

HOUSE FINANCE COMMITTEE
April 11, 2005
1:41 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

Co-Chair Meyer called the House Finance Committee meeting to order at [1:41:29 PM](#).

MEMBERS PRESENT

Representative Mike Chenault, Co-Chair
Representative Kevin Meyer, Co-Chair
Representative Bill Stoltze, Vice-Chair
Representative Eric Croft
Representative Richard Foster
Representative Mike Hawker
Representative Jim Holm
Representative Mike Kelly
Representative Carl Moses
Representative Bruce Weyhrauch

MEMBERS ABSENT

Representative Reggie Joule

ALSO PRESENT

Rick Urion, Director, Occupational Licensing, Department of Community and Economic Development; John Walsh, Lobbyist, Alaska Psychological Association; William Corbus, Commissioner, Department of Revenue; Mitch Usibelli, Manager, Usibelli Energy; Representative Jay Ramras; Representative John Coghill; Representative Ralph Samuels

PRESENT VIA TELECONFERENCE

Linda Wilson, Deputy Director, Public Defender Agency, Department of Administration; Martin Beals, Jr., M.D., Pediatrician, Anchorage; Debbie Golden, March of Dimes, Anchorage; Lisa Owens, Audiologist, Anchorage; Debbie Joslin, Eagle River; Tara Henry, Sexual Abuse Nurse Examiner (SANE), Anchorage, Tamara DeLucia, Office of Victim's Rights; Dan Dickinson, Director, Tax Division, Department of Revenue; Colleen Chinn-Acca, Fairbanks; Martin Beals, Jr., M.D. Pediatrician, Anchorage.

SUMMARY

HB 123 "An Act relating to occupational licensing fees and receipts; extending the termination dates of the Boards of Barbers and Hairdressers, Social Work Examiners, Pharmacy, Professional Counselors, Psychologist and Psychological Associate

Examiners, and Veterinary Examiners; relating to an exemption that allows one bill to continue more than one board, commission, or agency program; and providing for an effective date."

CSHB 123 (FIN) was REPORTED out of Committee with a "no recommendation" recommendation and with fiscal impact note #1 by the Department of Commerce, Community and Economic Development.

HB 71 "An Act relating to a credit for certain exploration expenses against oil and gas properties production taxes on oil and gas produced from a lease or property in the state; relating to the deadline for certain exploration expenditures used as credits against production tax on oil and gas produced from a lease or property in the Alaska Peninsula competitive oil and gas area wide lease sale area after July 1, 2004; and providing for an effective date."

HB 71 was heard and HELD in Committee for further consideration.

HB 219 "An Act relating to crimes and dangerous instruments."

CSHB 219 (FIN) was REPORTED out of Committee with a "do pass" recommendation and with three zero fiscal impact notes: #1 CRT, #2 LAW, #3 DPS, and a new ADM zero fiscal note.

HB 91 "An Act relating to indecent exposure."

HB 91 was REPORTED out of Committee with a "do pass" recommendation and with three zero fiscal impact notes: #1 ADM, #2 LAW, and #3 CRT.

HB 109 "An Act relating to establishing a screening, tracking, and intervention program related to the hearing ability of newborns and infants; providing an exemption to licensure as an audiologist for certain persons performing hearing screening tests; relating to insurance coverage for newborn and infant hearing screening; and providing for an effective date."

HB 109 was heard and HELD in Committee for further consideration.

[1:41:44 PM](#)

HOUSE BILL NO. 123

"An Act relating to occupational licensing fees and receipts; extending the termination dates of the Boards of Barbers and Hairdressers, Social Work Examiners, Pharmacy, Professional Counselors, Psychologist and Psychological Associate Examiners, and Veterinary Examiners; relating to an exemption that allows one bill to continue more than one board, commission, or agency program; and providing for an effective date."

RICK URION, DIRECTOR OCCUPATIONAL LICENSING, DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT; offered to answer questions regarding HB 123.

Co-Chair Meyer asked for an explanation of the \$486,000 fiscal note. Mr. Urion reported that the fiscal note covers direct costs by the boards. Vice-Chair Stoltze inquired if that amount is already built into the budget. Mr. Urion replied that is correct.

Co-Chair Meyer asked where the funds from the fines and penalties go. Mr. Urion explained that the fines went to the profession until a few years ago. It was discovered that fines are not covered in law, so new legislation was needed. He related that the fines do not generate revenue because it costs money to collect them. The bill addresses an issue of fairness when it allows fines and penalties collected by various occupations to be included with fee collections for the purpose of determining whether revenue collected approximately equals the total costs of regulation for an occupation or board.

