

**ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
HOUSE RESOURCES STANDING COMMITTEE**

February 12, 2024

1:22 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Representative Tom McKay, Chair
Representative George Rauscher, Vice Chair
Representative Thomas Baker
Representative Kevin McCabe
Representative Dan Saddler
Representative Stanley Wright
Representative Jennie Armstrong
Representative Donna Mears
Representative Maxine Dibert

MEMBERS ABSENT

All members present

COMMITTEE CALENDAR

HOUSE BILL NO. 296

"An Act relating to the powers of the board of agriculture and conservation; relating to loans and limitations under the Alaska Agricultural Loan Act; relating to federal crop insurance contributions; relating to municipal and state procurement preferences for agricultural products harvested in the state and fisheries products harvested or processed in the state; and providing for an effective date."

- HEARD & HELD

HOUSE BILL NO. 257

"An Act requiring the Department of Natural Resources to make Cook Inlet seismic survey data available to certain persons; and providing for an effective date."

- MOVED HB NO. 257 OUT OF COMMITTEE

HOUSE BILL NO. 281

"An Act relating to the permitting, lease, and sale of state land for remote recreational cabin sites; and providing for an effective date."

- SCHEDULED BUT NOT HEARD

PREVIOUS COMMITTEE ACTION

BILL: HB 296

SHORT TITLE: AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS/LOANS/SALES

SPONSOR(s): RULES BY REQUEST OF THE GOVERNOR

01/26/24 (H) READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
01/26/24 (H) RES
02/12/24 (H) RES AT 1:00 PM BARNES 124

BILL: HB 257

SHORT TITLE: COOK INLET SEISMIC DATA

SPONSOR(s): MCKAY

01/16/24 (H) PREFILE RELEASED 1/12/24
01/16/24 (H) READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
01/16/24 (H) RES
02/05/24 (H) RES AT 1:00 PM BARNES 124
02/05/24 (H) Heard & Held
02/05/24 (H) MINUTE(RES)
02/09/24 (H) RES AT 1:00 PM BARNES 124
02/09/24 (H) Heard & Held
02/09/24 (H) MINUTE(RES)
02/12/24 (H) RES AT 1:00 PM BARNES 124

WITNESS REGISTER

BRENT GOODRUM, Deputy Commissioner
Office of the Commissioner
Department of Natural Resources
Anchorage, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: During the hearing on HB 296, provided a PowerPoint presentation titled "HB 296 - CROP Act," on behalf of the House Rules Committee by request of the governor, sponsor.

RENA MILLER, Special Assistant II
Office of the Commissioner
Department of Natural Resources
Anchorage, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: During the hearing on HB 296, provided a sectional analysis of the bill on behalf of the House Rules Committee by request of the governor, sponsor.

BRYAN SCORESBY, Director
Division of Agriculture
Department of Natural Resources

Palmer, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: During the hearing on HB 296, answered questions on behalf of the House Rules Committee by request of the governor, sponsor.

ACTION NARRATIVE

[1:22:41 PM](#)

CHAIR MCKAY called the House Resources Standing Committee meeting to order at 1:22 p.m. Representatives Mears, Armstrong, Dibert, McCabe, Baker, Saddler, and McKay were present at the call to order. Representatives Wright and Rauscher arrived as the meeting was in progress.

HB 296-AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS/LOANS/SALES

[1:23:36 PM](#)

CHAIR MCKAY announced that the first order of business would be HOUSE BILL NO. 296, "An Act relating to the powers of the board of agriculture and conservation; relating to loans and limitations under the Alaska Agricultural Loan Act; relating to federal crop insurance contributions; relating to municipal and state procurement preferences for agricultural products harvested in the state and fisheries products harvested or processed in the state; and providing for an effective date."

[1:24:10 PM](#)

BRENT GOODRUM, Deputy Commissioner, Office of the Commissioner, Department of Natural Resources (DNR), introduced HB 296 via a PowerPoint presentation titled "HB 296 - CROP Act," on behalf of the House Rules Committee by request of the governor, sponsor. He stated that the governor's goals with HB 296 are to increase food security and independence for Alaskans and to grow and expand Alaska's agriculture economic sector. The bill is part of a series of immediate steps boosting state policies already in statute while work continues on short-, medium-, and long-term recommendations and actions.

