

HOUSE FINANCE COMMITTEE
April 11, 2006
1:42 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

Co-Chair Meyer called the House Finance Committee meeting to order at [1:42:25 PM](#).

MEMBERS PRESENT

Representative Mike Chenault, Co-Chair
Representative Kevin Meyer, Co-Chair
Representative Bill Stoltze, Vice-Chair
Representative Richard Foster
Representative Mike Hawker
Representative Jim Holm
Representative Reggie Joule
Representative Mike Kelly
Representative Beth Kerttula
Representative Carl Moses
Representative Bruce Weyhrauch

MEMBERS ABSENT

None

ALSO PRESENT

Heath Hilyard, Staff, Representative Tom Anderson; Rick Urion, Director, Occupational Licensing, Department of Community and Economic Development; David Logan, DMD, Alaska Dental Society; Mila Cosgrove, Director, Division of Personnel, Department of Administration; Art Chance, Director, Labor Relations, Department of Administration; Jim Duncan, Alaska State Employee Association; Craig Johnson, Staff, Representative Lesil McGuire; Jeff Prather, Gaming Group, Tax Division, Department of Revenue

PRESENT VIA TELECONFERENCE

Robert Robertson, DMD, Alaska Dental Society; Jim Towle, Executive Director, Alaska Dental Society, Anchorage; George Shaffer, DMD, Alaska Dental Society, Ketchikan; Ric Schmidt, General Manager, KNOM-AM/FM, Nome; Dennis Bookey, Morris Communications, Anchorage; Stuart Whyte, KFMJ Radio, Ketchikan; Vicki Muzik, KRMJ Radio, Ketchikan

SUMMARY

HB 93 "An Act relating to dentists and dental hygienists and the Board of Dental Examiners; establishing certain committees for the discipline and peer review of dentists; excluding the adjudicatory

proceedings of the Board of Dental Examiners and its committees from the Administrative Procedure Act and from the jurisdiction of the office of administrative hearings; and providing for an effective date."

CSHB 93 (FIN) was REPORTED out of Committee with a "no recommendation" and with fiscal note #1 by the Department of Commerce, Community and Economic Development.

HB 485 "An Act amending the State Personnel Act to place in the exempt service pharmacists and physicians employed in the Department of Health and Social Services or in the Department of Corrections and corporate income tax forensic auditors employed by the division of the Department of Revenue principally responsible for the collection and enforcement of state taxes who specialize in apportionment analysis and tax shelters of multistate corporate taxpayers; and providing for an effective date."

HB 485 was REPORTED out of Committee with a "no recommendation" and with zero fiscal note #1 by the Department of Commerce, Community and Economic Development, fiscal note #3 by the Department of Corrections, three new indeterminate fiscal notes by the Department of Health and Social Services, and a new indeterminate fiscal note by the Department of Revenue.

HB 447 "An Act relating to the use of broadcasting to promote raffles and lotteries."

CSHB 447 was REPORTED out of Committee with a "do pass" recommendation and with zero fiscal note #1 by the Department of Revenue.

HB 475 "An Act describing contributions to the health reimbursement arrangement plan for certain teachers and public employees; clarifying eligibility for membership in that health reimbursement arrangement plan; relating to the 'administrator' of the Public Employees' Retirement System of Alaska; and providing for an effective date."

HB 475 was heard and HELD in Committee for further consideration.

HB 470 "An Act relating to the mandatory use of motor vehicle headlights."

HB 470 was POSTPONED to a later date.

HB 308 "An Act relating to false caller identification."

HB 470 was WAIVED out of Committee.

1:42:40 PMHOUSE BILL NO. 93

"An Act relating to dentists and dental hygienists and the Board of Dental Examiners; establishing certain committees for the discipline and peer review of dentists; excluding the adjudicatory proceedings of the Board of Dental Examiners and its committees from the Administrative Procedure Act and from the jurisdiction of the office of administrative hearings; and providing for an effective date."

