

SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE

April 11, 2017

1:45 p.m.

1:45:31 PM

CALL TO ORDER

Co-Chair MacKinnon called the Senate Finance Committee meeting to order at 1:45 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Senator Lyman Hoffman, Co-Chair
Senator Anna MacKinnon, Co-Chair
Senator Click Bishop, Vice-Chair
Senator Mike Dunleavy
Senator Peter Micciche
Senator Donny Olson
Senator Natasha von Imhof

MEMBERS ABSENT

None

ALSO PRESENT

Juli Lucky, Staff, Senator Anna MacKinnon; Juliana Melin, Staff, Senator Mia Costello; Pete Fellman, Staff, Senator Click Bishop; Sara Race, Director, Permanent Fund Dividend Division, Department of Revenue; Shareen Crosby, Staff, Senator Natasha von Imhof; Kris Curtis, Auditor, Division of Legislative Audit; Janey Hovenden, Director, Division of Corporations, Business and Professional Licensing, Department of Commerce, Community and Economic Development; Dr. Rachel Bergartt, Board of Veterinary Examiners, Juneau.

PRESENT VIA TELECONFERENCE

Brian Berube, Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium, Anchorage; Pamela Sanash, Self, Nenana; Lea McKenzie, Self, Sutton; Romaine Kobilsek, Spay Arkansas, Arkansas.

SUMMARY

SB 45 EXEMPTION: LICENSING OF CONTRACTORS

CSSB 45(FIN) was REPORTED out of committee with a "do pass" recommendation and with one previously published zero fiscal note: FN1(CED).

SB 51 EXTEND BOARD OF VETERINARY EXAMINERS

SB 51 was HEARD and HELD in committee for further consideration.

SB 78 PERM FUND DIVIDEND CONTRIBUTIONS/LOTTERY

SB 78 was HEARD and HELD in committee for further consideration.

HB 48 ARCHITECTS, ENGINEERS, SURVEYORS: EXTEND Mr. Dale

HB 48 was REPORTED out of committee with a "do pass" recommendation and with one previously published fiscal impact note: FN1(CED).

Co-Chair MacKinnon discussed housekeeping. She relayed that SB 51 related only to the board extension and did not include changes to the board.

#hb48

HOUSE BILL NO. 48

"An Act relating to the composition of the State Board of Registration for Architects, Engineers, and Land Surveyors; extending the termination date of the State Board of Registration for Architects, Engineers, and Land Surveyors; and providing for an effective date."

1:46:34 PM

Co-Chair MacKinnon relayed that the public hearing for HB 48 had been held on April 1, 2017. She related that her office had received no amendments to the legislation. Staff to the bill sponsor was available in the audience for questions.

1:47:31 PM

Vice-Chair Bishop MOVED to report HB 48 out of Committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying fiscal note. There being NO OBJECTION, it was so ordered.

HB 48 was REPORTED out of committee with a "do pass" recommendation and with one previously published fiscal impact note: FN1 (CED).

1:48:29 PM

AT EASE

1:50:05 PM

RECONVENED

#sb45

SENATE BILL NO. 45

"An Act relating to an exemption from the regulation of construction contractors."

1:50:10 PM

Co-Chair MacKinnon informed the committee that public testimony had been taken on SB 45 on April 7, 2017.

Vice-Chair Bishop MOVED to ADOPT proposed committee substitute for SB 45, Work Draft 30-LS0321\0 (Bruce, 4/10/17).

Co-Chair MacKinnon OBJECTED for discussion.

JULI LUCKY, STAFF, SENATOR ANNA MACKINNON, directed committee attention to Page 3, lines 8 through 11 and explained changes (copy on file):

Moved the language defining when construction begins from section 4 (uncodified law) to section 3, so it will appear in AS 08.18.161 with the rest of the exemption language.

Ms. Lucky explained that the change would make it easier for the public to look up, and obey, the law.

