

**ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
HOUSE JUDICIARY STANDING COMMITTEE**

February 14, 2001

1:13 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Representative Norman Rokeberg, Chair
Representative Scott Ogan, Vice Chair
Representative John Coghill
Representative Kevin Meyer
Representative Ethan Berkowitz
Representative Albert Kookesh

MEMBERS ABSENT

Representative Jeannette James

COMMITTEE CALENDAR

SPONSOR SUBSTITUTE FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 13

"An Act relating to municipal service areas and providing for voter approval of the formation, alteration, or abolishment of certain service areas."

- MOVED CSSSHB 13(JUD) OUT OF COMMITTEE

HOUSE BILL NO. 52

"An Act relating to the Interstate Compact for Adult Offender Supervision and the State Council for Interstate Adult Offender Supervision; amending Rules 4 and 24, Alaska Rules of Civil Procedure; and providing for an effective date."

- HEARD AND HELD

PREVIOUS ACTION

BILL: HB 13

SHORT TITLE: SERVICE AREAS: VOTER APPROVAL/TAX ZONES

SPONSOR(S): REPRESENTATIVE(S) BUNDE

Jrn-Date	Jrn-Page		Action
01/08/01	0027	(H)	PREFILE RELEASED 12/29/00
01/08/01	0027	(H)	READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
01/08/01	0027	(H)	CRA, FIN
01/10/01	0056	(H)	COSPONSOR(S): KOHRING

01/12/01	0066	(H)	SPONSOR SUBSTITUTE INTRODUCED
01/12/01	0066	(H)	READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
01/12/01	0066	(H)	CRA, FIN
01/25/01		(H)	CRA AT 8:00 AM CAPITOL 124
01/25/01		(H)	Heard & Held
01/25/01		(H)	MINUTE(CRA)
01/30/01		(H)	CRA AT 8:00 AM CAPITOL 124
01/30/01		(H)	Moved SSHB 13 Out of Committee MINUTES(CRA)
01/31/01	0209	(H)	CRA RPT 2DP 1DNP 4NR
01/31/01	0209	(H)	DP: SCALZI, MORGAN; DNP: KERTTULA;
01/31/01	0209	(H)	NR: HALCRO, MURKOWSKI, GUESS, MEYER
01/31/01	0209	(H)	FN1: ZERO (CED)
01/31/01	0209	(H)	ADDITIONAL REFERRAL TO JUD
01/31/01	0209	(H)	JUD REFERRAL ADDED AFTER CRA
01/31/01	0209	(H)	REFERRED TO JUDICIARY
02/05/01		(H)	JUD AT 1:00 PM CAPITOL 120
02/05/01		(H)	Heard & Held MINUTES(JUD)
02/14/01		(H)	JUD AT 1:00 PM CAPITOL 120

BILL: HB 52

SHORT TITLE: COMPACT FOR ADULT OFFENDER SUPERVISION

SPONSOR(S): RLS BY REQUEST OF THE GOVERNOR

Jrn-Date	Jrn-Page		Action
01/10/01	0053	(H)	READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
01/10/01	0053	(H)	JUD, FIN
01/10/01	0054	(H)	FN1: (COR)
01/10/01	0054	(H)	GOVERNOR'S TRANSMITTAL LETTER
01/10/01	0054	(H)	REFERRED TO JUDICIARY
02/05/01		(H)	JUD AT 1:00 PM CAPITOL 120
02/05/01		(H)	Scheduled But Not Heard
02/14/01		(H)	JUD AT 1:00 PM CAPITOL 120

WITNESS REGISTER

REPRESENTATIVE CON BUNDE
Alaska State Legislature
Capitol Building, Room 501
Juneau, Alaska 99801

POSITION STATEMENT: Sponsor of SSHB 13.

HEATHER M. NOBREGA, Staff
to Representative Rokeberg
House Judiciary Standing Committee
Alaska State Legislature
Capitol Building, Room 118
Juneau, Alaska 99801

POSITION STATEMENT: Provided comments on the constitutional aspects of SSHB 13.

CANDACE BROWER, Program Coordinator
Office of the Commissioner - Juneau
Department of Corrections
240 Main Street, Suite 700
Juneau, Alaska 99801

POSITION STATEMENT: Presented HB 52 on behalf of the department and answered questions.