HEATH HILYARD, STAFF, REPRESENTATIVE TOM ANDERSON, noted that he went over the adopted work draft, Version C, at the previous meeting.

Co-Chair Meyer opened public testimony.

1:44:41 PM

DR. ROBERT ROBERTSON, DMD, ALASKA DENTAL SOCIETY, offered to answer questions.

DR. GEORGE SHAFFER, DMD, ALASKA DENTAL SOCIETY, KETCHIKAN, spoke to the purpose of the bill. The bill strengthens the action of the Board of Dental Examiners allowing them to deal with discipline in a more-timely manner, ensuring that all of the testimony and records that are included in a complaint are viewed. The bill would also allow the board to enter the process at an earlier stage when complaints from patients are more benign. He offered to answer questions.

1:47:16 PM

JIM TOWLE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, ALASKA DENTAL SOCIETY, ANCHORAGE, offered to answer questions.

1:48:53 PM

DAVID LOGAN, DMD, ALASKA DENTAL SOCIETY, echoed Dr. Shaffer's comments. He related that the bill would establish peer review, a feature currently not available. It will allow the board to collectively use its expertise on dental matters. Currently, the board is limited in that only one board member is allowed to review a case. HB 93 would allow the public to bring more cases to the board. It would allow for earlier intervention for impaired practitioners.

[1:50:31 PM](#)

RICK URION, DIRECTOR, OCCUPATIONAL LICENSING, DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, testified that the Board of Dental Examiners met last month and 7 out of 8 opposed the bill. He read an email from a board member, which implied that attorneys want dentists to think that the bill will rid them of occupational licensing. He related that in the past ten years there have been 195 cases, 40 of which were brought against two dentists, and 95 that were dismissed without action. He discussed how the current peer review operates, referring to a Dental Complaint Flow Chart (copy on file.) He stated that the purpose of licensure is for public safety. He strongly opposed the bill.

Representative Kelly asked Mr. Urion if he wrote the fiscal note. Mr. Urion replied that he did not. Co-Chair Meyer noted that it has changed considerably. Mr. Urion pointed out that the bill has changed considerably.

Representative Kelly asked how the bill differs from how physicians self regulate. Mr. Urion said that doctors do exactly what the dentists are doing now.

[1:56:58 PM](#)

Co-Chair Chenault referred to the new fiscal note and the expense for travel, which is the same as in the old fiscal note. He wondered where the funds would come from to pay for those costs. Mr. Urion said that the law requires those costs to be paid by dentists.

Co-Chair Meyer asked if they are receipt paid. Mr. Urion said yes. All costs are paid by the dentists.

[1:58:24 PM](#)

Mr. Hilyard addressed Mr. Urion's concerns. He mentioned the sponsor's work with the Division throughout the process of re-writing the bill. He noted that it is a difference of philosophy.

Co-Chair Meyer asked why the bill's approach is better than the status quo. Mr. Hilyard stated that the bill provides for a better public process.

[2:00:39 PM](#)

Representative Kelly asked for more information about the various models. Mr. Hilyard said he is not familiar enough to speak about them. Representative Kelly asked why the board is so opposed to this bill. Mr. Hilyard referred to an email from a dental board member from North Pole, which

says the board takes no official position on the bill. Representative Kelly asked if there is a split in the dental society. Mr. Hilyard deferred to Mr. Towle to address that issue.

[2:03:08 PM](#)

Mr. Towle reported that there is no division within the Alaska Dental Society regarding this bill. He referred to an email, which states that the board takes no position on the bill.

Co-Chair Meyer asked Dr. Logan to comment. Dr. Logan opined that all board members he talked to spoke in support of the legislature. He noted that dentists do not feel that the board is out to get them. Speaking as a board member, he stated that the board takes a balanced view. He cited problems with the board not getting information regarding investigations. He addressed the peer review for organized dentistry, a panel of board members that hears a case itself, usually regarding minor matters.

