

HOUSE FINANCE COMMITTEE
February 19, 2008
1:39 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

Co-Chair Meyer called the House Finance Committee meeting to order at [1:39:51 PM](#).

MEMBERS PRESENT

Representative Mike Chenault, Co-Chair
Representative Kevin Meyer, Co-Chair
Representative Bill Stoltze, Vice-Chair
Representative Harry Crawford
Representative Les Gara
Representative Mike Hawker
Representative Mike Kelly
Representative Mary Nelson
Representative Bill Thomas Jr.

MEMBERS ABSENT

Representative John Harris
Representative Reggie Joule

ALSO PRESENT

Lori Davey, President, Motznik Information Services; Megan Foster, Staff, Representative Les Gara; Kevin Brooks, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Administration; Representative Bob Roses, Sponsor; Walt Monegan, Commissioner, Department of Public Safety; Mark Drygas, Battalion Chief, Fairbanks Fire Department, Alaska Professional Firefighters Association; Jeff Landvatter, Alaska State Trooper; Jeanne Ostnes, Staff, Representative Craig Johnson; Representative Craig Johnson, Sponsor; Representative Nancy Dahlstrom.

PRESENT VIA TELECONFERENCE

Terry Vrabec, Director, Alaska Police Standards Council; Bob Claus, Self, Craig; Steve Smith, Deputy Chief, Anchorage Police Department; Chuck Copp, Chief, Kenai Police Department; Rod Arno, Executive Director, Alaska Outdoor Council; Captain Burke Waldron, Operations Director, Alaska Wildlife Troopers.

SUMMARY

HB 65 "An Act relating to breaches of security involving personal information, credit report and credit score security freezes, consumer credit monitoring, credit accuracy, protection of social security numbers, care of records, disposal of

records, identity theft, furnishing consumer credit header information, credit cards, and debit cards, and to the jurisdiction of the office of administrative hearings; amending Rule 60, Alaska Rules of Civil Procedure; and providing for an effective date."

CS HB 65 (FIN) was REPORTED out of Committee with "no recommendation" and with new fiscal note by the Department of Administration and new indeterminate note by the Office of Management and Budget.

HB 267 "An Act relating to authorizing the state to join with other states entering into the Wildlife Violator Compact and authorizing the compact to supersede existing statutes by approving standards, rules, or other action under the terms of the compact; and directing the initiation of civil actions to revoke appropriate licenses in this state based on a resident licensee's violation of or failure to comply with the terms of a wildlife resource citation issued in another state that is a party to the compact."

CS HB 267 (RES) was REPORTED out of Committee with a "do pass" recommendation and with zero note #1 by the Department of Fish and Game and zero note #2 by the Department of Public Safety.

HB 193 "An Act relating to the composition of the Alaska Police Standards Council; and providing for an effective date."

HB 193 was HEARD and HELD in Committee for further consideration.

HJR 2 Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the State of Alaska requiring an affirmative vote of the people before any form of gambling for profit may be authorized in Alaska.

HJR 2 was SCHEDULED but not HEARD.

HOUSE BILL NO. 65

"An Act relating to breaches of security involving personal information, credit report and credit score security freezes, consumer credit monitoring, credit accuracy, protection of social security numbers, care of records, disposal of records, identity theft, furnishing consumer credit header information, credit cards, and debit cards, and to the jurisdiction of the office of administrative hearings; amending Rule 60,

Alaska Rules of Civil Procedure; and providing for an effective date."

[1:41:33 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE GARA, SPONSOR, spoke on behalf of himself and co-sponsor Representative John Coghill and made two clarifications regarding HB 65 for the record. He began with AS.45.48.030, Methods of Notice (page 3). When a company realizes that they have released financial information to the public, whether by accident or on purpose, this section requires that the company tell the people affected. Notification must take place through a letter sent to the most recent known address. He said one of the companies had asked if they would have to keep trying to notify a consumer if the address was wrong. Representative Gara said that under the standard in the bill, the company has to write once. They don't have to keep sending the letter.

Representative Gara clarified the second issue, 45.48.410, Request and Collection (page 17). This section bans a person or company from selling, trading or making money from Social Security Numbers (SSN). However, there are situations in which the bill allows use of SSNs. He said the most important exception is in 45.48.410(b)(6). A company can always use an SSN if they are not making money by using it, if it has no independent value, or if it is part of a larger transaction such as a credit check or if the SSN is needed to verify identity for debt collection or to prevent fraud.

