

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
HOUSE JUDICIARY STANDING COMMITTEE

March 30, 2009

1:14 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Representative Jay Ramras, Chair
Representative John Coghill
Representative Carl Gatto
Representative Bob Lynn
Representative Max Gruenberg
Representative Lindsey Holmes

MEMBERS ABSENT

Representative Nancy Dahlstrom, Vice Chair

COMMITTEE CALENDAR

HOUSE BILL NO. 137

"An Act relating to an interstate compact on educational opportunity for military children; amending Rules 4 and 24, Alaska Rules of Civil Procedure; and providing for an effective date."

- MOVED HB 137 OUT OF COMMITTEE

HOUSE BILL NO. 108

"An Act relating to real property foreclosures, to the sale of property on execution, and to deeds of trust."

- HEARD AND HELD

PREVIOUS COMMITTEE ACTION

BILL: HB 137

SHORT TITLE: COMPACT: EDUCATION OF MILITARY CHILDREN

SPONSOR(S): REPRESENTATIVE(S) COGHILL

02/16/09	(H)	READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
02/16/09	(H)	EDC, JUD, FIN
03/20/09	(H)	EDC AT 8:00 AM CAPITOL 106
03/20/09	(H)	Heard & Held
03/20/09	(H)	MINUTE(EDC)
03/23/09	(H)	EDC AT 8:00 AM CAPITOL 106
03/23/09	(H)	Moved Out of Committee

03/23/09 (H) MINUTE(EDC)
 03/23/09 (H) EDC RPT 5DP 1NR
 03/23/09 (H) DP: MUNOZ, WILSON, GARDNER, BUCH,
 SEATON
 03/23/09 (H) NR: KELLER
 03/30/09 (H) JUD AT 1:00 PM CAPITOL 120

BILL: HB 108

SHORT TITLE: PROPERTY FORECLOSURES AND EXECUTIONS

SPONSOR(S): REPRESENTATIVE(S) RAMRAS

02/02/09 (H) READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
 02/02/09 (H) L&C, JUD
 02/23/09 (H) L&C AT 3:15 PM BARNES 124
 02/23/09 (H) Heard & Held
 02/23/09 (H) MINUTE(L&C)
 03/13/09 (H) L&C AT 3:15 PM BARNES 124
 03/13/09 (H) -- MEETING CANCELED --
 03/16/09 (H) L&C AT 3:15 PM BARNES 124
 03/16/09 (H) Moved CSHB 108(L&C) Out of Committee
 03/16/09 (H) MINUTE(L&C)
 03/18/09 (H) L&C RPT CS(L&C) 1DP 5NR
 03/18/09 (H) DP: CHENAULT
 03/18/09 (H) NR: BUCH, COGHILL, NEUMAN, HOLMES,
 OLSON
 03/25/09 (H) JUD AT 1:00 PM CAPITOL 120
 03/25/09 (H) Scheduled But Not Heard
 03/30/09 (H) JUD AT 1:00 PM CAPITOL 120

WITNESS REGISTER

KAREN LIDSTER, Staff
 Representative John Coghill
 Alaska State Legislature
 Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Presented HB 137 on behalf of the sponsor,
 Representative Coghill.

LARRY LeDOUX, Commissioner
 Department of Education and Early Development (EED)
 Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Provided comments and responded to
 questions during discussion of HB 137.

EDDIE JEANS, Director
 School Finance and Facilities Section
 Department of Education and Early Development (EED)

Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Responded to questions during discussion of HB 137.

CAROL COMEAU, Superintendent of Schools
Anchorage School District (ASD)
Municipality of Anchorage (MOA)
Anchorage, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Provided comments during discussion of HB 137.

THOMAS HINTON, Senior State Liaison
Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense Military
Community and Family Policy
United States Department of Defense (DOD)
Fredericksburg, Virginia

POSITION STATEMENT: Provided comments during discussion of HB 137.

RICHARD L. MASTERS, Special Counsel
National Center for Interstate Compacts (NCIC)
The Council of State Governments (CSG)
Lexington, Kentucky

POSITION STATEMENT: Provided comments during discussion of HB 137.

JANE W. PIERSON, Staff
Representative Jay Ramras
Alaska State Legislature
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Presented HB 108 on behalf of the sponsor, Representative Ramras.

