

HOUSE BILL 286<sup>1</sup>: LOCAL GOVERNMENT; RESTRICT ABILITY OF COUNTY  
GOVERNING AUTHORITIES TO REDUCE FUNDING FOR COUNTY POLICE  
DEPARTMENTS

*Amending O.C.G.A. § 36-8-8 and § 36-60-28 and § 45-1-8*

**First signature:** Representative Houston Gaines (116<sup>th</sup>)

**Co-sponsors:** Trey Kelley (16<sup>th</sup>), Katie Dempsey (13<sup>th</sup>), Marcus Wiedower (119<sup>th</sup>), J Collins (68<sup>th</sup>), Joseph Gullett (19<sup>th</sup>), Randy Robertson (29<sup>th</sup>)

**Summary:** The purpose of this Bill is to restrict the ability of county and municipal governing authorities to reduce funding for county and municipal police departments, unless revenues decrease by more than 5 percent or during the previous year the county made a one-time purchase or incurred a one-time legal obligation that increased the budget appropriation by more than 4 percent above the budgets for preceding years.<sup>2</sup>

**Status:** Signed by Governor May 7, 2021. Effective Date July 01, 2021.<sup>3</sup>

TEXT OF HOUSE BILL 286<sup>4</sup>

To amend Chapter 8 of Title 36 of the Official Code of Georgia Annotated, relating to county police, so as to restrict the ability of county governing authorities to reduce funding for county police departments; to amend Chapter 60 of Title 36 of the Official Code of Georgia Annotated, relating to general provisions applicable to municipal corporations, so as to restrict the ability of municipal or consolidated government governing authorities to reduce funding for municipal police departments; to provide for exceptions; to amend Chapter 1 of Title 45 of the Official Code of Georgia Annotated, relating to general provisions for public officers and employees, so as to require the state and certain local governments to provide certain public safety employees with the ability to have legal insurance premiums deducted from the employee's payroll; to provide for definitions; to provide for related matters; to repeal conflicting laws; and for other purposes.

---

<sup>1</sup> H.B. 286, 156th Gen Assemb., Reg. Sess. (Ga. 2021), *available at* <https://www.legis.ga.gov/api/legislation/document/20212022/202454> (last visited Nov. 7, 2021).

<sup>2</sup> *Id.*

<sup>3</sup> *2021-2022 Regular Session-HB 286, Local government; restrict ability of county governing authorities to reduce funding for county police departments*, GA. GEN ASSEMB., <https://www.legis.ga.gov/legislation/59296> (last visited Nov. 7, 2021) [hereinafter HB 286 Status Sheet].

<sup>4</sup> H.B. 286.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF GEORGIA:

**SECTION 1.**

Chapter 8 of Title 36 of the Official Code of Georgia Annotated, relating to county police, 15 is amended by adding a new Code section to read as follows:

"36-8-8.

(a)(1) Except as provided for in paragraph (2) of this subsection, the governing authority of a county that has elected to establish a county police force pursuant to this chapter shall not decrease the annual budgetary appropriation for such police force by more than 5 percent of the previous fiscal year's appropriation for such police force.

(2)(A) Paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not apply if actual or anticipated revenues of the county for the applicable fiscal year decrease by more than 5 percent. In such event, the governing authority shall be authorized to decrease the budgetary appropriation for such police force, but in no event shall the budget of the police force be decreased by a greater percentage than the overall percentage decrease in actual or anticipated revenues of the county.

(B) Paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not apply if during the previous fiscal year the county made a one-time capital public safety facility, equipment, or software purchase or incurred a one-time legal obligation that increased the annual budgetary appropriation of such police force by more than 4 percent above the annual budgetary appropriation for such police force for the fiscal year immediately preceding the previous fiscal year and the current fiscal year.

(b)(1) Except as provided for in paragraph (2) of this subsection, the governing authority of a county that has elected to establish a county police force pursuant to this chapter shall ensure that the annual budgetary appropriations for such police force during a rolling five-year period shall not decrease by more than 5 percent during such time period.

(2) Paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not apply if actual or anticipated revenues of the county for the applicable time period decrease by more than 5 percent. In such event, the governing authority shall be authorized to decrease the budgetary appropriation for such police force, but in no event shall the budget of the police force be decreased by a 21 HB 286/AP H. B. 286 - 3 - greater

percentage than the overall percentage decrease in actual or anticipated revenues of the county.