[1:43:49 PM](#)

Co-Chair Chenault thought a Social Security card was never intended to be used as identification. Representative Gara said the sponsors agreed. They did not want companies demanding that people use their SSN for identification purposes; however, there is also no ban on it being used as identification.

Co-Chair Meyer asked if there were amendments to the bill.

Representative Nelson MOVED to RESCIND previous action taken on Amendment #3, 25-LS0311\K.2, Bannister, 2/07/08 (Copy on File). There being NO OBJECTION, the action was rescinded.

Representative Nelson read Amendment #3, which deletes "the disclosure of permanent fund dividend applicant records" and all references to the same in the bill. She said the provision was put in by the Judiciary Committee. The battle to not allow the Dividend Corporation to give out applicant information was fought for years and won; she did not want the issue slipped into a bill that is going the other way in terms of providing information.

AT EASE [1:47:05 PM](#)
RECONVENE [1:51:36 PM](#)

Co-Chair Meyer called for questions on Amendment #3.

Representative Nelson MOVED to ADOPT Amendment #3, 25-LS0311\K.2, Bannister, 2/07/08 (Copy on File).

Page 1, Line 1, deleting "the disclosure of permanent fund dividend applicant records,"; Page 2, Line 4 through Page 3, Line 18, deleting all material and then renumber the following bill sections accordingly: Page 29, Line 17, deleting "sec. 5", inserting "sec. 3"; Page 29, Line 21, deleting "sec. 5", inserting "sec. 3"; Page 29, Line 24, deleting "sec. 5", inserting "sec. 3"; Page 29, Line 26, deleting "sec. 6", inserting "sec. 4".

Representative Hawker OBJECTED.

LORI DAVEY, PRESIDENT, MOTZNIK INFORMATION SERVICES, spoke in opposition to Amendment #3. Her company had access to Fund Dividend (PFD) information before 2004. She said the loss of access to PFD information has made it more difficult for title companies, banks and attorneys to effectively differentiate people, especially those with the same name. Motznik is not asking to have the same access to information as they had before 2004, when anyone could download the PFD file off the State's website into a database. She said the amendment introduced into Judiciary gives access only to the name, mailing address and year of birth, not to SSNs or information for people under 18 years of age. The information will be used to effectively differentiate people and serve due process.

[1:54:47 PM](#)

Ms. Davey explained that when Motznik does background screening for employment or housing, they can get name and date of birth from a criminal file and other public records. However, if a person does not vote, own a car, have a hunting or fishing license or show up anywhere else in the public record, there is no way to differentiate a person with a criminal record and no other address information from someone else with the same name. She does not consider the PFD information they are asking to be re-disclosed (name, address and year of birth) to be private information.

Representative Nelson asked how companies in other states find information when they do not have access to data bases like the PFD. Ms. Davey assumed in other states companies had more access to tax records, which are not available in Alaska.

Representative Crawford referred to a person with his name and a mix-up that resulted in Representative Crawford's PFD check being taken away. He understood both the need to have access to information and to limit it. He wondered how to keep protecting people if access is re-opened.

[1:57:39 PM](#)

Ms. Davey said the information would be managed similar to how it is managed in the DMV, by limiting the people and companies who have access to the information. There are limited reasons why the information can be accessed. A form must be signed and there must be verification that the business being done is legitimate. The amendment limits the access. She described how Motznik's system tracks requests for information and keeps records indefinitely.

Representative Gara wondered what records would be used in states that do not have an income tax. Ms. Davey said she only operates in Alaska and did not know. Representative Gara wondered if tax records were public in other states.

Representative Gara wondered if the most recent address information someone could find on someone they were trying to do harm would be the PFD information. Ms. Davey thought that potentially DMV would have updated information. There are other means as well, since voter information is updated with the PFD. For most people that information is already available.

[2:00:43 PM](#)

Representative Gara voiced concerns about giving out address information. Ms. Davie answered that in Alaska it is difficult to do business without access to the PFD information. Representative Gara reiterated his concerns.

[2:02:27 PM](#)

Representative Hawker said he MAINTAINED his OBJECTION.

Representative Thomas asked if the Division of Elections had the authority to use the PFD to update addresses.

MEGAN FOSTER, STAFF, REPRESENTATIVE LES GARA said that she believed they did. Representative Hawker had asked the Division of Revenue (DOR) the same question recently and the answer was yes. Co-Chair Meyer noted that DOR people present were nodding their heads.

Representative Thomas pointed out that even if the amendment were voted down, Elections would still have access to the addresses.

