

**ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE  
HOUSE JUDICIARY STANDING COMMITTEE**

March 28, 2016

1:06 p.m.

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Representative Gabrielle LeDoux, Chair  
Representative Wes Keller, Vice Chair  
Representative Neal Foster  
Representative Charisse Millett  
Representative Matt Claman

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Representative Bob Lynn  
Representative Jonathan Kreiss-Tomkins  
Representative Kurt Olson (alternate)

**COMMITTEE CALENDAR**

HOUSE BILL NO. 205

"An Act relating to conditions of release; relating to community work service; relating to credit toward a sentence of imprisonment for certain persons under electronic monitoring; relating to the restoration under certain circumstances of an administratively revoked driver's license, privilege to drive, or privilege to obtain a license; allowing a reduction of penalties for offenders successfully completing court-ordered treatment programs for persons convicted of driving under the influence; relating to termination of a revocation of a driver's license; relating to restoration of a driver's license; relating to credits toward a sentence of imprisonment, to good time deductions, and to providing for earned good time deductions for prisoners; relating to early termination of probation and reduction of probation for good conduct; relating to the rights of crime victims; relating to the disqualification of persons convicted of certain felony drug offenses from participation in the food stamp and temporary assistance programs; relating to probation; relating to mitigating factors; relating to treatment programs for prisoners; relating to the duties of the commissioner of corrections; amending Rule 32, Alaska Rules of Criminal Procedure; and providing for an effective date."

- HEARD AND HELD

**PREVIOUS COMMITTEE ACTION**

BILL: HB 205

SHORT TITLE: CRIMINAL LAW/PROCEDURE; DRIV LIC; PUB AID

SPONSOR(S): REPRESENTATIVE(S) MILLETT

04/17/15 (H) READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS  
04/17/15 (H) JUD, FIN  
03/11/16 (H) JUD AT 12:30 AM GRUENBERG 120  
03/11/16 (H) -- MEETING CANCELED --  
03/12/16 (H) JUD AT 2:00 PM GRUENBERG 120  
03/12/16 (H) -- MEETING CANCELED --  
03/14/16 (H) JUD AT 12:30 AM GRUENBERG 120  
03/14/16 (H) Heard & Held  
03/14/16 (H) MINUTE (JUD)  
03/16/16 (H) JUD AT 12:30 AM GRUENBERG 120  
03/16/16 (H) Heard & Held  
03/16/16 (H) MINUTE (JUD)  
03/18/16 (H) JUD AT 12:30 AM GRUENBERG 120  
03/18/16 (H) Heard & Held  
03/18/16 (H) MINUTE (JUD)  
03/21/16 (H) JUD AT 12:30 AM GRUENBERG 120  
03/21/16 (H) Heard & Held  
03/21/16 (H) MINUTE (JUD)  
03/21/16 (H) JUD AT 5:00 PM GRUENBERG 120  
03/21/16 (H) Heard & Held  
03/21/16 (H) MINUTE (JUD)  
03/22/16 (H) JUD AT 5:00 PM GRUENBERG 120  
03/22/16 (H) Heard & Held  
03/22/16 (H) MINUTE (JUD)  
03/23/16 (H) JUD AT 12:30 AM GRUENBERG 120  
03/23/16 (H) JUD AT 1:00 PM GRUENBERG 120  
03/28/16 (H) JUD AT 1:00 PM GRUENBERG 120

**WITNESS REGISTER**

GRACE ABBOTT, Staff  
Representative Charisse Millett  
Alaska State Legislature  
Juneau, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** During the hearing of HB 205, presented the reinvestment component to the committee.

SYLVAN ROBB  
Policy Analyst  
Office of Management & Budget (OMB)  
Juneau, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** During the hearing of HB 205, discussed reinvestment.

APRIL WILKERSON, Director  
Administrative Services Division  
Department of Corrections  
Juneau, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** During the hearing of HB 205, discussed the fiscal note.

LAUREE MORTON, Executive Director  
Council on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault (CDVSA)  
Juneau, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** During the hearing of HB 205, discussed reinvestment.

BRENDA STANFILL  
Commissioner  
Alaska Justice Commission  
Anchorage, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** During the hearing of HB 205, discussed victims.

JOSHUA "J.D." ALEX  
Anchorage, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** During the hearing of HB 205, offered support for reinvestment.

#### **ACTION NARRATIVE**

[1:06:36 PM](#)

**CHAIR GABRIELLE LEDOUX** called the House Judiciary Standing Committee meeting to order at 1:06 p.m. Representatives Millett, Claman, Keller, and LeDoux were present at the call to order. Representative Foster arrived as the meeting was in progress.

#### **HB 205-CRIMINAL LAW/PROCEDURE; DRIV LIC; PUB AID**

[1:07:03 PM](#)

CHAIR LEDOUX announced that the only order of business would be HOUSE BILL NO. 205, "An Act relating to conditions of release; relating to community work service; relating to credit toward a sentence of imprisonment for certain persons under electronic monitoring; relating to the restoration under certain

circumstances of an administratively revoked driver's license, privilege to drive, or privilege to obtain a license; allowing a reduction of penalties for offenders successfully completing court-ordered treatment programs for persons convicted of driving under the influence; relating to termination of a revocation of a driver's license; relating to restoration of a driver's license; relating to credits toward a sentence of imprisonment, to good time deductions, and to providing for earned good time deductions for prisoners; relating to early termination of probation and reduction of probation for good conduct; relating to the rights of crime victims; relating to the disqualification of persons convicted of certain felony drug offenses from participation in the food stamp and temporary assistance programs; relating to probation; relating to mitigating factors; relating to treatment programs for prisoners; relating to the duties of the commissioner of corrections; amending Rule 32, Alaska Rules of Criminal Procedure; and providing for an effective date."

[Before the House Judiciary Standing Committee was CSHB 205, labeled 29-LS0896\H, adopted in the 3/14/16 meeting.]

CHAIR LEDOUX advised that the focus of this meeting will be on reinvestment policies.

[1:07:22 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE MILLETT reminded the members that the reinvestment portion is the crucial lynchpin in the bill by reinvesting the savings back into programs to stop recidivism.

CHAIR LEDOUX agreed, and she again stressed that the bill will not move without the reinvestment component because it is absolutely critical to the bill.