[1:46:28 PM](#)

Co-Chair Chenault asked how much the Department of Law actually spends on collecting the fines. Mr. Urion replied that he could look up the records. He added that there are five personnel alone that deal with occupational licensing issues.

Representative Weyhrauch asked if licensing fines are determined on a case-by-case method. Mr. Urion replied that various boards have various methods of figuring out the fines. Representative Weyhrauch suggested that some cases might be technical violations, others fraud, which would require different fine amounts. Mr. Urion said that is correct.

[1:49:11 PM](#)

Representative Hawker asked if there is unequal allocation of fine costs between occupations. Mr. Urion replied that would be handled at individual board levels. Costs from a profession will be borne by its own profession. He emphasized that every profession favors this bill.

Co-Chair Meyer asked if licensing fees would decrease. Mr. Urion replied that the amount is miniscule.

[1:51:44 PM](#)

Representative Hawker MOVED to adopt Amendment 3:

Page 1, line 1

After "An act relating to"

Delete "occupational licensing fees and receipts;"

Page 1, line 7

Delete Section 1

Page 2, line 28

Delete Section 2

Page 3, line 9

Delete Section 3

Page 3, line 20

Delete Section 4

Page 4, line 22

Delete Section 11

Page 4, line 27

Delete Section 12

Renumber remaining sections accordingly.

Co-Chair Meyer OBJECTED for discussion purposes.

Representative Hawker explained that the Amendment 3 deletes all sections in the bill not related to the extensions of the boards. The committee has attempted in the past to keep board extensions clean and not cluttered with other issues, not mix policy with ministerial activities. He suggested that the committee would need to hear from all of the boards in order to know that they all are supportive of the new CS.

Mr. Urion related that last year he was directed to write this bill in its current form. He expressed frustration about the turn of events with the addition of Amendment 3.

Vice-Chair Stoltze noted that it is important to clean sunsets up.

Co-Chair Meyer WITHDREW his OBJECTION.

There being NO OBJECTION, Amendment 3 was adopted.

[1:55:46 PM](#)

JOHN WALSH, LOBBYIST, ALASKA PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION, asked if Amendment 3 amends the bill as previously amended by Amendment 1. Representative Hawker responded that Amendment 3 amends Version Y, the Labor and Commerce CS.

Representative Foster moved to report CSHB 123 (FIN) out of Committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying fiscal note.

CSHB 123 (FIN) was REPORTED out of Committee with a "no recommendation" recommendation and with fiscal impact note #1 by the Department of Commerce, Community and Economic Development.

[1:59:10 PM](#)

HOUSE BILL NO. 71

"An Act relating to a credit for certain exploration expenses against oil and gas properties production taxes on oil and gas produced from a lease or property in the state; relating to the deadline for certain exploration expenditures used as credits against production tax on oil and gas produced from a lease or property in the Alaska Peninsula competitive oil and gas areawide lease sale area after July 1, 2004; and providing for an effective date."

WILLIAM CORBUS, COMMISSIONER, DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE, related:

House Bill 71 extends from July 1, 2007 to July 1, 2010 the deadline for making qualified exploration expenditures under new AS 43.55.025 (passed in 2003) in the Bristol Bay area. Leases in the Bristol Bay (Alaska Peninsula) Competitive Oil and Gas Lease Sale are not expected to be issued prior to the spring of 2006. Production expenditures on these leases thus will most likely be made after July 1, 2007 and will not qualify for tax credits under the current law.

House Bill 71 is intended to encourage exploration and development of one of the largest undeveloped onshore oil and gas fields remaining in Alaska outside of the North Slope. Development of this field has the potential to bring stable, high paying, year round jobs to an area which has traditionally relied on a seasonal commercial fishing economy. Gas from this field can provide an efficient relatively low cost energy source for heating and the production of electricity to the Alaska Peninsula area. Oil and gas development can provide transportation infrastructure and lower the cost of living in this area. Local residents and commercial interests, including native corporations in the Alaska Peninsula area support development of the gas and oil resources in this area. Under the terms of the lease sale, any development of oil and gas under

state waters within the three-mile limit would have to be done by directional drilling from onshore.