1:51:46 PM

JULIANA MELIN, STAFF, SENATOR MIA COSTELLO, expressed the sponsor's support for the change.

Co-Chair MacKinnon WITHDREW her OBJECTION. There being NO OBJECTION, it was so ordered.

[1:52:45 PM](#)

Vice-Chair Bishop MOVED to report CSSB 45(FIN) out of Committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying fiscal note. There being NO OBJECTION, it was so ordered.

CSSB 45(FIN) was REPORTED out of committee with a "do pass" recommendation and with one previously published zero fiscal note: FN1(CED).

[1:53:18 PM](#)

AT EASE

[1:55:52 PM](#)

RECONVENED

#sb78

SENATE BILL NO. 78

"An Act creating the education endowment fund and the dividend lottery fund; authorizing contributions from the permanent fund dividend to the dividend lottery fund; relating to transfers from the dividend lottery fund and the education endowment fund; relating to the definition of 'gambling'; and providing for an effective date."

[1:55:59 PM](#)

Vice-Chair Bishop MOVED to ADOPT proposed committee substitute for SB 78, Work Draft 30-LS0534\M (Martin, 4/5/17).

Co-Chair MacKinnon OBJECTED for discussion.

Co-Chair MacKinnon noted that the public hearing on the bill had been held on April 7, 2017.

[1:56:44 PM](#)

PETE FELLMAN, STAFF, SENATOR CLICK BISHOP, shared that people had been uncomfortable with the word "lottery" being used in the legislation. He said that the word "raffle" had been chosen as a replacement because the bill was akin to a bucket raffle. He stated that throughout the bill the descriptions for "contributions" and "donations" had been

clarified to indicate that the donations would be used for a specific purpose. He added that some language had been changed from "may to "shall" because it would clarify that the commissioner would use the donations for the programs that the bill created. He referred to the document, "Changes Proposed by Finance CS-Version 30-LS0534\M to CSSB78(EDC) (copy on file):

Proposed Finance CS would change all references from "lottery" to "raffle" and it will change all references from "contributions" to "donations" it also changes the "may" to "shall"

Bill Title

Page 1, line 1: Delete "lottery" Insert "raffle"
Page 1, line 2: Delete "contributions" Insert "donations"
Page 1, line 2: Insert "for educational"
Page 1, line 3: Insert "purposes and to enter the permanent fund dividend raffle"
Page 1, line 3: Delete "lottery fund" Insert "raffle"
Page 1 line 4: Delete "lottery" Insert "raffle"

***Section 1. AS 11.66.280(3) is amended to read.**

Page 2 line 19: Delete "drawing" Insert "raffle"

***Section 2. AS 43.23.063. Education endowment fund.**

Page 2 line 25: Delete "contributions" Insert "donations"
Page 3 line 18: Delete "lottery" Insert "raffle"
Page 3 line 19: Delete "contributions" Insert "donations" Delete "lottery" Insert "raffle"
Page 3 line 20: Delete "lottery" Insert "raffle"
Page 3 line 22: Delete "may" Insert "shall"
Page 3 line 23: Delete "contributions" Insert "donations"
Page 3 line 24: Delete "may" Insert "shall" Delete "lottery" insert "raffle"
Page 3 line 28: Delete "lottery" Insert "raffle"
Page 3 line 31: Delete "contributed" Insert "donated"
Page 4 line 4/5 Delete "contributed" Insert "donated for educational purposes and to enter the permanent fund dividend raffle"
Page 4 line 5: Delete "contributions" Insert "donations"

Page 4 line 8: Delete "contributions" Insert "donations"

Page 4 line 9: Delete "may" Insert "shall"

Page 4 line 10: Insert "shall appropriate"

Page 4 line 11: Delete "lottery" Insert "raffle"
Delete "may" Insert "shall"

Page 4 line 12: Delete "contributions" Insert "donations"

Page 4 line 13: Delete "Nothing in this section created a dedicated fund"

Page 4 line 15: Delete "lottery" Insert "raffle"

Page 4 line 15, 16: Delete "contribution to the fund" Insert "donation as provided in (b) of this section"

Page 4 line 17: Delete "drawing" Insert "raffle"

Page 4 line 19, 21, 23, 25: Delete "lottery" Insert "raffle"

Page 4 line 26: Insert "Nothing in this section creates a dedicated fund."