[2:07:39 PM](#)

Representative Kelly asked for comments on why dentists are moving in a different direction than doctors. Dr. Logan could only speak from the dentists' perspective. The largest change is that peer review would be opened up. The board would now hear cases earlier in the process and direct them to a peer review or disciplinary committee or full investigative process. The investigators now are well trained, but not qualified to assess dental matters.

[2:09:47 PM](#)

Co-Chair Chenault asked if the current ruling is that the finding has to come back to the board after 120 days. Dr. Logan said that is correct. Co-Chair Chenault asked if the concern is that board members don't know what has been going on. Dr. Logan explained the current system. Investigators present the findings and recommendations and the board votes, having never heard about the case previously. The new program is that the board would be aware of the case from the beginning and direct it to the best place to be dealt with, then the case would come back to the board for approval of the decision. Co-Chair Chenault summarized that currently the board is not given much information and the bill would allow for access to more information.

[2:12:48 PM](#)

Representative Kerttula asked if a due process problem is created because some on the board may investigate and then vote. Dr. Logan deferred to Dr. Shaffer.

Dr. Shaffer related that under the present system the board operates under the Administrator Procedures Act (APA). This gives the board the ability to look at evidence early on in the process or to refer it to an investigator. In the present system, there is a problem with reserving the board's independence. Currently, the board cannot see any evidence. The board does not sit as an appeals body. The appeals body goes to the Superior Court. That was the driving force behind the bill. The present system does not allow the board to participate earlier in order to protect the public. The bill would allow for the process to be defined outside of the Administrative Procedures Act.

[2:17:30 PM](#)

Representative Kerttula asked if currently the board makes decisions that can be appealed. Dr. Shaffer said according to the APA, the appeal is to the Superior Court. The Department says the appeal is back to the Department. This is a difference of opinion.

Representative Kerttula asked if the board is the original decision maker regarding suspended licenses. Dr. Shaffer said that is correct, but for many years the board has not been allowed to see evidence. Representative Kerttula recalled that the AG's office would bring the evidence to the board after an investigation was complete, and a decision would be made. She asked if the new system would create due process problems. Dr. Shaffer replied that under the bill, there would be a single person, the board president, who would do a triage, and who could be recused from the process. The rest of the board members would have the evidence and then make the decision. The Department maintains that the board cannot see the evidence.

Dr. Shaffer explained that in the bill there are two committees, the peer review committee and a disciplinary committee, both of which can be made up of members of the board. The board can also call on other dentists to help them with the process. Then the board would make the final decision.

Representative Kerttula summarized Dr. Shaffer's concern about lack of information to the board. Dr. Shaffer concurred.

Representative Kelly asked how other states deal with this issue. Dr. Logan reported that there is a huge variation. Most states have a peer review process.

[2:22:49 PM](#)

Co-Chair Chenault thought that the board might have a variety of opinions on the bill. Mr. Logan said the board is not allowed to take a position on legislation.

Representative Weyhrauch asked if the committee could request the board to take an opinion. Co-Chair Chenault thought it would be a personal opinion.

[2:24:33 PM](#)

Representative Foster MOVED to REPORT CSHB 93 (FIN) out of committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying fiscal note.

Representative Hawker OBJECTED. He spoke to reservations related to the Division of Occupational Licensing. He opined that something in Alaska about licensing is not working. He wondered what the root of the problem is.

Representative Stoltze also spoke of a concern about licensing and the bill.

Co-Chair Meyer said there is no reason to hold the bill over.

Representative Weyhrauch said he does not know what the bill does, either. Representative Kerttula related that her experience with occupation licensing is that they do have all of the information at their hearings. She also voiced concern about the bill.

[2:28:02 PM](#)

Representative Hawker WITHDREW his objection to moving CSHB 93 from committee.