ROBERT H. SCHMIDT, Attorney at Law
Groh Eggers, LLC
Anchorage, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Expressed concerns about HB 108.

STEPHEN ROUTH, Attorney at Law
Routh Crabtree, apc
Anchorage, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Provided comment during discussion of HB 108.

BRYAN BUTCHER, Director
Government Affairs & Public Relations
Alaska Housing Finance Corporation (AHFC)

Department of Revenue (DOR)
Anchorage, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Responded to a question during discussion of HB 108.

ACTION NARRATIVE

[1:14:49 PM](#)

CHAIR JAY RAMRAS called the House Judiciary Standing Committee meeting to order at 1:14 p.m. Representatives Ramras, Gatto, Lynn, Gruenberg, and Holmes were present at the call to order. Representative Coghill arrived as the meeting was in progress.

HB 137 - COMPACT: EDUCATION OF MILITARY CHILDREN

[1:15:02 PM](#)

CHAIR RAMRAS announced that the first order of business would be HOUSE BILL NO. 137, "An Act relating to an interstate compact on educational opportunity for military children; amending Rules 4 and 24, Alaska Rules of Civil Procedure; and providing for an effective date."

[1:15:39 PM](#)

KAREN LIDSTER, Staff, Representative John Coghill, Alaska State Legislature, on behalf of the sponsor, Representative Coghill, relayed that HB 137 would eliminate some of the barriers faced by the children of military personnel as they transition from one school system to another; such children, between kindergarten and 12th grade, might move an average of six to nine times. Such moves can be stressful, and adoption of the compact contained in HB 139 could ease some of that stress, thereby being of benefit to over 12,000 school-age children of military personnel. Thus far, [13] states have adopted the compact and [20] states have pending legislation.

MS. LIDSTER, referring to the sectional analysis included in members' packets, explained that Section 1 of HB 137 would add to Title 14 a new Chapter 34, pertaining to the Interstate Compact on Educational Opportunity for Military Children. Article I [of Chapter 34's proposed AS 14.34.010, which contains 18 articles,] outlines the purpose of the compact as being to remove barriers to educational success imposed on children of military families by facilitating enrollment, placement, and timely graduation; by providing enforcement of rules, uniform

collection and sharing of information; and by promoting coordination, flexibility, and cooperation among member states. Article II defines the terms used throughout the compact. Article III outlines which children the compact shall apply to. Article IV addresses educational records and enrollment, outlining how sending and receiving states shall handle a student's official and unofficial records - with the compact's Interstate Commission determining what information shall be included in the latter - and the timeline for handling a student's records; providing for a 30-day grace period for immunizations; and addressing entrance age and grade level.

MS. LIDSTER explained that Article V addresses course placement, education program placement, special education services, placement flexibility, and absences related to deployment. Article VI addresses eligibility for enrollment and for extracurricular participation. Article VII addresses graduation, providing procedures for waivers, exit exams, and transfers during a student's senior year. Article VIII addresses coordination among a compact member state's government, local education, and military agencies via the establishment of a state council or existing body for that purpose, and outlines the membership of such council or body. Article IX addresses the creation of an Interstate Commission on Educational Opportunity for Military Children and its responsibilities, powers, and duties, detailing its membership, voting rights, meetings, executive committee, bylaws and rules, data collection, and a process for reporting alleged violations.

MS. LIDSTER explained that Article X lists the powers and duties of the Interstate Commission, including dispute resolution, promulgation of rules, issuing advisory opinions, enforcing compliance, and others related to establishing, running, and supporting the state councils at a national level. Article XI pertains to the organization and operation of the Interstate Commission, providing structure for it to organize, establish bylaws, set up committees, and establish procedures for meetings, and providing for startup rules for the initial administration of the compact. Article XII gives the Interstate Commission rulemaking authority and guidelines, and a provision for judicial review of proposed rules. Article XIII addresses oversight, enforcement, and dispute resolution, charging the three branches of government with the purpose and intent of the compact, stating that the Interstate Commission shall receive all service of process and has standing to intervene, addressing the consequences of default, authorizing dispute resolution and

mediation, and providing enforcement powers, including the authority to initiate legal action.