MR. GOODRUM spoke to slide 2, "Agriculture in Alaska: Status Report," which read as follows [original punctuation provided with some formatting changes]:

- Robust Alaska agriculture is a long-held vision
- Hardy Alaskans are farming

- 2017 national census: Nearly 1,000 Alaska farms and ranches produced about \$29.6 M in crop value and \$40.8 M in animal production
- So much more potential - with the right support
- Why grow agriculture?
 - Greater food security and independence for Alaskans
 - Develop an economic sector (jobs, value chain benefits)

[1:26:17 PM](#)

MR. GOODRUM read from slide 3, "Agriculture in Alaska: Key Challenges," which read as follows [original punctuation provided with some formatting changes]:

- High cost, high risk business
- Often starting from scratch
- Market access, supply/demand
- Lack of infrastructure
- Human challenges: more farmers, laborers
- Chicken and egg dynamic - where can State be a catalyst?

[1:27:58 PM](#)

MR. GOODRUM displayed slide 4, "CROP Act." He said HB 296 considers structure already found in existing statutes and builds on three major components, forming the acronym CROP Act: Capital access, Revue protection, and Open Procurement. These components, he continued, are based on recommendations by task forces, division experts, stakeholders, and policy priorities. These components were selected for their ability to quickly get direct support to the industry with minimal new staff or new programs to be developed.

[1:28:38 PM](#)

MR. GOODRUM reviewed slide 5, "Capital Access - The 'C' in CROP Act." The Board of Agriculture and Conservation, he explained, is responsible for managing the Agricultural Revolving Loan Fund (ARLF), a key source of capital for farmers and producers. He said HB 296 seeks to be responsive to the agriculture industry's evolving needs. Comprised of seven working citizen members, the board finds it difficult at times to meet the five-person quorum

statutory requirement, which can unnecessarily delay action on loan applications and approvals. Reducing the quorum from five to four members would help increase efficiency of the board. As recommended by task forces, HB 296 would expand activities eligible for ARLF loans by adding shipping as an eligible activity to qualify for an ARLF loan, paving the way for new agricultural transportation focused cooperatives to help reduce shipping costs into and around Alaska. The bill would also allow refinancing of ARLF and other loans, assuming applicants and activities are ARLF eligible. A \$2 million capital infusion into ARLF would be the first capital injection to the fund since 1986, boosting available capital to lend by almost 20 percent to ensure ARLF has resources to meet the anticipated additional demand due to the bill's attractive provisions. To keep pace with inflation, HB 296 would also revise the current statutory cap of \$1 million in total loans to any one borrower. The board would set new loan limits and ceilings in regulation, a process that requires public notice and public input.

[1:31:01 PM](#)

MR. GOODRUM discussed slide 6, "Capital Access - Fund Data Points." He said ARLF currently has 52 active loans and that the graph depicts the types of activities for which those loans are being used [barley, flour; meat processing; other; flower fields; livestock, not cattle; dairy; cannabis cattle; oysters; produce-Greenhouses; hay].

[1:31:43 PM](#)

MR. GOODRUM moved to slide 7, "Revenue Protection - The 'R'." The concept of state funding of the premiums for federal crop insurance, he related, is already in statute [AS 03.13], but it was never funded; HB 296 would revise the support formula. The fiscal note includes capital to pay for the state support; \$2 million would support crop insurance premiums for current acres under production and allow for additional acres in the program. The state financed revenue protection would incentivize production to boost feed supply and support larger livestock herds, which would help offset risk and enable farmers, particularly new farmers, to invest in agricultural infrastructure and the expansion of production. At current production in 2023 premium levels, the five-year cost to the program is about \$900,000. Should participation grow in the program as desired, which would mean more acres under production, additional capital can be provided for premium support. The Alaska Farm Bureau and task force reports indicate

state support for insurance would help move the needle. Access to revenue protection policies will help increase access to capital and lower a farmer's risk while improving equipment like irrigation systems that boost production. Mr. Goodrum said HB 296 focuses on barley, wheat, and oats because these are the foundational crops of Alaska's livestock food chain. More secure livestock feed should enable greater herd size, which in turn improves the throughput at slaughterhouses, improving the economics of those operations. Federal crop insurance revenue protection is important because it covers price and crop risks and could in the future be required for feed grain crops under the ARLF loan eligibility.

