

STATUTE REVISIONS PROPOSALS SURVEY

No.	Budget No. - Agency	North Dakota Century Code Title(s), Chapter(s), or Section(s) and Description	No.1 Briefly describe the current process or program established in statute.	No.2 Briefly describe any issues, problems, or inefficiencies with the current process or program.	No.3 Briefly describe your agency's proposed solution or statutory change to correct the issue or problem or to improve the efficiency of the process or program.	No.4 Describe the fiscal impact, if any, of the proposed solution or statutory change on general fund or other fund revenues or expenditures for the 2027-29 biennium.	No.5 Does your agency intend to submit an agency prefiled bill draft on this topic for introduction during the 2027 legislative session?	No.6 Would your agency be willing to present to the Legislative Task Force on Government Efficiency regarding this topic?
1	108 - Secretary of State	Section 54-35-15.2(10) - Information Technology Committee - Powers and duties	Paragraph 10 defines the criteria to qualify as a major IT project. For the purposes of this subsection, a major project is an information technology project that meets one or more of the following criteria, as determined by the Chief Information Officer: a. An estimated total cost, as defined by the information technology department, of five million dollars or more; b. Requires one year or longer to reach operational status; or c. Requires oversight due to its potential benefits, risks, public impact, visibility, or another significant reason.	Issues related to 10.b requires one year or longer to reach operational status. There are limited implementations regardless of cost that take less than 1 year to implement. The 1-year project implementation timeline pulls almost all projects into project management (even when likely unneeded) due to time needed for IT involvement, intake process, review, project charter development, procurement, hosting environment stand-up etc. which typically takes 6-8 months before an agency can even launch development work. End-to-End project timelines when working around other agency needs (tasks/responsibilities - elections) can extend implementation timelines and increase costs from a project management aspect. Upgrades to systems, which are already known and have already gone through all IT oversight in implementation, get pulled into full scale project management.	Review of thresholds and timelines and criteria to ensure they are capturing those projects with appropriate risk, dollar threshold and impacts. This level of oversight on the vast majority of IT projects increases costs in project management and greatly diverts staff time to meetings in which not much actually happens from an oversight perspective as the project is lower risk. Provide agency a seat at the table related to IT decision making on projects they are sponsors on. Review on upgrades of systems what IT elements need to be redone or whether the project needs full project management regardless of implementation timeline. Exclude upgrades from large project oversight	Estimated cost savings are difficult to quantify at this point in time, but the agency has immediately felt the impacts of including this level of oversight to an upgrade. Savings will be realized in reduced Enterprise Project Management Office costs, project manager cost and staff time for multiple high cost FTE that could be directed to the highest priority responsibilities	No	Presented in December 2025
2	108 - Secretary of State	Chapter 16.1-09 - Statement of Interests	House Bill No. 1469 (2025) updated statement of interests filing requirements to an annual filing.	Statements of interests are required annually for all roles held by an elected official, governor appointed cabinet member or board member, as well as if filing for candidacy. This requires each individual with multiple roles to enter the same information repeatedly for each role.	Suggest adjusting the law to accommodate one filing for all roles so it removes unnecessary duplication on the annual filing.	Estimated cost of \$50,000 - \$75,000 to upgrade systems to accommodate multiple role assignments to one filing.	No	N/A
3	110 - Office of Management and Budget (OMB)	Chapter 48-09 - Concessions	Procurement of concessions (cafes, restaurants, and confectioneries). Newspaper advertising is required at \$25,000.	Law requires award to highest responsible bidder based on offered rental rate only, without allowing for considerations other than financial return. Also, the threshold of \$25,000 annually for advertising for three weeks in the newspaper is low compared to other procurement statutes.	Amend the law to give government entities flexibility to do either a bid or a request for proposal process that evaluates cost and other factors like menu, experience and reference checks, plus revenue potential. Raise the advertising threshold to \$50,000 or higher.	Nominal impact on the General Fund. Potential higher revenue generation if the change results in improved quality of the concessions. Insignificant savings on newspaper advertising at a higher threshold. Efficiency is achieved by requiring competition at a higher threshold and using qualitative and cost evaluation criteria to measure the responsibility of the contractor and quality of the proposed concession services.	No. If pursued we would seek legislative sponsor.	Yes
4	110 - OMB	Chapter 54-44.7 - Architect, Engineer, and Land Surveying Services	Selection of architect, engineer, and land survey using a competitive process for projects with fees exceeding \$35,000.	Authority to create a pool of pre-qualified architects, engineers, and land survey contractors is limited to certain agencies: Department of Transportation, Department of Water Resources, and (most recently) the Adjutant General (Senate Bill No. 2130 (2025))	Suggest amending language similar to SB 2130 (which was also incorporated into House Bill No. 1623 - the rural health appropriation bill passed during the January 2026 special legislative session) into Chapter 54-44.7. See House Bill No. 1623, Section 7, Subsection 2.	Savings of time and labor by creating authority for agencies to have a pre-qualified vendor pool of architect, engineers, and land surveyors. These services are required for any public improvement over the threshold for bidding.	No. If pursued we would seek legislative sponsor.	Yes
5	110 - OMB	Chapter 46-05 - Newspapers - Publication of legal notices	Section 46-05-03 requires OMB to biennially negotiate a standard rate for legal notice publication. Section 46-05-09 requires legal notice publication on the website maintained by the North Dakota Newspaper Association. Various sections of Century Code require publication of legal notices in newspapers.	Calculating rates for newspaper posting is a manual, labor-intensive practice. As newspaper publication becomes less frequent and fewer local newspapers continue publication, requiring legal notice publication in newspapers becomes less practical than simply requiring public notice through an appropriate online publication.	A more cost effective and efficient way to publish notices that are currently required to be published in newspapers may be publication on a state managed online portal, such as the Alaska Online Public Notice portal.	Although not quantified, cost savings could be significant. A typical display advertisement in all North Dakota official county newspapers costs between \$3,000-\$4,000, per notice.	No	No
6	117 - State Auditor	Section 54-10-14 - Political subdivisions Audits - Fees - Alternative audits and reports	Lists political subdivisions subject to audits once every two years.	The code is vague and causes confusion among political subdivisions on its application. There are a couple dozen different political subdivision types listed in this section but there are dozens of situations where these entities operate under these names but do not collect taxes, or operate as non-profits, and we believe that is not the intent of the law for these entities to submit financials to our office.	To clarify in code which specific statutes the entities are operating under that would qualify for 54-10-14, thus creating a district delineation to whether a political subdivision must comply with the statute.	None	Possibly	Yes
7	117 - State Auditor	Section 54-10-14 - Political subdivisions Audits - Fees - Alternative audits and reports	Lists political subdivisions subject to audits once every two years.	Some political subdivisions are audited as a part of a governing body but read the statute and think they have to have their own audit.	Clearly outline in statute that entities already audited as part of another political subdivision do not have to have their own audit.	None	Possibly	Yes
8	190 - Retirement and Investment Office (RIO)	N/A - Information Technology Department	Centralizing information technology services into a single agency has reduced flexibility, slow decision-making, and limited responsiveness to agency-specific needs. In addition, RIO must absorb a share of the central IT organization's overhead costs, which has increased expenses without necessarily improving service quality or efficiency.	Centralizing IT services under ITD limits RIO's flexibility. RIO also incurred additional shared-service fees that include overhead and tools they may not fully use, increasing overall costs.	The agency will bring desktop support services in-house to improve responsiveness, accountability, and user support for day-to-day operations. Core enterprise functions—such as cybersecurity, network infrastructure, cloud services, and statewide systems—will remain with ITD to leverage specialized expertise and shared resources. This hybrid model creates internal efficiencies while preserving the benefits of centralized, high-risk and highly technical services.	Two FTE's will be shifted from ITD budget to the RIO budget.		Yes
9	190 - RIO	N/A - ITD billing transparency	The current ITD invoices lack sufficient detail and are difficult to interpret, preventing effective review and validation of charges. As a result, we have identified overpayments and request improved billing transparency tied to specific services and contract terms.	The ITD billing process lacks sufficient detail and transparency, making it difficult to reconcile charges to specific services or contractual terms. This opacity creates inefficiencies in financial oversight, increases administrative burden, and has already resulted in identified overpayments. Without clearer invoicing, accurate budgeting, auditability, and accountability are compromised.	Implement standardized, itemized invoicing that clearly ties each charge to a specific contract, service, billing period, and rate. Require monthly billing reconciliation with supporting documentation, establish pre-payment review controls, and hold quarterly billing review meetings with ITD to resolve discrepancies and prevent overpayments.	The proposed solution is expected to be cost-neutral to low-cost to implement, as it primarily involves process changes rather than new systems. In the near term, it may require minimal staff time to establish review controls and conduct reconciliation, but over time it will generate savings by preventing overpayments, improving budget predictability, and reducing time spent resolving billing disputes.		Yes
10	190 - RIO	N/A - ITD large IT approval process	ITD Large IT approval process.	The current process lacks timely classification, early project management assignment, predictable decision-making cadence, and clear communication around prioritization. These gaps resulted in avoidable delays, duplicated effort, and increased operational burden on RIO staff.	Earlier confirmation of project status, prompt assignment of a dedicated project manager, and more structured decision timelines would materially improve efficiency.	The proposed solution is expected to be cost-neutral to low-cost to implement, as it primarily involves process changes rather than new systems.		Yes
11	192 - Public Employees Retirement System (PERS)	Section 54-52.2-03.2 - Deferred Compensation Program - Board authority - Provider information	There are currently thirteen active providers participating in our 457 Deferred Compensation Plan. Of these, four providers are authorized to enroll new hires into their respective plans	The Public Employees Retirement System is responsible for accurately implementing and maintaining reporting changes for all providers within the 457 Deferred Compensation Plan. Effective January 1, 2026, we began accepting rollover contributions, which required system updates to accommodate all thirteen providers. Additionally, PERS tracks contributions and withdrawal activity for each provider on a quarterly basis. The PERS Companion Plan is the only plan under our Board's fiduciary oversight. We do not have visibility into fees assessed by other providers, whether those providers act as fiduciaries on behalf of our members, or any other activities that may occur within those organizations.	Direct all new enrollees into the Companion Plan. This approach will strengthen the plan by increasing membership, thereby enhancing collective purchasing power within the industry. Greater buying power is expected to help maintain minimal fees for employees participating in the plan. Additionally, consolidating enrollment under a single provider will significantly reduce administrative time and complexity, eliminating the need to reconcile multiple providers in the future.	This change is not expected to result in any fiscal impact. Instead, the proposed adjustments will deliver significant administrative efficiencies and strengthen member confidence in the plan. By streamlining processes and consolidating enrollment, we aim to enhance operational effectiveness while reinforcing trust in the stability and value of the Companion Plan.	Yes	Yes
12	192 - PERS	Section 54-52.3-03 - Employer savings used to defray expenses of administering program - Continuing Appropriation	The employer portion of Federal Insurance Contributions Act (FICA) savings generated from employee enrollments in the Flex Spending Program is currently redirected to the PERS office to cover the administrative expenses of our agency. This allocation ensures that operational costs are managed effectively without additional fiscal impact on participating employers or employees.	Currently, PERS administers the FlexComp program for all state employees, excluding those in higher education. Higher education institutions manage their own FlexComp programs, with each individual campus responsible for specific compliance activities throughout the year.	The Public Employees Retirement System and higher education are currently evaluating the potential to reduce costs to the State by consolidating the administration of Higher Education's FlexComp program under the PERS umbrella, rather than maintaining separate administration by higher education institutions.	The Public Employees Retirement System and higher education are currently evaluating this possibility.	Unknown	Yes
13	201 - Department of Public Instruction (DPI)	Section 15.1-02-16 - Superintendent of Public Instruction - Issuance of credentials to teachers and administrators; Administrative Rule 67-11-24	A School health technician is an individual who has demonstrated an understanding of common school health needs and can respond appropriately and efficiently in a school setting and can determine when referrals are needed. Individuals who wish to provide services as a school health technician in educational settings must hold the North Dakota certificate of completion for school health technicians. To obtain the school health technician certificate of completion, an individual must complete and submit the required application and provide documentation of completing the following trainings: •First Aid, CPR, and automated external defibrillator training (provider of your choice) •Medication administration course taught by a registered nurse (provider of your choice) •Completion of an approved online training as identified by the Department of Public Instruction and the Department of Health and Human Services The approved online training course "School Health Technician Certification" can be found on the North Dakota Educational Hub. •Administrative Rule 67-11-24 •School Health Technician Flyer •Application for School Health Technician Certificate	Although DPI and DHHS collaborated to put together the qualifications, classes, forms, etc. for a person to receive this "Certificate" - DPI has yet to have even one person even inquire about it. There seems to be zero interest in this at the school/district level. This legislative action does not require districts to hire or certify anyone under this section. There is no cost to apply for this credential. Therefore, this credential is not needed and creates both educator and administrative burden.	Remove this option from the list of credentials that DPI maintains and offers.	The fiscal impact would be in the maintaining of training and personnel to keep this on the list. The estimate would be approximately \$10,000 annually and approximately 0.10 FTE.	Yes	Yes

No.	Budget No. - Agency	North Dakota Century Code Title(s), Chapter(s), or Section(s) and Description	No.1 Briefly describe the current process or program established in statute.	No.2 Briefly describe any issues, problems, or inefficiencies with the current process or program.	No.3 Briefly describe your agency's proposed solution or statutory change to correct the issue or problem or to improve the efficiency of the process or program.	No.4 Describe the fiscal impact, if any, of the proposed solution or statutory change on general fund or other fund revenues or expenditures for the 2027-29 biennium.	No.5 Does your agency intend to submit an agency prefiled bill draft on this topic for introduction during the 2027 legislative session?	No.6 Would your agency be willing to present to the Legislative Task Force on Government Efficiency regarding this topic?