Three changes were made to HB 71 in the House Resources Committee substitute:

1. A change to HB 71 was added in the House Resources Committee to extend the exploration tax credit to wells drilled in the Nenana Basin through July 1, 2008. The Administration supports this amendment.

2. A second change added in the Resources Committee substitute eliminates the exploration tax credit for exploration in ANWR.

3. The third change added in House Resources eliminates the exploration tax credit for certain wells that might be considered delineation wells under the current law. The Administration does not support this change to existing tax policy. The idea behind the original bill was if an explorer was going to push the boundaries of the area under production out 25 miles, then the state would underwrite the well work associated with that exploration, even to the extent of figuring out how much production is there. All the other limits -of kinds of expense and when the work has to be done still exist. We think that was good idea then, we think it's a good idea now and if explorers thought it was a good idea, we shouldn't change the law now. These companies have made and are making decisions based on a law that was to be in effect from July 1, 2004 to July 1, 2007 it would be inappropriate to make changes to that law at this time.

[2:04:20 PM](#)

Representative Hawker asked which change was not endorsed. Commissioner Corbus deferred to Dan Dickinson.

[2:05:01 PM](#)

DAN DICKINSON, DIRECTOR, TAX DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE, (via teleconference) responded that the tax policy change made in the House Resources CS, which the Administration is not endorsing, changed the requirements and limitations on which wells might or might not qualify for the last two years of the four years from which this tax credit can apply.

Representative Hawker asked for clarification on the language at issue.

Mr. Dickinson replied the language is found in Section 1, lines 7-10 (new subsection 3), Section 3, 4 and 5. Under the current legislation, a 20 percent credit is set up if an exploration well is drilled more than 3 miles from an

existing well. There is also a 20 percent credit if an exploration well is more than 25 miles from a unit boundary, as it existed on the date in the bill. If a company qualifies for both credits, then a 40 percent credit is possible. The CS does not allow for credit for wells that are less than 3 miles from a prior well, but more than 25 miles from a leased boundary. He gave an example.

[2:09:30 PM](#)

Representative Hawker inquired about the rationale behind the change. Mr. Dickinson replied that once hydrocarbons have been found, the thought is that the state should stop subsidizing and not allow any more dollars for the credit. If the boundaries are pushed out, the credit is then earned. The issue is how far the boundaries can be extended and still qualify for credit.

Representative Hawker asked if there could be one or two wells in proximity to each other as part of an initial exploratory find, or if that is prohibited.

Mr. Dickinson replied that the new language would prohibit that situation. HB 61 created a credit in the income tax for certain exploration and development work in the Cook Inlet. It is appropriate at times to issue a credit pertinent to the activity needed to get additional production, which is the goal. Representative Hawker noted that the line is clear in this CS between exploration drilling and development drilling.

Co-Chair Meyer asked if Mr. Dickinson agreed with Representative Hawker. He replied that the definitions are based on the location of the well.

[2:13:13 PM](#)

Representative Weyhrauch noted on page 2, line 6, in Version S, the word "or" appears. He recalled that the Ways and Means version had the word "and". He asked if this is a change. Mr. Dickinson thought the wording should say "and". He clarified that the Resource Committee set up three situations in subsections 1, 2, and 3.

[2:16:26 PM](#)

Representative Weyhrauch referred to Section 4 and asked whether outer boundaries that have not been delineated by the required date might prevent eligibility. Mr. Dickinson explained that the lack of a unit boundary would still qualify a new well in the Bristol Bay extension area for the 20 percent credit. Mr. Dickinson recalled that if the boundary had not been delineated, you did not qualify.

REPRESENTATIVE RALPH SAMUELS explained that is a policy call about the second well. In response to the question about "and" and "or", he explained that the Resources Committee switched from "and" to "or" because it didn't want anyone receiving an 80 percent credit. He opined that the wording still needs clarification. He shared discussions that happened in the Resources Committee Meeting.

[2:21:26 PM](#)

Representative Holm asked about the rationale for only allowing one well.

Representative Samuels explained the thinking behind the decision. The idea was not to give credit for exploration on a known property.

Mr. Dickinson strongly urged that the committee adopt HB 71 be adopted with the additional conceptual language changes.

[2:23:43 PM](#)

MITCH USIBELLI, MANAGER, USIBELLI ENERGY, NENANA, related that his company is involved in two projects, Nenana Basin and Healy Basin. He referred to handouts on each project (copy on file.) He shared the history of the Nenana Basin project and explained the maps in the handout. He termed this project an exciting, yet high-risk frontier exploration. He highlighted the summary sheet of Exploration Incentive Credit Programs. He noted that the sunset date on the project is 2007.