[1:08:27 PM](#)

GRACE ABBOTT, Staff, Representative Charisse Millett, Alaska State Legislature, said her PowerPoint presentation, "Reinvestment, House Judiciary Committee - HB 205, March 28, 2016" focuses on the reinvestment portion of the commission's recommendations regarding reinvestment. Ms. Abbott turned to page 1, "Justice Reinvestment Concept," and said the bill frees up funds by focusing prison beds on the serious and violent offenders, and it reinvests a portion of the savings into the services needed to reduce recidivism and protect the public. She explained that the reinvestment portion of the savings is at

the discretion of the committee as policy makers, and that many of the changes in thinking, sentencing, and community supervision are contingent upon the savings being reinvested.

1:10:09 PM

MS. ABBOTT turned to page 2, "Reinvestment Directive to the Commission." Initially, she said, the Alaska Criminal Justice Commission's was directed through the enabling statutes within SB 64. Subsequent to that directive, it received a letter from the Finance co-Chairs, Senate President, and Speaker of the House, which read: "In this budget climate, investments that expand treatment and services only become possible with a reform package that results in substantial, real net savings to the state." The presiding officers leading the Finance Committees understood and requested investment into treatment and other services be looked into through the commission process, she noted.

MS. ABBOTT turned to page 3, "Language provided to committee" and asked the committee to turn to the packet previously handed out, and the section of proposed language. She explained that this is the reinvestment language that many different parties have been looking into in trying to build and fortify. She further explained that this recycles the Recidivism Reduction Program introduced in 2014 within SB 64, and turns this into a capitalized fund that would provide reentry grants, and the specifics are described within the language. It offers rehabilitation treatment and guiding the released individuals back into communities, and builds upon the work the legislation asks the Department of Corrections (DOC) to perform while people are still incarcerated, which includes emphasizing assistance in helping people back on their feet and helping people to become contributing members of the community.

1:12:27 PM

MS. ABBOTT turned to page 4, "Oversight," and said that many of the policies require oversight by evaluating effectiveness, and to ensure that the oversight takes place by both the state agencies and the legislature. The intent, she related, is to be certain there is a focused team of experts that at this point have been assembled through the commission and the commission continues to monitor the different policies to be certain the successes shown through the data that is likely to happen, are in fact happening. The Alaska Criminal Justice Commission would also oversee savings and reinvestment to be certain the state's

dollars are being saved, and that those saved dollars are put toward the best use possible, she said.

CHAIR LEDOUX opened invited testimony.

[1:14:01 PM](#)

SYLVAN ROBB, Policy Analyst, Office of Management & Budget (OMB), turned to "How Would Reinvestment in House Bill 205 Work?," and said the concept of justice reinvestment is based upon the recommendations put forward by the Alaska Criminal Justice Commission and is reflected in this bill as part of the reform package. She explained that the idea behind justice reinvestment is to take the reforms that will yield a reduction in prison beds and use a portion of those savings for reinvestment into programs that will lead to reduced recidivism and will address victimization. As HB 205 currently stands, there is an anticipated saving of approximately \$51 million in savings over the course of the next five years, even after the reinvestments are made. She turned to the graph at the top of page 1 - describing how reinvestment will work, and emphasized that the numbers in the graph are purely to make reinvestment easy to follow so there would be a straight line between the savings from one year to the next because the FY17 numbers won't match up exactly with an FY17 budget figure the committee might find on OMB's website. Additionally, she noted, the reinvestment numbers are numbers used in the general scope and since the fiscal notes are still coming together, the committee can't back into them exactly from a fiscal note at this point.

[1:16:06 PM](#)

CHAIR LEDOUX pointed to the budget currently being worked on, which is next year's budget, and asked whether it will be a net savings or a net spending.

MS. ROBB responded that OMB came up with a net savings, although it included the \$8 million reduction that the Department of Corrections (DOC) was assigned in Governor Bill Walker's budget as part of that. Therefore, the savings from the anticipated 307 bed reductions is approximately \$4.5 million of savings.

CHAIR LEDOUX questioned that even next year putting the reinvestment component into it there will still be actual savings.

MS. ROBB answered that there will be savings provided the committee counts the reduction DOC has already incurred within the governor's budget.

CHAIR LEDOUX surmised that DOC incurred that in the governor's budget because it is assumed there will be less people in the jails because of this bill.

[1:17:19 PM](#)

MS. ROBB explained that a portion of those savings come from that, there is also a savings related to Medicaid reform in that Medicaid pays for prisoners when they are in the hospital for 24 hours.

CHAIR LEDOUX asked whether it is a net savings or a net spending if the committee does not include that portion.

MS. ROBB replied that the short answer is no. They are asking for more reinvestment in FY17, and then the savings OMB expects from bed reductions, absent the governor's reduction.

CHAIR LEDOUX asked how much is that.

MS. ROBB responded that the savings expected is \$4.7 million.

CHAIR LEDOUX said she thought Ms. Robb said that there will be a net expense if the bed reduction is not counted, which appears to be as a result of Medicaid savings in the governor's budget.

MS. ROBB apologized because she misunderstood the question, and answered that a savings is anticipated of \$4.7 million, absent the governor's reduction. The cost for the first year would be \$12.3 million, and \$1.5 of that is a one-time investment in upgrades to the victim notification and time entry. She said the remainder would go toward reinvestment programs provided to inmates through DOC, community based programs through the Department of Health and Social Services (DHSS), and the Alaska Council on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault (CDVSA).

[1:18:56 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE CLAMAN surmised that the savings in DOC costs will be approximately \$4.7 million, and asked whether he was incorrect.

MS. ROBB answered no, there is an expected savings in FY17 of \$4.7 million based upon a reduction in marginal costs from the reduction in prison beds.

REPRESENTATIVE CLAMAN asked the amount of the additional reinvestment cost in FY17.

MS. ROBB responded that \$12.3 million would be the investment for the first year.

REPRESENTATIVE CLAMAN surmised that net is around \$7.6 million invested in the reinvestment that the state won't see the savings until future years.

MS. ROBB agreed, and said that the large decrease in bed reduction comes in the second year, in FY18, because it takes a while to get the program ramped up and the reinvestments kick in, certainly some of the reforms will take a while to be seen downstream.

[1:20:20 PM](#)

CHAIR LEDOUX pointed to the chart and noted that it showed a total savings of \$150.5 million, and asked whether that amount was net.

MS. ROBB answered no, and explained that is the total savings over the five years and it is the gross savings.