CSHB 93 (FIN) was REPORTED out of Committee with a "no recommendation" and with fiscal note #1 by the Department of Commerce, Community and Economic Development.

[2:28:42 PM](#)

At-ease.

[2:30:35 PM](#)

HOUSE BILL NO. 485

"An Act amending the State Personnel Act to place in the exempt service pharmacists and physicians employed in the Department of Health and Social Services or in the Department of Corrections and corporate income tax forensic auditors employed by the division of the Department of Revenue principally responsible for the

collection and enforcement of state taxes who specialize in apportionment analysis and tax shelters of multistate corporate taxpayers; and providing for an effective date."

Co-Chair Meyer noted the seven fiscal notes that would be addressed.

JIM DUNCAN, ALASKA STATE EMPLOYEE ASSOCIATION, responded to a question from Co-Chair Meyer, Mr. Duncan commented on a letter sent to the administration. He noted that he had only a brief opportunity to review the administration's response. He related that the April 6 letter by Art Chance, Director, Labor Relations, Department of Administration, complimented his testimony on the bill.

Mr. Duncan stated that he did not believe that removing these jobs from the classification system was unconstitutional. He also clarified his understanding that legislators maintained the right to move positions from classified service to exempt service. He maintained, however, that passing a statute during a contract period moving positions from classified to exempt status would impair the contract status. He recalled that positions had been moved in the past.

Mr. Duncan questioned the policy reason for moving the positions. He asked if the issue was rate of pay rather than policy. He spoke in support of raising salaries. He suggested that to impair a contract was in conflict with the Alaska Constitution. He suggested that there should be a systematic way of amending a job class.

[2:37:30 PM](#)

Representative Weyhrauch asked what the legal problem was with this method. Mr. Duncan pointed to the process in the contract, which allows for positions to be moved within a class, but to do the move by statute is prohibited.

Representative Weyhrauch followed by asking if the main issue from a management view was to hire positions quickly and if the process was otherwise too cumbersome. Mr. Duncan again asked if the goal was to pay more money. He suggested that there was a process that could be started to reclassify and amend the pay plan. He maintained that the situation was not so critical as to impair the contract process.

Representative Weyhrauch asked if it was possible to open one segment to address this issue. Mr. Duncan commented that in discussions with Mr. Chance, he had suggested adding three additional levels of salary and to pay the same amount as in exempt service.

[2:40:16 PM](#)

Representative Hawker asked if to open a pay plan could be restricted to certain jobs, or if it would set a precedent for others seeking to raise their pay scale. Mr. Duncan responded that the pay plan would only be opened to add three ranges. That would give latitude to reexamine pay scale. He referred to reclassification within job families. He noted that there should be care given to which jobs were compared.

Representative Hawker commented on the level of belligerence on the part of the administration, but expressed concern over raising the level of pay scale for all job classes. Mr. Duncan noted that paying a higher rate in exempt service was also possible in classified service, as long as the proper process is followed.

Representative Hawker reiterated his offense at the tenor of the letter from the administration, and again expressed concern over opening up a job classification.

[2:43:41 PM](#)

Representative Kerttula observed that even if the entire job family were raised, jobs still needed to be considered case by case. Mr. Duncan concurred, and added that he did not negotiate ranges, but rather overall percentage increases. He also noted that it would not open the way to moving other positions into Ranges 28, 29,30.

[2:45:11 PM](#)

Representative Weyhrauch observed that the policy choice was whether to create a new classification range, or to simply move positions into exempt service. He asked if another bill is needed to accomplish the new ranges. Mr. Duncan replied that that is bargainable and a letter of agreement could be signed. Representative Weyhrauch questioned if it was a good public policy decision to bump specialized jobs or high demand positions out of exempt classification. Mr. Duncan agreed that this was the central question, and maintained he had not been satisfied with the argument for creating the exempt status.