***Section 3.** This act takes effect January 1, 2018

[1:59:02 PM](#)

Co-Chair MacKinnon asked about Page 4, line 9; and queried the purpose of changing the word "may" to "shall."

Mr. Fellman explained that the language change was meant to specify that the money would be used exclusively for education.

[1:59:58 PM](#)

Co-Chair MacKinnon WITHDREW her OBJECTION. There being NO OBJECTION, it was so ordered.

Senator Micciche wondered whether an individual could write-off \$75 dollars as a donation to the Public Education Fund and the Education Endowment, while the \$25 to the raffle fund would be non-deductible.

Mr. Fellman answered in the affirmative.

[2:00:58 PM](#)

Co-Chair MacKinnon solicited comments from the administration concerning the legislation.

SARA RACE, DIRECTOR, PERMANENT FUND DIVIDEND DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE, replied that the fund would work similarly to the University of Alaska College Savings Program and would be another available option on the online permanent fund application.

[2:01:29 PM](#)

Senator von Imhof considered the estimated 2 percent administrative costs and wondered whether the costs could fluctuate as the raffle became more popular.

Ms. Race stated that the Treasury Division would be managing the account, while the Permanent Fund Division would be simply hosting the program through the application. She said that she could refer the question to the Treasury Division and have an answer sent back to the committee.

Senator von Imhof wanted assurances that the administrative cost would be controlled.

[2:03:00 PM](#)

Co-Chair MacKinnon noted that there was a one-time, fixed expense of \$8 thousand. She asked Ms. Race whether there was anything she would like to highlight in the fiscal note.

Ms. Race believed that the department could implement the proposed program online application. She said that the one-time charge was needed to make the changes necessary to implement the program.

Co-Chair MacKinnon referred to the second page of the fiscal analysis (FN 3):

This added option will require programming changes to be made to the division's database and online dividend application. It will take approximately 50 hours at \$ 160.00 per hour for a total of \$8,000.

Ms. Race answered that the analysis was correct.

[2:04:09 PM](#)

Senator von Imhof queried the mechanics of the drawing.

2:04:43 PM

AT EASE

2:05:27 PM

RECONVENED

Mr. Fellman relayed that the department had communicated that it was already doing online advertising for other programs such as college savings program and thought it would be very simple to add the raffle to those advertisements.

2:06:12 PM

Senator Micciche understood that a person who turned 18 March 31, the deadline for the application, would be eligible to participate in the raffle.

Ms. Race replied in the affirmative. She stressed that the option to participate would only be available on an adult application.

Co-Chair MacKinnon asked what would happen if an estimated dividend did not cover the cost of the preordered raffle tickets.

Ms. Race responded that the division would consider it in the same way it currently handled garnishment, contribution or assignment.

Co-Chair MacKinnon understood that the program would be administered through regulation.

Ms. Race answered in the affirmative.

Co-Chair MacKinnon referred to an order of priority for vetting those who owed the state money in the form of court fines, child support, etc. She asked whether the bill specifically prevented people from purchasing raffle tickets if they had fiduciary obligations to the state.

Ms. Race stated that involuntary deductions were always taken out first; the administration recommended that language be written into the bill that addressed voluntary deductions.

2:09:34 PM

Co-Chair MacKinnon said that the bill would be held until the language was inserted. She requested that Ms. Race work with the bill sponsor to update the legislation.

[2:10:05 PM](#)

Co-Chair MacKinnon noted that there were multiple voluntary deductions that could be made, and she hoped to hear recommendations from the administration and the committee in the immediate future.