(c) Subsections (a) and (b) of this Code section shall not apply if:

(1) The governing authority ensures that an equal or greater level of law enforcement services will be provided to the county by either the sheriff or another local government pursuant to an intergovernmental agreement;

(2) During the applicable time period, the county is ordered by a court of competent jurisdiction to begin providing a public service at a level such county was not providing prior to the issuance of such court order necessitating county-wide budgetary adjustments; or

(3) Whenever a governing authority shall propose to adopt a police department budget which would exceed any limits in subsections (a) and (b) of this Code section, it shall adopt that budget rate at an advertised public meeting and at a time and place which is convenient to the taxpayers of the taxing jurisdiction. The governing authority shall also place an advertisement in a newspaper of general circulation serving the residents of the unit of local government and post such advertisement on the website of the governing authority, which describes the proposed percentage reduction in police services from the previous year's appropriation for police services. At least one week prior to the meeting of the governing authority at which adoption of the budget rate will be considered, the governing authority shall conduct a public hearing, at which time any persons wishing to be heard on the budget reduction may appear.

(d) This Code section shall not apply to any county police force employing less than 25 full-time or part-time certified law enforcement officers."

## SECTION 2.

Chapter 60 of Title 36 of the Official Code of Georgia Annotated, relating to general provisions applicable to municipal corporations, is amended by adding a new Code section to read as follows:

"36-60-28.

(a)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, the governing authority of a municipality that has established a municipal police force shall not decrease the annual budgetary appropriation for such police force by more than 5 percent of the previous fiscal year's appropriation for such police force.

(2)(A) Paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not apply if actual or anticipated revenues of the municipality for the applicable fiscal year decrease by more than 5 percent. In such event, the governing authority shall be authorized to decrease the budgetary appropriation for such police force, but in no event shall the budget of the police force be decreased by a greater percentage than the overall percentage decrease in actual or anticipated revenues of the municipality.

(B) Paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not apply if during the previous fiscal year the municipality made a one-time capital public safety facility, equipment, or software purchase or incurred a one-time legal obligation that increased the annual budgetary appropriation of such police force by more than 4 percent above the annual budgetary appropriation for such police force for the fiscal year immediately preceding the previous fiscal year and the current fiscal year.

(b)(1) Except as provided for in paragraph (2) of this subsection, the governing authority of a municipality that has established a municipal police force shall ensure that the annual budgetary appropriations for such police force during a rolling five-year period shall not decrease by more than 5 percent during such time period.

(2) Paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not apply if actual or anticipated revenues of the municipality for the applicable time period decrease by more than 5 percent. In such 21 HB 286/AP H. B. 286 - 5 - event, the governing authority shall be authorized to decrease the budgetary appropriation for such police force, but in no event shall the budget of the police force be decreased by a greater percentage than the overall percentage decrease in actual or anticipated revenues of the municipality.

(c) Subsections (a) and (b) of this Code section shall not apply if:

(1) The governing authority ensures that an equal or greater level of law enforcement services will be provided to the municipality by another local government pursuant to an intergovernmental agreement;

(2) During the applicable time period, the municipality is ordered by a court of competent jurisdiction to begin providing a public service at a level such municipality was not providing prior to the issuance of such court order necessitating city-wide budgetary adjustments;  
or

(3) Whenever a governing authority shall propose to adopt a police department budget which would exceed any limits provided for in subsections (a) and (b) of this Code section, it shall adopt that budget rate at an advertised public meeting and at a time and place convenient to the taxpayers of the taxing jurisdiction. The governing authority shall also place an advertisement in a newspaper of general circulation serving the residents of the unit of local government and post such advertisement on the website of the governing authority, which describes the proposed percentage reduction in police services from the previous year's appropriation for police services. At least one week prior to the meeting of the governing authority at which adoption of the budget rate will be considered, the governing authority shall conduct a public hearing, at which time any persons wishing to be heard on the budget reduction may appear.

(d) This Code section shall also apply to any consolidated government that operates a police force, and such police force shall be considered a municipal police force for the purposes of this Code section.

(e) This Code section shall not apply to any municipal police force employing less than 119 25 full-time or part-time certified law enforcement officers."

### **SECTION 3.**

Chapter 1 of Title 45 of the Official Code of Georgia Annotated, relating to general provisions for public officers and employees, is amended by adding a new Code section to read as follows:

"45-1-8.