[2:46:51 PM](#)

Representative Hawker asked if anything prevented crafting a law to allow additional salary ranges in only certain job classifications. Mr. Duncan observed that this was the affect of creating exempt positions. He noted that it was not appropriate for the legislature to change the pay plan, as it was subject to collective bargaining. He again

cautioned that the policy decision to move the positions to exempt service would set a difficult precedent.

[2:48:40 PM](#)

Representative Kelly asked for clarification about whether the Attorney General agreed with Mr. Duncan's definition of the contract process, and whether it was within the right of management to change the pay scale.

Mr. Duncan stated that he would advocate adding three ranges to the pay scale for all bargaining units. He noted that it would require using the process available to challenge the statute. He stressed that he did not wish to challenge it, but felt clearly compelled by the Constitution as it pertains to contracts.

[2:51:20 PM](#)

MILA COSGROVE, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF PERSONNEL, DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION and ART CHANCE, DIRECT, LABOR RELATIONS, DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION, testified regarding the bill.

Co-Chair Meyer asked whether time was critical in this matter. Mr. Chance responded that public policy decisions were made in the Department of Revenue, and stated that he was not concerned with the time, but the manner of the process.

Ms. Cosgrove verified that the Department was not able to recruit the personnel needed within the existing pay plan to accomplish the work forthcoming.

[2:53:41 PM](#)

Representative Hawker asked whether pharmacists and high-grade accountants, since they shared a high level of independence, could be recruited privately. Ms. Cosgrove stated her understanding that pharmacists must be hired by the Department, although she conceded that they were occasionally hired on a contract basis. She maintained that hiring on a contract basis was not a good business practice in the state.

Representative Hawker asked if it was possible as an immediate solution, to hire on a contract basis while bargaining representatives sought a long-term solution. Mr. Chance commented that many disputes resulted in the contracting out of employees. He conceded that it may result in a cost savings, but questioned whether it could be done within correct public policy. He emphasized the need for a public policy decision.

[2:57:00 PM](#)

Representative Kelly reiterated his question over whether it was a management right to decide and if it could be done immediately. Mr. Chance responded that, in the past, positions had been moved to exempt service, and that there was language allowing for it. He gave the example of a vacancy, and noted that the right existed within a contract to move a position. He admitted that they would oppose moving the positions within a job classification after they had become exempt, since they would become a different body with different legal rights. He noted that this question had not been answered by any court, although there had been disputes in past years. He stated that it was unclear whether a "contract bar" existed to prevent moving positions from classified to exempt.

[2:59:52 PM](#)

Representative Kelly summarized that a management right existed and that it could occur immediately. Mr. Chance stated that the management right existed with legislators. He conceded that since the positions were vacant, a debate could ensue.

[3:00:56 PM](#)

Representative Kerttula asked if the wage increase were accomplished, whether it would solve the problem. Ms. Cosgrove noted that the issue was more complicated. She pointed out the need to compete with the private market for these types of positions. She also noted that pharmacists are primarily in the supervisory unit and not represented by Mr. Duncan's union. She pointed out that classified employees are subject to various criterion, and that by applying these criterion to pharmacists, they were currently accurately classified at their salary rate. She noted that to move a position by seven salary ranges creates a precedent problem, rather than seeking other medical professions to create a new precedent for paying a higher salary. She stated that she does not believe this could be accomplished in the classified service.

[3:03:29 PM](#)

Representative Weyhrauch observed that if these positions were moved to exempt status, many of the same issues would still be in play. Ms. Cosgrove agreed that to some extent that is correct.

Ms. Cosgrove spoke to good qualifications and licensing. Representative Weyhrauch said they would not be encumbered by the collective bargaining agreement. Ms. Cosgrove said correct.