MICHAEL J. STARK, Assistant Attorney General
Legal Services Section-Juneau
Criminal Division
Department of Law
PO Box 110300
Juneau, Alaska 99811-0300

POSITION STATEMENT: Presented HB 52 on behalf of the department and answered questions.

BLAIR McCUNE, Deputy Director
Central Office
Public Defender Agency
Department of Administration
900 West 5th Avenue, Suite 200
Anchorage, Alaska 99501-2090

POSITION STATEMENT: Answered questions on HB 52.

ACTION NARRATIVE

TAPE 01-18, SIDE A
Number 0001

CHAIR NORMAN ROKEBERG called the House Judiciary Standing Committee meeting to order at 1:13 p.m. Representatives Rokeberg, Ogan, Coghill, and Meyer were present at the call to order. Representatives Berkowitz and Kookesh arrived as the meeting was in progress.

HB 13 - SERVICE AREAS:VOTER APPROVAL/TAX ZONES

Number 0029

CHAIR ROKEBERG announced that the first order of business would be SPONSOR SUBSTITUTE FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 13, "An Act relating to municipal service areas and providing for voter approval of the formation, alteration, or abolishment of certain service areas." [Adopted as a work draft at the previous hearing was version 22-LS0164\F, Cook, 2/3/01.]

Number 0147

REPRESENTATIVE CON BUNDE, Alaska State Legislature, sponsor, began his opening remarks by acknowledging the presence, at the last hearing on the proposed CS, of one of the members of the Constitutional [Convention, former Senator Fischer]. He felt sure that all of the members of the Constitutional Convention would have agreed that the Alaska State Constitution was a living document, and that it spoke very strongly to checks and balances. In his view, the proposed CS was about checks and balances; it would allow local folks to check the power of local government if they wish. Power should lie with the voter and not with local government. The key issue in the proposed CS was local government and local control, and how to define local control. He noted that the committee had already heard dueling legal opinions, but he put far more faith in the opinion of the legislature's attorney. He added that nothing was unconstitutional until it was found to be so by the Alaska Supreme Court. He commented that legislative will should be taken into account, and that the legislature was responsive to its constituency. He reminded the committee that this was not just a parochial issue - people in the Matanuska-Susitna (Mat-Su) valley and in Fairbanks also had a very strong interest.

CHAIR ROKEBERG observed that the committee had recently received a letter from Mr. Gatti, attorney for the Matanuska-Susitna Borough, and a letter from Larry DeVilbiss.

Number 0513

HEATHER M. NOBREGA, Staff to Representative Rokeberg, House Judiciary Standing Committee, Alaska State Legislature, provided comments on the constitutional aspects of the proposed CS. It was her belief that the proposed CS was constitutionally sound. In 1974, the Alaska Supreme Court found, with regard to Article X, Section 11, of the state constitution, that while home rule powers were intended to be broadly applied, they were not

intended to be preeminent; the legislature could dictate how they wanted it done. [The legislature] could bring forth rules that limit those powers.

Number 0590

REPRESENTATIVE BERKOWITZ referred to Alaska's Constitutional Convention, page 121, regarding the structure of government that reads as follows: "In all cases, however, service areas were to be creatures of boroughs and function under borough fiscal control." He asked Ms. Nobrega how this fits under her analysis.

MS. NOBREGA offered that Article X, Section 5, of the constitution, states that [a service area] is subject to the provisions of law or charter, and that is what the proposed CS is doing. It creates a law that would rule how the service areas were implemented. She said she would agree, however, with Representative Berkowitz, that it is possible for something to be constitutionally permissible, yet contrary to the spirit of the drafters [of the Alaska State Constitution].

Number 0704

CHAIR ROKEBERG confirmed that this was a very difficult issue, it was not a clear-cut case and there were splits of opinion. He was taken with the message from Mr. DeVilbiss that stated: "HB 13 is good for the little guys in service areas who have at least a little control over what is good for them. That is good," and felt the statement encapsulated the whole issue. He agreed with Representative Berkowitz that there was not a clear-cut area from which to interpret this constitutionally. However, from the preponderance of evidence heard, coupled with the opinion of Legislative Legal Services, he believed it indicated that [the proposed CS] was constitutional. Furthermore, the legislature had a responsibility, and certainly the right, to enact legislation in areas that may be gray.