(a) As used in this Code section, the term:

(1) 'Correctional officer' means any person who is authorized to exercise the power of arrest and who is employed or appointed by the Department of Corrections or the State Board of Pardons and Paroles.

(2) 'Emergency health worker' means hospital emergency department personnel and emergency medical services personnel.

(3) 'ERISA' means the federal Employee Retirement Income Security Act 132 of 1974, 29 U.S.C. Section 1001, et seq.

(4) 'Firefighter' shall have the same meaning as set forth in Code Section 25-4-2.

(5) 'Highway emergency response operator' means a person employed by the Department of Transportation who operates a towing or recovery vehicle or highway maintenance vehicle.

(6) 'Jail officer' means any person who is employed or appointed by a county or municipality and who has the responsibility of supervising inmates confined in a municipal or county detention facility.

(7) 'Juvenile correctional officer' means any person employed or appointed by the Department of Juvenile Justice whose primary responsibility is the supervision and control of youth confined in its programs and facilities.

(8) 'Probation officer' means a community supervision officer, county or Department of 144 Juvenile Justice juvenile probation officer, or probation officer serving pursuant to Article 6 of Chapter 8 of Title 42.

(9) 'Public safety employee' means a peace officer, correctional officer, emergency health worker, firefighter, highway emergency response operator, jail officer, juvenile correctional officer, or probation officer.

(b) The State of Georgia and the governing authority of each county and municipality that currently provides electronic payroll deposits to employees shall also provide payroll deductions to any full-time or part-time public safety employee who requests such a deduction for the purpose of purchasing insurance that provides such public safety employee with legal representation during all civil, administrative, or criminal actions caused as a result of his or her role or responsibilities as a public safety employee. Such deduction shall only be used to pay the premiums on insurance plans that are compliant within current ERISA standards and any dues or fees required by any professional organization that owns and provides such ERISA compliant product as a benefit of membership."

#### **SECTION 4.**

All laws and parts of laws in conflict with this Act are repealed.

#### **SPONSOR'S RATIONALE**

Representative Houston Gaines sponsored this Bill, which restricts a county's ability to reduce funding for county police departments.<sup>5</sup> The Bill proposal came to fruition after Athens and Atlanta debated cutting back on,

---

<sup>5</sup> H.B. 286.

or redirecting, funds that had been allocated for law enforcement.<sup>6</sup> These city debates followed the 2020 protests against racial injustices and calls to “defund the police.”<sup>7</sup> The bill’s sponsor, State Rep. Houston Gaines, an Athens Republican, called “keeping our community safe” the most important role of law enforcement.”<sup>8</sup> Furthermore, Gaines stated that “calls to defund the police (or) slash police budgets... is a dangerous idea that will harm those who most need protections and put victims at risk.”<sup>9</sup> He backed this by stating that “last year, Minneapolis slashed funding for its police department and we have already seen them back tracking in recent days. But that won’t make up for the crimes committed, the lives lost, and the damage done to that community.”<sup>10</sup> Gaines’ purpose for the Bill is to ensure that this movement to defund the police would never occur in Georgia and that it will provide protection for our communities.<sup>11</sup> He asserted that “local governments should be hiring more officers and paying them more in order to fight a spike in crime”, rather than defunding these necessary departments.<sup>12</sup> Gaines pushed back on opposers of the Bill by stating that “I support local control, but when you have local governments that are out of control, I knew we had to act,” presumably because the consequences of not doing so could be serious.<sup>13</sup> Representative Kasey Carter, in agreement with Gaines stated, “[w]e’re all for local control until the locals get out of control. Everybody stands behind the mantra of home rule and local control,

---

<sup>6</sup> Jeff Amy, *Athens Rep. Houston Gaines Pushes Bill Aiming to Block ‘Defunding’ of Police*, ATHENS BANNER-HERALD (Feb. 18, 2021, 11:10 AM), <https://www.onlineathens.com/story/news/state/2021/02/18/athens-rep-houston-gaines-pushes-bill-aiming-block-defunding-police-georgia/6799823002/>.

<sup>7</sup> *Id.*

<sup>8</sup> Maya T. Prabu, *Georgia House Backs Bill to Block Cities from Cutting Deeply into Police Funding*, ATLANTA J. CONST. (Feb. 24, 2021), <https://www.ajc.com/politics/georgia-house-backs-bill-to-block-cities-from-cutting-deeply-into-police-funding/A767MW2VYRHVDL7RY2SXGO26UE/>.