Senator Micciche probed the prioritization of deductions, whether voluntary or involuntary.

Ms. Race specified that garnishments would always be paid out first, then the university college savings program, any funds available after that would be distributed to Pick.Click.Give recipients in the order they were selected.

[2:11:43 PM](#)

Senator von Imhof thought it would make sense to put the raffle alongside the Pick.Click.Give program as a voluntary donation to education.

[2:12:20 PM](#)

Senator Micciche agreed with the payment priority list set out by the administration. He thought that it needed to be decided whether the raffle would come before or after Pick.Click.Give on the priority list.

Ms. Race agreed.

[2:12:52 PM](#)

Co-Chair MacKinnon asked whether the sponsor had any recommendations.

Vice-Chair Bishop appreciated the conversation and stated that he was open to the committee's thoughts on the legislation.

Senator Micciche feared that the raffle could take funds away from organizations already in the Pick.Click.Give program, which could result in the state having to pay for additional services.

Co-Chair MacKinnon reiterated that involuntary deductions already had a priority payment written into statute. She stated that the issue to consider was how to order voluntary contributions for payment.

[2:15:00 PM](#)

Vice-Chair Bishop referred to \$388 million spent annually on raffle tickets in the state.

Senator von Imhof wondered whether there could be a way to let an applicant know when they had exhausted their total dividend and had no more available funds to donate

Ms. Race replied in the negative. She stated that at the point in time that the dividend application was being administered, the amount of the dividend was not known. She continued that individuals selected their contributions based on a projected dividend amount.

[2:17:20 PM](#)

Co-Chair MacKinnon asked whether statute allowed for a prorated reduction of a Pick.Click.Give. donation when the actual dividend amount was less than the original donation.

Ms. Race stated that the distribution of the voluntary donations to Pick.Click.Give would have priority based on the order in which the organizations were chosen.

[2:18:52 PM](#)

Senator Micciche thought that it would be difficult to choose whether to donate to Pick.Click.Give or the raffle.

[2:19:54 PM](#)

Vice-Chair Bishop agreed with Senator Micciche.

Co-Chair MacKinnon stated that with the support of the sponsor, she would draft a committee substitute, which would be sent in a timely manner to offices for review.

Mr. Fellman spoke to the concern addressed by Senator Micciche. He thought that the language could be structured to allow a person picking the lottery first and then picked

an organization from Pick.Click.Give then the lottery could be the last priority for payment.

Co-Chair MacKinnon wondered whether a modification in the prompting programming for donations would be possible and queried the cost of making changes to the application prompting programming.

Ms. Race replied that modifying the program was possible. She felt that further research should be done to determine a specific cost. She noted that Pick.Click.Give and the university savings program were separate choices that would be made when applying for a dividend, the lottery would create a third choice.

[2:22:08 PM](#)

Co-Chair MacKinnon hoped Ms. Race could work with division programmers to understand the details and cost of any necessary changes.

SB 78 was HEARD and HELD in committee for further consideration.

[2:23:17 PM](#)

AT EASE

[2:23:56 PM](#)

RECONVENED

#sb51

SENATE BILL NO. 51

"An Act extending the termination date of the Board of Veterinary Examiners; and providing for an effective date."

[2:23:59 PM](#)

Vice-Chair Bishop MOVED to ADOPT proposed committee substitute for SB 51, Work Draft 30-LS0465\U (Bruce, 4/7/17).

Co-Chair MacKinnon OBJECTED for discussion.

[2:24:38 PM](#)

SHAREEN CROSBY, STAFF, SENATOR NATASHA VON IMHOF, explained that the CS would extend the termination date of the Board of Veterinary Examiners.

Co-Chair MacKinnon WITHDREW her OBJECTION. There being NO OBJECTION, it was so ordered.