[1:33:58 PM](#)

MR. GOODRUM continued to slide 8, "Revenue Protection - How it Works." He explained that eligible crops are those with revenue protection policies available, currently barley, wheat, and oats. In years one and two under the program the state would pay 100 percent of the premium [sufficient for the] farmer to achieve 85 percent revenue protection. There would be step downs in years three, four, and five. In year three, the state would pay 100 percent of the premium [sufficient for] the farmer to achieve 80 percent revenue protection and in year four that would step down to 75 revenue production. In year five and beyond the farmer would need to pay the premium to attain a [55] percent revenue protection and the state would pay the additional 15 percent to reach 70 percent revenue protection. The farmer would pay for any additional amount that he or she wants above that.

[1:35:07 PM](#)

MR. GOODRUM spoke to slide 9, "Revenue Protection - How it Works," which read as follows [original punctuation provided with some formatting changes]:

- Through federal Risk Management Agency (RMA)
- State role: accept applications, verify eligible producers, submit verification to RMA, send funds to RMA
- Producer role: selects coverage at desired level from an approved provider, reports acreage, pays any premium not covered by state
- State does not adjudicate loss claims or cover losses

1:36:09 PM

CHAIR MCKAY surmised there is an established metric for how many bushels per acre can be expected in Alaska for barley, wheat, and oats and that that is the basis for the insurance.

MR. GOODRUM confirmed that the RMA has been tracking these numbers and productions in Alaska for several years, so from an insurance perspective is comfortable in its understanding of production in Alaska.

1:37:24 PM

MR. GOODRUM resumed his presentation. He turned to slide 10, "Open Procurement - The 'O' and 'P'." He explained that the procurement preferences already in statute apply to state agencies and to school districts and municipalities that receive state funds. Procurements that have preferences include Alaska-grown agricultural products and fishery products harvested or processed in waters over which the state has jurisdiction. A protection included within HB 296 is that when responding to solicitations, sellers of eligible products must provide their current wholesale pricing lists, and debarment or civil penalties are possible for submitting inaccurate price information. As well, HB 296 directs that an annual report [be submitted] to the legislature with specific data requirements. Other than fishery products, only a very small number of Alaska producers can provide the quantities needed by institutional buyers, which is why increased spending is expected. Task forces, the [Alaska] Farm Bureau, and others have recommended more work on getting retailers to offer more Alaska-grown products, creating more opportunity for producers to scale up and to increase Alaska's local food security and independence.

1:39:19 PM

RENA MILLER, Special Assistant II, Office of the Commissioner, Department of Natural Resources (DNR), provided a sectional analysis of HB 296 on behalf of the House Rules Committee by request of the governor, sponsor. She spoke to slides 11-16 in Mr. Goodrum's PowerPoint presentation. She reviewed slide 11, "HB 296 - Sectional Overview," which read as follows [original punctuation provided with some formatting changes]:

- Capital access - Sections 1-6
- Revenue protection - Sections 7-10, 23
- Open Procurement - Sections 11-22, 24-25

- Four effective dates

MS. MILLER moved to slide 12, "HB 296 Sectional Analysis (version \A)." She discussed sections 1-7: Section 1 would reduce the seven-member Board of Agriculture and Conservation (Board) quorum from five to four. Section 2 would allow the Board to refinance debt and to make loans for shipping costs to and within the state. Section 3 would remove the \$1 million maximum amount of cumulative Board loans to any one borrower, and Board would set maximums in regulation; and would update loan security requirements. Section 4 would remove statutory cap to borrowers in farm disaster areas for short-term loans (less than one year) and Board would set maximums in regulation; would increase cap for borrowers not in farm disaster area. Section 5 would increase the cap on farm product processing loans from \$250,000 to \$500,000 and would make corresponding adjustments related to loan priority and security. Section 6 would remove \$250,000 statutory cap on loans for clearing land and Board would set maximum in regulation. Section 7 would increase the state contribution toward producers' federal crop insurance revenue protection policy premiums, and state support would step down after year two.

[1:43:15 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE RAUSCHER asked whether he is correct in understanding that HB 296 would remove the \$1 million ceiling for loans and the ceiling would be addressed through regulation.

