

Testimony on HB 1615

3/5/25

Chair Larson, Vice-Chair Pahlson, members of Senate Judiciary Committee

~~The governor's~~ My name is Reed Johnson and I am a legal intern with the governor's office and a second-year law student at UNW.

As written, the governor's office opposes HB 1615. Currently, a public-spirited organization must apply first with the AG's office, next with the governing body of the city or county in which the proposed site is located, and finally securing approval for a site authorization from that governing body (NDCE 53-06.1-03 (2)(a)). Think:

(1) State, (2) City or County, (3) Establishment Bar. 1615 changes this by: ^{applying w/ State, second,} first, securing a gaming site location (p.1, lines 10), ^{finally,} next securing approval from the governing body of the city or county (p.1, lines 11-12), 1615 goes

(1) State, (2) Bar, (3) City or County. Additionally, 1615 says a governing body may ^{not} ~~next~~

"require a site to enter a lease with a specific organization as a condition of receiving a site authorization." p. 2, lines 7-8.

1615 allows bars to negotiate directly with charities and simply inform the County or City governing body on the back end. ~~The~~

↳ amendments do the same.

①

The governor's office has concerns about losing local governance and control over charitable gaming. By keeping the current language, the local governing body retains control over which charity may go to which ~~be~~ eligible bar or restaurant. ^{> no ^muscling}
The governor's office fears there will be unintended consequences if HB 1615 is passed as written. Thank you, and I stand for any questions of the committee.

* Accountable ≠ efficient *

Bill passed in original form: Amendments:

- bar owner doesn't have a say
 - allowed to have a preference in current state
- business arrangements