

Konrad Jackson

From: Sean Eichrodt, PCI <apolloinvserv@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 09, 2015 3:12 PM
To: House Labor and Commerce; Rep. Kurt Olson; Rep. Max Gruenberg; Rep. Jim Colver; Rep. Gabrielle LeDoux; Rep. Cathy Tilton; Rep. Andy Josephson; Rep. Sam Kito; Rep. Mike Chenault; Rep. Mark Neuman; Ginger Blaisdell
Subject: HB 9 Opposition

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

March 09, 2015

Honorable Alaska State Representatives:

I owned and operated an investigations firm in Alaska for two years, working primarily insurance and criminal cases. I have nearly a decade investigative experience in both the military and private sector, and made Alaska my home after honorably discharging from the U.S. Army. While I no longer operate as a private investigator, I would like to voice my concerns about several issues with this bill.

The cost will be prohibitive toward investigators. While the Alaska Business Licenses section currently boasts 117 businesses involved in private investigations, that number is artificially inflated. Of those, over half are security firms, lock smith firms, or security system companies. Several have owners who would not be able to pass a background check, and many more would not be able to afford such a license. Estimating \$250,000 per year for operating costs that DCCED would incur as a result of this bill, and estimating 40 investigators/agencies, would result in a \$6250.00 licensing fee. This is a hard pill for any agency to swallow, regardless of their contracts and income.

Another issue with this bill is the expectation of firearms training. Private investigators are not like security officers, public safety officers, or police officers. Private Investigators do not enforce laws, regulations, or rules, and they are not there to protect others. Alaska's concealed carry law allows for any citizen of legal age and not otherwise prohibited by law to carry a concealed firearm on their person. No Alaska law exists, to my knowledge that keeps any other profession from carrying a firearm while conducting their work, except those involved in public safety. Again, Private Investigators are not involved in public safety. Also, Private Investigators often go from private life to work instantaneously, meaning that if a Private Investigator is asked by a client to go check on something, and they have a firearm with them as a private citizen, they must first go secure their firearm if they are not trained to DCCED's standard. Further, that standard is not outlined in this bill.

More concerns arise from those who are exempt from this law. For example, those who perform background checks. There is a public safety issue with this. Background investigators go into the homes of a variety of people to conduct interviews of those who know the subject of the background investigation. This could be detrimental if the background investigator were a repeat sex offender, or something else of that nature. Accident reconstructionists actively involved in uncovering the truth about an accident are conducting a type of investigation, and typically conduct interviews, review video footage of nearby cameras, etc.

While I respect Rep. Hughes' opinion, I disagree that Private Investigators have any "quasi-authoritative" tasking, never mind by law enforcement agencies, and it is against the law for them to say that they have such authority unless a court order has been issued. This is already a law, and punishable as a Class C Felony for impersonation of a public safety officer. If this bill is truly about public safety, then a background check, costing an investigator \$20.00 at DPS for any individual would surely suffice. Thank you for reading my concerns.

Very Respectfully,

Sean T. Eichrodt, PCI

apolloinvserv@gmail.com