[3:05:22 PM](#)

Representative Joule wondered if exempts run the risk of being left out by a new administration. Mr. Chance addressed the mythology about exempt status. Teachers are exempt because of rights under Title 14. Alaska Marine Highway employees are exempt because they were originally hired out of Seattle. Most exempts are so far removed from ranges 5-30, that they can't be paid without distorting the scale. Addressing the status of being released by a new administration, Mr. Chance reported that almost no "at will" employees exist. Division directors, special assistants, and some partially exempt employees can be dismissed - the rest have to have probable cause.

Representative Kelly asked if exempt people could organize. Mr. Chance said they could. Representative Joule asked how many people it takes to organize. Mr. Chance reported that there is no numerical limit. A community of interest must be demonstrated.

[3:09:04 PM](#)

Co-Chair Meyer addressed the fiscal notes: zero fiscal note #1 by the Department of Commerce, Community and Economic Development, fiscal note #3 by the Department of Corrections, three new indeterminate fiscal notes by the Department of Health and Social Services, and a new indeterminate fiscal note by the Department of Revenue.

[3:10:47 PM](#)

Co-Chair Chenault commented on the fiscal notes: all are zero for this year, but indeterminate for next year. He pointed out the certainty of costs in the future.

Co-Chair Meyer said the bill was set aside in hopes of organizing a collective bargaining process, but that didn't happen. The legislature needs to take action soon on the bill, but it needs additional discussion.

[3:13:06 PM](#)

Representative Foster MOVED to REPORT HB 485 out of Committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying fiscal notes.

Representative Hawker OBJECTED. Representative Hawker maintained that he has heard no solution for this issue and that there would be litigation. He said he is not comfortable with this bill. He suggested that raising classifications could accomplish the same goal without

litigation. He said he is not endorsing labor's side, but taking the least risky route.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion to REPORT HB 485 out of committee.

IN FAVOR: Holm, Kelly, Stoltze, Foster, Chenault, Meyer
OPPOSED: Hawker, Joule, Kerttula, Moses, Weyhrauch

The MOTION PASSED (6-5).

HB 485 was REPORTED out of Committee with a "no recommendation" and with zero fiscal note #1 by the Department of Commerce, Community and Economic Development, fiscal note #3 by the Department of Corrections, three new indeterminate fiscal notes by the Department of Health and Social Services, and a new indeterminate fiscal note by the Department of Revenue.

Representative Weyhrauch concurred with Co-Chair Chenault's concerns about future costs related to this bill.

[3:17:44 PM](#)

HOUSE BILL NO. 447

"An Act relating to the use of broadcasting to promote raffles and lotteries."

CRAIG JOHNSON, STAFF, REPRESENTATIVE LESIL MCGUIRE, explained the bill. The bill levels the playing field between broadcast advertising and the print media regarding the advertising of lawful "charitable gaming activity". He referred to examples of newspaper advertisements in members' packets. Currently, an FCC rule does not allow for those types of activities to be advertised on radio or television. The FCC states that local communities can dictate whether or not they can be advertised on broadcast media. He emphasized that the bill will not increase gaming.

[3:19:49 PM](#)

Representative Weyhrauch asked why the words "other than animal classics" are needed in this bill. Mr. Johnson replied that it was an amendment added by a member of the Labor and Commerce Committee.

Representative Stoltze clarified that the animal classic bill did not provide for advertising.

Mr. Johnson said he was referring to previous legislation.

[3:21:24 PM](#)

At-ease.

[3:24:19 PM](#)

VICKI MUZIK, KRMJ RADIO, KETCHIKAN, concurred with Mr. Johnson's statements. She related that the bill is a platform to level the playing field. The non-profits that are seeking to raise money are not gambling institutions. She testified in favor of the bill.

RIC SCHMIDT, GENERAL MANAGER, KNOM-AM/FM, NOME, reported that his hands are tied when it comes to helping organizations raise funds for charity. He testified in support of the bill. He asked the legislators to "help us help them", referring to the non-profits.

Representative Foster noted that there are many raffles for the needy, which can't be aired.