<sup>9</sup> *Id.*

<sup>10</sup> GPB Lawmakers, *House Day 22*, YOUTUBE (Feb. 24, 2021) <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Z7zMVP7TT1E> (beginning at 1:21:22).

<sup>11</sup> *Id.* (beginning at 1:21:42).

<sup>12</sup> Jeff Amy, *Kemp Signs Bill Aimed at Banning ‘Defund the Police’ Efforts*, U.S. NEWS.COM (May 7, 2021, 3:14 PM), <https://www.usnews.com/news/best-states/georgia/articles/2021-05-07/kemp-signs-bill-aimed-at-banning-defund-the-police-efforts>.

<sup>13</sup> *Id.*

but at some point, you've got locals who are making it harder for businesses to operate or individuals to do certain things.”<sup>14</sup>

During a speech in support of this Bill,<sup>15</sup> Kemp stated that defunding the police “will endanger our communities and our law enforcement officers and leave the most vulnerable at risk.”<sup>16</sup> Additionally, he praised officers and stated, “when it seemed like many in our society abandoned them and demonized their profession, they continued to put their lives on the line for the sake of others.”<sup>17</sup> Several states agreed with Governor Kemp’s legislation and passed similar bills.<sup>18</sup> The Bill is also

---

<sup>14</sup> Mark Niesse & Maya T. Prabhu, *Republican -Led General Assembly Passes State Laws that Override Locals*, ATLANTA J. CONST. (Apr. 23, 2021), <https://www.ajc.com/politics/georgia-lawmakers-say-they-respect-local-control-until-they-dont/JBPOXVUTH5DG3NJJ65EY3EG4GU/>.

<sup>15</sup> Press Release, Office of the Governor, Gov Kemp Signs Bill to Protect Police Budgets, (May 7, 2021), <https://gov.georgia.gov/press-releases/2021-05-07/gov-kemp-signs-bill-protect-police-budgets> (Governor Brian Kemp signed the Bill into law on May 7, 2021).

<sup>16</sup> Amy, *supra* note 12; *see also* Niesse & Prabhu, *supra* note 14 (“Kennesaw State University political scientist Kerwin Swint argued that state legislatures are well within their powers as a governing body to impose certain restrictions on local governments.” He said that “the state legislature has the power to give, to take away, to limit, to shape and form government, and they’ve done so over the years”).

<sup>17</sup> Press Release, *supra* note 15.

<sup>18</sup> *See* H.B. 1, 2021 Leg., Reg. Session, (Fl. 2021), available at <https://flsenate.gov/Session/Bill/2021/1>; *see also* A.G. Gancarski, Gov. DeSantis Signs Florida’s Anti-Riot Bill, FLORIDA POLITICS (Apr. 19, 2021), <https://floridapolitics.com/archives/421571-antiriot/> (Governor DeSantis of Florida believes that this “bill shows the state of Florida takes public safety very seriously”, but opposers argue that it allows the governor to usurp control of a city budget and amend it to their liking, additionally, one supporter of House Bill 1 made the argument that “Businesses are not going to relocate to an area where they don’t feel that their investment is safe”, thus preventing the defunding of police is necessary to defend both people and property); *see also* Press Release, ACLU of Florida, ACLU of Florida Condemns Passage of HB1 in the Full Senate, (Apr. 15, 2021), <https://www.aclufl.org/en/press-releases/aclu-florida-condemns-passage-hb1-anti-protest-bill-full-senate> (the Bill prevents local governments from determining how to allocate law enforcement resources but Micah Kubic, executive director of ACLU of Florida, stated that “HB 1 is racist, unconstitutional, and anti-democratic... The Bill was purposefully designed to embolden the disparate police treatment... of Black and Brown people); *see also* Andrew Solender, *Bipartisan House Bill Would Penalize Cities and States That Defund Their Police*, Forbes (July 16, 2020, 4:33 PM), <https://www.forbes.com/sites/andrewsolender/2020/07/16/bipartisan-house-bill-would-penalize-cities-and-states-that-defund-their-police/?sh=3aa747ca2336>; *see also* Defund Cities that Defund Police Act, H.R. 7632, 116th Cong. (2019-2020) available at <https://www.congress.gov/bill/116th-congress/house-bill/7632?r=5&s=1>. (New York Representative Anthony Brindisi states that “this commonsense, bipartisan legislation, will make sure that our police departments are well-funded so they can reform and improve upon their core mission: protecting and serving our communities”).