Number 0764

REPRESENTATIVE BERKOWITZ made a motion to adopt Amendment 1, which read:

Page 1, line 4 through page 2, line 23
Delete all material
Renumber following sections accordingly

Number 0821

REPRESENTATIVE COGHILL objected. During the following discussion, he said Amendment 1 would be contrary to what they were trying to enact in the title and would also go against the sponsor's recommendations. In addition, service districts in the Fairbanks area would no longer have assistance in obtaining some degree of authority.

REPRESENTATIVE BERKOWITZ mentioned that it was his understanding that Amendment 1 would receive widespread support in Fairbanks.

REPRESENTATIVE COGHILL countered that he did not think anyone in his district had had the opportunity to address what would be left of the proposed CS, should Amendment 1 be adopted.

REPRESENTATIVE BUNDE added that he had spoken with a road area supervisor from the Fairbanks area, Mr. Frank, who was adamant that, for their needs, the proposed CS needed to include the provisions that Amendment 1 would remove.

Number 1069

A roll call vote was taken. Representatives Meyer, Berkowitz, and Kookesh voted for Amendment 1. Representatives Rokeberg, Ogan, and Coghill voted against Amendment 1. [Representative James was absent.] Therefore, Amendment 1 failed by a vote of 3-3.

REPRESENTATIVE MEYER explained that while the bill was before the House Community and Regional Affairs Standing Committee, many of the same discussions took place. He acknowledged that some members of his constituency were opposed to the proposed CS. However, because he felt that ultimately, the courts would have to resolve the constitutional issues, he would be voting to move the proposed CS out of committee.

CHAIR ROKEBERG said that it would be a very difficult vote for him. Despite this, he was going to support moving the proposed CS out of committee. He believed it did have the constitutional foundation to be passed. He had voted for similar legislation in the past, but it was still a difficult decision because he understood the municipality's concerns.

Number 1163

REPRESENTATIVE COGHILL moved to report the proposed CS for SSHB 13, version 22-LS0164\F, Cook, 2/3/01, out of committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying fiscal note.

Number 1175

REPRESENTATIVE BERKOWITZ objected.

REPRESENTATIVE OGAN acknowledged that while there were conflicting opinions on the constitutionality of the proposed CS, he had confidence in his own ability to sense constitutional problems. In addition, he said he put great faith in the opinion of Tam Cook, the legislature's legal counsel.

Number 1252

A roll call vote was taken. Representatives Rokeberg, Ogan, Meyer, and Coghill voted in favor of moving the proposed CS for SSHB 13, version 22-LS0164\F, Cook, 2/3/01. Representatives Berkowitz and Kookesh voted against it. [Representative James was absent.] Therefore, CSSHB 13(JUD) was reported from the House Judiciary Standing Committee by a vote of 4-2.

HB 52 - COMPACT FOR ADULT OFFENDER SUPERVISION

Number 1291

CHAIR ROKEBERG announced that the next order of business would be HOUSE BILL NO. 52, "An Act relating to the Interstate Compact for Adult Offender Supervision and the State Council for Interstate Adult Offender Supervision; amending Rules 4 and 24, Alaska Rules of Civil Procedure; and providing for an effective date."

Number 1312

CANDACE BROWER, Program Coordinator, Office of the Commissioner - Juneau, Department of Corrections, presented HB 52. She explained that HB 52 was an effort to repeal the current interstate compact [Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers (ICSPP)] that was enacted in 1937 and replace it with the new Interstate Compact for Adult Offender Supervision (ICAOS). The ICSPP governed the state-to-state transfer and supervision of parolees and probationers. It was a reciprocal agreement between states to exchange parolees and probationers, and to continue their needed supervision. The current compact is outdated. In addition, nationally, there

were now approximately 250,000 probationers and parolees crossing state borders. Thus, this outdated system had become overwhelmed.

MS. BROWER informed the committee that the Council of State Governments (CSG) and the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) had made an effort to update the current ICSPP; however, they determined that was not feasible because it was just too far out of date. Instead, the new ICAOS was created, and to date, nine states had enacted legislation to adopt it. In order for the ICAOS to take effect, it would have to be adopted by 35 states. She noted that an advantage to being amongst the first states to adopt the ICAOS would be the opportunity to help set the national regulations regarding how the ICAOS operated.