14	201 - DPI	Section 15.1-02-16.2 - Credentials for teachers and coordinators of Title I; Administrative Rule 67-11-03.5	A new section of Chapter 15.1-02 was created and relates to credentials for teachers and coordinators of Title I and requires the DPI to do the following: "The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall create a process to reinstate and recertify Title I credentials for individuals in the state who held a valid certification, issued by DPI, as of July 1, 2018, and continue the process in perpetuity. A school district may advertise employment for a Title I certified teacher each year until the position is filled. The board of a school district may authorize the hiring of a teacher who is not certified as a Title I teacher for the school year if the school district fails to receive applications from qualified applicants to fill the advertised position by July 1." Changes were made to match state licensure and the expiration date aligns to an individual's teaching license. In the case of a lifetime teaching license, the credential would need to be renewed every five years. For those interested in obtaining or renewing Title I reading, mathematics, or coordinator credentials, the online application is available in the ND Teach web application. To review the final administrative rules, please visit the following links: Title I Credential Step-by-Step Guide For Applicants Title I Credential Renewal Requirements To review the final administrative rules, please visit the following links: Title I Reading and Math Credential Title I Coordinator Credential	This legislative action does not require districts to hire a teacher with a Title I credential, and Title I teachers are not required to have a credential to continue teaching in a Title I program. There is no cost to apply for this credential. Therefore, this credential is not needed and creates both educator and administrative burden.	Remove this option from the list of credentials that DPI maintains and offers.	The fiscal impact would be in the maintaining of training and personnel to keep this on the list. The estimate would be approximately \$10,000 annually in ND Teach and approximately 0.10 FTE.	Yes	Yes
15	201 - DPI	Section 15.1-19-11 - School safety patrols - Establishment - Adoption of rules	"The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall adopt rules to guide safety patrol members in the conduct of their duties and shall specify the identification to be worn and the signals to be used by safety patrol members while on duty. School Safety Patrols: A school safety patrol manual is available for use by school administrators, school safety patrol supervisors, and safety committee members in local communities. It is intended to assist in providing information concerning school safety patrol organization and operation. The manual also contains the standards for operation of the school safety patrol required by Sections 15.1-19-11 and 15.1-19-12.	This requirement is outdated and rules were never created to comply with Section 15.1-19-11.	Remove this requirement from statute.	None.	Yes	Yes
16	201 - DPI	Section 15.1-02-16 - Superintendent of Public Instruction - Issuance of credentials for teachers and administrators; Administrative Rule 67-11	The Education Standards and Practices Board (ESPB) currently issues all teaching licenses, while DPI issues credentials defined in 15.1-02-16. For instance, principal credentials, superintendent credentials, school counselors, library media, etc.	In conversations with ESPB, it has been noted that North Dakota is one of the few states where licensure and credentialing are managed by two separate agencies. This separation often creates confusion and frustration in the field—particularly due to differing processes, expectations, and application requirements. While ESPB handles licensure through its Assistant Director and Director, SAO has relied on an administrative assistant to issue critical credentials, which has led to significant errors. Additionally, because ESPB approves educational leadership programs for higher education institutions, they possess expertise in this area. In contrast, DPI lacks the necessary insight into higher education programming, creating a disconnect in what we allow for approval compared to ESPB's standards.	Transfer the responsibility for issuing credentials for critical licenses to the ESPB office. This approach was identified as the preferred solution during discussions with ESPB because they have direct knowledge and expertise in higher education teacher preparation and administrative education programs. Additionally, ESPB is already responsible for approving educational leadership programs based on standards they have developed, which align with many higher education accreditation requirements. Centralizing credentialing with ESPB ensures consistency, reduces errors, and leverages their specialized insight into program quality and compliance.	Currently this work employees an approximately 0.70 FTE. While we don't have a fiscal impact, there could be one for ESPB (transfer?)	Being discussed with ESPB	Yes
17	201 - DPI	Section 15.1-02-16(19) - Superintendent of Public Instruction - Issuance of credentials to teachers and administrators	Credentials for specialists trained in dyslexia	Add dyslexia to the previous submission from other offices addressing ESPB issuing credentials.				
18	201 - DPI	Section 15.1-06-08 - Rules for school accreditation - Waiver Section 15.1-06-08.1 - Statutes - Waiver Section - 15.1-06-08.2 - Innovative education program - Participation - Reports to Legislative Management	This statute allows schools to apply for waivers around innovation, 4-day school weeks, and instruction time.	There is significant ambiguity in the North Dakota Century Code regarding the distinction between time waivers and innovative waivers. Currently: Section 15.1-01-08 addresses time waivers. Sections 15.1-08.1 and 15.1-08.2 address innovative waivers. However, Section 15.1-08.1 lacks clarity that it applies specifically to innovative waivers. Additionally, the term "accreditation" is incorrectly used in section 15.1-08; it should be "approval", as accreditation refers to a different process. Further, Section 15.1-06-04(5) states that schools operating on a four-day school week must obtain a waiver but does not specify which type of waiver is required. This lack of specificity creates confusion for districts and administrators.	Revise the bill to align with current practices and terminology. Additionally, update statutory language to require that any district operating a four-day school week must obtain an innovative waiver. This change will necessitate an amendment to Section 15.1-06-04.	None	Unknown	Yes
19	201 - DPI	Section 15.1-32-26 - Dyslexia screening and intervention - Report to Legislative Management - Professional development	The only assignment provided on reporting is item 5. "Before July 1, 2024, the Superintendent of Public Instruction shall provide a report to the Legislative Management regarding dyslexia screening and intervention under this section."	The date for this report has passed, providing no ongoing requirement for the superintendent to report on dyslexia screening and intervention, which means there is no compliance action for the districts.	Either the date is removed and this whole section remains with no compliance action, or the reporting schedule should be updated to wording that demonstrates an ongoing obligation, such as "will report periodically"	\$300,000 in state funds are issued for the purpose of carrying out this statute including professional development. If left as is, no report on the use and impact of the funds is required.		Yes
20	204 - Center for Distance Education	Chapter 54-44.4 - State Purchasing Practices; Administrative Rule 4-12	Chapter 54-44.4 establishes the State's centralized purchasing framework and authorizes OMB to adopt administrative rules governing procurement practices. Under Section 54-44.4-02(2), agencies with delegated purchasing authority must comply with statute, administrative rule, and OMB policy. Section 54-44.4-05(4) authorizes OMB to adopt rules specifying when competition may be waived or limited, when negotiation may be used, and the required justifications and procedures for those purchasing methods. These statutory provisions are implemented through Administrative Rule Chapter 4-12, which establishes requirements for delegation, independent examination and determination, notice, documentation, and justification for limited competitive and noncompetitive procurements. The circumstances listed in NDCC 54-44.4-05(4)(a-m) are implemented across Administrative Rule Chapter 4-12. The administrative rules operationalize these statutory categories. The alternate procurement approval requirement arises from a separate rule provision rather than from the statutory categories themselves.	NDCC 54-44.4-05(4) authorizes OMB to adopt rules specifying when competition may be waived or limited and the required justifications and procedures for limited competitive and noncompetitive purchasing. The statute does not expressly require that each determination made under 54-44.4-05(4)(a-m) be submitted to the State Procurement Office on an Alternate Procurement Request form or receive transaction-by-transaction approval. In practice, Administrative Rule 4-12-09-01(4) has been interpreted and applied to require use of an alternate procurement request as the vehicle for these determinations. This implementation effectively adds a mandatory submission and approval step even when an agency with delegated purchasing authority can follow the requirements of Administrative Rule Chapter 4-12. The result is duplicative procedural work, extended timelines, and reduced workforce capacity, with oversight functioning primarily as confirmation of rule compliance rather than a separate substantive evaluation.	Allow agencies with delegated purchasing authority to satisfy the written determination and justification requirements of Administrative Rule Chapter 4-12 and Section 54-44.4-05(4)(a-m) through an agency-prepared written determination retained in the procurement file when all rule-prescribed procedures are followed. Under this approach, the Alternate Procurement Request form may continue to be used by agencies as an internal documentation or tracking mechanism, but would not be required to be submitted for external review or approval when the procurement fully complies with NDAC Chapter 4-12. Submission of an Alternate Procurement Request would remain appropriate when statute or rule does not prescribe a complete process.	The precise fiscal impact is indeterminate. However, the proposed change is expected to reduce indirect administrative costs by decreasing the staff time required for submission, review, and approval processes through the State Procurement Office. The primary fiscal effect is improved operational efficiency, reducing procedural delays, minimizing duplicative procurement activities, and allowing agency staff to redirect time toward core program and operational functions. This approach aligns with other OMB-administered compliance frameworks, such as budget execution, routine fiscal controls, grant compliance, and statewide policy adherence. Agencies apply established requirements internally, retain documentation, and demonstrate compliance through audit and post-review. Formal waiver or exception requests are reserved for circumstances where an agency seeks to deviate from established policy or exceed delegated authority, consistent with OMB processes, without OMB approving each individual transaction or agency action in advance. Examples include agency budget execution and allotment management, internal fiscal controls and expenditure tracking, grant and federal funds compliance, and adherence to statewide policies governing information technology, records retention, and internal controls. In these areas, OMB establishes requirements and oversight expectations, while agencies determine internal processes and are subject to post-review, audit, and corrective action as needed. Oversight for procurement would similarly occur through post-review, audit sampling, and delegation management rather than universal pre-transaction approval.	No. This proposal is intended to improve consistency, clarity, and compliance within the existing statutory and administrative framework rather than to establish a new program or pursue additional legislation.	This matter reflects a broader procurement process alignment issue affecting multiple agencies rather than an issue unique to the Center for Distance Education. Procurement workflows are routinely reviewed under Red Tape Reduction and other government efficiency initiatives. The proposed approach focuses on reducing duplicative procedural steps while preserving appropriate oversight through audit, post-review, and delegation management. Clarifying and aligning delegated purchasing processes in this manner would streamline timelines and improve efficiency without diminishing accountability or statutory compliance.

