change was made because of legal drafting standards. He deferred to Ms. Bergerud.

MS. BERGERUD confirmed that this was a conforming change; however, the language could be changed back if the committee requested this.

REPRESENTATIVE PRAX questioned whether the added definitions in Section 2 would broaden the definition of "sex" in regard to AS 18.80.

MS. BERGERUD responded in the affirmative.

REPRESENTATIVE PRAX questioned whether any current legal cases have been decided to help understand the application of the definitions in Section 2.

MS. BERGERUD responded that there has not been any local or state guidance in the law on these definitions. She offered the understanding that the federal court system has been addressing this issue because Bostock v. Clayton County is a relatively new decision. In response to a follow up concerning other cases, she responded that there have been other federal cases; however, she expressed uncertainty about cases concerning public accommodations which would provide substantive guidance. In summary, she stated that there are many cases "winding their way" through the court system across the country, but no guidance has been given.

MR. WALSH, concerning the language in Section 2, stated that this was adopted when the bill was before the prior session. He continued that language concerning the definition of "sex" and "sexual orientation" was also added to the bill, because past definitions had been limited and outdated.

[4:05:50 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PRAX, in a follow up, asked whether the definitions of "sex" and "sexual orientation" in Merriam Webster's Dictionary has been used by the courts.

MR. WALSH responded that traditionally this dictionary, along with Black's Law Dictionary, has been used. He deferred to Ms. Bergerud.

MS. BERGERUD responded that in the statutory interpretation the court system would look for the plain meaning of the language, and this would be what a group of relevant individuals think a word means. After this, these dictionaries and others would be referred to in order to find a common thread of meaning. She stated that the courts do not have a definitive way of doing this.

REPRESENTATIVE PRAX expressed the concern that language changes over time and expressed doubt that there is a common understanding of these definitions. He questioned the attire concerning "drag" and expressed the understanding that it would be "garish."

[4:09:09 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE FIELDS, concerning proper attire at the workplace, questioned whether employers would be able to maintain expectations. Notwithstanding a person's sexual orientation, he questioned the acceptance of "drag" attire in the workplace.

MR. CORBISIER responded that the expectation of proper attire in the workplace would be reasonable. He gave the example that some workplaces do not allow hoodies or jeans, which are considered gender neutral pieces of clothing.

MR. WALSH noted, for the record, that "drag" is typically described as an "art form" and not normally a workplace consideration. If an employee comes out as transgender, and the employee's attire becomes an issue with the employer, this would

be a verbatim case of Bostock v. Clayton County, where it is directly addressed.

[4:12:42 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SADDLER question whether there is a finite number of gender identities.

MR. CORBISIER expressed the opinion that the answer is no.

REPRESENTATIVE SADDLER suggested that this is then subjective.

MR. CORBISIER responded that there would be an objective test, as in Bostock v. Clayton County.

REPRESENTATIVE SADDLER expressed the understanding that Mr. Corbisier's answers were contradictory.

MR. CORBISIER clarified that there is not a finite universe of gender identities; however, there still would be an objective test. He offered the example of a female employee married to a male; however, if the same female is married to a woman, and the employer lets the employee go because of this, this would be a sex-based discrimination.

REPRESENTATIVE SADDLER posed that if there is no finite universe of gender identity, then anybody can assert that an identity exists; when an individual is treated differently because of this [there could be a discrimination case]. He questioned whether this is a fare statement.

MR. CORBISIER concurred with the statement. He further explained by comparing this to the idea that there is no finite universe of race for humans, with every race being a protected class. He added that every single human being is a member of a protected class that is their race.

REPRESENTATIVE SADDLER surmised, "We are all special."

[4:15:38 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE FIELDS, in response to the discussion, suggested that for discrimination cases, it is not what is the gender or race, rather there must be proof with evidence of discrimination because of this existence of the gender or race. He argued that this is the key point.

MR. WALSH, addressing the topic, stated that a series of tests were created in result of Bostock v. Clayton County. He explained that these tests require a high bar, and they would be used to examine other cases being made. He gave an example.

[4:17:31 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PRAX provided an example of an employee not removing a tongue stud when repeatedly asked by the employer, and subsequently the employee was fired. He questioned whether this was discrimination.

CHAIR SUMNER, referring to Bostock v. Clayton County, expressed the opinion that if the same action had been taken with a female employee, it would not be discrimination.

REPRESENTATIVE PRAX expressed concern over this example because there may not be another employee to compare this with.

[4:20:52 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE CARRICK requested an example which would illustrate the required burden of proof for a case to be pursued. She suggested that it would be a high bar for ASCHR to take on a case.

MR. CORBISIER stated that any details of cases which are not in the annual report cannot be discussed because of the law concerning public records. In general, he stated he can describe the process and the evidentiary standards. He stated ASCHR is required on a jurisdictional basis to take in any case presented which has been articulated. Once evidence has been presented, it will be determined if there is substantial evidence present. He stated that the court has said that substantial evidence lies between reasonable suspicion and probable cause, with probable cause being at 50 percent. However, if the case is deemed to have substantial evidence, this would not mean it will go to trial, because if it does go to trial it would need to be proved by a preponderance of evidence.

[4:26:27 PM](#)

MR. WALSH, concerning Representative Prax's previous question, answered that dress codes can be expected by employers. Businesses would be in violation of Bostock v. Clayton County when a trait has been related to the individual's sex and the

termination of employment. He quoted from the decision and explained the "but-for" test. He stated that, in other words, if one aspect [of an individual's sex] changes the outcome of the scenario, then a "but-for" cause has been found.

[4:28:55 PM](#)

The committee took an at-ease from 4:28 p.m. to 4:34 p.m.

[4:34:13 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE WRIGHT questioned whether there are mechanisms in place for a fraudulent claim of sex discrimination.

MR. CORBISIER responded that the investigation would reveal this type of fraud. He stated that this applies to all complainants. He continued that 90 percent of cases presented to ASCHR end up with no substantial evidence. He added that all the cases can be appealed. In response to a follow-up question, he stated that when circumstances merit it, there can be an award of fees.

[4:37:13 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE ARMSTRONG, with closing comments, related a story of an Alaskan transgender teenager, who had the question, "Why don't people want us to be happy? Could you find that out for me." She stated that the proposed legislation would be the first step in the answer to this question. She continued by remarking that making Alaska a place where people feel welcome would help businesses, military families, and young adults.

[4:38:37 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE RUFFRIDGE moved to report HB 99 out of committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying zero fiscal notes. There being no objection, HB 99 was reported out of the House Labor and Commerce Standing Committee.

[4:38:59 PM](#)

The committee took an at-ease from 4:38 p.m. to 4:40 p.m.

[4:40:17 PM](#)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the committee, the House Labor and Commerce Standing Committee meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.