MS. LIDSTER explained that Article XIV addresses the financing of the Interstate Commission by providing a method by which it may pay reasonable expenses, collect annual assessments, and be audited. Article XV addresses membership, the effective date, and amendments to the compact; specifically, membership is open to all states, the compact become effective when 10 states enact it into law, and amendments may be proposed by the Interstate Commission and only become effective when enacted into law by all member states. Article XVI addresses withdrawal from, reinstatement to, and the dissolution of the compact. Article XVII pertains to severability and construction, with all provisions being severable, with the compact being liberally construed, and with nothing prohibiting the applicability of other interstate compacts. Article XVIII pertains to the binding effect of the compact and the actions of the Interstate Commission, stating that nothing in the compact prevents enforcement of any other law not inconsistent with the compact, that all laws inconsistent with the compact are superseded by the compact to the extent of the conflict, that all rules and bylaws promulgated by the Interstate Commission are binding, and that any provisions that exceed constitutional limits are ineffective to the extent of the conflict.

MS. LIDSTER explained that Section 1's proposed AS 14.34.020 establishes the compact administrator and the duties of that office; proposed AS 14.34.030 establishes the state council as a subcommittee; proposed AS 14.34.040 authorizes the adoption of regulations; and proposed AS 14.34.090 provides for a short title. Section 2 provides for indirect court rule amendments to Rule 4 and Rule 24(b) of the Alaska Rules of Civil Procedure. [Section 3 and 4 address conditional effects, and Section 5 addresses the effective date.]

REPRESENTATIVE LYNN concurred that having to transfer his children to a new school every couple of years while he served in the military was difficult.

[1:29:51 PM](#)

LARRY LeDOUX, Commissioner, Department of Education and Early Development (EED), noting that he's been a principal at both a high school and an elementary school in a military community, characterized HB 137 as representing strong common sense, and concurred that having to change schools every few years can be

stressful on military families and on the children themselves as they try to navigate the new school system and become part of the new community. The school districts serving military communities in Alaska are very supportive, and most districts already follow the proposed guidelines; the compact, therefore, he surmised, is necessary so that other states can treat the transferring children of military personnel with more respect.

COMMISSIONER LeDOUX then provided an example wherein one student who'd been transferred five days before graduating from high school couldn't receive any credit from his past school because he left early, and characterized that example as illustrative of the need for the proposed compact. He noted that the issue of immunizations also creates a dilemma when records aren't transferred in a timely manner, because regulations say that proof of immunization is required; although most principals will find a way to get transferred children into school, they shouldn't have to go to those lengths.

COMMISSIONER LeDOUX, in response to questions, said that the bill won't impact how school districts deal with "special needs" children because federal law - the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) - already addresses that issue; that although some issues might arise during implementation, he doesn't believe complying with the proposed compact will be burdensome - again, most schools in Alaska already do comply; and that he believes the compact would apply to children who are being homeschooled under "an Alaska sponsored program."

[1:37:25 PM](#)

EDDIE JEANS, Director, School Finance and Facilities Section, Department of Education and Early Development (EED), in response to comments, clarified that it would depend on whether a child who is being homeschooled is enrolled in the public school system - if so, then the compact would apply, regardless of whether the child is coming to Alaska or leaving Alaska. The compact would not apply, however, to children who are not part of the public school system.

REPRESENTATIVE GRUENBERG asked whether the compact would conflict with the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001.

COMMISSIONER LeDOUX said he doesn't believe it would.

REPRESENTATIVE GRUENBERG asked whether the compact would apply to "pre-kindergarten" children.

COMMISSIONER LeDOUX said many states have a variety of early learning programs but nothing consistent from one state to another, so it would be very difficult to define a relationship between such programs.

REPRESENTATIVE GRUENBERG surmised, then, that having the compact apply to children who have not yet entered kindergarten would be impractical at this time.

COMMISSIONER LeDOUX concurred, adding that such would be the case until there is more consistency between states with regard to their early learning programs.

REPRESENTATIVE GRUENBERG asked whether there is a plan to expand the compact so that it would apply to children other than just those of military personnel.

REPRESENTATIVE COGHILL suggested that the representative from the Council of State Governments (CSG) would be better able to address to that question.