No.	Budget No. - Agency	North Dakota Century Code Title(s), Chapter(s), or Section(s) and Description	No.1 Briefly describe the current process or program established in statute.	No.2 Briefly describe any issues, problems, or inefficiencies with the current process or program.	No.3 Briefly describe your agency's proposed solution or statutory change to correct the issue or problem or to improve the efficiency of the process or program.	No.4 Describe the fiscal impact, if any, of the proposed solution or statutory change on general fund or other fund revenues or expenditures for the 2027-29 biennium.	No.5 Does your agency intend to submit an agency prefiled bill draft on this topic for introduction during the 2027 legislative session?	No.6 Would your agency be willing to present to the Legislative Task Force on Government Efficiency regarding this topic?
21	204 - Center for Distance Education	Section 32-12.2-15 - Contracts Limiting liability to the state	Section 32-12.2-15 limits the state's authority to enter into indemnification and hold harmless agreements, generally prohibiting state agencies from assuming liability for the acts or omissions of other parties except as expressly authorized by law. Compliance with this statute is implemented through agency contract management practices and supported by review processes involving the OMB Risk Management Division and the Office of the Attorney General. Agencies are responsible for ensuring that contracts do not include prohibited indemnification provisions and for obtaining appropriate legal or risk management review when such language is identified.	While the statutory prohibition is clear, indemnification and hold harmless provisions are routinely included in vendor contracts as standard terms. This results in repeated contract negotiations, legal review, and contract revisions to remove or modify prohibited language, even when the outcome is consistent and predictable under statute. The lack of standardized guidance or pre-approved alternative language can extend procurement timelines and increase administrative workload without materially improving risk outcomes. If pre-approved alternative language beyond the existing Attorney General contract drafting manual template is not available, a standardized submission process for Risk Management and Attorney General review could create efficiencies and more consistent review timelines.	Clarify through guidance or administrative standardization the acceptable handling of indemnification and hold harmless provisions under Section 32-12.2-15, including model contract language or standard exceptions consistent with statute. This would allow agencies to address noncompliant indemnification terms efficiently and consistently during procurement and contract execution, while preserving required legal and risk management review where appropriate. Develop an OMB-Risk Management and Attorney General policy or process that defines specific information required for review and the submission procedures for exemption requests.	The proposed clarification is expected to reduce indirect administrative costs by decreasing the time spent on contract negotiations, legal review cycles, and procurement delays.	No, this proposal is intended to improve consistency and compliance rather than to create a new program or system.	The matter reflects a broader efficiency concern affecting multiple agencies and workflows rather than an issue unique to the Center for Distance Education. It is best addressed through coordinated administrative guidance involving OMB Risk Management and the Attorney General.
22	204 - Center for Distance Education	N/A – No existing statutory authority permitting state agencies to expend appropriated funds for food and non-alcoholic beverages for public-facing ceremonies (e.g., graduation, credentialing, recognition, or award ceremonies).	There is no statutory process or authorization governing the purchase of food and non-alcoholic beverages for public-facing ceremonies conducted by state agencies. In the absence of statutory direction, OMB fiscal policies generally prohibit such expenditures, as food and beverage purchases are considered allowable unless associated with authorized travel. As a result, agencies do not have the ability to provide light refreshments at public ceremonies without seeking alternative funding.	The lack of statutory authority creates operational and reputational challenges for agencies that host public-facing ceremonies and recognition events. Such ceremonies are part of normal governmental functions and often include external stakeholders, partners, or constituents. Light refreshments are customary in these settings and facilitate engagement; however, agencies must either (1) forego refreshments entirely, (2) rely on external donors or sponsors, or (3) require attendees to self-fund, creating administrative, logistical, and optics issues inconsistent with the nature of the events.	Authorize state agencies, by statute, to expend state funds for light refreshments (non-alcoholic beverages and snack-type items) in connection with public-facing governmental ceremonies, including but not limited to graduation, credentialing, commissioning, recognition, or award ceremonies. The authorization could include fiscal controls such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A per-event dollar cap,• An annual aggregate cap, and/or• OMB review for expenditures exceeding the cap. This would preserve existing prohibitions on food purchases for staff-only events, routine meetings, holiday parties, or social functions, while enabling agencies to support legitimate ceremonial activities aligned with their public missions.	The proposed change is not expected to have a material fiscal impact. Agencies hosting qualifying ceremonies would absorb any expenditures within existing appropriations. Events are episodic, limited in scope, and subject to defined caps. No additional general fund appropriation would be requested.	No at this time. The agency would be willing to coordinate with OMB or the Legislative Council if the Task Force determines that a uniform statutory approach is warranted.	Yes
23	204 - Center for Distance Education	Section 54-06-21 - Public employee personnel records - Administration - Access	Section 54-06-21 prescribes detailed procedures for managing employee personnel files, including requirements related to signatures, acknowledgments, grievance rights, physical access to the file, reproduction of materials, and the inclusion or exclusion of certain materials. The statute assumes a paper-based personnel file managed on-site by an agency administrator and accessed by the employee during normal business hours.	The statute contains highly prescriptive, paper-based requirements that are not aligned with modern electronic human resources information systems (HRIS) and digital personnel file management. Specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Signature and witness procedures assume physical documents and in-person interactions,• File access is limited to normal business hours and in-person appointments,• Employees must pay for physical reproduction of materials, and• Agencies must track and document physical access to files. Modern HRIS platforms provide secure audit logs, electronic acknowledgments, version control, and self-service employee access without manual witness procedures or paper reproduction. The current statutory language increases administrative burden, introduces compliance risk for technical violations, and limits agencies' ability to modernize recordkeeping consistent with cybersecurity and retention best practices.	Amend Section 54-06-21 to: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Authorize and recognize electronic personnel file management,• Allow electronic acknowledgment in lieu of physical signatures and witness statements,• Require secure employee access without restricting access to in-person appointments during business hours,• Eliminate paper reproduction requirements and instead require reasonable access to downloadable copies, and• Delegate specific workflow and security requirements to OMB-human resources rules rather than statute. The amendment would preserve employee rights related to review, response, and due process, while removing paper-based procedural mandates that are no longer operationally necessary.	The proposed changes are not expected to increase state expenditures. Agencies are already transitioning to electronic personnel systems to improve efficiency, data security, and compliance. The modernization may reduce administrative burden and physical storage costs over time. No additional general fund appropriation would be requested.	Not at this time. The agency would be willing to participate in or support a uniform statewide modernization effort led by OMB or the Task Force.	Yes
24	204 - Center for Distance Education	Section 54-06-26 - Use of state telephones by state officials and employees	Section 54-06-26 authorizes state officials and employees to use state telephones for local essential personal calls as long as the use does not interfere with agency operations. The statute also authorizes agencies to establish guidelines for reasonable and appropriate essential personal use.	The statute was drafted for a legacy telephony environment in which employees had desk telephones and the primary concern was occasional personal calls. Today, many agencies provide state-issued smartphones that include voice, text, data, app access, hotspot functionality, cameras, and integrated communications platforms. These devices contain sensitive state information and are subject to cybersecurity, privacy, and records-retention requirements. The statutory language creates ambiguity for agencies attempting to implement strict acceptable-use policies, mobile device management, cybersecurity controls, or reimbursement models. The statute also grants an implied baseline entitlement to personal use that may conflict with federal, state, or contractual IT security obligations.	Amend Section 54-06-26 to remove entitlement language and instead authorize agencies, through rule or policy, to determine acceptable use standards for state-issued telephones and mobile devices. The amendment would: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Allow agencies to prohibit personal use when necessary,• Remove the legacy distinction between "local calls" and other usage, and• Align statutory language with modern cybersecurity, data governance, and records management requirements. This approach preserves agency discretion while eliminating statutory ambiguity and improving consistency across the state workforce.	No material fiscal impact is expected. Agencies already manage device procurement and usage within existing appropriations. The amendment may reduce administrative burden associated with interpreting outdated statutory language and may facilitate more consistent policies across agencies. No additional appropriation would be requested.	Not at this time. The agency would support a statewide modernization effort coordinated by the Task Force, OMB, or ITD.	Yes
25	204 - Center for Distance Education	Section 54-06-15 - Failure of official and employees working in Capitol building to return keys upon termination of employment - Duty of person in charge of employing unit - Payment of fee in lieu of return - Retention of final warrant for salary or wage	The statute authorizes employing units located in the state Capitol building to withhold an employee's final paycheck until physical building keys issued under Section 54-21-17.1 are returned, or until a \$5 in-lieu fee is paid. The statute defines "employing unit" and "person in charge," and applies only to access keys for the Capitol building.	The statute is outdated, narrow in scope, and not aligned with modern security and offboarding practices. It: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Applies only to the State Capitol Building rather than all state facilities,• Contemplates only physical brass keys rather than digital access badges, fobs, or credentials,• Sets an in-lieu fee of \$5 that does not reflect actual security or replacement costs, and• Does not address state-issued equipment such as laptops, tablets, mobile devices, or other controlled assets that agencies must recover upon separation. Many agencies currently provide valuable equipment and devices containing sensitive state data. These items pose significantly greater fiscal and cybersecurity risk than physical keys. Without statutory authority, agencies rely on labor-intensive collection efforts and have limited leverage when equipment is not returned. The withholding of paper warrants referenced in the statute is also outdated in a modern electronic payroll environment.	Amend Section 54-06-15 to: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Apply to all state-owned or state-leased facilities,• Include the return of state-issued access devices (keys, badges, fobs, credentials), and• Authorize the withholding of final payroll until such access devices are returned or settled;• Expand the statute to include the return of state-issued equipment and controlled assets such as laptops, mobile devices, tablets, hotspots, and other assigned equipment necessary for state business. Replacement fees should reflect actual replacement or security cost, rather than the current \$5 statutory amount. Detailed offboarding and asset management procedures could be delegated to OMB or ITD policy for statewide consistency. The modernization would support uniform offboarding, improve cybersecurity, discourage asset loss, and align with contemporary HRIS and asset management systems.	No material increase in expenditures is anticipated. Agencies currently absorb the cost of unreturned access devices and equipment. Updated statutory authority may reduce asset replacement losses and improve state cybersecurity posture. No additional appropriation would be requested.	Not at this time. The agency would support a statewide modernization effort coordinated by OMB, ITD, or the Task Force.	Yes- Key return has not been an issue for the Center for Distance Education to date but other equipment has
26	215 - North Dakota University System (NDUS)	Section 15-10-66 - State commissioner of higher education - Board member information access - Report to the Legislative Management	The section states the State Commissioner of Higher Education shall provide a report to the Legislative Management on state board of higher education policies regarding communications between board members and board member access to current and historic board information.	The State Board of Higher Education has changed its policy that all board members access to current and historic board information, so this century code section is no longer needed.	Remove century code section.	N/A	No, however we will be working with the Interim Higher Education Institutions Committee Chairman, Senator Sickler to remove this section during this interim.	Yes.