Representative Nelson said she was happy to be offering the amendment to delete the provision. She did not want to slip major changes into other legislation, especially a bill like HB 65, which tries to limit access to information. She thought if there were strong support for the provision, there should be a stand-alone piece of legislation so that it could be discussed on its own.

[2:05:01 PM](#)

A roll call vote was taken on the MOTION to ADOPT Amendment #3.

IN FAVOR: Nelson, Stoltze, Thomas, Crawford, Gara
OPPOSED: Kelly, Hawker, Chenault, Meyer

Representative Harris was absent from the vote.

The MOTION PASSED (5/4).

Vice-Chair Stoltze asked if Amendment #4, 25-LS0311\K.1, Bannister, 1/30/08 (Copy on File), which had passed the previous day, was superfluous. Co-Chair Meyer said yes.

AT EASE [2:06:34 PM](#)
RECONVENE [2:07:16 PM](#)

Co-Chair Meyer referred to new fiscal note for \$2 million by the Department of Administration, new fiscal note by the Department of Revenue and new indeterminate fiscal note by the Office of Budget and Management.

Representative Hawker wanted an explanation of the \$2 million fiscal note.

[2:08:15 PM](#)

KEVIN BROOKS, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER, DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION (DOA), gave information regarding the Department's fiscal note. He explained that since the State was the victim of a security breach in 2005, DOA had been requesting funds to strengthen data security. The Department replaced switches and routers on the network and took other measures to secure the hardware and infrastructure. The \$2 million requested in the fiscal note would pay for encryption of data so the various state data bases would be protected in the event of another breach.

Representative Hawker asked what the \$1,765,600 under "equipment" in the fiscal note was for. Mr. Brooks replied that the budget was for both hardware and software. Software is included in equipment when the amount needed is large.

Representative Hawker asked for clarification. Mr. Brooks replied that the \$2 million in the FY 09 budget is a continuation that would complete and implement a double fire wall to put around all public facing servers. The \$2 million in the capital budget completes the implementation of that as well as a network admission control. He added that the detail is in the Capitol budget, but they are separate and distinct projects. The only similarity is the amount.

[2:11:20 PM](#)

Representative Hawker stated that he believed that the Legislature is only beginning to see the requested funding to deal with data security in Alaska. He pointed out previous funding adding up to approximate \$16 million listed on the second page of the fiscal note. He voiced concerns regarding long term planning.

Mr. Brooks agreed but wanted to list every dime that has gone into security. He said there is money in the capital budget for the proposed project and that the Department did have a five year plan. The encryption budgeted is in that plan. He emphasized that the encryption needed to be done as soon as possible; HB 65 points to the urgency to encrypt data.

[2:14:33 PM](#)

Representative Hawker emphasized that he was not arguing the merits of encryption. He wondered if HB 65 places a burden of responsibility on the State. Mr. Brooks answered that from the Department's perspective, the State is treated like any other keeper of data. The State is not in the business of making profit from the data but still keeps enormous amounts of personal data.

Representative Gara clarified that HB 65 did not require data encryption, although it is a good, safe practice. Mr. Brooks agreed that HB 65 did not require encryption, but DOA believes encryption is a prudent thing to do in light of penalties in place in the bill.

Representative Hawker asked what penalties HB 65 would impose upon state employees or the State itself. Mr. Brooks answered that state employees would be covered under a public officials bond, so there would be no personal liability. However, the bill has been amended to include actual economic damages caused in a breach. There are also costs to notify. He acknowledged positive amendments that will enable mass notifications, but thought the State had vulnerabilities that other companies did not have because of the amount of personal data the State maintains.

[2:17:17 PM](#)

Representative Hawker reiterated concerns about the fiscal note and the enormity of data security issues.

[2:18:11 PM](#)

Mr. Brooks agreed that the State will need to be diligent in security efforts, as the level of sophistication of hackers is growing.

Co-Chair Meyer pointed out that the new fiscal note by the Department of Revenue was deleted because Amendment #3 had passed.

Vice-Chair Stoltze MOVED to report CSHB 65 (FIN) out of Committee with individual recommendations and with new fiscal note by the Department of Administration and new indeterminate note by the Office of Management and Budget. There being NO OBJECTION, it was so ordered.

CS HB 65 (FIN) was REPORTED out of Committee with "no recommendation" and with new fiscal note by the Department of Administration and new indeterminate note by the Office of Management and Budget.