[1:40:55 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE GRUENBERG, referring to the language on page 8, lines 26-29, raised the issue of possibly amending that language to clarify that a student placed in the care of a non-custodial parent or other person standing in loco parentis could attend a school in that person's jurisdiction.

COMMISSIONER LeDOUX, in response to a comment, offered his belief that the proposed compact reflects how all students who transfer to Alaska are treated.

MR. JEANS mentioned that the Board of Education and Early Development supports HB 137, and that the EED has received [letters of] support from "Kodiak, Anchorage, and Sitka" as well as the Alaska School Activities Association (ASAA). He offered his belief that there is a lot of support for [the compact].

COMMISSIONER LeDOUX, in response to questions, surmised that the compact is intended to apply to the children of military personnel who are transitioning between two communities, and that as a whole, the compact would provide school administrators across the country with guidelines by which to make sound decisions regarding the children of military personnel, though it might not cover every possibility.

1:49:47 PM

CAROL COMEAU, Superintendent of Schools, Anchorage School District (ASD), Municipality of Anchorage (MOA), relayed that the Anchorage school board recently passed a resolution in support of the compact and believes that it would institutionalize most of the practices that [Alaska's schools] have tried to implement over the years, thereby making those practices part of state law. She offered her belief that the compact would go a long way towards reducing the stress placed on military families, particularly during times of deployment, characterizing the resulting transfers as being in a different category than normal transfers, which don't involve one's parents going to war. She offered her hope that the committee would move the bill from committee, indicating that [the school board] has heard examples of how important it is for the children of military personnel to be able to become part of the school structure and involved in school activities. In conclusion, she said, "We think this is the right thing to do."

MS. COMEAU, in response to questions, said that [the law] clearly allows school districts to waive the exit exam requirement if a student has passed an exit exam in another state; that the [Anchorage School District] has been able to "work through" all the various state history requirements as long as students transferring in have completed the history requirements of the state they're transferring from; and that [the Anchorage school district] doesn't see anything negative about [the compact].

1:54:54 PM

[Chair Ramras turned the gavel over to Representative Coghill.]

THOMAS HINTON, Senior State Liaison, Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense Military Community and Family Policy, United States Department of Defense (DOD), said he appreciates that Alaska is considering this legislation, particularly given that it addresses one of the issues that most affects the military community, and that it's been exciting to see the [positive] response [to the proposed compact] across the country.

[Representative Coghill returned the gavel to Chair Ramras.]

MR. HINTON noted that in addition to 11 other states, both Mississippi and Virginia recently adopted similar legislation. This compact, which can now be activated, was developed over a long period of time with the help of many, including the CSG, he relayed, and characterized it as the right approach, fulfilling the need for coordination among the states and school districts when the children of military personnel change schools. He too remarked that with the variety of early learning programs that different states have, it would be very difficult to define a relationship between such programs.

2:02:29 PM

RICHARD L. MASTERS, Special Counsel, National Center for Interstate Compacts (NCIC), The Council of State Governments (CSG), relayed that whenever interstate problems arise, the CSG is in favor of interstate cooperation whenever possible as opposed to federal intervention, and that the CSG is pleased that 13 states have now adopted the compact. He mentioned that close to 90 percent of the nation's military installations and personnel are located in approximately 20 states, and so although the goal is to have all 50 states join the compact, most of the [recruitment] efforts have been directed first towards those states with the largest military populations and most military installations, including Alaska - which ranks about number five.

[Chair Ramras turned the gavel over to Representative Coghill.]

MR. MASTERS explained that the goal was to develop a dynamic, deliberately-broad mechanism to address the four areas of most concern to students of military personnel: enrollment, placement and attendance, eligibility, and graduation. The provisions of the compact are intended to provide broad guidance towards a reasonable accommodation, to "level the playing field" so that students of military personnel are not penalized simply for being part of a family that's chosen to serve the country via the military. Although the compact may not address every situation, it does contain the flexibility for limited rulemaking by individual states so that they may address specific issues themselves. For example, the issue raised earlier about the language on page 8, lines 26-29, could perhaps be addressed should doing so prove necessary.

MR. MASTERS, referring to earlier questions and comments, concurred that the proposed compact won't conflict with the NCLB Act, and that the compact won't address homeschooled students

who are not part of the public school system but will address those who are, and relayed that the CSG is interested in pursuing a similar mechanism that would apply to children other than those of military personnel, but is not interested in altering the compact proposed by HB 137 to that effect because it would result in two different agreements.