MS. MILLER replied yes and explained that the Board of Agriculture and Conservation has authority to promulgate regulations and would do so to set that cap.

REPRESENTATIVE RAUSCHER asked whether the idea of having [the ceiling] in regulation is to lower or to raise [the ceiling].

MS. MILLER offered her belief that it is to allow flexibility and to raise that [ceiling].

REPRESENTATIVE RAUSCHER asked whether flexibility means [the ceiling] could be one amount for one person or farm and not for another.

MS. MILLER responded that the flexibility is in updating that as conditions require year after year should it be needed. With it currently set in statute, an act of the legislature is required to revise [the ceiling]. The bill would provide the Board of

Agriculture and Conservation with the flexibility to revise it by regulation.

[1:44:30 PM](#)

MS. MILLER resumed the sectional analysis for HB 296. She explained that Section 7 starts into those sections relating to the revenue protection of the federal crop insurance premium support. Section 7 would increase the state's contribution towards the producers' federal crop insurance policy premiums and go to the tiered system outlined by Mr. Goodrum; it would be on a percentage of revenue protection defined in Section 10. Section 7 would also replace provisions that are repealed by Section 23 of the bill relating to statutory language from the 1980s.

[1:45:58 PM](#)

MS. MILLER continued to slide 13, "HB 296 Sectional Analysis (continued)." She said Section 8 would provide conforming changes to align with Section 7. Section 9 would allow DNR to adopt regulations for the crop insurance program described in Section 7. Section 10 would define the term revenue protection in reference to the Code of Federal Regulations. Section 11 would, for a five-year period, require that municipalities which receive state funds to buy in-state agricultural products no matter how much more they cost compared to outside products, providing that the product is available in similar quality. Section 12 would, at the end of the five-year period, revert to current statute which says that municipalities "must" buy an in-state product if it's no more than 7 percent more expensive than out-of-state products and "may" buy it if it's up to 15 percent more expensive. Section 13 would, for a five-year period, would do the same as Section 11 in relation to the purchase of in-state fisheries products. Section 14 would, at the end of the five-year period, revert to the current preference for those fisheries products. Section 15 would, during the five-year period of broadening procurement preferences, require sellers of these agricultural or fisheries products to submit their wholesale price lists when responding to a municipality's solicitation for purchase. A seller providing inaccurate pricing information would receive penalties for doing so.

[1:48:04 PM](#)

CHAIR MCKAY remarked that the public might be concerned about the Section 11 provision that municipalities must buy in-state

agricultural products no matter the cost. There could be market manipulation, he said, such as someone outrageously overpricing a product and yet cornering the market on that product.

MS. MILLER replied that current statute provides a preference for in-state agricultural or fisheries products that says if there is a similar quality product in-state to out-of-state, then the in-state product gets a 7 percent preference. The preference applies to municipalities receiving state money that are also procuring these products to local school districts and to any agencies of the state. That preference would be expanded by HB 296 to say that for a five-year trial period the preference won't stop at 7 percent; rather, if there is an in-state version of the product that is available, then the municipality with the state's institutional buying power must purchase it. [The bill includes] protections to be responsible with this public money, reporting being a key protection aspect. The five-year trial period combined with the reporting requirement is intended to provide the legislature with data and information to determine how this procurement preference is working, and whether to extend that preference or to revert to the 7 percent or to take some other approach.

CHAIR MCKAY said he likes incentives to buy in-state but that this provision seems to be a bit non-free market.

[1:50:56 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SADDLER asked whether evidence is available which shows that the 7 percent preference isn't effective. He further asked whether information is available regarding having no cap for buying Alaska, and whether most of the Alaska-grown product would be captured if the preference was raised to 10, 20, or 50 percent.

MS. MILLER answered that DNR doesn't have much data right now. It is known that there is a limited amount of Alaska-grown agricultural products that are being produced in quantity and in a form that conforms with the needs of the potential buyers. Sometimes there is variation in the form of the product, such as an institution may require cut broccoli versus a head of broccoli. Relating to the drive toward food security and independence, the administration is looking with this preference to open doors for producers to expand their markets and in this instance to leverage the state's institutional buying power to do so. While more work is needed on longer term solutions to

expand market access, this preference is a step to take an immediate action and perhaps see some immediate gain.