CHAIR LEDOUX asked, if money is put into the reinvestment whether it comes out about equal over a five year period.

MS. ROBB responded that \$51 million net is expected in savings over the five years so the investment would be \$99.5 million, which are rough numbers as things come together.

[1:21:04 PM](#)

MS. ROBB advised there are three large pieces that OMB expects the reinvestment to be spent on. The largest piece of reinvestment would go to the Department of Corrections (DOC) to begin a pretrial program and money would go for additional treatment for inmates. She advised that the two remaining pieces of reinvestment are the community reinvestment portion, and one piece would go to the Council on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault for prevention programs and to work with victims. The third piece would be used primarily for reentry programs and

counseling for inmates once they are in the community. She said they are hopeful the reinvestment will be overseen by the Alaska Criminal Justice Commission and will receive reports each year tracking the data to be certain the plan is working as expected, and to also recommend adjustments as needed.

[1:22:50 PM](#)

MS. ROBB turned to the question of whether reinvestment will happen just once or every year, and said that both the savings and reinvestment money will be ongoing. She put forth that the savings will carry forward in the bed reduction and the reinvestment will be an ongoing investment to reduce recidivism and help people get into the community and be productive citizens after release.

MS. ROBB referred to the Alaska Criminal Justice Commission's report and noted a few small differences between that report and OMB. She said the commission had a ten year horizon and OMB looked at a five year horizon for savings because it felt more realistic and reasonable in the scope of where things stand now. The other difference is that when the commission talked about the savings and reduction in the number of prisoners, it was working from a model that shows the projected increase in the future of prisoners, and OMB felt it was important to go from the baseline where the state is now. Therefore, OMB did not include any reduction in future inmates and went from actual people currently incarcerated or awaiting trial and took reductions from there.

[1:24:17 PM](#)

MS. ROBB turned to page 3, and advised that it lays out the way the savings and costs play out. She asked the committee to look at the top table where the savings is shown and noted that all of these savings in the bed reduction are achieved through marginal cost savings. Each row represents one of the five fiscal years included here, and in moving across it depicts the reduction in prison beds by fiscal year. Again, she said that reflects the fact that the very large decrease in beds comes in the second year, in FY18. The next column shows the cumulative prison bed change and it reflects how many beds the state will have saved as the years go on, she said.

[1:25:05 PM](#)

CHAIR LEDOUX said she sees a reduction in prison beds in FY17 through FY19, and then an increase in FY20 and FY21.

MS. ROBB agreed, and noted it was because the report by the commission shows the projected increase in prisoners, and DOC can speak to the increases seen in prisoners over the past decade. She remarked that by FY20 and FY21 the impact of the reforms is outpaced by the increase in the prison population they would expect to see. She pointed out that the state will still have those 1,600 reduction in prisoners, "but at that point the population will start to increase again as we outpace the reforms."

CHAIR LEDOUX pointed out that it then appears the reforms are not working. She related that the whole purpose of this was so the state would end up with less prisoners, and she asked why she is seeing more prisoners in here.

MS. ROBB advised that she is from OMB and not the person from the commission, but the state is still down a great deal from where the state would have been in the absence of the reforms. Although, the impact of the reforms does wind up being overwhelmed by the projected growth. Therefore, this puts the state in a lower place that it would have been, but the reforms don't prevent the state from ever having another increase in the prison population, she explained.

[1:27:06 PM](#)

CHAIR LEDOUX said she understands that Ms. Robb is the numbers person, and possibly someone in the audience could assist.

REPRESENTATIVE CLAMAN asked whether part of it is that the expectation with the reforms that, although the sentences are shorter for non-violent offenders, the sentences have gotten longer for violent offenders. Therefore, at some point as the state changes the prison population with fewer non-violent offenders, the state is not letting out violent offenders and the violent offender sentences will eventually start appearing as the growth in prison bed use.

[1:27:49 PM](#)

MS. ROBB opined that he was on the right track, coupled with the fact that the population in the state is likely to continue to increase as well. Certainly, she said, there are people who

know all the ins and outs of the model and can provide all of the details.

MS. ROBB returned to the table at the top of page 3, pointed to the savings for FY17, and said it includes the cut to the DOC budget that was in the governor's budget. Thereby, bringing the total savings for FY17 in the DOC budget to \$12.7, with a savings for the reform package at that point because it is the first year of \$12.7 million.

[1:28:36 PM](#)

CHAIR LEDOUX said she is baffled as to why figures are included that are already in the governor's budget, when this bill has not passed.

MS. ROBB responded that she is not certain why the decision was made to include that except that it does represent the decrease in DOC's budget, and while it doesn't come from these reforms it is a decrease in their budget in FY17 relative to FY16.

CHAIR LEDOUX argued that it has nothing to do with this bill.

MS. ROBB agreed.

[1:29:22 PM](#)

MS. ROBB turned to the projected savings in FY18 and said they are \$20.8 million because in FY18 is when all of the reforms will have kicked in, and the largest decrease, approximately 1,400 beds, is seen that year. In FY19, most of the reforms will be implemented at that point and a reduction of 103 beds is expected, yielding a savings of \$3.1 million. Thereafter, the number of beds start to increase beginning in FY20 which leads to an increase of \$1.7 million, with a slightly larger bed increase in FY21 leading to a \$2.1 million increase. She pointed out that it gives the state a total gross savings of \$150.5 million over the five year period.

REPRESENTATIVE CLAMAN referred to the governor's cuts or savings built into this chart and asked whether OMB can get back to the committee with an analysis depicting just the savings related to this bill.

MS. ROBB said absolutely.

REPRESENTATIVE CLAMAN asked that it be before the end of the week when amendments are due.

MS. ROBB said OMB will get the analysis to the committee right away.

[1:31:04 PM](#)

MS. ROBB turned to the second table on page 3, and said the rows represent the fiscal years and reiterated there is an additional cost in FY17 related to computer related costs the Department of Corrections (DOC) can speak to.

CHAIR LEDOUX asked whether those computer issues are directly related to HB 205, or something in the governor's budget that would have to happen even if this bill did not pass.

MS. ROBB opined that they are directly related to this bill as it is an improvement in the time accounting due to time being accounted for differently, and it is also an improvement in the victim notification system.