[2:30:33 PM](#)

Mr. Usibelli described the history of the second project, the proposed Healy Basin exploration license. He spoke of projects delays. He described the maps in the handout. He noted that this project is a gas-only project, for coalbed methane and shallow gas exploration. The coalbed methane industry has grown rapidly and the Department of Energy's forecast is for the production of non-conventional gas to increase. He reviewed the summary sheet on Healy Exploration License Application and discussed the current timeline.

[2:35:40 PM](#)

In response to a question from Co-Chair Meyer, Mr. Usibelli replied that he thinks that this tax system works.

Representative Holm asked how long before data will be available on the projects. Mr. Usibelli replied that his company is processing that data now and will know more over next two to three months, by mid-summer.

In response to a question from Representative Kelly, Mr. Usibelli replied that both areas' wells would be outside of the 25-mile and 3-mile limits. He added that if well is over the 30 years old the limit does not apply.

[2:39:05 PM](#)

Co-Chair Chenault asked how this tax incentive is going to affect his company's coalbed methane, and oil and gas, exploration. Mr. Usibelli replied that initial exploration work would qualify for this tax credit. Co-Chair Chenault referred to the Healy Basin and asked about its size in relation to the tax incentive. Mr. Usibelli said it is his understanding that the area falls outside of the 25-mile limit. He explained that there is plenty of opportunity for exploration there.

[2:41:55 PM](#)

Co-Chair Meyer suggested that a new CS be written incorporating potential amendments. He asked for information about Cook Inlet drilling. Mr. Dickinson reported that AS 43.55.025. applies to any gas or oil exploration drilling in the state and creates a four-year window. This bill expands the window for specific areas at the request of the Governor.

[2:44:25 PM](#)

Representative Kelly suggested finding middle ground between the extremes of opinion surrounding this bill. He noted that he feels under-informed about the bill. Mr. Dickinson offered to provide additional information. He related that Representative Samuels summed it up earlier.

Co-Chair Chenault noted that the mile limits need to be addressed and that he would be offering amendments.

[2:48:56 PM](#)

Mr. Dickinson summarized that the intent is to push the boundaries of exploration. The Cook Inlet would only be able to move south. A lot of activity would be excluded that would otherwise qualify.

[2:50:12 PM](#)

Representative Kelly asked for clarification on the department's position. Mr. Dickinson observed that there were several changes made. The department has no problem with the extension to the Nenana Basin. There is only one aspect that the department objects to.

HB 71 was HELD in Committee for further consideration.

[2:51:19 PM](#)

At ease.

[3:03:56 PM](#)

HOUSE BILL NO. 219

"An Act relating to crimes and dangerous instruments."

[3:04:19 PM](#)

Representative Hawker, sponsor, explained that the idea for the bill was brought to him by an expert forensics nurse, Ms. Tara Henry. The crime of strangulation is currently prosecuted as a misdemeanor. The bill would change that to make strangulation a felony, a serious life-threatening assault. The Department of Law, the Public Safety Employee Association, police departments, the Alaska State Troopers, the domestic violence prevention community, and the forensics community support this bill. HB 219 has zero fiscal impact notes, except for the Public Defender Agency indeterminate note.

Vice-Chair Stoltze asked if the bill could adversely affect a Good Samaritan or someone performing CPR. Representative Hawker added that another possible concern is about a strangling occurred in self-defense. He opined that the bill does not compromise any other area within criminal law. He shared a story about law enforcement training, which is no longer allowed to use chokeholds.

Representative Kelly asked about this law as it applies in other states. Representative Hawker noted that is a popular issue in other states.

[3:10:49 PM](#)

TARA HENRY, SEXUAL ABUSE NURSE EXAMINER (SANE), ANCHORAGE, (via teleconference) related that she is forensic nurse who provides expert testimony on assaults, including strangulation. Strangulation is commonly used in domestic violence assaults. She explained the physics of strangulation and the lack of visible symptoms. She urged the passage of HB 219 so that these cases can be prosecuted as felonies. She listed other states that have, or are in the process of having, strangulation bills.

[3:15:21 PM](#)

Representative Croft inquired if the problem is difficulty in proving the crime. Ms. Henry explained that one problem

is that a medical expert is needed to testify in these cases. Also, a jury is often unable to see physical evidence in this crime.