27	215 - NDUS	Section 15-10-71 - State Commissioner of Higher Education - Higher education trends - Report to Legislative Management	The section states the State Commissioner of Higher Education shall provide an annual report to the Legislative Management regarding trends in higher education, including state and regional student enrollment, North Dakota University System institution reserves, state and regional tuition rates, state and regional student financial assistance, and the University System's response to the trends and changes, including new or expanded educational programs, closed programs, and future budget requests.	This required annual report is provided to the Interim Higher Education Committee without the Chairman's consideration of the specific topics that are most pertinent. The University System works closely with the Higher Education Committee Chair on all Higher Education agenda items. The University System is happy to provide any information that is requested at any of the Interim Higher Education Committee meetings and thus, this section can be removed as it is not necessary. The University System report will always be the same as stated above.	Remove century code section.	N/A	No, however we will be working with the Interim Higher Education Institutions Committee Chairman, Senator Sickler to remove this section during this interim.	Yes.
28	215 - NDUS	Section 15-10-12.3 Capital construction projects - Local fund sources - Local matching funds - Report to Budget Section	The section requires a biennial report of the source of all funds used in any capital construction project if any local funds are used.	This is a duplication of efforts, in that the University System provides a report annually to OMB that is presented to the Budget Section of all University System capital projects as required in Section 15-10-47 (Construction projects at institutions of higher education - Variance reports.)	Remove century code section.	N/A	No, however we will be working with the Interim Higher Education Institutions Committee Chairman, Senator Sickler to remove this section during this interim.	Yes.

No.	Budget No. - Agency	North Dakota Century Code Title(s), Chapter(s), or Section(s) and Description	No.1 Briefly describe the current process or program established in statute.	No.2 Briefly describe any issues, problems, or inefficiencies with the current process or program.	No.3 Briefly describe your agency's proposed solution or statutory change to correct the issue or problem or to improve the efficiency of the process or program.	No.4 Describe the fiscal impact, if any, of the proposed solution or statutory change on general fund or other fund revenues or expenditures for the 2027-29 biennium.	No.5 Does your agency intend to submit an agency prefilled bill draft on this topic for introduction during the 2027 legislative session?	No.6 Would your agency be willing to present to the Legislative Task Force on Government Efficiency regarding this topic?
29	230 - University of North Dakota (UND)	Section 54-44-04.6 - State surplus property - Department heads to inform director - Disposition of property - Proceeds - Exchange of property	1. Institutions of higher education inform State Surplus of surplus property. 2. Political subdivisions may provide their surplus property to the state for disposition. 3. Surplus property is transferred at fair market value to state agencies, political subdivisions, and eligible nonprofit organizations (whom must be notified of the availability of surplus property). 4. If not transferred, surplus property is either sold on sealed bid or public auction (if value > \$3000), or fair market value (if < \$3000). Unsalable surplus property may be recycled or disposed of. 5. Proceeds of surplus property are to be deposited with the state in the surplus operating fund (unless subject to special distribution requirements or if sale is > \$3000, proceeds less administrative costs are deposited with the agency).	It is administratively burdensome to notify State Surplus of all salable surplus property, especially considering that the majority of surplus property is of minimal value. (i.e. office furniture that has that is 10, 20, or more years old). It is an inefficient process and not cost affective. Additionally, there are inconsistencies with Century Code and current practice.	Permit the University System and institutions of higher education to operate their own surplus process that aligns with Century Code, essentially omitting #'s 1 and 2. Example process: 1. Surplus property is transferred at fair market value to state agencies, political subdivisions, and eligible nonprofit organizations (whom must be notified of the availability of surplus property - i.e. notification through publicly posting of state surplus property). 2. If not transferred, surplus property is either sold on sealed bid or public auction (if value > \$3000), or fair market value (if < \$3000). Unsalable surplus property may be recycled or disposed of. 3. Proceeds of surplus property are to be deposited with the institution (unless subject to special distribution requirements).	Will create more efficiencies with less labor and time to do this work.	Yes	Yes
30	230 - UND	Section 24-02-03.3 - Central management system for all state-owned licensed motor vehicles	"The director shall establish within the department a central vehicle management system to regulate the operation, maintenance, and management of all motor vehicles owned or leased by the state...Every state agency, institution, department, board, bureau, and commission unless exempted by the director must use the system."	There are times when it is administratively burdensome to use the State Fleet Motor Pool for in state travel. i.e. inability to check-out a state fleet vehicle from an airport or on evenings/weekends. A request must go to the director of the State Fleet Motor Pool for approval each time an exemption is needed.	Permitting the employee's department, institution, board, commission, or agency to approve the use of a public car rental company for in state travel similar to their ability to approve the use of an employee's personal motor vehicle (pursuant to Section 54-06-09.4).	Will create efficiencies.	Yes	Yes
31	230 - UND	Section 15-10-44.1 - Required use of electronic mail, file server administration, database administration, application server, and hosting services	"Each institution and entity under the control of the SBHE shall obtain electronic mail, file server administration, database administration, research computing, storage, application server, and hosting services through a delivery system established by the board. The board shall establish policies and guidelines for the delivery of services, including the transition from existing systems to functional consolidation, with consideration given to the creation of efficiencies, cost-savings, and improved quality of service." Goes hand in hand with the SBHE 1200 policy series	While this requirement may have made sense when it was created more than a decade ago, the technology landscape, vendor models, and institutional needs have evolved dramatically since then. However, aside from the systemwide adoption of shared email, UND has been the only institution consistently adhering to the statute. In practice, the mandate has not delivered the intended results. This statute hinders efficiencies by: 1. Vendor ecosystems have shifted to cloud-first models - When the law was created, centralization of on-prem infrastructure could produce economies of scale. Today, vendors design their products for distributed cloud architectures, decentralized access, and institution-specific configurations. Forcing institutions to funnel services through a single delivery model no longer aligns with how modern platforms operate. 2. One-size-fits-all models do not meet the diverse needs of higher education campuses - The statute assumes that 11 institutions—each with unique missions, sizes, and research portfolios—can be effectively served through identical IT services. This is especially unrealistic when comparing the needs of the two research institutions with the smaller teaching-focused campuses. 3. Attempted centralization has produced more inefficiency than efficiency - Because the centralized system often fails to meet the operational workflow needs of institutions, they must: Hire additional staff to bridge gaps, Purchase supplemental or redundant software, or Develop institution-specific solutions outside the central framework. The result is increased costs, duplicated effort, and fragmented responsibilities—the opposite of what the statute originally intended. 4. Functional consolidation does not reflect current best practices - The legacy assumption that consolidating infrastructure automatically creates efficiencies is no longer valid. Modern efficiency comes from: agility, scalability, right-sizing solutions to institutional needs, and leveraging cloud-native capabilities. A rigid consolidation mandate prevents institutions from adopting the solutions that best support their academic, research, and operational missions. What was once intended to create cost savings and streamline technology operations has now become a barrier to innovation, efficiency, and service quality. Updating the statutory framework to reflect today's technological landscape—and the differentiated needs of higher education institutions—is essential for improving service delivery, reducing unnecessary expenditures, and enabling institutions to operate effectively in a modern, cloud-driven environment.	To correct the current inefficiencies, the statute must be fundamentally updated. Instead of mandating a centralized, one-size-fits-all system, the law should require the University System Core Technology Services (CTS) and institutions to jointly define and operate a core/shared IT services model. This aligns systemwide needs with institutional realities. 1. Establish shared governance Create a formal model where University System/CTS and institutional chief information officers jointly determine which services are "core" and how they are delivered. 2. Define true systemwide services Core areas—such as identity management, cybersecurity, and network infrastructure—should remain unified across all institutions to ensure consistency and reduce risk. 3. Provide institutional autonomy Institutions, especially research campuses, must have the flexibility to select mission-specific tools, academic technologies, and research systems that meet their unique needs. 4. Restructure CTS to support partnership CTS must shift from a centralized provider to a collaborative partner, reorganizing operations to improve responsiveness, transparency, and service quality. The current centralized model has produced more inefficiency than efficiency, forcing institutions to hire additional staff, buy supplemental software, and work around service gaps. Technology has evolved, but the statute has not. Without a fundamental change in how we operate, the University System will continue to spend more while delivering less to students, faculty, and staff.	The fiscal impact is expected to be positive, with long-term savings. Eliminating duplication: Institutions will no longer need to buy supplemental tools or hire extra staff to fill gaps. Smarter use of cloud/on-prem services: Institutions can adopt the right solutions for their needs, reducing infrastructure and operational costs. Better resource alignment: CTS and institutions can focus staff and budgets where they make the most impact.	Madhavi Marasinghe (UND) would be willing to draft proposed changes. Marc Walman (NDSU) would be willing to testify and draft a proposal too.	Yes