[1:31:58 PM](#)

MS. ROBB explained that in subsequent years the cost incurred from this year would be \$10.8 million, and the reinvestment cost in FY18 would be \$11 million. She noted the expectation is that \$10 million would go to the Department of Corrections to be used for the pretrial program, expanding treatment options for inmates, and an additional \$1 million in FY18 for the community reinvestment for reentry and through CDVSA. She reiterated that in general terms for reinvestment the net savings over five years is \$51 million.

CHAIR LEDOUX asked whether the \$51 million is including the \$8 million that is part of the governor's current budget.

MS. ROBB answered that it does.

CHAIR LEDOUX confirmed that Ms. Robb will give the committee an analysis relating solely to HB 205.

MS. ROBB answered in the affirmative.

[1:33:47 PM](#)

APRIL WILKERSON, Director, Administrative Services Division, Department of Corrections, said the fiscal note in FY17 does reflect an increase to the Department of Corrections (DOC) budget of just over \$1.5 million, which is primarily associated with reinvestment items such as the pretrial services. In FY18, DOC anticipates an overall reduction of just over \$7.1 million being the largest year of savings associated with the fiscal note, and in FY19 there is a \$10.2 million reduction. She explained that the reductions to the department are primarily associated with the reduction in the prison population. Based upon the population projection anticipated through the sentencing changes and the earned good time credits, DOC does anticipate reducing overall population by just over 1,400 offenders, she said.

MS. WILKERSON referred to page 2 of the fiscal note and said that probation and parole also have incentive reductions allowable to the population and the legislation allows for incentive reductions and for individuals to be released early from probation and parole. Ms. Wilkerson pointed the committee to the middle of page 2, pretrial services, and said it has the largest impact. The department anticipates the following: assessments of approximately 32,000 individuals on an annual basis spread throughout the entire year; approximately 70 percent of those individuals would be placed into the pretrial program; and of those individuals 66 percent would be required to have some sort of supervision while released into the pretrial services program. She said that following the legislation in the bill, it would mimic the department's general probation caseload it currently experiences.

CHAIR LEDOUX asked what she meant by "mimic" the department's general probation caseload that it is doing right now.

MS. WILKERSON answered that the legislation allows for home visits, UA testing, searches of not only the person themselves, their home, their vehicles; and continual supervision while those individuals are released to pretrial services.

[1:38:29 PM](#)

CHAIR LEDOUX noted that Ms. Wilkerson said it mimics what the department is doing.

MS. WILKERSON explained that currently on the felony probation, that is part of what the DOC probation and parole officers do because they supervise individuals post-sentence in the

community. Therefore, when the department identified pretrial and looked at the legislation and the authority to arrest, authority to carry a gun, authority to remand immediately, the searches, and the home visits, the department based its pretrial assumptions on what the department's officers are doing post-sentence.

REPRESENTATIVE MILLETT said they are modeling pretrial after what the department does for probation.

CHAIR LEDOUX surmised that currently most people are unable to post bail, and under this bill there is a system that will not pay much attention to the bail amount. Although, depending upon the crime and background of the person charge almost everyone will end up with pretrial oversight. She asked whether she was correct.

MS. WILKERSON answered that that is the assumption the department used.

CHAIR LEDOUX asked whether there will be bail at all.

MS. WILKERSON opined that there are some crimes that would continue to require a bail, but she deferred to the Department of Law and the Alaska Court System.

CHAIR LEDOUX noted there was a representative of one of the above entities in the audience.

[1:41:06 PM](#)

MS. WILKERSON advised that the pretrial services is spread out over two years. The department is asking for one-third of the pretrial to get ramped up and established, and then the department would be asking for the full amount of the pretrial funding and positions in the second year. Overall, she said, the total is 125 positions and just over \$15 million combined for the two years. The department, as it starts the pretrial services, would be looking for efficiencies and effective ways to reduce the second year anticipated amount.

MS. WILKERSON turned to the bottom of page 3, Board of Parole, and said the department is requesting funding for the Board of Parole in that the legislation allows for an administrative parole that does not require a hearing so individuals meeting the conditions and criteria would be automatically released to administrative parole which would definitely increase the number

of individuals released out on parole into the community. In addition, she pointed out, the legislation also sets limitations on how long a person on parole who violates can spend in jail and, currently, there are 120 days before they are required to have a hearing and this legislation reduces that to 30 days. The department does anticipate an increased number of hearings that would be necessary. The overall with the Board of Parole is an increase to their budget of \$775 thousand, and five positions along with that, she said.

[1:43:04 PM](#)

CHAIR LEDOUX asked whether she said \$775 thousand because the fiscal note read \$750 thousand.

MS. WILKERSON pointed to page 3 under Board of Parole, and explained that \$750 thousand represents the changes in the Victim Information Notification System (VINE), and on page 4 of the fiscal note it completes the rest of the necessary items needed for the Board of Parole. She turned to the bottom of page 4, and noted there is also language for the community residential centers (CRC) to require cognitive substance abuse and behavioral disorder treatment programs to individuals held in CRCs. The department anticipates that approximately \$2 million is delayed until 2018, she explained.

CHAIR LEDOUX asked why it is delayed until 2018.

MS. WILKERSON responded that within the language that section has an effective date of July 1, 2017, which would be for FY18.

[1:44:39 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE CLAMAN referred to prior testimony that one of the costs of the \$1.5 million investment is for computers, and asked how much of that is related to pretrial services and evaluating people, and how much is caused by an increasingly complicated time accounting system.

MS. WILKERSON replied that the funding is specific and only toward the adjustments needed in the time accounting system, and VINE. There is \$1.5 million set aside to rewrite to accommodate those changes associated with this legislation, she said.

REPRESENTATIVE CLAMAN asked Ms. Wilkerson to differentiate between the time accounting costs versus VINE because with the

state's increasingly complicated time accounting it causes him to believe this legislature should try to make it simpler.

MS. WILKERSON responded that currently the department budgeted, in the fiscal note, \$750 thousand for each system and the department will do its best in-house because it has analysts and programmers to help rewrite, and opined that the time accounting would require outsourcing to a contractor. She reiterated that the department has that set aside, equivalent amounts, with the intent to ensure within those parameters.

[1:46:49 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE MILLETT surmised that the \$1.5 million is for programming because the system is being changed for calculating time served, but the corrections officers that are calculating time are still the same people and it is simply modifying the computer to account for time differently.

MS. WILKERSON agreed.