HOUSE BILL NO. 193

"An Act relating to the composition of the Alaska Police Standards Council; and providing for an effective date."

[2:20:50 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE BOB ROSES, SPONSOR, gave an overview of HB 193 which changes the composition of the Alaska Police Standards Council (APSC). Currently the Council is made of four chief administrative officers; HB 193 would change that to three. Included in the three positions would be one position that could be a correctional administrative officer. The bill does not change the composition of the private sector or the rural representation to the Council. Representative Roses addressed concerns about displacing people currently serving on the Council. He assured the Committee that the two officers would never be able to control the majority vote.

[2:23:15 PM](#)

Representative Roses cited other boards that have the authority to grant, suspend or revoke certification, and pointed out that all those boards have peer representation. He thought the issue was an equitability issue and not a union issue. The Governor would have opportunity to select from a group of officers whose names would be forwarded by the Association. The Governor is free to choose from any

group; the list is only a recommendation list. He said six police chiefs came to his office when he introduced the bill to try and talk him out of it. The more they talked the more he was convinced the bill is needed.

[2:25:53 PM](#)

Representative Roses addressed concerns that the proposal would move the disciplinary process to a higher level and that some police officers would have a tendency to protect their own personnel. Representative Roses sees the bill as an opportunity for peer representation on a board that is currently made up mostly of chiefs and commissioners.

[2:27:41 PM](#)

Representative Crawford thought the bill would give a voice to line officers.

Representative Thomas pointed out that he did not see any Village Public Safety Officers (VPSO) on the board. Representative Roses replied that language included in the bill on the second page, line 4, would give an opportunity for VPSOs to serve. He thought rural representation was a very important part of the bill.

[2:29:51 PM](#)

WALT MONEGAN, COMMISSIONER, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY, spoke in opposition to the bill. He said that police operate under a para-military organizational structure. The Chief or equivalent head has to be accountable to the community and needs to have mobility in regards to consistent and fair standards, usually indicated by the cooperative work agreements that many of the departments already have. When a chief wants to take action, there are clear procedures that labor organizations can respond to.

Mr. Monegan pointed out that the APSC has two main functions, one of which is training. The lesson plans for the training section does not come from APSC, but from individual departments. The subject matter experts are already line officers.

Mr. Monegan continued with the second function of the APSC: oversight of a certification process that maintains a high standard of law enforcement. He emphasized the importance of objectivity. A chief has to keep a professional distance. He gave an example of firing three officers for dishonesty issues and the emotional responses to the firing. The de-certification process is a difficult and long process. Police officers are hard to find and to train, and APSC wants them to succeed. However, the process is necessary to keep public trust.

[2:36:56 PM](#)

Mr. Monegan felt the addition of two officers to the Council did not make sense because the training does not come from them, and second, they could not vote if the issue were with a person from their membership. He urged the Committee to look at the effectiveness of the two officers that would be on the Council.

[2:37:32 PM](#)

Vice-Chair Stoltze asked for comparisons between APSC and the Fire Standards Council. Mr. Monegan answered that the purpose of both councils is to ensure high standards of qualified personnel. They both want to protect the public. Vice-Chair Stoltze asked if the two councils make different personnel decisions. Mr. Monegan reiterated their similarities, although APSC has the ability to remove an individual entirely from the profession. There was a discussion about the grievance process in different unions and how the proposed changes in the bill would affect that process.

[2:40:53 PM](#)

Vice-Chair Stoltze said he would keep listening to both sides.

Mr. Monegan addressed Representative Thomas's concerns about VPSOs. He said the issue was that VPSOs are not certified police officers. They would not fall under APSC as they are employees of non-profits.

Representative Kelly asked Mr. Monegan if he had to build the Fire Standards Council from the ground up, would he have the representation that is being asked for on the APSC or would he remove it. Mr. Monegan replied that he would remove the representation from that council as well.

[2:42:39 PM](#)

MARK DRYGAS, BATTALION CHIEF, FAIRBANKS FIRE DEPARTMENT, ALASKA PROFESSIONAL FIREFIGHTERS ASSOCIATION, spoke in favor of HB 193. He supported having line personnel on the APSC. He thought the line personnel would feel represented and heard. The chiefs do not work the long shifts or face what the line personnel face. He referred to Brian Davis, line personnel on the Fire Standards Council. Mr. Drygas feels heard because of Mr. Davis's representation.