Number 1406

MS. BROWER expressed concern that there should be enforceable regulations regarding the transfer and supervision of parolees and probationers, but the current ICSPP was basically a gentlemen's agreement that allowed offenders to fall between the cracks. The adoption of the new ICAOS would establish a mechanism for all states, and offenders, to be held accountable through monitoring, data tracking systems, and increased required victim notification. Under the current ICSPP, there were times when states didn't come to an agreement on supervision of a released offender, yet the offender was released and sent to the other state anyway, without any accountability. The adoption of the new ICAOS would ensure that the sending state and the receiving state came to an agreement before the offender was released. In addition, the new ICAOS provided for the formation of an Interstate Commission (IC) that would resolve disputes between states.

MS. BROWER mentioned that because Alaska exported more offenders than it imported, it would benefit a great deal from the adoption of the new ICAOS. She gave an example of someone who had served his or her sentence after committing a crime in Alaska, and was eligible for supervised release. If that person felt his or her chances and opportunity of success were greater in another state because family and friends resided there, that person could apply to be supervised by officials in another state. In order to do that, that person would first apply to Alaska's interstate compact office. The application would then be reviewed by the receiving state and sent to the area where the offender planned to go. That area's supervising office would investigate the application and ensure that the offender

had a job and family or suitable placement. If approved, the offender would also be responsible for abiding by conditions set by both the sending state and receiving state.

Number 1600

MS. BROWER, in response to questions by Representative Berkowitz, estimated that Alaska had sent approximately 400 probationers out of state. She did not anticipate the number going up under the new ICAOS, but she believed it would provide for better supervision and enforcement of Alaska's offenders in other states. And under the new ICAOS, extradition would become easier.

Number 1653

MICHAEL J. STARK, Assistant Attorney General, Legal Services Section-Juneau, Criminal Division, Department of Law, added that there might be a receiving state that unreasonably denied a request to transfer interstate supervision. The new ICAOS would be enacting rules that would allow the sending state to enforce the compact and require the receiving state to take the person if he or she met the criteria. The new ICAOS would also prevent one state from "dumping" an offender in another state when there was a legitimate reason to refuse the request to transfer interstate supervision. In instances where an offender was transferred without permission from the receiving state, which has happened under the current ICSP, that person did not receive supervision from either the sending or receiving state. The new ICAOS would provide for revenues to deal with enforcing supervision and, where needed, to enforce the sending state to take the offender back and continue supervision. The new ICAOS provided for accountability of all people that moved between states, which did not adequately exist under the current ICSP.

REPRESENTATIVE COGHILL asked if the state would have a part in the IC, or would the state establish a member body in Alaska that would interact with the IC.

MR. STARK clarified that the ICAOS would be adopted as is. The ICAOS could not be modified because it was a contract with other states. What the ICAOS provided for was an IC, and all compacting states would have a voting member in the IC. That voting member would become the compact administrator for the state. Most states have independent county probation departments, so those states would have a number of compact administrators and must select one of them to represent their

state on the IC. In Alaska, which had only one Department of Corrections, there would be only one compact administrator. That person would sit on Alaska's state council and would also represent Alaska on the IC. The state council would be a body of seven persons with five voting members, one nonvoting member from the legislature, and one nonvoting member from the judiciary; the compact requires that all three branches of government be represented on the state council. The state council would advise the legislature, make recommendations, and implement the provisions of the compact in so far as ensuring compliance with rules the IC adopted.

Number 1839

MS. BROWER verified for Representative Coghill that the fiscal note reflected travel costs for members of the state council, as well as for the person who would represent Alaska in the IC.

MR. STARK clarified for Representative Coghill that language in Article III of the ICAOS created the IC and spoke about the state council, and that language regarding the powers and duties of the IC was found in Article IV. He explained that the state council was created outside of the ICAOS, through Section 3 of HB 52, which set out the membership and responsibilities of the state council.

REPRESENTATIVE BERKOWITZ asked, with regard to the nonvoting member from the judiciary on the state council, if [the language] had been vetted through the defense bar.