REPRESENTATIVE MILLETT opined that other states have done this recalculation and there are computer programs out there that DOC is looking at of which it may be able to model after, but DOC would still need contractors to implement.

MS. WILKERSON agreed.

CHAIR LEDOUX offered concern as to whether the legislature may have underestimated the amounts spent for computer services because both the state and the Municipality of Anchorage have had some horrible problems with doing things that would seem relatively simple.

[1:48:28 PM](#)

LAUREE MORTON, Executive Director, Council on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault (CDVSA), experienced difficulty with the operation of the presentation.

[1:49:34 PM](#)

The committee took a brief at ease.

[1:50:03 PM](#)

MS. MORTON discussed prevention and how people can change their behavior. With regard to primary prevention, an effective way is to not solely look at the individual or the community but to try to provide a comprehensive message across several different groups of folks, which is call the "Social Ecology." She then discussed having things to address the individual, influencers, community and society to better prevent violence. She said in 2003, Alaska was awarded a Domestic Violence Prevention Enhancement and Leadership Through Alliances (DELTA) grant from the Center for Disease Control (CDC). Four communities deployed that particular way of preventing violence. Subsequently, the CDC performed a study that indicated there is a tipping point in Alaska, page 2. The first year the communities are getting started, building awareness, and when entering years 3-5 more than one program is implemented and people are taking action and things are moving. She then pointed to year eight regarding comprehensive prevention programming and noted that an impact is beginning and a difference is being made. Ms. Morton advised that the CDVSA does not yet have a fiscal note, but the Office of Management & Budget (OMB) testified that \$5 million may be available to the Department of Health and Social Services (DHSS), and to CDVSA for reinvestment. She commented that if CDVSA was to receive \$2.5 million (page 3) it would look like the figures on page 3. Ms. Morton [turned to page 4, "Expanding Existing Programs] and advised that the four programs were Anchorage, Homer, Juneau, and Sitka communities where over the last five years the CDVSA specifically focused and intentionally provided expanded service where they looked at all of the different elements of the social ecology [page 1].

[1:56:01 PM](#)

CHAIR LEDOUX asked her explain what they looked at.

MS. MORTON responded that the four communities looked at the social ecology, such as the individual, community, and society, and how they can all work together, rather than choosing only one thing. For example, Anchorage has declared itself to be a "Green Dot" community and that affects not only the individual's decision but family, community, and social media. Ms. Morton said that what they would like to do with that kind of focused community prevention would be to expand into communities as they are ready for the more focused attention (page 5). A statewide program is Green Dot, and the Council on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault (CDVSA) would like to strengthen training bureaus and add five regional training centers or communities each year.

The left side of the slide depicts existing communities that have Green Dot programs currently available, she said.

[Ms. Morton played a Green Dot public service announcement that is played for middle schools, 1:57 through 1.58.]

[1:58:36 PM](#)

MS. MORTON related there are Green Dot programs for middle schools, communities, and in other organizations, and said they provide different ways to bring it together and expand programs. She noted that the money is well spent in that the communities are conscientious about how they deploy the materials and advantages, (page 6). She said that CDVSA would want to expand the prevention program with "Girls on the Run," "Coaching Boys Into Men," and "COMPASS: [A Guide for Men]" because these programs currently have a stronghold in Alaska wherein the effectiveness has been noted with increasing resiliency and protective factors in young people. These programs help them build ways to decrease tolerance for violence and increase their appreciation and understanding of what it means to be non-violent in relationships, and how to work peacefully together. She explained that CDVSA does not directly fund the 4th R Class program for 9th graders in schools around the nation, but it has been shown to be an effective method for reducing tolerance to violence, increasing awareness of abusive behaviors, and decreasing acceptance of sexual violence in Alaska. A study showed that children with more adverse experiences better profited by going through the 4th R Class program and is one of the tools that will better equipment them as they move into adulthood, she said.

[2:01:58 PM](#)

CHAIR LEDOUX referred to her testimony that programs have reduced tolerance to violence, increased resilience, and so forth, and asked her to explain how these programs have actually reduced violence.

[2:02:18 PM](#)

MS. MORTON responded that the example of a reduced tolerance for violence is teens in dating situations making choices not to carry forward on threats of violence, coercive sexual activity, and actually hitting their partner. She related that it is difficult to prove a negative but those are the actions that have been diminished as a result of going through this program.

Another way of seeing a difference is through the Youth Risk Behavioral Survey (YRBS) which goes directly to students, young men and women, who are asked questions about violent behavior or sexual violence they have experienced and being able to look at that and at the 4th R Class evaluation to see those reductions and tie that in. She asked Chair LeDoux if that answered her question.

CHAIR LEDOUX referred to the expanding existing programs in the four communities previously mentioned, and asked whether the CDVSA has seen a reduction in domestic or dating violence.

MS. MORTON answered that CDVSA performed a peer reviewed evaluation on the 4th R Class program, and the results are statistically significant. She referred to the Alaska Victimization Survey, discussed in a previous meeting, which is definitely an institutionally reviewed board approved instrument that showed an overall decrease in both sexual and intimate partner violence over the past five years. A possibility behind the results is that the respondents being 18 years and older and coming of age may have been able to build on those protective factors and their resiliencies. She put forth that there are good indicators and with funding of a 2020 survey it is hopeful there will be a definitive answer for Chair LeDoux's question.

[2:05:41 PM](#)

CHAIR LEDOUX asked whether there are any statistics showing that. For example, she offered a small community such as Sitka, [statistics showing] that domestic or sexual violence has decreased in the past five years, or increased.

MS. MORTON explained that the 2011 statewide Victimization Survey included Anchorage, Fairbanks, and Juneau, and in 2016 they would like to survey those three regions again to look back and hopefully see the similar difference that was seen at the state level. There are indicators, she related, but nothing that shows it works.

[2:07:20 PM](#)

MS. MORTON advised that in expanding existing [prevention] programs, much of the work in prevention has to with reaching young people, as young as possible. Reaching them in ways where they are able to build resiliency factors to form their normative way of behaving that is separate from the violence that seems to permeate everywhere (page 7), she explained.