[2:25:39 PM](#)

KRIS CURTIS, AUDITOR, DIVISION OF LEGISLATIVE AUDIT, of the "Performance Audit of the Department of Commerce, Community, and Economic Development, Board of Veterinary Examiners", dated March 18, 2016 (copy on file). She stated that the board was serving in the public's best interest by effectively licensing and regulation veterinarians and veterinary technicians. She said that the division recommended an 8-year extension, which was the maximum allowed for in statute. She noted one recommendation, found on Page 7, that the board chair should review the annual report for accuracy and completeness before final submission to the Department of Commerce, Community, and Economic Development. She noted the schedule of revenues and expenditures found on Page 6, Page 5 contained a schedule of licenses.

[2:27:48 PM](#)

Co-Chair MacKinnon referred to the chart on Page 6; she clarified that the board had a surplus in its account in FY 13, which resulted in a decrease in fees. She expressed concern that the board was going to enter deficit spending.

Ms. Curtis replied that the division did not issue recommendations if the department had appropriately increased and decreased fees in the past and appropriate action was expected to be taken in the future. She explained that only when boards failed to respond to deficits and surpluses that recommendations were issued.

[2:28:52 PM](#)

Co-Chair MacKinnon asked why the fees had not been increased in light of the looming deficit spending.

JANEY HOVENDEN, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF CORPORATIONS, BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL LICENSING, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, stated that

prior to the last renewal cycle, the fees had been raised from \$300 to \$500. She said that the board was in the black for FY 17 by \$25,303.

Co-Chair MacKinnon observed that in FY 16 and FY 17 there had been a budget deficit carryforward.

[2:30:34 PM](#)

AT EASE

[2:33:04 PM](#)

RECONVENED

Co-Chair MacKinnon clarified that the differences in the legislative audit accounting versus the department was that the legislative audit was calculating through the fiscal year, while the department was calculating through the calendar year.

Ms. Hovenden restated that before the last renewal cycle, a fee analysis had been conducted, it had been determined that feed needed to be increased from \$300 biannually, to \$500 biannually.

Co-Chair MacKinnon assured the committee that legislative audit and the department would come to terms on the actual numbers.

[2:34:14 PM](#)

Senator Olson asked whether there were ongoing investigations or complaints to licensees.

Ms. Hovenden stated that she would need to investigate the issue and get back to the committee.

[2:34:40 PM](#)

Co-Chair MacKinnon reiterated that the CS was a simple extension bill.

[2:35:00 PM](#)

Co-Chair MacKinnon OPENED public testimony.
DR. RACHEL BERNGARTT, BOARD OF VETERINARY EXAMINERS, JUNEAU, testified in support of the legislation and that she was available for questions. She believed that the

board was functional, unique, and necessary. She shared that the board regulated licensees and veterinary technicians. She shared that the board offered courtesy licenses for veterinarians coming in the state for special events and temporary licenses for veterinarians coming from out of state to provide relief service. She relayed that all applications were forwarded to the board for review.

[2:37:12 PM](#)

BRIAN BERUBE, ALASKA NATIVE TRIBAL HEALTH CONSORTIUM, ANCHORAGE (via teleconference), called in to speak to the alteration of the make up of the board. He hoped for additional rural input and further discussion on services in rural Alaska.

Co-Chair MacKinnon explained that the issue was not discussed in the current legislation.

Mr. Berube thought that many people in the state were concerned about the issue and wondered who he could talk to to bring the subject to light.

Co-Chair MacKinnon restated that the current bill was an extension bill and that another piece of legislation could be introduced that proposed to change the make up of the board.

[2:39:48 PM](#)

PAMELA SANASH, SELF, NENANA (via teleconference), spoke in opposition to the bill. She reiterated previous testimony concerning an amendment in another committee that would have changed the make-up of the current board.

Co-Chair MacKinnon restated that the issue was not discussed in the current committee substitute.