[2:45:33 PM](#)

JEFF LANDVATTER, ALASKA STATE TROOPER, spoke in favor of HB 193 (Statement on File). He has served for 23 years. He thought the bill was about representation and giving peace officers a voice on a committee that dictates their careers. He wanted to see rank and file members on the Council, just as on other similar boards. Two members would not be able to overturn decisions of the Council. Every patrol officer wants the best standing next to him and backing him up. A patrol officer can bring the perspective and insight the Council needs.

[2:48:15 PM](#)

TERRY VRABEC, DIRECTOR, ALASKA POLICE STANDARDS COUNCIL (TESTIFIED VIA TELECONFERENCE), spoke in opposition to HB 193. He referred to letters before the Committee from himself, from Daniel Hoffman, the Chairman of the APSC, and from Chief Charles Kamai from Kodiak (On File).

[2:49:30 PM](#)

BOB CLAUS, SELF, CRAIG (TESTIFIED VIA TELECONFERENCE), spoke in favor of HB 193. Mr. Clause has been a State Trooper for approximately twenty years and has trained police officers around the state. He thought adding two working police officers to the APSC would give a working officer's perspective to decision making, especially concerning training issues. Although he shares many years of experience with the police administrators that currently decide on course content, his understanding of face-to-face policing is based on on-going interactions with Alaskans. He described one of his work days. He felt a person with such experience is needed on the APSC.

[2:52:27 PM](#)

STEVE SMITH, DEPUTY CHIEF, ANCHORAGE POLICE DEPARTMENT (APD) (TESTIFIED VIA TELECONFERENCE), spoke on behalf of the Chief of APD, in opposition to HB 193. He said APD is opposed to the change in the APSC proposed in the bill. The Council is primarily a standard-setting and enforcement body, as well as being a training advocacy body for law enforcement in Alaska. The bill would alter the Council's internal operating environment, moving it more towards that of a labor management dispute forum. There are currently ample mechanisms in place to settle labor issues. Alaska law and collective bargaining agreements in effect within state law enforcement agencies already have appropriate forums for those issues. He thought the current system was working well and thought HB 193 would upset that balance.

[2:54:27 PM](#)

Representative Crawford questioned whether there was balance with eleven management members on the Council. He thought two line officers wouldn't upset the balance, but would add a voice.

Mr. Smith replied that the balance he referred to was the broader system of labor dispute mechanisms. He thought the Council presently fits well into that broader system. When someone comes before the Council with a potential decertification action, they will usually have either legal or union representation. The actual job action has already taken place or is in the process of taking place through their grievance and arbitration procedures with their department. The decertification action is a separate activity.

[2:56:20 PM](#)

CHUCK KOPP, CHIEF, KENAI POLICE DEPARTMENT (TESTIFIED VIA TELECONFERENCE), spoke in opposition to HB 193. He said many chiefs in Alaska also do day-to-day police work and understand the experiences of line officers. He wanted the Committee to understand that there has not been a complaint against the Council about unfairness. The union does not have a grievance against the Council. He served as chairman of the APSC for the last two years and felt the body worked exceptionally well in unison with the four public members, two of whom are from communities of 2,500 or less. House Bill 193 represents the removal of the largest public safety employer in Alaska from having representation, by removing a correctional administrative officer. He pointed out that Corrections oversees not only prisons but probation and parole. The Director of Probation and Parole is the administrative officer that has historically served on APSC, along with the Commissioner of Corrections. The removal of this person, who oversees so many personnel and operational matters, would be a significant loss and adversely affect the Council's functioning. He thought four chiefs are necessary on the Council.

Mr. Kopp appreciated the argument that the issue is representation, but he feels it is a conflict of interest. A person serves on the Council because they have been nominated by a labor organization. Labor organizations have their proper role in protecting the rights of the accused, but they already have representation before the Council. Five of the positions on the Council currently are occupied by individuals from labor organized agencies.

Mr. Kopp said firefighters are not required to take an oath of office to protect and serve their community and uphold the law. They are not required by statute to subscribe to a code of ethics or to live their private lives in alignment with that code. He read the code of ethics and said much of

the code does not apply to firefighters, while police officers are held to the highest standard in public service. He said the balance on the Council has served well for many years and felt HB 193 would upset that balance.

[3:06:02 PM](#)

Representative Thomas asked if any of the chiefs on the Council were union employees or former union employees. Mr. Kopp said that the chairman, Chief Dan Hoffman, was the former union president for the Fairbanks Police Department. Representative Thomas asked if he stepped down if there was a union issue before the Council. Mr. Kopp said he would if the issue involved one of his officers.