TAMARA DELUCIA, OFFICE OF VICTIMS' RIGHTS, ANCHORAGE, (via teleconference) related that strangulation is under prosecuted. She elaborated upon the physical symptoms of strangulation, some which lead to brain death. The bill would not require the prosecutor to show physical injury in order to charge the felony conduct. She shared that Alaska ranks number one in the nation for domestic violence death, many of which are a result of strangulation. She strongly urged support of HB 219.

[3:20:31 PM](#)

Representative Hawker spoke to the fiscal notes. He disagreed with the Public Defender Agency's indeterminate fiscal note, saying that it should be a zero note.

Co-Chair Chenault opined that there would be increased court costs if strangulation is changed from a misdemeanor to a felony. He added that he would not oppose the zero note.

Representative Weyhrauch agreed with Co-Chair Chenault and asked what happens when it does cost more. Representative Hawker explained the difference between an indeterminate note and a zero note. Co-Chair Meyer said that indeterminate notes are counted as zero notes for budgeting purposes.

Representative Weyhrauch asked about the dates on the notes. Co-Chair Meyer explained that the proposed fiscal note would be a zero note.

[3:27:41 PM](#)

Representative Holm wondered if there is an increase in trial court costs due to felony trials.

Representative Hawker spoke in favor of the zero note.

Representative Kelly wondered if the change from a misdemeanor to a felony would be easier, yet riskier, to prosecute.

[3:30:08 PM](#)

LINDA WILSON, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, PUBLIC DEFENDER AGENCY, DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION, (via teleconference) responded that the indeterminate fiscal note is appropriate. Felonies are much more costly to prosecute, even though some domestic violence charges may be handled by the city. She predicted

that there would be more felony prosecutions and a fiscal impact.

Representative Hawker said that the crime of strangulation is already a felony and this bill would not change that, but activities may be realigned within the legal process. He indicated that it works out to be a zero sum gain within the individual organizations.

[3:33:58 PM](#)

Co-Chair Meyer asked how many more case are anticipated. Ms. Wilson replied she could not guess that number.

Co-Chair Meyer accepted the new zero fiscal note.

[3:35:54 PM](#)

Representative Hawker MOVED to ADOPT Conceptual Amendment 1:

Page 1, line 1:

Delete "**crimes and dangerous instruments**"

Insert "**the definition of 'dangerous instrument' as applied within the criminal code**"

Co-Chair Meyer OBJECTED for discussion purposes.

Representative Hawker explained that the amendment would tighten up the title to include hands as a dangerous instrument.

Co-Chair Meyer WITHDREW his OBJECTION.

There being NO OBJECTION, Amendment 1 was adopted.

[3:37:24 PM](#)

Representative Croft indicated that he expected to find strangulation described under the definition of serious physical injury. He wondered why it fell under the dangerous instruments category.

Representative Hawker explained that was the original approach to the bill, but legislative legal and the Department of Law agreed it would be too wide of a definition. The House Judiciary Committee determined that it is a tight, but not overriding bill. The current language is a precise, targeted, and effective way of accomplishing the intention of the bill.

Representative Croft asked for the Public Defender's opinion whether it is cleaner in the dangerous instrument definition or in the serious physical definition. Ms. Wilson responded

that Representative Croft might be confusing deadly weapons with dangerous instruments. She opined that it makes more sense to include it with dangerous instruments.

[3:41:30 PM](#)

Vice-Chair Stoltze MOVED to report CSHB 219 (FIN) out of Committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying fiscal impact notes. There being NO OBJECTION, it was so ordered.

CSHB 219 (FIN) was REPORTED out of Committee with a "do pass" recommendation and with three zero fiscal impact notes: #1 CRT, #2 LAW, #3 DPS, and a new ADM zero fiscal note.

[3:43:03 PM](#)

HOUSE BILL NO. 91

"An Act relating to indecent exposure."

Representative Coghill, sponsor, explained that the bill was a result of an indecent exposure incident where the criminal was charged with a misdemeanor. HB 91 states that if there is a second exposure conviction, the crime moves up to a Class C felony.

Representative Weyhrauch asked if the bill involves exposure and masturbation. Representative Coghill responded that pending testimony would help clarify that question. He explained that if there is a previous conviction of indecent exposure, a second instance would be a felony. Representative Weyhrauch asked for more information about a second incident. Representative Coghill explained the elements of purposeful, and knowingly committing the crime.