Ms. Sanash testified in support of a sunset of the board in 2 years. She also suggested that the board should be completely dismantled. She said that traveling veterinarians to her rural community had been blocked by the board, which had resulted in danger to the human and animal public. She believed that the board was corrupt and should be reduced or abolished. She lamented that her area had been without animal vaccinations for 2 years because

traveling veterinarians could not obtain courtesy licensure through the board.

[2:44:06 PM](#)

LEA MCKENZIE, SELF, SUTTON (via teleconference), testified in opposition to the bill. She echoed previous concerns about traveling veterinarians obtaining licensure; she said that they were not flat out denied but were not made to feel welcome, either.

[2:46:47 PM](#)

ROMAINE KOBILSEK, SPAY ARKANSAS, ARKANSAS (via teleconference), testified in opposition to the bill. She expressed concern for the long term extension of the board given the current non-welcoming climate and the fee schedule. She argued that the board was not working in the best interest of the state by increasing the fee schedule, which made it difficult for non-profit veterinarians to afford to provide services in the state. She argued that traveling veterinarians provided services for animals that would otherwise go without.

[2:51:12 PM](#)

Co-Chair MacKinnon CLOSED public testimony.

[2:52:03 PM](#)

Vice-Chair Bishop asked whether Ms. Bergartt agreed with the 8-year extension proposed in the bill.

Dr. Bergartt replied in the affirmative. She specified that all 50 states had boards that regulated veterinarians and veterinary technicians.

[2:52:33 PM](#)

AT EASE

[2:52:53 PM](#)

RECONVENED

Co-Chair MacKinnon shared that the current bill version had a narrow scope but that she would allow for questions that pertained to previous versions.

Vice-Chair Bishop expressed concern for animal care in rural Alaska. She wondered whether the board supported veterinarians from out of state providing services in rural Alaska.

Dr. Bergartt confirmed that receiving animal care in rural Alaska was difficult. She said that board members were not aware where people intended to practice when they applied for a permanent license. She argued that the board did not control courtesy license fees.

[2:56:14 PM](#)

Dr. Bergartt disagreed with the statement that the board was not welcoming to outside veterinarians. She asserted that the same criteria were used to review every application and that board members did not make personal judgements about applicants. She said that a courtesy license for a special event had never been denied to a qualified applicant. She stressed that the powers of the board were outlined in statute and regulation. She explained that the job of the board was to regulate, not recruit, licensees. She relayed that the Alaska Veterinary Rural Outreach was a private non-profit in the state that practiced sterilization of animals. She added that other outside companies that wanted to work in the state could obtain the courtesy license - highlighting the fees were not set by the board. She said that outside experts conducting scientific research were required to obtain a courtesy license. She concluded that the requirements were not targeting rural veterinarians but were covering the cost of operating the board. She lamented that the licensure was expensive but felt that the necessity outweighed the expense.

[2:58:43 PM](#)

Vice-Chair Bishop expressed discomfort about licensees not disclosing where they would be practicing, specifically.

Dr. Bergartt clarified that specifics had to be given for courtesy licensure but that temporary licensees did not have to provide the same detail.

Vice-Chair Bishop asked whether the board might consider adding a request for information regarding where an applicant would be practicing.

Ms. Bergartt expressed confusion with the line of questioning.

[3:00:01 PM](#)

Vice-Chair Bishop continued discussing the question of temporary licenses and where applicants might practice under those licenses. He wondered whether it would be helpful to ask temporary license recipients where they anticipated practicing.

Dr. Bergartt replied that temporary veterinary license application required naming the practice that the applicant would be filling in for; however, occasionally practices did outreach clinics in area outside of their physical location. She thought that it could be restrictive to veterinarians to anticipate every physical location of practice.

[3:01:24 PM](#)

Co-Chair MacKinnon recalled public testimony from Arkansas that licensing fees had been inappropriately increased. She asked whether the state had the statutory power to increase fees or if it was the responsibility of the board.