32	230 - UND	Section 15-10-44.1 - Required use of electronic mail, file server administration, database administration, application server, and hosting services	"Each institution and entity under the control of the SBHE shall obtain electronic mail, file server administration, database administration, research computing, storage, application server, and hosting services through a delivery system established by the board. The board shall establish policies and guidelines for the delivery of services, including the transition from existing systems to functional consolidation, with consideration given to the creation of efficiencies, cost-savings, and improved quality of service." Goes hand in hand with SBHE 1200 Policy series	The requirement to use a single email platform (Microsoft Office 365) for all higher education institutions has created significant limitations. While shared email was intended to streamline operations, the current single-instance model—administered exclusively at the system level—prevents institutions from configuring the backend to meet their own research, compliance, and operational needs. Key problems created by the one-tenant model: Restricted administrative access: Institutions cannot manage or configure critical Office 365 settings because global controls sit solely with CTS. Inability to deploy endpoint and security tools efficiently: Universities are blocked from implementing solutions tailored to their environments, research portfolios, or risk profiles. Compliance and operational gaps: Example: UND cannot enforce blocks on institution-owned devices leaving the country, even though this is a standard security requirement for research institutions. Institutions are unable to apply necessary controls without affecting all other campuses, which makes proactive security and compliance measures nearly impossible.	Remove the statute to use the same email. The ideal solution is for the research institutions to have their own Office 365 tenants. This would give them full control to implement the security, compliance, and operational configurations their environments require. Institutions need the authority and flexibility to manage their own environments, whether through independent tenants or delegated admin rights. If separate tenants are not feasible, the alternative is to delegate meaningful administrative rights to each institution within the existing shared instance. This would allow campuses to manage their own settings, deploy necessary controls, and support research and operational needs—without impacting other institutions.	There will be a fiscal impact, but in the long term these changes will benefit the institutions and the university system by increasing efficiency, enabling greater automation, and strengthening security to better safeguard university assets.	Madhavi Marasinghe (UND) would be willing to draft proposed changes. Marc Walman (NDSU) would be willing to testify and draft a proposal too.	Yes
33	230 - UND	Section 48-01.2-20 - Selection process for construction manager at-risk planning and design phase services	Selection committee composed of: An administrative individual from the governing body, a registered architect, and a registered engineer, and a licensed contractor.	A licensed contractor. We have experienced that this is an issue for multiple reasons: 1.) There is a limited number of contractors within our area and typically they do not want to complete a second selection committee member task. 2.) Contractors availability is limited as they themselves have deadlines to meet. 3.) We do not fully know a contractor's relationship with the construction manager at risk. It could be very good or there could have been a dispute that we are not privy to, either way may impact the contractors impartiality.	We are not fully aware of the decision as to why a contractor would be included in this process. We believe that the construction manager at risk's past performance, references, etc... would allow proper vetting. The inclusion of a contractor, with their possible bias outweighs their value. Please re-evaluate and remove this entity from the selection committee. You may say that bias could also be within an architect or engineer as well and that may be true, but typically they will not be bound to the CMaR through a contractual relationship which may happen given that a contractor may be a subcontractor to the construction manager at risk. This may lead to a conflict of interest.	Yes	Yes	
34	230 - UND	Section 32-12.2-15. - Contracts limiting liability to the state	Routine software purchases under \$20,000 with non-standard terms require consultation with UND's Office of General Counsel and OMB before an agency can purchase.	Free or low cost software purchases - with 'public' data classification - that could be resolved in hours take weeks to process due to requirements to review terms of condition and consult with the Office of General Counsel and OMB (which in practice requires them to also review/redline the vendor's terms and conditions), when, for commercial off-the-shelf products, those terms and conditions are not typically negotiated.	Remove the requirement in statute for the Office of General Counsel and OMB Risk Management consultation and provide the authority to the agency or institution to make the determination on software risk and purchasing process for software under \$20,000.	N/A	Yes	Yes
35	230 - UND	Section 48-09-01. - Granting of concessions for cafes, restaurants, and confectioneries on public buildings and grounds	The provision of a service to the state by a third-party - are procedure differently than all other service procurements when it's concessions.	Conflicting procedures for state procurement officials who are primarily used to dealing with procurements via Chapter 54-44, or to those state real estate professionals responsible for leasing/renting.	Repeal Chapter 48-09.	N/A	Yes	Yes

No.	Budget No. - Agency	North Dakota Century Code Title(s), Chapter(s), or Section(s) and Description	No.1 Briefly describe the current process or program established in statute.	No.2 Briefly describe any issues, problems, or inefficiencies with the current process or program.	No.3 Briefly describe your agency's proposed solution or statutory change to correct the issue or problem or to improve the efficiency of the process or program.	No.4 Describe the fiscal impact, if any, of the proposed solution or statutory change on general fund or other fund revenues or expenditures for the 2027-29 biennium.	No.5 Does your agency intend to submit an agency prefiled bill draft on this topic for introduction during the 2027 legislative session?	No.6 Would your agency be willing to present to the Legislative Task Force on Government Efficiency regarding this topic?
36	230 - UND	Section 48-01.2-04. - Publication of advertisement for bids - Emergency exception	The publication of advertisements for bids for public improvements requires that "The advertisement must be published [for at least three consecutive weeks] in the official newspaper of the political subdivision in which the public improvement is or will be located, in a daily newspaper having a general circulation in the area where the project is located, and in a trade publication, electronic plan service, builders exchange, or other industry-recognized method of general circulation among the contractors, building manufacturers, and dealers in this state" unless exempt due to an emergency.	Most newspapers no longer publish a physical copy;	Allow electronic publishing of bids for public improvements to the State's bidders list established and maintained in accordance with Section 54-44.4-09. Bidders list as the sole or primary method of bid advertisement.	UND alone would save upward of \$6,000 annually. Other agencies would see similar or greater savings.	Yes	Yes
37	230 - UND	Section 48-01.2-05. - Contents of advertisement	1. The statute is overly technical regarding the nature of the advertisement, increasing the length of the advertisement and cost to the state. 4. That each bid must be accompanied by a separate envelope containing the contractor's license and bid security.	The statute does not contemplate electronic methods of bid advertisement and submittal. The specificity of the language ("separate envelope") should be removed.	The statute should be repealed or revised to reflect modern methods for the advertisement and submittal of bids, primarily through electronic means.		Yes	Yes
38	230 - UND	Section 48-01.2-06. - Bid requirements for public improvements	Subsection 2(a) specifies a dollar threshold for a non-competitive contract in circumstances under which a bid was not received for a portion of the project	Subsection 2(a) limits the governing body's ability to negotiate with the contractor to assume the construction manager at risk responsibilities	Suggest changing Subsection 2(a) threshold to 'a number deemed reasonable by the governing body	N/A	Yes	Yes
39	230 - UND	Section 48-01.2-20.(5)	Sub section (d) requires that "The person's safety record" be used as an evaluation criteria.	This cannot be qualitatively evaluated by an evaluation committee, there is no established standard for this.	Propose replacing "safety record" with EMR (Experience Modification Rate). EMR is a numerical score used by insurance companies to measure a contractor's safety record and predict future risk. An EMR of 1.0 is the industry average; a rating below 1.0 indicates a safer-than-average company with lower insurance costs, while a rating above 1.0 signifies higher risks and increased premiums.	N/A	Yes	Yes
40	230 - UND	Section 48-01.2-20(5) - Selection process for construction management at risk planning and design phase services	Subdivision (e) requires that "The person's familiarity with the location of the public improvement;" be used as an evaluation criteria.	This criteria stifles competition and overly weighs the evaluation process on 'local' vendors to the detriment of other vendors	Repeal subdivision (e).	N/A	Yes	Yes
41	230 - UND	Section 48-01.2-20(5) - Selection process for construction management at risk planning and design phase services	Subdivision (g) requires that "The person's compliance with state and federal law" be used as an evaluation criteria.	There is no established standard for this and this criteria is not qualitatively scoreable by a committee; this criteria stifles competition.	Repeal subdivision (g) .	N/A	Yes	Yes
42	230 - UND	Section 48-01.2-20(7) - Selection process for construction management at risk planning and design phase services	Subdivision (a) details the requirements for continuing a project if fewer than three proposals were submitted ("resolicit for qualifications, interview any person that applied, or consider using another allowed delivery method").	The statute does not allow the governing body the flexibility to proceed with a public improvement in circumstances where competition is limited or there is no competition.	If less than three bids are submitted, as long as the selection committee deems the proposal(s) responsive, the governing body may proceed with the highest scoring proposal, including with a non-competitive contract (if only one responsive proposal received)	N/A	Yes	Yes
43	230 - UND	Section 54-44.7-03(4) - Procurement procedures	The section details the requirements for continuing a project if fewer than three proposals were submitted.	The statute does not allow selection committee the flexibility to proceed with a architectural and engineering agreement in circumstances where competition is limited or there is no competition.	If less than three responses are submitted, as long as the selection committee deems the proposal(s) meet the selection criteria, the governing body may proceed with the highest scoring proposal, including with a non-competitive contract (if only one responsive proposal received).	N/A	Yes	Yes
44	230 - UND	Section 54-44.7-03(5) - Procurement procedures	Subdivision (d) requires "priority to firms located in North Dakota."	The statute conflicts with other recent repeals of preference and reciprocity statutes in procurement practices, and limits competition	Repeal subdivision (d).	N/A	Yes	Yes
45	230 - UND	Section 54-44.7-03(5) - Procurement procedures	Subsection (c) requires "Willingness to meet time and budget requirements" be included as an evaluation criteria.	This criteria cannot be qualitatively scored, as all vendors will tell you they are willing to meet time and budget requirements	Repeal subdivision (c)	N/A	Yes	Yes
46	230 - UND	Section 54-44.7-04. - Exception	The thresholds for an architect, engineer, construction management, or land surveying services exemption are set at \$35,000 and cumulative \$70,000.	The thresholds are outdated and do not reflect current economic conditions.	Increase the thresholds to \$50,000 and \$100,000 cumulative.	N/A	Yes	Yes
47	230 - UND	Section 15-10-12.1 - Acceptance of buildings and campus improvements - Legislative approval	The consent of the legislative assembly is required for any new buildings, campus improvements or building maintenance financed by donations, gifts, grants, and bequests that amounts to \$700,000 or more.	The current threshold means nearly all projects financed this way need legislative approval.	Increase the thresholds from \$700,000 to \$2,000,000.	N/A	Yes	Yes