Representative Stoltze asked if the bill could be used as a revenue source. Mr. Schmidt said it could be used for that, especially for non-profits. He said he is not talking about a lot of money. He spoke of the Rotary Duck Race and the scholarships it supports.

[3:31:01 PM](#)

Co-Chair Chenault asked if Mr. Schmidt does public service announcements. Mr. Schmidt said if there is a raffle they can't mention it.

[3:32:16 PM](#)

DENNIS BOOKEY, MORRIS COMMUNICATIONS, ANCHORAGE, agreed with the previous testimony and spoke in support of the bill. He pointed out that some of the gaming events are part of a bigger event. Broadcasters are not asking to change gaming, just the promotion of it.

Representative Stoltze asked if advertising to increase participation would increase gambling. Mr. Bookey replied that it could help increase the funds going to non-profit organizations. Representative Stoltze inferred that Mr. Bookey is also talking about bingo halls.

[3:34:28 PM](#)

STUART WHYTE, KFMJ RADIO, KETCHIKAN, testified in support of the bill. He emphasized that radio is looking for a level playing field. Right now, raffles not allowed to be advertised. The bill would allow charitable events to run at good times during the day.

Representative Foster asked if there are only two radio stations in Nome. One can accept paid advertising and one can't. He asked if that is correct. Mr. Schmidt said that is correct. The stations are very competitive on the commercial side, but very cooperative when it comes to public interest.

[3:37:38 PM](#)

Representative Stoltze asked if the expense limitation comes out of the 30 percent amount that charities receive.

JEFF PRATHER, GAMING GROUP, TAX DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE, said it would have no effect on the expense limitation.

Representative Stoltze asked if the bill would allow interactive gaming. Mr. Prather replied that the bill would allow raffles to be promoted over broadcast media. Representative Stoltze repeated the question. Mr. Prather said he did not see that happening.

[3:39:53 PM](#)

Representative Kerttula asked if there is any analysis of inequities between broadcast and print media. Mr. Prather said no.

Representative Stoltze noted sympathy for fund-raisers, but cautioned about gambling and gaming. He voiced concern about politics in gaming.

Representative Hawker spoke in support of the bill. He offered Conceptual Amendment 1, to remove on page 1, line 7, the section on "other than animal classics". There being NO OBJECTION, it was so ordered.

Representative Stoltze MOVED to adopt Conceptual Amendment 2, on page 1, line 8, to add the words "if the broadcasting is limited to public service announcements provided free of charge by a broadcaster to a permittee" following "broadcasting".

[3:46:15 PM](#)

At-ease.

[3:51:55 PM](#)

Representative Hawker OBJECTED.

Representative Stoltze spoke to his amendment. He addressed a concern. Representative Stoltze WITHDREW Conceptual Amendment 2.

Representative Foster MOVED to report CSHB 447 (FIN) out of Committee, as amended, with individual recommendations and the accompanying fiscal note.

Representative Weyhrauch OBJECTED. He questioned why the bill is necessary. He WITHDREW his OBJECTION.

There being NO OBJECTION, it was so ordered.

CSHB 447 was REPORTED out of Committee with a "do pass" recommendation and with zero fiscal note #1 by the Department of Revenue.

[3:56:30 PM](#)

HOUSE BILL NO. 475

"An Act describing contributions to the health reimbursement arrangement plan for certain teachers and public employees; clarifying eligibility for membership in that health reimbursement arrangement plan; relating to the 'administrator' of the Public Employees' Retirement System of Alaska; and providing for an effective date."

HB 475 was scheduled but not heard.

HOUSE BILL NO. 470

"An Act relating to the mandatory use of motor vehicle headlights."

HB 470 was POSTPONED to a later date.

HOUSE BILL NO. 308

"An Act relating to false caller identification."

HB 308 was WAIVED out of Committee.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was recessed at 3:56 PM until 8:30 tomorrow morning.