REPRESENTATIVE SADDLER stated he supports food security but is concerned about writing a blank check. He said he would prefer to have some parameters to protect the exchequer if 7 percent isn't effective.

MS. MILLER offered her understanding.

[1:53:45 PM](#)

MS. MILLER resumed the sectional analysis. She proceeded to slide 14, "HB 296 Sectional Analysis (continued)". She stated that Section 16 would, at the end of the five-year period, remove the protection of submitting wholesale pricelists for those municipal contracts. Section 17 would go into different statute, the procurement preference for state agencies and school districts, and would do the exact same thing. Section 18 would, at the end of the five-year period for Section 17, revert to current statute. Section 19 would put in a five-year pilot period regarding municipalities and fisheries products. Section 20 would, [at the end of the five-year period for Section 19], revert to current statute. Section 21 would provide protection by requiring that wholesale pricelists [be submitted] when responding to a state or school district's solicitation for agriculture products. Section 22 would, [at the end of the five-year period], revert to the current statute that doesn't require the submission of wholesale pricelists.

[1:55:17 PM](#)

MS. MILLER displayed slide 15, "HB 296 Sectional Analysis (continued)". She said Section 23, which relates to the federal crop insurance contributions, would prescribe the state's contribution towards crop insurance for each covered producer, with Section 7 establishing the new formula. Section 24 would require the Department of Administration and the Department of Commerce, Community, and Economic Development to put together an annual report to the legislature. Section 25 would provide transitional language for how pending procurements would be addressed while transitioning to the new preference. Section 26 would allow the Board of Agriculture and Conservation and the Department of Natural Resources to implement regulations related to the bill. Section [27] would set an immediate effective date for Section 1 relating to the Board of Agriculture and Conservation quorum and Section 26 allowing regulations.

Section 28 would set a 7/1/24 effective date for the five-year pilot procurement preference increase. Section 29 would set a 7/1/25 effective date for the sections related to the state support for the federal crop insurance premiums; this effective date would provide a year for the [Division of Agriculture] and the Department of Law to work together on regulations for that program. Section 30 would set a 6/30/29 effective date for those procurement sections to revert to current statute at the end of that five-year trial.

[1:57:02 PM](#)

CHAIR MCKAY asked whether there is currently a problem with loan defaults given that HB 296 would expand the program.

[1:57:33 PM](#)

BRYAN SCORESBY, Director, Division of Agriculture, Department of Natural Resources (DNR), answered that of the 52 loans, five are currently in default. He said [the division] is working with those five on a regular basis to bring those loans current and paid off and the division is confident that that process will continue to work. He expressed his opinion that the performance is high on the kind of loans the division does.

CHAIR MCKAY concurred.

[1:58:41 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE MCCABE asked what DNR is doing to increase the number of U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) approved meat processing plants, given they are the end of the supply chain that is being talked about.

MR. SCORESBY replied that Alaska has three USDA slaughterhouses which are in Delta Junction, North Pole, and Palmer. A livestock grower can sell live animals to anyone at an agreed price without a USDA inspection at slaughter. There are some mobile slaughterers that kill animals on site and deliver them to a processor where they are processed and packaged for someone to take home. It is legal by all standards. To get into the retail chain, it must go through a USDA slaughterer; there is some protection for the rancher as well as the buyer when an animal gets slaughtered through a USDA inspected facility.

REPRESENTATIVE MCCABE offered his understanding that there is a need in Alaska for USDA processors because the state's prisons

and schools must use USDA meat. So, he continued, the state must ensure there is end processing for those products.

MR. SCORESBY responded that the state was once down to two USDA processors. He explained that the problem with slaughterhouses in Alaska is the shortage of animals for slaughter capacity. Increased animals on the farm and their being killed and processed in a USDA facility would make all of them more successful and maybe even profitable.

[2:02:12 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SADDLER asked whether there is an estimate of the amount of loans held by private borrowers that might be refinanced under Section 2.

MR. SCORESBY answered that it is unknown who would come to the division with a refinance request. He said there are farm loans from other institutions at a higher interest rate than what the division is currently charging, and the division would entertain some business from those. A refinance loan, he noted, would still need to meet all ARLF criteria as per a new loan would.