Methods they would like to expand are within programs such as, "Talk Now, Talk Often," wherein parents can have a question/answer conversation time with teens about these difficult subjects. She referred to the current set of "Talk Now, Talk Often" and offered that CDVSA would like to move into a second set beginning with some general questions and moving on into deeper and deeper questions. She referred to "When I am an Elder" and explained that there are public service announcements with younger people from K-8th grade in outlying communities talking about how they want their world to be a world without violence when they are elders so as they grow up they can change their world. "Lead On for Peace and Equality" is a statewide conference that is led by students and adult supported wherein over 100 high schoolers a year apply to attend and talk for three days on what it means to be a leader in their community for peace, ending domestic violence and sexual assault. When they return to their communities they apply for mini-grants of \$2,500 - \$5,000 to carry on efforts that they put together during that time to work on their community and develop methods wherein the community stands up together and says no to domestic violence and sexual assault. The Council on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault (CDVSA) would like to increase the mini-grants, increasing "When I am an Elder" opportunities, and develop the subsequent set of cards to which she previously referred, she offered.

[Ms. Morton played a public service announcement 2:10 through 2:11.]

2:11:00 PM

MS. MORTON explained that CDVSA would like to continue peer-to-peer support from community to community and, currently, 19 communities have put together teams for prevention specifically for all different walks of life in their community. The CDVSA provides technical assistance and follow up support as they implement their plans, looking at different strategies such as what makes sense for them in their own communities within different organizations, and how to put that together to end domestic violence and sexual assault, she explained.

2:12:18 PM

MS. MORTON discussed the importance of investing money into evaluation and research to determine whether something is working (page 9). This would include the following: engaging evaluators to assist communities in strengthening their own

efforts; the Alaska Victimization Survey a Knowledge, Attitude and Belief Survey, and then resurvey to determine whether the attitudes have changed. She then listed and explained CDVSA's victims' services and creating and expanding further partnerships (page 10). She referred to the Victim Services Report, prepared from the roundtables and interviews as part of the Alaska Criminal Justice Commission report. The report suggested providing services for victims in rural and remote areas, and how to provide forensic exams locally rather than victims flying to a regional hub for their exam, she said.

[2:16:58 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE CLAMAN surmised that the expectation of the reinvestment is that the CVDSA will have some increased programmatic presence in these efforts, and yet the current budget proposal is cutting one position from the CDVSA staff. He asked whether the reinvestment is helping the state if the legislature takes away a position this year with the expectation that the reinvestment money will be there to keep that position.

MS. MORTON clarified that the CDVSA budget and operating budget in both bodies reduces the CDVSA staffing by three positions. She explained that one position was left vacant this year, a person is retiring in another position, and one position would be an actual person released July 1. She explained that including the reinvestment dollars, and with the focus on prevention and expanding victims' services she could put a position back because it is necessary to have one more person to fully implement everything.

REPRESENTATIVE CLAMAN asked whether that is the person being released on July 1, or whether it is a different position with a different job description.

MS. MORTON responded that it would be someone in the place of the person retiring in June.

[2:19:13 PM](#)

CHAIR LEDOUX asked how much of the reinvestment money will go to prevention, and how much toward victims' services.

MS. MORTON responded that it depends upon how the legislature and the governor divide the \$5 million. She said she had provided a scenario to the committee that the Council on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault (CDVSA) would receive \$2.5

million, but she does not know whether that has been decided. She estimated that CDVSA would likely put more money toward prevention than victims' services. Even if CDVSA put the entire \$2.5 million toward prevention it would not get the state to where it was in 2015; therefore, CDVSA would more heavily focus on prevention. She opined that is the intention of reinvestment, to make a concerted effort to help communities change lives, change norms, and CDSVA does not want to reduce victims' service efforts because it is just as critical to keep people safe now as it is to prevent new victims.

CHAIR LEDOUX related that victims' services seems separate, actually, than what HB 205 is all about.

MS. MORTON responded there was a specific reinvestment priority from the commission, and the victims' services report had to do with victims' services in terms of safe homes, engaging elders, and the forensic exams. She said CDVSA followed the recommendations in that part of the report.

[2:21:57 PM](#)

BRENDA STANFILL, Commissioner, Alaska Justice Commission, said that in working for many years with victims and not seeing progress she was excited when the Victimization Survey came out specifying that between 2010 and 2015 of every 100 women 12 were victimized in 2010; in 2015 for every 100 women only 8 were victimized. She opined that the change was due to prevention and being out in the communities talking about it. She referred to reinvestment and related that the state grew the offenders in communities and that the state has to own that because people are not born [offenders]. She referred to pretrial and noted that in performing risk assessments, the state can determine whether it is letting safe people out of jail or scary people. Another part of reinvestment is community treatment because if a person is stealing for drugs, they are an offender and a victim of drugs and are marginalized. Currently, if someone wants treatment they have to go on a waiting list and treatment must be available for them. She referred to the word "savings" and said she is hopeful that at some point all of the reinvestment savings will be reinvested.

[2:26:39 PM](#)

MS. STANFILL said she is also hopeful that next year the legislature will look at batterer's intervention programs and what to do with people being violent. The legislature has been

tremendously underfunding, such that \$200,000 going to batterer's intervention programs is going away this year. She offered that next year research could be undertaken to bring back evidence based data, continuing to focus on sexual offender treatment or containment, and looking at way ways to possibly keep communities safe.

[2:27:16 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE MILLETT asked her to explain the process of the commission, who participated, who was invited, and how victims are being served because there has been testimony from organizations unhappy with this legislation and that some of their reasons are valid.

MS. STANFILL responded that the commission's first meeting was approximately two years ago and it set out a process to move forward. She noted that it was made clear at the beginning of the process is that while there were 13 commissioners it would be an interactive process with many people. For instance, she related, the Department of Health and Social Services (DHSS) was not a commission member and it is a large piece and the commission invited DHSS and as many people as it could find. A comprehensive list was created to send emails to the people each commissioner represented, to get their names on the list, and to be certain they were noticed. Information was listed on the commission's web page, a tremendous amount of information was listed in newspapers. During each meeting there were approximately 30-35 participants and observers and often there was dialogue between the commission and the audience members with questions being thrown out to the audience. She said there was always a public comment time but usually by the time the commission got to the public comment segment, the public had commented numerous times because it wasn't that kind of meeting. In terms of participation she said she has heard some groups say they were not invited or at the table. She pointed out that this committee would have to ask the groups why they weren't there because the commission was transparent with its process.