Ms. Hovenden stated that AS 08.01.065 stipulated set fees that approximated the cost of the program. She added that the division considered advise from the board regarding fee changes. She relayed that the fee schedule was ultimately the responsibility of the state. She noted the program's past deficit, had lead to the rise in fee. She furthered that the courtesy license fee was less because it covered a shorter duration of coverage.

Co-Chair MacKinnon stated that it had been suggested that the state was charging fees for veterinarians coming to the state to perform a public service. She wondered whether all of the fees associated with the practice were justified

Ms. Hovenden relayed that all applicants went through identical screening and required board approval.

Dr. Bergartt affirmed that all licensing was reviewed in the same manner.

Co-Chair MacKinnon queried the timeline and possible challenges for the licensing process.

[3:05:23 PM](#)

Dr. Bergartt said that she could not speak to having ever missed a deadline or failed to license an applicant in a timely manner. She could not speak to the licensing practices of other states. She said that if people were under investigation for misconduct - states did communicate on the matter.

Ms. Hovenden had found that since 2012, through March 2017, there had been no courtesy licenses denied.

[3:06:56 PM](#)

Senator Micciche understood that the bill would extend the termination date of the board but that the issues surrounding veterinary practices in the state could be approached through specific legislation. He offered to help to work to craft solutions for problems in rural areas of the state.

[3:08:18 PM](#)

Senator Olson asked whether the veterinary community had a national databank for licensees.

Dr. Bergartt stated that there was an American Association of State Veterinary Boards but thought that there was not a national database. She continued that every state had its own licensing exam and standards.

[3:10:41 PM](#)

Senator Olson asked for commentary on the testimony that had recommended a shorted board extension.

Dr. Bergartt thought that the testifier was possibly misinformed of the term limits for board members. She did not believe that the board should be involved in dictating where veterinarians practiced in the state. She believed that communities needed to develop strategies to provide veterinary services in their areas. She stressed that the board could not provide direct services.

[3:12:45 PM](#)

Vice-Chair Bishop asked whether an individual homeowner in rural Alaska could administer a vaccination with a hypodermic needle.

Dr. Bergartt specified that there were vaccines that individuals could order but there were quality control issues. She added that private individuals could not administer the rabies vaccine at home. She recalled that there had been a lay vaccinator program, which had provided the vaccine, training, and refrigeration but that the program had been discontinued due to funding and liability. She thought that the question should be directed to the Department of Epidemiology.

[3:14:17 PM](#)

Senator Micciche relayed that he was ok with the bill moving forward.

Co-Chair MacKinnon thought that the bill could be used to address the proper licensure needed to ensure proper animal care in the state.

[3:15:44 PM](#)

Co-Chair MacKinnon drew attention to the Page 4 of the audit findings:

Two regulatory changes improved and increased veterinary services in bush communities. Regulation 12 AAC 68.041 added spay-and neuter clinics to the courtesy license definition of special event. This allows visiting veterinarians to provide spay-and-neuter services in bush communities. Additionally, regulation 12 AAC 68.300 amended veterinary technician duties to allow licensed veterinary technicians, employed by a licensed veterinarian, to receive guidance remotely while providing services in communities with no established veterinary practice.

Co-Chair MacKinnon asked whether there was additional information in the audit regarding rural communities.

Ms. Curtis stated that the audit had been structured to examine the rural issue during the planning phase, field

work had been done to see what the board had done in response to the concerns, it had been identified that the board had acted to change regulation and make improvements in the area.

[3:17:23 PM](#)

Senator Micciche wondered which agency the committee should work with to answer the concerns of rural Alaska.

Ms. Curtis thought there was a state veterinarian, employed by the state, who would be a resource for rural Alaskans.

Senator Micciche appreciated the testifier from Arkansas and spoke to the vast size of the state.

Co-Chair MacKinnon stated that the committee could discuss the fiscal note the following day.

Co-Chair MacKinnon discussed housekeeping.

#

ADJOURNMENT

[3:20:23 PM](#)

The meeting was adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