REPRESENTATIVE SADDLER pointed out that the Alaska Commercial Fishing and Agriculture Bank (CFAB) makes similar kinds of loans. He asked whether there are CFAB loans that might be refinanced at a lower rate through ARLF.

MR. SCORESBY replied that [the division] has some mariculture loans within its portfolio. However, until an application is seen, it is unknown whether it meets [ARLF's] criteria.

REPRESENTATIVE SADDLER asked whether there is any idea on what the demand might be for loans to cover shipping expenses.

MR. GOODRUM responded that DNR doesn't have that information yet as this is a new concept brought forth by some of the stakeholder groups that said forming transportation cooperatives would be good for the industry.

[2:04:47 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE MEARS stated that she wishes to engage with DNR in further discussion on three topics. The first topic, she related, is the inclusion of manufacturers in the revolving loan fund, which would require addressing the part of the statute that limits the power of the board [to] just farmers and

homesteaders. The second topic is loan repayment and that the State of Alaska should be first priority, which is a change that is included in Section 3. The third topic pertains to having different guardrails on the procurement because, she argued, an unlimited dollar amount constitutes an unfunded mandate to a lot of departments.

MR. GOODRUM offered his understanding that Representative Mears is saying she wants to engage DNR in further discussing these topics. He said DNR is willing and wants to learn more.

[2:06:41 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SADDLER noted that Section 1 would change the quorum for the Board of Agriculture and Conservation (BAC) from five of seven to four of seven. He asked how often properly noticed BAC meetings are inhibited or cancelled due to an absence of quorum.

MR. SCORESBY replied that last week three members of the BAC attended a scheduled work session, but without a quorum the work session couldn't be conducted at all. He further related that a year ago when he applied for his current position as director of the division he was a member of the BAC and therefore could not participate in the interviews, which created a conflict [with trying to reach a quorum].

[2:08:05 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SADDLER inquired about the difficulty in finding people willing to serve on the BAC.

MR. SCORESBY responded that one of the first tasks he did as director of the division was to fill the vacancies on the board. It isn't easy, he said, because members are volunteers and aren't paid. While their travel to board meetings is paid for, most of the meetings are via Teams. He pointed out that a conflict in recruiting board members from the farming community is that members are ineligible to get operating loans.

[2:09:16 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SADDLER observed that sections 4 and 5 expand the loan amount to \$500,000 and Section 3 gets rid of the \$1 million hard cap on loans and lets the BAC set a cap by regulation. He asked why some proposals in HB 296 would double the cap, but the \$1 million cap would be discarded.

MR. GOODRUM answered that the cap of \$1 million would not be done away with, it would later be set in regulation by the BAC. When the bill was being drafted, it was thought that these numbers made sense while allowing flexibility for the board to consider other caps that are better done in regulation.

[2:10:33 PM](#)

CHAIR MCKAY announced that HB 296 was held over.

[2:10:58 PM](#)

The committee took an at-ease from 2:10 p.m. to 2:13 p.m.

HB 257-COOK INLET SEISMIC DATA

[2:13:03 PM](#)

CHAIR MCKAY announced that the final order of business would be HOUSE BILL NO. 257, "An Act requiring the Department of Natural Resources to make Cook Inlet seismic survey data available to certain persons; and providing for an effective date."

[2:13:35 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE RAUSCHER moved to report HB 257 out of committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying fiscal note.

REPRESENTATIVE MEARS objected.

[2:14:07 PM](#)

The committee took an at-ease from 2:13 p.m. to 2:14 p.m.

[2:14:51 PM](#)

A roll call vote was taken. Representatives Rauscher, Saddler, Armstrong, Dibert, McCabe, Baker, and McKay voted in favor of the motion to move HB 257 out of committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying fiscal note. Representatives Mears voted against it. Therefore, HB 257 was moved out of the House Resources Standing Committee by a vote of 7-1.

[2:15:58 PM](#)

The committee took an at-ease from 2:15 p.m. to 2:19 p.m.

2:18:48 PM

CHAIR MCKAY noted that further work was being done on HB 281, so the bill would not be heard as scheduled.

2:19:11 PM

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the committee, the House Resources Standing Committee meeting was adjourned at 2:19 p.m.