[2:30:38 PM](#)

MS. STANFILL advised that the PEW Charitable Trust data was shared in open meetings and the information is also on the commission's web page. She discussed the emotional impact upon a victim when this legislation reduces penalties and opined that the commission tried to reduce penalties in the areas of secondary issues being the catalyst for the crime. The intent

here is not to say that crimes against persons will be a slap on the wrist, but rather if the reason a person is breaking windows is to get warm, or the offense is due to an addiction, or another issue, that it can be addressed through treatment. She discussed the roundtable discussions regarding victims, and said there was no intent to leave anyone out or that voices were not heard.

[2:33:57 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE MILLETT said the bill is not about cost savings, it is about changing a growing pattern that is driving communities to a place where people feel unsafe in their homes, or are having their property stolen from them. The intent is to invest in Alaskans who, ultimately, will get out of jail someday, and she noted her struggle in weighing the human expense against people that are victims of horrible crimes. There are recent instances that cause her to question whether this legislation is the right thing to do in that she can look at statistics and data, but the human element to this bill is something the legislature and public will struggle with. She asked Ms. Stanfill to explain how she communicates to the people distrusting of the bill to bring them comfort and put their minds at ease that the legislation will lead to better outcomes for Alaskans.

[2:36:02 PM](#)

MS. STANFILL responded that she does not know that she has been fully effective in making sure everyone felt comfortable while speaking with them. She opined there are definitely folks who say the legislation is not the right thing to do, the human element of it. A question she has continued to ask people is, if the state keeps someone in jail 30 or 45 days, the 15 days is really expensive, what exactly is the state getting for the 15 days. She said she learned through the commission that there is not that much difference between penalizing someone this amount of time versus that amount of time, it's about what happens in between that makes a difference. Therefore, if the state is keeping someone in jail 45 days and doing nothing to address the issue while inmates take naps, read magazines, lift weights, what the state is getting for the 35 days, she asked, and what could the state receive if offenders were on electronic monitoring with a requirement to stay sober within their community and attend outpatient treatment. Currently, while in jail there is no requirement to do any kind of programming or treatment so it could be that 45 days later they get out exactly

the same way they went in. She then discussed her prior view and experiences as a victims' advocate. She said she tries to think logically as to what the state gets out of the jail time, and to her they get public safety and that the reason they are in jail should be because the public is afraid of them. She pointed out that inmates will be released at some point in time and if there is someone who safely cannot be in a community without doing further damage, those are the people that should be in jail with long sentences. She described property crime as a routine crime and she questioned whether the public wants the person in jail for 45 days or rather to receive \$550 back for whatever was stolen. She suggested looking into how to get restitution back to victims which is money well spent, and also restorative justice with the person being involved in community services rather than just sitting in jail with their meals cooked and watching television. Although, she related, from a victims' advocate the change is scary.

[2:40:13 PM](#)

CHAIR LEDOUX inquired as to whether there is anything in the bill that strengthens restitution.

MS. STANFILL answered no; however, laws are currently written that strengthens restitution and the state just hasn't done it yet. In terms of the PFD garnishment and child support, victim restitution is second on the list of priority. Although, currently the PFD is deferred to the Department of Corrections (DOC) and possibly with the commission's work next year it could figure out a way to shift a portion to the victim.

[2:41:09 PM](#)

CHAIR LEDOUX asked whether a portion of the offender's salary could go directly to the person they've harmed.

MS. STANFILL advised that when a person has a parole officer there is a requirement that their actions include paying restitution and fines. She pointed out that it is not as easy with a civil judgment to obtain the money from an employee's workplace.

CHAIR LEDOUX expressed that that forces the victim to obtain the civil judgment. She suggested that on the part of business to include a provision wherein the victim receives what they lost. She noted that they might not be so convinced that the state needs to keep the felony level at \$750 because if a person has

been ripped off it is hard to forgive until they are whole again.

REPRESENTATIVE MILLETT suggested that is something this committee could review when it comes to the PFD reimbursement because, currently, the state is the first priority and possibly it could be shared with victims in a 50-50 percent manner.

CHAIR LEDOUX said she agrees, and asked Ms. Stanfill how she responds to people such as Ms. Dusenbury who lost a loved one. She further asked that shouldn't someone who has killed someone, even if it is not premeditated, shouldn't there be some jail time, isn't there something to be said about community opprobrium.

[2:44:11 PM](#)

MS. STANFILL deferred to the judges in determining their recommendation as to how to balance the community condemnation with the rehabilitation of the offender. She opined that the area of the bill Chair LeDoux referred to is involuntary manslaughter, and related that there was an accident in Fairbanks wherein a young woman died. The family said they did not believe the person needed to go to jail because they were a member of the community who made a terrible mistake and going to jail would change everything for this person's life. Although, she stated, there have been other situations where the family absolutely wanted this person to go to jail so it depends upon the circumstance and the family. Consideration must be made for what happened and whether that is the right thing to do. She said she has been thinking about Ms. Dusenbury and the right response in that situation, and that there will always be the one case where they question whether they did the right thing or not, and on this case she doesn't know.

[2:46:18 PM](#)

MS. STANFILL, in response to Representative Claman, confirmed that she was selected for the commission as an advocate for victims' rights.

REPRESENTATIVE CLAMAN referred to the list of victims' rights advocates attending the two roundtables and he listed the names of some of the advocates. He opined that within of all the victims' rights groups, only one has objected to this legislation and asked whether more groups are in opposition.

MS. STANFILL advised that she was only aware of the Office of Victims' Rights.

REPRESENTATIVE MILLETT interjected that Victims for Justice are opposed unless the reinvestment piece is included within the legislation.

REPRESENTATIVE CLAMAN reiterated that only the Office of Victims' Rights out of 15-20 groups participating in the process all but one supports what the commission and legislature is trying to do.

MS. STANFILL stated that is her understanding; however, all of the groups have indicated they support the bill with reinvestment, and do not support the bill if reinvestment isn't included. She related that she heard the testifier for the Office of Victims' Right state that if reinvestment is introduced to revisit them as they may have a different opinion. She then reiterated what other members of the committee have stated, that the reinvestment piece is coming.

[2:49:07 PM](#)

CHAIR LEDOUX advised that J.D. Alex flew to Juneau to testify and asked him to come forward.