Number 1990

BLAIR McCUNE, Deputy Director, Central Office, Public Defender Agency, Department of Administration, testified via teleconference. He answered Representative Berkowitz's questions by saying that [the Public Defender Agency] had not asked to be on a council like this because of potential conflict of interest, for example, if the council made regulations that denied somebody the chance to go out of state, and [the Public Defender Agency] was representing that person. He said, however, that [the Public Defender Agency] hoped to have input if they had particular concerns.

Number 2058

MR. STARK, in response to Representative Rokeberg, said that though the ICAOS required all three branches of government to be

involved in the state council, Section 3 of HB 52 was drafted to ensure separation of powers; thus the members from the legislature and judiciary were nonvoting members. He emphasized that all branches of government needed to stay involved because of the pervasive problems associated with having so many offenders crossing state lines. He said concerns about such things as Megan's Law and sex offender registration were taking [the country] in the direction of national data systems that would keep track of offenders wherever they were. He added that the ICAOS required that the IC file an annual report that would keep all the state legislatures and governors apprised of the business of the ICAOS. He did not anticipate adversarial issues arising in the state council.

REPRESENTATIVE ROKEBERG asked Ms. Brower to provide a short narrative analysis of what the existing circumstances were, and what the new ICAOS would do for the state. The analysis should show why the State of Alaska should enter into a compact with other states. He also asked what is done now in terms of interstate intercourse with other jurisdictions, and how the state currently speaks to those jurisdictions.

MS. BROWER answered that currently there was an interstate office that had a compact administrator who processed all applications.

MR. STARK clarified that the position of compact administrator already existed; HB 52 would simply repeal the existing ICSP and replace it with the new ICAOS.

Number 2186

REPRESENTATIVE KOOKESH commented that he saw they had two choices: to join the new ICAOS or stay with the old 1937 ICSP. He said he felt that if every other state adopted the new ICAOS and Alaska maintained the old ICSP, then Alaska would look pretty ridiculous. He also said that they must recognize that [Alaska] had to join modern society, and they should just go forward with [the adoption of the ICAOS].

Number 2225

MR. STARK explained for Representative Ogan that the ICAOS was drafted so that 35 states must enact the ICAOS before it becomes effective. He supposed it was a somewhat arbitrary number - it was simply the number chosen by the body that drafted the ICAOS. He said that currently there are 9 or 10 states that have

enacted the ICAOS, and many other states have similar legislation before them. He confirmed that it is federal authority that allows for the compact, as well as for states to enter into interstate compacts.

REPRESENTATIVE BERKOWITZ pointed out that the ICAOS was an agreement between the states, not an agreement mandated by the federal government and then imposed on the states. Also, this is considered normal commerce between states.

CHAIR ROKEBERG added that the action of a compact is provided for in the United States Constitution.

REPRESENTATIVE OGAN voiced concern over language he felt gave the ICAOS the ability to pass laws that the state must abide by.

REPRESENTATIVE BERKOWITZ noted that the ICAOS had the force of law only because it was essentially a contract that the state entered into.

Number 2384

MR. STARK added that also, should the legislature adopt the ICAOS, it would become part of state statute, and thereby require Alaska to follow any rules adopted by the IC. He pointed out that this was one of the enforcement mechanisms that dealt with states when they did not follow the rules. The IC could go into court and get a court order that forces a state to abide by the rules the IC set. He pointed out that the language regarding the binding effects of the ICAOS is found on page 19, Article XIII. He added that the ICAOS did provide for states to ask for legal interpretations from the IC. In an effort to allay Representative Ogan's concerns, Mr. Stark referred to language on page 20 that allowed a state to disregard any provision of the ICAOS, should it exceed that state's constitutional limits. Further, should the state find it untenable to abide by a rule adopted by the IC, the state could simply withdraw from the ICAOS.

REPRESENTATIVE OGAN wanted clarification that under the ICAOS, the legislature would delegate its legislative power to an interstate compact that had the ability to [make rules that] had the force of law in Alaska.

Number 2450

MR. STARK countered that the legislature would only delegate rule-making authority to the IC. The IC would then adopt rules through the federal Administrative Procedure Act, which included public notice and an opportunity for public input. In addition, Alaska would have a member on the IC while it adopted rules.

REPRESENTATIVE BERKOWITZ suggested that this was akin to, but not just like, executive branch regulation authority.