Representative Croft asked if it applies to minors only. Representative Coghill replied that it does.

[3:48:24 PM](#)

DEBBIE JOSLIN, EAGLE RIVER, (via teleconference) spoke of an exposure incident in Delta Junction involving her two daughters, ages 2 and 7. Because masturbation was not involved, the man was charged with a misdemeanor. He had a history of exposure to children. She termed it a gateway crime to abuse of children. The bill applies to second-time incidents with minors under 16.

[3:53:36 PM](#)

Representative Croft spoke of his own two children and fears of something happening to them. He noted that Section 1

clearly talks about exposure in front of a minor. Section 2 needs language added such as "exposure or conduct described above in front of a minor". Representative Coghill said that was also his concern. He noted that reckless disregard would have to be proven. He stated an intention that it say "for those under 16".

Representative Croft noted he would contact legislative legal about this issue.

Representative Weyhrauch noted that the prosecution of this crime would be determined by the child's perceptions and testimony. He question how innocent behavior could be safeguarded. Representative Coghill said that's why he went to AS 11.41.460 to include "knowingly, purposeful act", and AS 11.41.458, which addresses masturbation.

Representative Kelly asked if the exposor would be listed as a sex offender. Representative Coghill said yes.

[4:01:00 PM](#)

Vice-Chair Stoltze MOVED to report HB 91 out of Committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying fiscal impact notes. There being NO OBJECTION, it was so ordered.

HB 91 was REPORTED out of Committee with a "do pass" recommendation and with three zero fiscal impact notes: #1 ADM, #2 LAW, and #3 CRT.

[4:02:19 PM](#)

HOUSE BILL NO. 109

"An Act relating to establishing a screening, tracking, and intervention program related to the hearing ability of newborns and infants; providing an exemption to licensure as an audiologist for certain persons performing hearing screening tests; relating to insurance coverage for newborn and infant hearing screening; and providing for an effective date."

REPRESENTATIVE JAY RAMRAS, sponsor, explained that the bill is for mandatory screening for hearing loss for newborns, an investment in the future. The fiscal note is minor, \$30,000, to handle 10,000 live births in Alaska per year. Hearing loss is the number one congenital birth defect and it affects 30 to 40 Alaskans per year. The cost of tracking a child who's hearing loss goes undetected in the first two to three years of life is about \$412,000 per child. The \$30,000 annual fiscal note would protect from a potential \$12 million future liability. Hearing loss is often not detected until children are between 2 and 3 years old, which

effects their cognitive development. This mandate has been adopted in 33 other states.

Vice-Chair Stoltze asked if there are any service organizations that take on this cause.

Representative Ramras explained that the Quota Club's mission is to help with hearing issues. Currently children are not being tracked and there is a need to develop a statistical base.

[4:06:08 PM](#)

DEBBIE GOLDEN, MARCH OF DIMES, ANCHORAGE, (via teleconference) explained the history and mission of March of Dimes. Hearing loss is the most common birth disability. She spoke of the costs and savings of hearing screenings. Passing HB 109 will assure that all newborns are tested.

COLLEEN CHINN-ACCA, FAIRBANKS, (via teleconference) read a statement from Sarah Pate urging support for HB 109. She stressed the effectiveness of early intervention. She spoke in support of the legislation. She noted that children who don't hear, miss the early language-learning period. Early language intervention allows the possibility of cochlear implants.

[4:14:30 PM](#)

LISA OWENS, AUDIOLOGIST, ANCHORAGE, (via teleconference) spoke in support of the legislation. She stressed the importance of early intervention. Children under three with hearing loss show speech delays, and difficulties in reading and in social interaction. They require more special resources as children and as adults. Those children who are identified before the age of three have less need for support and special programs and have opportunity for cochlear implants.

[4:18:07 PM](#)

In response to a question by Co-Chair Meyer, Ms. Owens described methods used to test children under three. Tests can be done by a variety of health care and childcare professions. She described the testing procedure. Co-Chair Meyer asked if an ear, nose, and throat specialist would typically test hearing loss. Ms. Owens replied that a specialist would need to perform the tests using the new technology. She explained various types of hearing loss.

MARTIN BEALS, JR., M.D. PEDIATRICIAN, ANCHORAGE, (via teleconference) testified in support of the legislation. He noted that early intervention saves costs.

[4:23:28 PM](#)

Representative Foster spoke in support of the legislation.

HB 109 was HELD in Committee for further consideration.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 PM