“supported by the Police Benevolent Association, the largest police group in Georgia.”<sup>19</sup> They stated that “We believe this bill is a strong statement of support for our law enforcement officers and the citizens they protect across the state and will help ensure our local governments don’t defund our police service.”<sup>20</sup>

#### OPPOSITION’S RATIONALE

State representative, Bee Nguyen, points to the tension between police and minority communities as one of her concerns for the Bill.<sup>21</sup> She agrees that the goal of law enforcement should be to make communities safer; however, she believes that is not the reality for all communities.<sup>22</sup> She explained that “if you are Black or Brown, whether armed or unarmed, you are more likely to be killed by law enforcement than our white counterparts.”<sup>23</sup> Furthermore, opposers cite statistics that “the Government Accountability Office found that policing accounts for less than two percent of the decline in crime.”<sup>24</sup>

Another issue that opposers, such as Debra Nesbitt and Savannah Mayor Van Johnson, have with the Bill is the precedence it sets for the control that states can retain over local budgets.<sup>25</sup> Nesbitt, Associate Legislative Director of Advancing Georgia’s Counties, opposed the Bill at the senate hearing because it “violates’ counties’ rights to local control.”<sup>26</sup> She further stated that “the Bill represents a ‘slippery slope’ in terms of

---

<sup>19</sup> Amy, *supra* note 6.

<sup>20</sup> *Id.*

<sup>21</sup> Prabu, *supra* note 8.

<sup>22</sup> *Id.*

<sup>23</sup> GPB Lawmakers, *supra* note 10, (beginning at 1:30:50).

<sup>24</sup> David Edwards & Shirley Franklin, *We’re Overpoliced and Underinvested in Communities*, ATLANTA J..CONST. (June 27, 2020), <https://www.ajc.com/news/opinion/opinion-over-policed-and-underinvested-communities/QXi89BlgOP94YlQ6np9k9H/>; see also *id.* (“In 1989, Atlanta’s rate of violent and serious property crimes was 17,903 per 100,000 residents. By 2018, there were only 4,463 crimes per 100,000 residents, a 74 percent reduction. This includes an 82 percent decline in the rate of violent crime. Even more starkly, in 1989 there were 246 homicides in Atlanta; last year, there were 88. In 1989, Atlanta had 52 crimes for every uniformed officer. In 2018, there were 14 per officer”).

<sup>25</sup> K.A. Bond & J. Burnett, *Despite Opposition, HB 286 Moves Through State Legislature*, the MAINLINE (Apr. 7, 2021), <https://www.mainlinezine.com/despite-opposition-hb-286-moves-through-state-legislature/>.

<sup>26</sup> *Id.*

state overreach, and that its passage could clear the way for the state to dictate the funding for other county services.”<sup>27</sup>

Mayor Van Johnson of Savannah hoped the Governor would not sign the Bill into effect because of its clear implications on the state exceeding its amount of state overreach. .<sup>28</sup> He stated that “local municipalities should be able to continue making decisions for themselves.”<sup>29</sup> He primarily argued that the city should have the right to be able to cut or increase their budgets because, “it’s the citizens of Savannah with very little help from the state that determine how we spend our money.”<sup>30</sup>

Representative Nguyen expounded on the mental health issue in our communities, stating that “law enforcement’s job is not to handle mental health, and they are simply not equipped to do it.”<sup>31</sup> However, “between five and fifteen percent of calls placed to law enforcement are families who are calling for mental health support for their loved ones... People with untreated mental health issues are sixteen times more likely to be killed by law enforcement.”<sup>32</sup> She stated that some of the funds allocated to law enforcement should be allocated to “social workers, healthcare, housing, education, or creating new programming is aimed at reducing incarceration.”<sup>33</sup>

Project South, an Institute for the Elimination of Poverty and Genocide, located in Atlanta, Georgia, argues that House Bill 286 “creates harmful barriers to decreasing and reallocating funds from the police unless certain requirements are met. Instead, the bill attempts to create a guaranteed funding for police that cannot be diverted to community-based needs such as social services or mental health resources.”<sup>34</sup> The organization also cites that “No substantial data has demonstrated a positive

---

<sup>27</sup> *Id.*

<sup>28</sup> Bria Bolden, *Savannah Mayor Hopes Gov. Kemp Will Not Sign HB 286*, WTOC 11 (Apr. 2, 2021, 11:28 PM), <https://www.wtoc.com/2021/04/03/savannah-mayor-hopes-gov-kemp-will-not-sign-hb/>.