48	235 - North Dakota State University (NDSU)	Section 15-10-44.1 - Required use of electronic mail, file server administration, database administration, application server, and hosting services	"Each institution and entity under the control of the SBHE shall obtain electronic mail, file server administration, database administration, research computing, storage, application server, and hosting services through a delivery system established by the board. The board shall establish policies and guidelines for the delivery of services, including the transition from existing systems to functional consolidation, with consideration given to the creation of efficiencies, cost savings, and improved quality of service." Goes hand in hand with SBHE 1200 Policy series	While this requirement may have made sense when it was created more than a decade ago, the technology landscape, vendor models, and institutional needs have evolved dramatically since then. However, aside from the systemwide adoption of shared email. In practice, the mandate has not delivered the intended results. It is highly expensive to implement and results in less effective IT services. This statute hinders efficiencies by: 1. Vendor ecosystems have shifted to cloud-first models - When the law was created, centralization of on-prem infrastructure could produce economies of scale. Today, vendors design their products for distributed cloud architectures, decentralized access, and institution-specific configurations. Forcing institutions to funnel services through a single delivery model no longer aligns with how modern platforms operate. 2. One-size-fits-all models do not meet the diverse needs of higher education campuses - The statute assumes that 11 institutions—each with unique missions, sizes, and research portfolios—can be effectively served through identical IT services. This is especially unrealistic when comparing the needs of the two research institutions with the smaller teaching-focused campuses. 3. Attempted centralization has produced more inefficiency than efficiency - Because the centralized system often fails to meet the operational workflow needs of institutions, they must: Hire additional staff to bridge gaps, Purchase supplemental or redundant software, or Develop institution-specific solutions outside the central framework. The result is increased costs, duplicated effort, and fragmented responsibilities—the opposite of what the statute originally intended. 4. Functional consolidation does not reflect current best practices - The legacy assumption that consolidating infrastructure automatically creates efficiencies is no longer valid. Modern efficiency comes from: agility, scalability, right-sizing solutions to institutional needs, leveraging cloud-native capabilities and minimizing IT service complexity. This statute has the effect of creating highly complex IT services that are very difficult to manage. A rigid consolidation mandate prevents institutions from adopting the solutions that best support their academic, research, and operational missions. What was once intended to create cost savings and streamline technology operations has now become a barrier to innovation, efficiency, and service quality. Updating the statutory framework to reflect today's technological landscape—and the differentiated needs of higher education institutions—is essential for improving service delivery, reducing unnecessary expenditures, and enabling institutions to operate effectively in a modern, cloud-driven environment.	To correct the current inefficiencies, the statute must be fundamentally updated. Instead of mandating a centralized, one-size-fits-all system, the law should require University System CTS and institutions to jointly define and operate a core/shared IT services model. This aligns systemwide needs with institutional realities. 1. Establish shared governance Create a formal model where University System CTS and institutional chief information officers jointly determine which services are "core" and how they are delivered. 2. Define true systemwide services Core areas—such as identity management, cybersecurity, and network infrastructure—should remain unified across all institutions to ensure consistency and reduce risk. 3. Provide institutional autonomy Institutions, especially research campuses, must have the flexibility to select mission-specific tools, academic technologies, and research systems that meet their unique needs. 4. Restructure CTS to support partnership CTS must shift from a centralized provider to a collaborative partner, reorganizing operations to improve responsiveness, transparency, and service quality. The current centralized model has produced more inefficiency than efficiency, forcing institutions to hire additional staff, buy supplemental software, and work around service gaps. Technology has evolved, but the statute has not. Without a fundamental change in how we operate, the University System will continue to spend more while delivering less to students, faculty, and staff.	The fiscal impact is expected to be positive, with long-term savings. Eliminating duplication: Institutions will no longer need to buy supplemental tools or hire extra staff to fill gaps. Smarter use of cloud/on-premises services: Institutions can adopt the right solutions for their needs, reducing infrastructure and operational costs. Better resource alignment: CTS and institutions can focus staff and budgets where they make the most impact.	Marc Wallman (NDSU) would be willing to draft proposed changes with Madhavi Marasinghe, (UND)	Yes

No.	Budget No. - Agency	North Dakota Century Code Title(s), Chapter(s), or Section(s) and Description	No.1 Briefly describe the current process or program established in statute.	No.2 Briefly describe any issues, problems, or inefficiencies with the current process or program.	No.3 Briefly describe your agency's proposed solution or statutory change to correct the issue or problem or to improve the efficiency of the process or program.	No.4 Describe the fiscal impact, if any, of the proposed solution or statutory change on general fund or other fund revenues or expenditures for the 2027-29 biennium.	No.5 Does your agency intend to submit an agency prefilled bill draft on this topic for introduction during the 2027 legislative session?	No.6 Would your agency be willing to present to the Legislative Task Force on Government Efficiency regarding this topic?
49	235 - NDSU	Section 15-10-44.1 - Required use of electronic mail, file server administration, database administration, application server, and hosting services	"Each institution and entity under the control of the state board of higher education shall obtain electronic mail, file server administration, database administration, research computing, storage, application server, and hosting services through a delivery system established by the board. The board shall establish policies and guidelines for the delivery of services, including the transition from existing systems to functional consolidation, with consideration given to the creation of efficiencies, cost-savings, and improved quality service." Goes hand in hand with SBHE 1200 Policy series	The requirement to use a single email platform (Microsoft Office 365) for all higher education institutions has created significant limitations. While shared email was intended to streamline operations, the current single-instance model—administered exclusively at the system level—prevents institutions from configuring the backend to meet their own research, compliance, and operational needs. Key problems created by the one-tenant model: Restricted administrative access: Institutions cannot manage or configure critical Office 365 settings because global controls sit solely with CTS. Inability to deploy endpoint and security tools efficiently: Universities are blocked from implementing solutions tailored to their environments, research portfolios, or risk profiles. Compliance and operational gaps: Example: UND cannot enforce blocks on institution-owned devices leaving the country, even though this is a standard security requirement for research institutions. Institutions are unable to apply necessary controls without affecting all other campuses, which makes proactive security and compliance measures nearly impossible.	Remove the statute to use the same email. The ideal solution is for the research institutions to have their own Office 365 tenants. This would give them full control to implement the security, compliance, and operational configurations their environments require. Institutions need the authority and flexibility to manage their own environments, whether through independent tenants or delegated admin rights. If separate tenants are not feasible, the alternative is to delegate meaningful administrative rights to each institution within the existing shared instance. This would allow campuses to manage their own settings, deploy necessary controls, and support research and operational needs—without impacting other institutions. In short, institutions need the authority and flexibility to manage their own environments, whether through independent tenants or delegated administrative rights.	There will be a fiscal impact, but in the long term these changes will benefit the institutions and the university system by increasing efficiency, enabling greater automation, and strengthening security to better safeguard university assets.	Marc Wallman (NDSU) would be willing to draft proposed changes with Madhavi Marasinghe, (UND)	Yes
50	241 - Minot State University (MISU)	15-10-12.1 - Acceptance of buildings and campus improvements - Legislative approval	Legislative approval for campus improvements or building maintenance if the cost is more than \$700,000.	Requiring legislative approval for campus improvements or building maintenance projects exceeding \$700,000 presents growing challenges given the continued escalation of construction and materials costs. What may have been an appropriate threshold when established no longer reflects current market conditions. Routine maintenance, code-compliance upgrades, and necessary infrastructure repairs increasingly exceed this amount due to inflation, labor shortages, and higher material prices—often without expanding project scope or improving facilities beyond basic needs. As a result, the fixed \$700,000 cap can create delays in addressing time-sensitive maintenance issues, increase administrative burden, and potentially lead to higher long-term costs if projects are postponed. Consideration should be given to adjusting the threshold to better align with today's construction environment or indexing it to inflation or regional construction cost indices. Doing so would preserve legislative oversight for truly significant capital projects while allowing institutions to efficiently manage routine maintenance and necessary improvements.	Propose increasing the \$700,000 legislative approval threshold for campus improvements and building maintenance to reflect current construction costs. With a distinction between routine maintenance and major capital expansion. This change would preserve legislative oversight for significant projects while allowing agencies to complete necessary maintenance and life-safety projects more efficiently, reducing delays and avoiding higher long-term costs.	The proposed change is not expected to have a direct fiscal impact. However, it would result in administrative and time savings by reducing the need for legislative approval on routine maintenance projects that exceed the outdated threshold due solely to increased construction costs. Streamlining the approval process would allow projects to proceed more efficiently, reduce staff time spent preparing and managing approval requests, and help avoid cost escalation associated with project delays.	No	Yes
51	241 - MISU	Chapter 48-01.2 - Public improvements bids and contracts	Requirement to procure plans, drawings, and specifications for a public improvement in excess of \$250,000 from an architect or engineer.	Century Code is very vague on the definition between public improvement and maintenance. We had a project to replace siding and windows on a building and after consulting with Attorney General legal counsel were advised that this was a public improvement and therefore had to procure an architect for this project, even though there were no structural changes. This added an additional \$30,000 cost to the project.	1. Define Maintenance vs. Public Improvement in statute: Maintenance: Non-structural repair, replacement, or renewal of existing building systems or components (e.g., roof, siding, windows, HVAC units, finishes) that does not increase the building's footprint, alter load-bearing elements, change occupancy, or materially change life-safety systems. Public Improvement: New construction, additions, structural modifications, change of use/occupancy, or work that materially alters life-safety systems. 2. Architect/Engineer Requirement Clarification: Exempt non-structural maintenance projects (as defined above) from mandatory architect/engineer procurement unless otherwise required by building code or life-safety considerations. Preserve architectural and engineering requirements for structural, life-safety, and code-implicated projects.	Direct savings: Avoids unnecessary professional fees (e.g., \$30,000 in the cited project). Time savings: Shortens procurement timelines by weeks to months, reducing escalation costs and allowing maintenance to occur in optimal weather windows. Risk control: Keeps architectural and engineering involvement where it's most needed—structural or life-safety changes—while reducing over-scoping on routine maintenance.	No	Yes