[Representative Coghill returned the gavel to Chair Ramras.]

MR. MASTERS, in response to a question, said the name of the book he coauthored is "The Evolving Use and Changing Role of Interstate Compacts: a Practitioner's Guide". In response to further questions, he explained that the U.S. Supreme Court - in West Virginia Ex Rel. Dyer V. Simms, 341 U.S. 22 (1951) - has already ruled that delegating rulemaking authority to an interstate compact agency is not unconstitutional but is instead an axiom of modern government; pointed out that Article XVIII says in part that any provisions of the compact that exceed constitutional limits are ineffective to the extent of the conflict; and acknowledged that any changes to the articles of the proposed compact would require legislative approval, and that a legislature could stipulate in its enacting legislation that any rules promulgated by the Interstate Commission be subject to legislature approval.

CHAIR RAMRAS, after ascertaining that no one else wished to testify, closed public testimony on HB 137.

[2:22:05 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE LYNN moved to report HB 137 out of committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying fiscal notes. There being no objection, HB 137 was reported from the House Judiciary Standing Committee.

The committee took an at-ease from 2:22 p.m. to 2:24 p.m.

HB 108 - PROPERTY FORECLOSURES AND EXECUTIONS

[2:24:25 PM](#)

CHAIR RAMRAS announced that the final order of business would be HOUSE BILL NO. 108, "An Act relating to real property foreclosures, to the sale of property on execution, and to deeds of trust." [Before the committee was CSHB 108(L&C).]

[2:24:39 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE COGHILL moved to adopt the proposed committee substitute (CS) for HB 108, Version 26-LS0318\P, Bannister, 3/26/09, as the work draft.

REPRESENTATIVE GRUENBERG objected for the purpose of discussion.

2:25:10 PM

JANE W. PIERSON, Staff, Representative Jay Ramras, Alaska State Legislature, explained on behalf of the sponsor, Representative Ramras, that proposed AS 09.35.140(b) in Section 2 of Version P now contains a requirement that the notice of execution of the sale of real property also be noticed on an Internet web site, and expands the list of qualified web sites to include newspapers of general circulation so long as they meet the requirements listed in Section 2's proposed AS 09.35.140(c). She surmised, therefore, that if a newspaper were qualified to run legal ads, it would also be qualified to run the Internet publication. Furthermore, proposed AS 09.35.140(c) also requires that any Internet web site used for this purpose be free to the viewing public.

MS. PIERSON indicated that Section 4 - proposed AS 34.20.070(b) - now contains a reference to proposed AS 34.20.070(e) - found in Section 6 and requiring a description of conditions for curing the default - and requires among other things that the notice of default served on the trustor include language stating that the payment to cure the default must be made two days prior to the sale date stated in the notice of default, or two days prior to the date the sale is postponed to. Proposed AS 34.20.070(e) contains language conforming to that of proposed AS 34.20.070(b). She surmised that these provisions should provide adequate notice to the trustor regarding curing the default. Section 10's proposed AS 34.20.080(j), she relayed, now provides that if the sale is rescinded under proposed AS 34.20.080(g) that the deed of trust foreclosed in the rescinded sale is restored to the validity and priority it would have had had the sale not occurred.

MS. PIERSON, in response to a question, clarified that Section 4 now also contains a reference to proposed AS 34.20.080(e), which is contained in Section 9 and which pertains to [postponing the sale].

REPRESENTATIVE GRUENBERG removed his objection.

CHAIR RAMRAS stated that Version P was before the committee.

REPRESENTATIVE HOLMES questioned whether the term, "(a)" ought to be added to Section 1's proposed AS 09.35.140.

MS. PIERSON surmised that doing so might be cleaner.

[2:31:05 PM](#)

ROBERT H. SCHMIDT, Attorney at Law, Groh Eggers, LLC, after relaying that his firm processes only about 100 foreclosures per year, expressed concern that the Internet publication provisions in Version P could prove problematic because the newspapers in some smaller communities don't have their own Internet web sites, thereby requiring those conducting a foreclosure sale in such communities to use his competitor's web site. He said that although the bill does several favorable things, Version P now also raises an issue regarding what he called the two-day cutoff.