[2:50:06 PM](#)

JOSHUA "J.D." ALEX, said he is 36 years old, an Athabaskan, he is currently being groomed to be on the Eklutna Board in Anchorage, and he is representing himself. He said he is president of a non-profit corporation that is in the process of determining its goals. Mr. Alex offered his testimony as follow:

In the past, to where I am now, it starts off I've spent 25 months in prison. I have five DUIs. I'm a two-time felon. My driver's license is lost for life, there's no set way of getting it back. Right now, after ten years which is life in Alaska, I just ask a lawyer or a judge, "Can I get my license back?" And it's either a yes or no, there's no hoops to jump through right now. So, I could just be drive-less for the remainder of my life. I've never harmed anybody in all my time, I've never had any accidents, thank God, you know. So, currently, I am a carpenter and a millwright with the union, Local #1281, I've been

sober for six years - right after I got out of prison. I've built and assembled gas turbines for the Chugiak Power Plant in Anchorage. I've worked in Sitka with the Blue Lake Dam of hydro-turbines and I've worked at Eklutna, built diesel engines for providing power to communities. And up to now I've also worked really hard and I am a landlord, I own a four-plex. I have - - I also provide homes for low income people for, you know, a place to live. And I pay my property taxes, of course. ... So the only way I could get to this point was networking. I would have to talk, be face-to-face with individuals and show them my genuism [sic] of how I've come this far and what I want to do with my life, you know. And it's really hard, what I've done to get here, especially because I'm a bicycler, I use public transportation, you know. I -- I use family and friends, I -- I try to grab any help I can get, you know. And it's getting harder as you get older, you know, your body wears down, so.

[2:53:31 PM](#)

Now, what helped me get to this point is while I was in prison there was this treatment program called RSAT CTC, Residential Substance Abuse Treatment/Cognitive Therapeutic Community. It was for a year and what it was is you had 30 or so inmates and they were your peers and they held you accountable for every behavior that they seen. Also I've listened to David Stern Show and I've heard more of the RSAT brothers, I call them, from prior years before my generation. So, I know that there are more out there doing good besides the handful of brothers that I know.

My belief is, on this HB 205, it is a step in the right direction, it really is. We need structure, we do. ... And some of the examples I can think in my head to do is, maybe in the halfway house like aptitude testing, see what people in the halfway house are -- like to do and stuff, kind of like a re-schooling of sorts. Incentive programs of some sorts, you know, encourages, you know, more hoops to jump through and if you can jump through these hoops you get rewarded, or something, you know. ... I believe length of time in jail encourages only more criminal thinking without treatment. And believe me, the punishment should fit the crime, especially for

Madison and she's been a victim of the whole situation. I do believe that she should have gotten more time, you know, but. So, and also in early March I listened to a hearing that we -- was with the Judiciary Committee, I think or Finance. ... It was how to reduce the criminal process recidivism, you know, and there was a state or study outside in the lower 48's that were doing something that would drastically reduce the burdens upon society that criminals would, you know, affect, right? I think a -- we should really follow up on this because there's all --- there's -- there's got to be a way to fix this. ... I mean, and if all the burdens could be gone and become -- and we become successful pro-social members of society is possible, it is. ... In my particular situation of this house bill because it is so complex and I did try to read through it all, which is immense. ... My personal situation there's an amendment I would like to see, you know, it's -- of course it's for the driver's license. It's -- the driver's license revocation. I would like to see it made retroactive because even if this bill passes it still doesn't affect me. I'm here just for future people right now. ... Like I said, after ten years I -- all I do is ask the questions, it's either yea or nay. There's no hoops to jump through, there's nothing I can do to, you know, get -- I can pay more money into society or whatever, just you know, there's nothing I could do, so. And my last thoughts, it's going to be tough, it is, I mean we are groomed to be how we are and we can't change how we are after a lifetime, like 10-15 years of being brought up, in 30-45 days. I'm sorry to say, but it's true, you know. We need our leaders, our legislation to work hard to continue just to be -- have a lot of tenacity, you know. I fought my way to get here after seven years, you know. I just -- invest in it, you know. We just need our legislation to provide resources for the structure. ... You know, many tumble and we lose our way but it doesn't mean that we -- we're lost forever, it doesn't, it really doesn't. Sometimes we all need a little help. In the Christian sense of the way, on Easter, help us resurrect ourselves back to life, you know. And, if you're not a Christian think of the phoenix, you know, and if I can turn my life around I'm sure anybody else can. And if there's any more --

if there's any question I would be happy to answer them.

2:59:20 PM

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER referred to RSAT and asked whether it is a residential program for substance abuse.

MR. ALEX responded that it is Residential Substance Abuse Treatment/Cognitive Therapeutic Community.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER asked whether the program is Alaska based.

MR. ALEX opined no, although there were other models in the states. He added that the RSAT program stopped one or two years after his release.

3:00:12 PM

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER explained that he asked the question because the legislature has difficulty in determining how to spend money and the problem is that it doesn't know how to measure success on reinvestment. He opined that RSAT is based on standards put out by the U.S. Justice Commission, but he wasn't sure. He pointed out that the committee has a lot of work to do with the people responsible for developing and adopting risk assessment tools, what kind of treatment programs will bring real results, and decide how to measure the results. In general terms, he said he wanted to say a positive about the commission's willingness and effort to go there and vouched for its sincere effort to make reinvestment. He then remarked that the legislature will not be able to answer all of the reinvestment questions on the frontend.

3:02:06 PM

MR. ALEX referred to previous testimony wherein it was stated that after three years there would be an increase in the [prison] population because more people would be going in than being released, even after the reduction. He opined that if the state does reinvest and works hard to find the right tools to help, it may take a little longer but those numbers will go down because the more structure the state can offer people the better they will be. Treatment for [this generation could be the foundation for the next generation, thereby, allowing healthy] peers growing up and in the long run society, as a whole, will get better. He acknowledged that initially it will be a

struggle, it will probably take longer than projected, and it will turn out for the better.

[3:03:33 PM](#)

CHAIR LEDOUX related that she appreciated Mr. Alex's appearance because it is one thing to hear statistics, and another thing to hear someone's personal story. She expressed admiration for Mr. Alex in getting his life together.

REPRESENTATIVE CLAMAN related that he would like more information regarding the current restitution statute and how it is enforced.

[3:04:45 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER related that restitution is an important question to him and he asked that the committee dedicate time to this issue beyond this meeting rather than doing it off the cuff.

CHAIR LEDOUX agreed.

[HB 205 was held over.]

[3:06:25 PM](#)

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business before the committee, the House Judiciary Standing Committee meeting was adjourned at 3:06 p.m.