52	241 - MISU	N/A - OMB biennial budget upload process	OMB biennial budget upload process	Completion of OMB's biennial budget process, including the salary plan upload, creates inefficiencies for higher education institutions. Unlike most state agencies, higher education funding is allocated based on a statutory funding formula rather than on authorized FTE counts or individual salary levels. As a result, the required salary plan upload provides limited analytical or fiscal value for higher education, while requiring significant staff time to align salary data with a process designed for agencies funded by position and payroll detail.	Exempt higher education from the salary plan upload requirement. Amend OMB budget instructions (or Century Code, if necessary) to waive the salary plan upload for higher education institutions funded by the statutory funding formula. Require higher education institutions to submit a much more aggregate/high level biennial budget.	Administrative time savings: Eliminates duplicative position-level data preparation and reconciliation, reducing staff hours across campuses and the University System office.	No	Yes
53	250 - State Library	Section 54-24-09 - Distribution of certain publications for certain libraries required	State agencies in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches send 8 copies of all publications intended for general public distribution to the State Library. State Library retains 2 copies and distributes the rest to the libraries of State Historical Society, UND, North Dakota State University, Library of Congress and two other institutions.	Some agencies find sending the 8 copies of physical documents to be cost prohibitive. Electronic born documents are captured via web crawling vs. agencies providing them to State Library.	There is a draft bill that was passed by the Legislative Procedures and Arrangements Committee to change the number of required copies from 8 to 3. The State Library proposes an additional amendment that would require state agencies to send electronic copies to us directly.	The State Library would monitor compliance of the submission of electronic documents during the 2027-29 biennium. If compliance is as high for electronic documents as physical, we would anticipate a change to procedures for the 2029-31 biennium and would propose/report any potential savings at that time.	Not at this time	Yes
54	406 - Department of Labor and Human Rights	Section 34-14-08 - Assignment of wage claims to labor commissioner for recovery by civil action	Under Section 34-14-08, the Labor Commissioner may take assignment of an employee's wage claim and bring a civil action to recover the unpaid wages on behalf of the employee. The statute contemplates that the Commissioner will pursue recovery through the court system as a civil plaintiff.	In practice, the department has relied on the Attorney General's Office to initiate these civil actions. The statute does not require the Attorney General to do so, and the Attorney General's Office has indicated it no longer has capacity to pursue these cases. As a result, although the department may determine wages are owed and issue a determination, there is no practical enforcement mechanism when an employer refuses to comply. The department lacks independent litigation resources to file civil actions, and many claimants cannot afford to hire private counsel to enforce their claims in court. This creates a gap between wage determinations and actual recovery for employees.	Amend Section 34-14-08 to create a streamlined enforcement mechanism following a final wage determination, such as: Authorizing the department to file the wage determination with the district court, where it may be entered as a judgment unless the employer timely requests judicial review; or Expressly authorizing the department to enforce wage determinations administratively in the same manner as other state agency orders that may be docketed as judgments. This would eliminate the need for separate civil litigation to enforce uncontested wage determinations and provide a practical enforcement mechanism consistent with due process.	Minimal fiscal impact anticipated for the department. The proposal would reduce reliance on external litigation resources and may reduce administrative time spent on unenforceable determinations. Any impact would primarily involve minor court administrative processing.		Yes
55	406 - Department of Labor and Human Rights	Chapter 34-14 - Wage Claims and Collection Chapter 34-06 - Minimum Wages and Hours	Chapter 34-14 authorizes the department to investigate and enforce wage claims arising under North Dakota wage and hour laws. The statutory framework assumes that covered employment has a sufficient nexus to North Dakota, generally based on work performed within the state. The statute does not expressly address employees who perform all work outside North Dakota for a North Dakota-based employer.	The statute is silent on whether wage claims may be asserted by individuals who perform all work outside North Dakota for an in-state employer. This lack of clarity creates uncertainty regarding jurisdiction in cases involving remote or overseas workers, requiring case-by-case legal analysis and increasing the risk of inconsistent outcomes. The absence of explicit statutory direction may also result in time spent investigating claims over which the department ultimately lacks jurisdiction.	Amend Chapter 34-14 to expressly clarify the scope of the department's jurisdiction with respect to wage claims involving work performed outside North Dakota. This could include statutory language specifying whether and under what circumstances the wage claim process applies to employees who perform work entirely outside the state for North Dakota-based employers. Clarifying jurisdiction would improve administrative efficiency, reduce uncertainty for employers and workers, and provide clearer guidance to the department.	No significant fiscal impact anticipated. The proposed change would primarily clarify existing authority and jurisdiction rather than expand enforcement activities. Any impact would be administrative in nature and absorbed within existing resources.	Unknown	Yes
56	406 - Department of Labor and Human Rights	Chapter 14-02.4 - Human Rights	The North Dakota Human Rights Act prohibits discrimination in housing based on protected characteristics, including status with respect to public assistance. The statute prohibits discriminatory terms, conditions, privileges, facilities, and discriminatory statements or notices related to housing. The statute does not require housing providers to participate in government assistance programs.	The statute does not clearly address whether a housing provider's refusal to accept lawful third-party rental payments—when those payments originate from public assistance programs—may constitute discrimination. As a result, disputes arise where housing providers assert that blanket payment policies are neutral business decisions, while tenants allege unequal treatment based on protected status. This lack of clarity leads to inconsistent outcomes and uncertainty for housing providers, tenants, and the department.	The department proposes a limited statutory clarification confirming that while housing providers are not required to participate in public assistance programs, policies or practices that categorically refuse lawful third-party rental payments may constitute discrimination when they result in unequal terms, conditions, privileges, or services for tenants based on a protected characteristic. The proposed clarification would ensure consistent application of the statute while preserving housing providers' discretion to decline program participation.	No fiscal impact is anticipated. The proposal is a clarifying amendment and does not create new programs, require additional staffing, or impose new regulatory obligations.	Unknown	Yes

No.	Budget No. - Agency	North Dakota Century Code Title(s), Chapter(s), or Section(s) and Description	No.1 Briefly describe the current process or program established in statute.	No.2 Briefly describe any issues, problems, or inefficiencies with the current process or program.	No.3 Briefly describe your agency's proposed solution or statutory change to correct the issue or problem or to improve the efficiency of the process or program.	No.4 Describe the fiscal impact, if any, of the proposed solution or statutory change on general fund or other fund revenues or expenditures for the 2027-29 biennium.	No.5 Does your agency intend to submit an agency prefiled bill draft on this topic for introduction during the 2027 legislative session?	No.6 Would your agency be willing to present to the Legislative Task Force on Government Efficiency regarding this topic?
57	412 - Aeronautics Commission	Section 57-40.5-03(1) - Aircraft excise tax exemptions	The statute references Public Law 79-663 (38 U.S.C. § 1901), which was not enacted.	Veterans are unclear what disability percentage qualifies for the exemption (e.g., 50% vs. 100%). It is also unclear whether the exemption scales with disability level.	Clarify the disabled veteran exemption or align it with the motor vehicle excise tax exemption under 57-40.3-04, which requires 100% disability.	None identified	The agency is reviewing options for submitting a prefiled clean-up bill and would be interested in participating in any broader statutory efficiency legislation advanced by the Task Force.	Yes
58	412 - Aeronautics Commission	Section 2-08-03 - Aircraft dealer's license - Fees - Dealer's place of business	Dealers pay a \$10 fee to add each additional demonstration aircraft to their license during the year.	Creates unnecessary administrative work for both dealers and licensing staff for minimal revenue.	Eliminate the \$10 fee for adding additional aircraft to a dealer's license.	Estimated reduction to special fund of approximately \$140 annually	The agency is reviewing options for submitting a prefiled clean-up bill and would be interested in participating in any broader statutory efficiency legislation advanced by the Task Force.	Yes
59	412 - Aeronautics Commission	Section 2-08-04 - Ultralight vehicle dealer's license - Fees - Dealer's place of business	Statute currently allows for both an ultralight dealer license and an aircraft dealer's license.	No ultralight dealer licenses have been issued in at least five years, making the separate license unnecessary.	Eliminate the separate ultralight dealer license and include ultralight sales under the aircraft dealer's license.	None	The agency is reviewing options for submitting a prefiled clean-up bill and would be interested in participating in any broader statutory efficiency legislation advanced by the Task Force.	Yes
60	474 - Department of Mineral Resources (DMR)	Section 38-08-04.5 - Abandoned Oil and Gas Well Plugging and Site Reclamation Fund (AWPSRF) - Continuing appropriation - Budget Section report	This section states that fees collected by the Industrial Commission shall be placed into AWPSRF. This includes permit fees or other services.	The current drilling permit fee in North Dakota is \$100. In 2025, DMR issued 1095 permits. The revenue from those permits was \$109,500. This amount would not be sufficient to plug a single well.	Ideally the DMR would amend Administrative Rule 43-02-03-16 to adjust the drilling permit fee to \$500 dollars. Along with that Administrative Rule change, Section 38-08-04.5 would need to be amended to change the destination of the funds from AWPSRF into the Oil and Gas Reservoir Data Fund (RDF) under Section 38-08-04.6 which defrays the costs of providing data compiled by DMR. Currently the biggest issue to the DMR is the software system, additional funds would allow the software issues to be upgraded and maintained annually. The impact on the operator would be minimal. A \$500 permit fee would be the lowest cost of the entire drilling process. Additionally, the \$500 fee would still rank low against other state's permit fees.	DMR estimates a decrease in drilling permits for the next biennium to be down to 800 applications for permit to drill a year. The revenue over the biennium for 1,600 applications for permit to drill would amount to \$800,000 being deposited into RDF.	Yes	Yes
61	485 - Workforce Safety and Insurance (WSI)	Section 65-04-04 - Employers obligated to pay premiums and assessments - Certificate provided; Administrative Rule 92-01-02-23.1	There is currently nothing stated in statute on the type of payment WSI will accept for employer premium payments. Currently, employers can make payment electronically (automated clearing house, wire, or credit card) or they can submit a check or cash. Checks and cash are received at WSI and a lockbox at the Bank of North Dakota.	The processing of checks or cash has a lot of manual components. This is very time consuming and could result in errors occurring. Electronic payments are more efficient and have a smaller likelihood of errors occurring.	Workforce Safety and Insurance would like to establish in statute that payments made to WSI for employer premiums need to be made electronically.	This change may result in a slight increase in credit card processing fees the agency pays. Credit card fees are paid by WSI through a continuing appropriation so there would be no increase to WSI's appropriated budget. This change would result in a significant savings with staff time needed to process the checks/cash.	Yes	WSI intends to bring legislation addressing this item. WSI certainly can present this item to the Task Force but will defer to the Task Force to ultimately determine if necessary.