<sup>29</sup> *Id.*

<sup>30</sup> *Id.*

<sup>31</sup> GPB Lawmakers, *supra* note 10, at 1:29:23.

<sup>32</sup> *Id.* (beginning at 1:29:38).

<sup>33</sup> *Id.* (beginning at 1:31:37).

<sup>34</sup> Project South, *HB 286 Prevents Divestment in Police and Decreases Public Safety in Georgia*, Project South Fact Sheet available at <https://projectsouth.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/HB-286-Factsheet.pdf>.

correlation between increased police budgets and reduced crime. Instead, in periods of declining police force, violent crime rates have also declined.”<sup>35</sup> Instead of providing more safety, Project South expounds on the fact that “Police brutality has been declared a public health issue and leading cause of death for young men between the ages of 18 to 35, particularly in the African American, indigenous, and Latinx communities.”<sup>36</sup> Finally, Project South cites New York Times in their argument that “data indicates an increase in employment, social welfare, and income, reduces crime more effectively than police intervention.”<sup>37</sup> Rather than allocating more funds to police as suggested by House Bill 286, “Divesting funds from police budgets to invest in mental health and social welfare programs are more likely to reduce crime, incarceration, and violence toward Black and brown people.”<sup>38</sup>

#### IMPLICATIONS IN GEORGIA

Governor Kemp signed House Bill 286 into law in May of 2021 for the purpose of protecting budgets allocated to police departments.<sup>39</sup> The Bill bars cities and counties from reducing their law enforcement budgets by more than five percent in one year and cumulatively by twenty-five percent over five years.<sup>40</sup> However, there are exceptions to the rule, and “cities and counties can cut more than 5 percent if local revenues decline by more than that.”<sup>41</sup> Furthermore, “cities and counties with fewer than twenty-five officers are exempt” from the law.<sup>42</sup> Despite the exceptions and exemptions, local governments no longer have the authority to make deductions greater than 5 percent per year on law enforcement related spending.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> *Id.*

<sup>36</sup> *Id.*

<sup>37</sup> *Id.*; see also Emily Badger & Quoc Trung Bui, *Cities Grew Safer. Police Budgets Kept Growing.*, NEW YORK TIMES (June 12, 2020), <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/06/12/upshot/cities-grew-safer-police-budgets-kept-growing.html>.

<sup>38</sup> *Id.*

<sup>39</sup> Press Release, *supra* note 17.

<sup>40</sup> H.B. 286.

<sup>41</sup> Amy, *supra* note 12.

<sup>42</sup> *Id.*

<sup>43</sup> Amy, *supra* note 6.

## LEGISLATIVE GENEALOGY

The Bill was introduced to the House Hopper on February 03, 2021.<sup>44</sup> The Bill was read to the House on February 04, 2021.<sup>45</sup> It was read for a second time on February 08, 2021.<sup>46</sup> On February 18, 2021, the House Committee favorably reported the Bill by substitute.<sup>47</sup> The Bill was read to the House for the third time and was passed by substitute on February 24, 2021.<sup>48</sup> On February 25, 2021 the Bill was read and referred to the Senate.<sup>49</sup> The Bill was withdrawn and recommitted by the Senate on March 15, 2021 and on March 22, 2021 the Senate committee favorably reported it by substitute and it was read for a second time.<sup>50</sup> On March 25, 2021 it was read to the Senate for the third time and the Senate passed it by substitute.<sup>51</sup> On March 31, 2021, the House agreed to the Senate substitute with a vote of one-hundred yea's and seventy-three nays.<sup>52</sup> The Bill was sent to the governor on April 07, 2021, and signed by him on May 07, 2021.<sup>53</sup> The Bill became effective on July 01, 2021.<sup>54</sup>

**Prepared by:** *Allyssia Andrews*

---

<sup>44</sup> HB 286 Status Sheet.

<sup>45</sup> *Id.*

<sup>46</sup> *Id.*

<sup>47</sup> *Id.*

<sup>48</sup> *Id.*

<sup>49</sup> *Id.*

<sup>50</sup> *Id.*

<sup>51</sup> *Id.*

<sup>52</sup> *Id.*

<sup>53</sup> *Id.*

<sup>54</sup> *Id.*