Representative Thomas asked Mr. Kopp about his experience as a trainer. Mr. Kopp listed his extensive teaching and training experience. He said the Council is careful in its deliberations regarding decertification.

[3:10:03 PM](#)

Co-Chair Meyer closed public testimony.

HB 193 was HEARD and HELD in Committee for further consideration.

HOUSE BILL NO. 267

"An Act relating to authorizing the state to join with other states entering into the Wildlife Violator Compact and authorizing the compact to supersede existing statutes by approving standards, rules, or other action under the terms of the compact; and directing the initiation of civil actions to revoke appropriate licenses in this state based on a resident licensee's violation of or failure to comply with the terms of a wildlife resource citation issued in another state that is a party to the compact."

[3:12:07 PM](#)

JEANNE OSTNES, STAFF, REPRESENTATIVE CRAIG JOHNSON, said HB 267 was patterned after the driver's license compact which all other states in the nation have entered into. If a person's driver's license is revoked in one state in the country, that person cannot get a license in another state. In 1985, states began making a similar compact in relation to wildlife violators, and it was quickly recognized as a valuable tool to deter serious wildlife violators everywhere in the nation. Twenty-six states are currently compact members. She referred to a photograph (On File) of a poacher who had been fined and jailed in Alaska, but was able to return to his home state and obtain another hunting license.

The biggest reason for the compact is to stop inter-state travel of serious poachers. Second, the compact provides for the issuance of citations to nonresidents, which is a big issue in Alaska; currently the violator must be immediately taken before a magistrate to prevent them from fleeing across state lines to avoid citation consequences. Third, the compact provides a strong deterrent for serious fish and wildlife crimes.

Ms. Ostnes listed the provisions of the Wildlife Violator Compact (Copy on File).

[3:15:34 PM](#)

Co-Chair Meyer referred to two zero notes.

Representative Thomas wondered if the poacher she had referred to lost his license in Alaska. Ms. Ostnes said his Alaska license was revoked.

REPRESENTATIVE CRAIG JOHNSON, SPONSOR, referred to the map of member states (Copy on File) and pointed out that a violator in any of those states would either go to Texas or Alaska to poach. He related Committee testimony about hunters telephoning the Department of Fish and Game and asking if Alaska were a member of the compact, an indicator that people who have violated in their own states are looking for an open place to hunt.

[3:17:09 PM](#)

Vice-Chair Stoltze observed that some of the non-compact states, including Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Alabama and Texas, are some of the biggest hunting states. He wondered if Representative Johnson was aware of why those states are not part of the compact. Representative Johnson replied that Texas has many private reserves. Vice-Chair Stoltze mentioned regulations in California, which is a compact member, and worried that Californian regulations would affect Alaskans if Alaska became part of the compact. Representative Johnson replied that Alaska is still in control of its own laws; HB 267 does not give up any sovereignty. The State also has the right to review and determine whether an individual would lose their license. Vice-Chair Stoltze characterized HB 267 as preventing Alaska from being the last refuge of scoundrels.

[3:21:16 PM](#)

ROD ARNO, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, ALASKA OUTDOOR COUNCIL (TESTIFIED VIA TELECONFERENCE), spoke in support of HB 267. He said the bill deals mainly with nonresidents. In his years of experience, the majority of violators are violators everywhere. This is a tool that will help the wildlife

troopers in Alaska, especially given the vastness of the state and the shortage of officers.

CAPTAIN BURKE WALDRON, OPERATIONS DIRECTOR, ALASKA WILDLIFE TROOPERS (TESTIFIED VIA TELECONFERENCE), spoke in favor of HB 267 on behalf of the Department of Public Safety. He thought the compact would deter poachers caught in Alaska from failing to appear on their citations, and make wildlife troopers more efficient in the field. Currently time is wasted processing poachers who are arrested.

[3:23:52 PM](#)

Co-Chair Meyer closed public testimony.

Vice-Chair Stoltze MOVED report the CS for HB 267 (RES) out of Committee with individual recommendations and with attached zero note #1 by the Department of Fish and Game and zero note #2 by the Department of Public Safety. There being NO OBJECTION, it was so ordered.

CS HB 267 (RES) was REPORTED out of Committee with a "do pass" recommendation and with zero note #1 by the Department of Fish and Game and zero note #2 by the Department of Public Safety.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 2

Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the State of Alaska requiring an affirmative vote of the people before any form of gambling for profit may be authorized in Alaska.

House Joint Resolution No. 2 was SCHEDULED but not HEARD.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 PM.