62	540 - Adjutant General	Section 37-17.1-27 - State Disaster Relief Fund - Creation - Uses	State Disaster Relief Funds - before the agency can charge any expenditures to this fund, the agency shall provide a description of what the expenditure is to the appropriation committees of the house or senate, or to the Budget Section if the Legislative Assembly is not in session. We currently send an email to Legislative Council prior to charging to this fund.	By having to notify ahead of charging the expenditure, we wind up coding things like payroll costs to another fund (375), and then once Legislative Council has been notified we then enter journal vouchers to move the expense to the proper location. We do not know up front what the exact amount of payroll costs will be so we have to wait until payroll has posted (to the other fund) in order to provide accurate information on what will be charged to the State Disaster Relief Fund.	In the past 5 years, I feel that we have only been asked a question about the report provided to legislative council a few times. The questions have generally been related to the disaster itself and not the use of the fund. I would be fine sending a report to Legislative Council after the fact if that would be acceptable so that we are not doing extra work in additional journal vouchers. If possible, I would propose even sending a quarterly report instead of each time.	No fiscal impact.	Yes, following review and approval from the Governor's Office	Yes, following review and approval from the Governor's Office
63	540 - Adjutant General	Section 37-03-13 - Adjutant General to control military installations - Maintenance fund - Insurance	This statute gives the Adjutant General control of all North Dakota National Guard real property, installations and facilities and allows revenue from the leases or subleases.	We believe the statute is out dated and may be too specific and its interpretation could limit our ability to generate revenue from our training areas to support the emerging technologies of things like uncrewed aircraft systems and counter uncrewed aircraft systems. The revenue generated would be used to improve training areas for the National Guard that are also used but other state and federal agencies and industry partners.	We don't have the exact language that we would like yet but generally we would like to remove some of the specific items listed and either include "emerging technologies" or other broad language that allows us to look into the future for other opportunities. We would also like the ability for this fund to receive donations from non-profit groups, and though retail sales at Camp Grafton Training Center and potentially other National Guard locations around the state.	The fiscal impact of this authority is expected to reduce our need to ask the state for minor training area improvement funds, allow us to self-fund state FTEs to serve as operations officers/managers of the training and retail sales areas when the requestor is not a Department of War entity.	Yes, following review and approval from the Governor's Office	Yes, following review and approval from the Governor's Office
64	540 - Adjutant General	Section 44-04-17.1 - Definitions Section 44-04-18 - Access to public records - Electronically stored information Chapter 57-40.6 - Emergency Services Communication Systems	The Department of Emergency Services (DES) has the largest number of open record requests of any state agency in a year, amounting to 400 in a year. Most of these open records requests are 911 calls that come through State Emergency Communication Center. Many requests come from state's attorneys. Some come from private citizens or defense attorneys. 911 call audio can only be given to law enforcement partners, this extends to state's attorneys. Citizens or defense attorneys may not receive an audio call record per century code. They are able to come to our office to hear the audio but the record may not leave the premise. We must transcribe the audio and then redact any private and active investigation information.	We originate the record, however, we believe we should not be considered the record owner. 1. We don't have the necessary information to redact investigation information. 2. We don't have the authority to require an agency to appropriately redact information. 3. However, we are held responsible to the citizen and open record laws on returning that request in a timely manner. Example: Citizen or defense attorney requests a 911 call that came through State Emergency Communications Committee (SECC) but originated in McKenzie County. Currently SECC transcribes and we request that McKenzie County Law Enforcement to redact private or investigation information. McKenzie County doesn't want to redact the information and kicks the responsibility back to us and or returns a transcription entirely blacked out. Example: Recently the Highway Patrol refused to redact a record and suggested that was our responsibility. Example: Highway Patrol took over a Foster County investigation. Fargo Forum requested a 911 call - they sent open record request to the Highway Patrol who denied the request because it was under active investigation. Fargo Forum then requested the same information through SECC, we contacted Highway Patrol, they gave us the same response they gave Fargo Forum. Our representative with the Attorney General's office reiterated this response not to release the record. Then Fargo Forum requested an opinion from the Attorney General and the Attorney General did an opinion that the SECC should have released the record without the Highway Patrol permission.	We believe we should be considered the repository - not the record owner. Records should be requested from the owning agency (public goes to the Sheriff's Office). The agency requests the record from SECC. We supply the record untouched. The agency is responsible to fulfill the request.	Minor savings in that SECC would no longer pay contractor by the hour to transcribe and redact. Additional soft cost savings. Savings in Attorney General fees as we ask for clarification over specific open records requests	Yes, following review and approval from the Governor's Office	Yes, following review and approval from the Governor's Office
65	540 - Adjutant General	Section 44-04-17.1 - Definitions Section 44-04-18 - Access to public records - Electronically stored information Chapter 57-40.6 - Emergency Services Communication Systems	Current law states: Unpublished names and telephone numbers generated by an emergency services communication system coordinator or a public safety answering point (PSAP) or provided to an emergency services communication system coordinator or PSAP under Section 57-40.6-06 are confidential and may be used only for verifying the location or identity, or both, for response purposes, of a person calling a PSAP for emergency help or by the emergency services communication system coordinator or PSAP for the purpose of a public safety agency notifying a person of an emergency. 2. Published names and telephone numbers maintained by an emergency services communication system coordinator or PSAP are exempt records as defined in Section 44-04-17.1 but must be provided upon request to the treasurer and auditor of the county served by the PSAP for the purpose of verifying and correcting names and addresses used for official purposes.	This law makes sense when considering phone books. However in today's digital environment, what is published and unpublished phone number? We don't know if we should be redacting the phone number.	Declare all phone numbers as protected information.	None	Yes, following review and approval from the Governor's Office	Yes, following review and approval from the Governor's Office

No.	Budget No. - Agency	North Dakota Century Code Title(s), Chapter(s), or Section(s) and Description	No.1 Briefly describe the current process or program established in statute.	No.2 Briefly describe any issues, problems, or inefficiencies with the current process or program.	No.3 Briefly describe your agency's proposed solution or statutory change to correct the issue or problem or to improve the efficiency of the process or program.	No.4 Describe the fiscal impact, if any, of the proposed solution or statutory change on general fund or other fund revenues or expenditures for the 2027-29 biennium.	No.5 Does your agency intend to submit an agency prefiled bill draft on this topic for introduction during the 2027 legislative session?	No.6 Would your agency be willing to present to the Legislative Task Force on Government Efficiency regarding this topic?
66	540 - Adjutant General	Section 44-04-17.1 - Definitions Section 44-04-18 - Access to public records - Electronically stored information Chapter 57-40.6 - Emergency Services Communication Systems		Text to 911 and video 911 is largely uncovered in the Century Code.	Law makers and 911 Association officials should collaborate to establish appropriate laws.	None	Yes, following review and approval from the Governor's Office	Yes, following review and approval from the Governor's Office
67	601 - Department of Commerce	Section 54-60-13 - Business hotline	The commissioner shall create and implement a business hotline program. The program must provide for a telephone number through which the department shall provide, during regular business hours, in-state and out-of-state callers with information regarding how to do business in the state, the services and assistance available to businesses, the advantages of doing business in the state, and information on state and other resources that provide assistance to businesses in the state. In addition to directly providing information, the department may use the business hotline as a clearinghouse through which to refer callers to other federal, state, local, or private sector economic developers. The program must include an in-state and out-of-state marketing campaign in support of the program. The commissioner shall follow up on business leads gained through the program and shall gather data on the results of calls, including business expansion, location, and startup.	This requirement is redundant because the department already provides these services as part of its existing operations. We currently: - Maintain a phone line and online resources for businesses seeking information on doing business in the state. - Offer guidance on available services, advantages of operating here, and connect businesses to state, federal, and private-sector resources. - Conduct marketing and outreach efforts to promote business opportunities. - Track and follow up on business leads. Since these functions are already integrated into our standard processes and supported by existing programs, codifying them in law does not add value.	Eliminate this section of code as it is outdated.	Not applicable	No	Yes
68	601 - Department of Commerce	Section 57-38-01.41 - Twenty-first century manufacturing and animal agricultural workforce incentive	A taxpayer that is a primary sector business is allowed a nonrefundable credit against the tax imposed under Sections 57-38-30 or 57-38-30.3 for purchases of qualifying machinery and equipment in this state to improve job quality or increase productivity. The amount of the credit under this section is 15% of the cost of the qualifying machinery and equipment purchased in the taxable year. Qualified expenditures under this section may not be used in the calculation of any other income tax deduction or credit allowed under this chapter.	The automation tax credit has been effect for several years. It has proven to be effective in the sense that it does support manufactures expansion and automation opportunities. It has also proven to be very cumbersome to manage taking hundreds of hours to administer effectively. In 2024, we piloted a program entitled "Automate ND" which was a more direct automation support program for manufactures of all sizes and capacities. It would be the most effective use of resources to shift from the complexity of the tax credit program and shift to a more direct engagement opportunity similar to the previously piloted AutomateND.	Eliminate the automation tax credit	The credit may not exceed \$3 million per calendar year however If the maximum amount of allowed credits are not claimed in any calendar year, any remaining unclaimed credits may be carried forward and made available in the next succeeding calendar year	No	Yes
69	670 - Racing Commission	Section 53-06.2-01 - Pari-mutuel horse racing definitions	The current process starts with statutory permission, not agency discretion. The definition section narrowly defines "racing" as: Live or simulcast horse racing. (Historically) simulcast dog racing.	All our live race funding opportunities hinge on Section 53-06.2-01's narrow definition of "racing.". The statute treats pari-mutuel wagering as inseparable from animal racing. New pari-mutuel formats are technology-driven, not animal-driven. This regulatory burden reflects 20th-century racing economics, not 21st-century wagering economics. Some inefficiencies with the current process include: - Lost tax revenue - Lost consumer protections - Limited reinvestment into: - North Dakota Agriculture - North Dakota Breeding - North Dakota Rural economies - North Dakota Live Horse Racing	From the current statute, decouple pari-mutuel wagering from animal racing. Amend Section 53-06.2-01 to define pari-mutuel wagering based on the pooling and payout mechanism, not the type of event. Shift the statutory focus from what is being raced, (animals), to a fact based definition of how pari-mutuel wagers are pooled and settled. Modernizing the statute to regulate pari-mutuel wagering by its system, rather than by the contests species, allows the Racing Commission to adapt responsibly while preserving legislative control and consumer protections.	Fiscal impact to the racing commission comes in the form of increased tax revenues for each special fund from increased pari-mutuel wagering dollars. Updating this statute would allow the commission to process applications from pari-mutuel wagering providers throughout the world seeking to use technology to attract 21st. century wagering opportunities that does not include just animal racing. The impact could be life changing to many horsemen and women throughout the state without the need to expand gambling within North Dakota.	Yes	Yes
70	801 - Department of Transportation	Section 24-02-19 - Request for bids - How solicited	Current century code requires that any request for bids on construction work must be published in the official newspaper of the county where the project is located.	Publishing in the official news paper has worked in the past however it is no longer the most effective method to advertise large highway infrastructure projects reaching our statewide audience of contractors and stakeholders.	The Department of Transportation proposes utilizing the department's website, targeted email lists, subscription services, and other electronic platforms and remove the requirement for publishing in the official news paper.	Cost savings of approximately \$20,000 - \$30,000 per biennium.	Unknown	Yes