[Chair Ramras turned the gavel over to Representative Coghill.]

MR. SCHMIDT offered his understanding that under the bill, a person could stop a foreclosure by paying what's due plus associated charges as long as that payment occurs at least two days prior to the [foreclosure] sale, but the person would be precluded from curing the default if payment is not made at least two days prior to the sale. He pointed out that the financial institution his firm represents would never turn down a cure and would rather the person keep the property. Version P appears to mandate that any attempt at curing the default be refused if it can't occur at least two days prior to the sale, thus requiring the bank to go forth with the sale. Surmising that that is not the intent of the bill, he indicated that he has some suggested language to address this problem.

MR. SCHMIDT then offered his belief that there appears to be a typographical error on page 3, line 4, surmising that proposed AS 09.35.140(c)(2) is not meant to cover newspapers at all. In conclusion, he characterized HB 108 as a good bill that will do much to modernize Alaska's foreclosure laws. In response to a question, he reiterated his concern about what he'd called the two-day cutoff [as provided for in Sections 4 and 6], adding that most modern deeds of trust will conflict with "this" because they stipulate that a foreclosure sale can be stopped by curing the default before the sale, thus providing broader rights for cure than what the bill currently proposes. He

acknowledged, though, that that's not necessarily a reason for not having the "two-day rule," and that various out-of-state lenders who operate substantially higher loan portfolios might benefit by such a rule. In response to a comment, he posited that local banks might not be interested in having such a rule, and would instead prefer to accept a payment cure rather than going through with the foreclosure sale.

REPRESENTATIVE COGHILL suggested to Mr. Schmidt that he provide the committee with any suggested changes in writing.

REPRESENTATIVE COGHILL returned the gavel to Chair Ramras.

CHAIR RAMRAS opined that the benefits of the bill outweigh the potential problems with the [two-day cutoff], surmising that generally borrowers wouldn't be able to remedy a situation in those last two days anyway.

[2:42:02 PM](#)

STEPHEN ROUTH, Attorney at Law, Routh Crabtree, apc, in response to a question, relayed that his firm processes substantially more than 100 foreclosures per month, and - with the full concurrence of its clients - does everything possible to keep borrowers in their homes. Referring to Version P, he offered his belief that its intent is to broaden the definition of Internet web sites suitable for publications, with the goal being to widen the publicity for sales, since any proceeds go back into the borrower's account. People are now shopping on the Internet for property, and so the bill would bring Alaska into that market; both Florida and Arkansas have passed similar legislation, and Alaska would be the third state [should HB 108 pass].

MR. ROUTH, referring to Mr. Schmidt's comment, opined that those newspapers that don't yet have a web site could simply set one up because it's easy to do. Referring to the bill's stipulation that a default must be cured at least two days prior to the foreclosure sale, he posited that the goal of that language is to ensure that enough notice is provided to the lending institution so that it doesn't proceed with an unnecessary foreclosure sale. He said he agrees that no bank is going to object to having the default cured even when it occurs at the last minute.

REPRESENTATIVE HOLMES questioned whether the provisions in a deed of sale would supersede [state law].

MR. ROUTH offered his belief that the deed of trust provisions would prevail.

REPRESENTATIVE HOLMES questioned whether that would create a problem given that in such a situation, the legal notice of the default sale would stipulate the two-day cutoff.

MR. ROUTH acknowledged that that could create a problem and be confusing to the borrower.

REPRESENTATIVE HOLMES indicated that that's of concern to her.

REPRESENTATIVE GRUENBERG suggested that Mr. Schmidt and Mr. Routh work together and present the committee with any suggested changes.

MR. SCHMIDT and MR. ROUTH agreed to do so.

[2:51:53 PM](#)

BRYAN BUTCHER, Director, Government Affairs & Public Relations, Alaska Housing Finance Corporation (AHFC), Department of Revenue (DOR), in response to a question, explained that although he'd not yet received a copy of Version P, the AHFC was supportive of the prior version of HB 108, and surmised that the concern raised by Mr. Schmidt [regarding the two-day cutoff] could be resolved.

[HB 108, Version P, was held over.]

[2:52:59 PM](#)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the committee, the House Judiciary Standing Committee meeting was adjourned at 2:53 p.m.