CHAIR ROKEBERG added that the ability of the various states to enter into compacts, and to create rules between them, was what in large part kept the federal government out of the issue.

TAPE 01-18, SIDE B
Number 2510

MR. STARK noted that the ICAOS would not have any federal government representation on it.

REPRESENTATIVE MEYER asked what would happen if the minimum of 35 states enacting the ICAOS was not reached.

MR. STARK reiterated that the ICAOS would not take effect unless a minimum of 35 states ratified it. He directed attention to page 22, Section 9, which had the language pertaining to the effective date. If this minimum was never reached, or until it was reached, the existing ICSPP would still be in effect. However, he fully expected all the states to adopt the ICAOS at some point. As Ms. Brower noted before, Mr. Stark felt it was very important to be amongst the first of the 35 states because, after the first 12 months of reaching the minimum number of states, the initial rules of the IC would be adopted. His concern was that with Alaska being a small rural state, some of the more populous states might adopt rules that would adversely impact Alaska. He wanted to ensure that Alaska would have input as the IC was adopting the initial rules. He also clarified for Representative Meyer that the costs outlined in the fiscal note might be lessened after the first year if the IC adopted a rule permitting participation of members via teleconference.

Number 2427

MS. BROWER commented that the fiscal note also reflected a fee, based on offender population, that the ICAOS assessed member states. She did not anticipate any further costs.

MR. STARK outlined some of the criteria used in the formulation of the fee, and noted that Alaska was in a group of states that were being assessed the lowest amount. He also emphasized that ICAOS only applied to persons under supervision for criminal convictions, not civil convictions. In response to questions by Representative Coghill, Mr. Stark said that under the existing ICSPP, there was already an organization of compact administrators that met annually and, because they felt they lacked enforcement mechanisms, were the driving force behind the creation of the new ICAOS. He also noted that many of the rules under the current ICSPP would be readopted under the new ICAOS, and that the primary changes would be with the enforcement provisions of those rules. He did anticipate increased accountability and tracking. On the point of being amongst the first 35 states, he expressed a concern that Alaska needed to initially address a provision that would allow states that don't have their own misdemeanor supervision to refrain from supervising another state's transferred misdemeanants. For example, under the new ICAOS, Alaska would be forced to supervise transferred misdemeanants if the sending state normally supervises them, even though Alaska doesn't supervise its own misdemeanants under formal probation.

Number 2163

MR. STARK expanded on transfer procedures by saying that currently the sending state sets its own probation conditions for its offender, who then comes to our state to be supervised. The receiving state can also impose additional conditions, which must be reasonable, and the offender must comply with both sets of conditions. He clarified that in cases of conflict, the compact administrators resolve the differences. In any case, the offender and both states are notified of all conditions that the offender must comply with.

REPRESENTATIVE ROKEBERG directed attention to page 5, lines 20-23. He felt that the language in the ICAOS regarding the appointment of the compact administrator was ambiguous.

Number 2042

MR. STARK explained that that language was meant to give states the option of appointing the compact administrator through either the state council or the governor in consultation with the legislature and the judiciary. He referred to page 20, line 9, which contained language specific to Alaska, whereby the governor in consultation with the legislature and the judiciary

shall make the appointment. He noted this was not a confirmation process; instead, the governor would notify the legislature and the judiciary of his choice and solicit comments before finalizing the appointment. He clarified that the compact administrator was not in a political position; that person simply enforced interstate supervision rather than made policy.

MR. STARK defined for Representative Coghill the court rule language located on page 22. He said it meant that if there was any litigation anywhere in the country in which the powers and responsibilities of the IC were raised, the IC had the right to be served with process and be part of that lawsuit.

Number 1930

MR. McCUNE added that [the Public Defender Agency] saw HB 52 as an improvement over the present situation. He believed that the National Institute of Corrections in Washington, D.C., had done a lot of research and work on this issue. [The Public Defender Agency] supported HB 52.

Number 1752

CHAIR ROKEBERG advised members that the committee would hold HB 52 over and take it up again as soon as possible. He noted that Representative Ogan wished to further investigate the constitutional issues of HB 52. [HB 52 was held over.]

ADJOURNMENT

Number 1694

There being no further business before the committee, the House Judiciary Standing Committee meeting was adjourned at 2:20 p.m.