

HOUSE FINANCE COMMITTEE
May 6, 2019
9:01 a.m.

9:01:32 AM

CALL TO ORDER

Co-Chair Wilson called the House Finance Committee meeting to order at 9:01 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Representative Neal Foster, Co-Chair
Representative Tammie Wilson, Co-Chair
Representative Jennifer Johnston, Vice-Chair
Representative Dan Ortiz, Vice-Chair
Representative Ben Carpenter
Representative Andy Josephson
Representative Gary Knopp
Representative Bart LeBon
Representative Kelly Merrick
Representative Colleen Sullivan-Leonard
Representative Cathy Tilton

MEMBERS ABSENT

None

ALSO PRESENT

Nancy Meade, General Counsel, Alaska Court System; John Skidmore, Director, Criminal Division, Department of Law; Grey Mitchell, Director, Division of Workers' Compensation, Department of Labor and Workforce Development; Representative Lance Pruitt; Representative David Eastman; Senator Lora Reinbold.

SUMMARY

HB 49 CRIMES; SENTENCING; MENT. ILLNESS; EVIDENCE

CSHB 49(FIN) was REPORTED out of committee with five "do pass" recommendations, five "amend" recommendations, and one "no recommendation" recommendation; and two new fiscal impact notes from the Department of Administration, two new

fiscal impact notes from the Department of Corrections, four new indeterminate notes from the Department of Corrections, one new fiscal impact note from the Alaska Judicial System, one new fiscal impact note from the Department of Public Safety, and with one previously published zero impact note: FN1 (DHS); and one previously published fiscal impact note: FN6 (LAW).

HB 68 LABOR STDRS/SAFETY; WORKER COMPENSATION

HB 68 was HEARD and HELD in committee for further consideration.

Co-Chair Wilson reviewed the agenda for the morning.

#hb49

HOUSE BILL NO. 49

"An Act relating to criminal law and procedure; relating to controlled substances; relating to probation; relating to sentencing; relating to reports of involuntary commitment; amending Rule 6, Alaska Rules of Criminal Procedure; and providing for an effective date."

[9:01:32 AM](#)

Vice-Chair Johnston MOVED to ADOPT Amendment 1, 31-GH1029\E.3 (Radford, 5/5/19) (copy on file):

Page 27, line 10:
Delete "or"
Insert "[OR]"

Page 27, line 13:
Delete "VA, or VIA controlled substance."
Insert "or VA[,OR VIA] controlled substance; or
(5) under circumstances not proscribed under AS 11.71.030(a)(3), 11.71.040(a)(3), 11.71.040(a)(4), or 11.71.060(a)(2), possesses any amount of a schedule VIA controlled substance."

Co-Chair Foster OBJECTED for discussion.

Vice-Chair Johnston explained that the amendment modernized the state's marijuana statutes.

Representative Josephson asked for further clarification of the amendment.

Co-Chair Wilson offered that the amendment brought the statutes in line with the legalization initiative.

Co-Chair Johnston added that the language was offered and vetted in the Senate.

Representative Foster WITHDREW his OBJECTION.

There being NO further OBJECTION, Amendment 1 was ADOPTED.

Representative LeBon MOVED to ADOPT Amendment 2, 31-GH1029\E.4 (Marx/Radford, 5/5/19) (copy on file):

Page 32, line 29, following "convictions":
Insert "and any pending criminal charges"

Co-Chair Foster OBJECTED for discussion.

Representative LeBon indicated that the amendment "simply" added "pending criminal charges" to the factors a judge could consider during the pretrial process. He recalled testimony regarding a revolving door of arrest and release and hoped the amendment would rectify the problem.

Vice-Chair Ortiz asked the sponsor to explain how the amendment would affect the judicial system and the role of judges. Representative LeBon thought that adding the language would offer "a complete picture of any issues" that attributed to the process.

Co-Chair Foster withdrew his OBJECTION.

There being NO further OBJECTION, Amendment 2 was ADOPTED.

[9:05:19 AM](#)

Representative LeBon MOVED to ADOPT Amendment 3, 31-GH1029\E.5 (Radford, 5/5/19) (copy on file):

Page 33, line 4:
Delete "and"

Page 33, line 6, following "community":
Insert "; and"

(12) the pretrial risk assessment provided by the commissioner of corrections."

Page 34, lines 6 - 7:
Delete all material.

Co-Chair Wilson OBJECTED for discussion.

Representative LeBon explained the amendment. He communicated that the amendment would add the pretrial risk assessment tool to the criteria that a judge shall consider when determining conditions of release in subsection (c), deleting the language that "the court may consider the pretrial risk assessment" on page 34, lines 6 and 7. The assessment tool was intended to help ensure that lowest risk individuals were released pretrial to reduce the size of the pretrial prison population and offered the court a standardized approach when dealing with bail decisions. The tool ensured that individuals were not unfairly discriminated against.

9:06:08 AM
AT EASE

9:08:00 AM
RECONVENED

Representative Josephson was trying to understand the amendment's impact. He deduced that the pretrial risk assessment was given a "shall" standard that the court must consider and deleted the "may" language. He understood that currently, the pretrial risk assessment had a shall standard and the present version of HB 49 authorized a "may" posture. The amendment returned the "shall."

Representative LeBon replied that the amendment added criteria to the pretrial risk assessment tool that the judge "shall" consider when determining conditions of release. He ascertained that reliance on the tool contributed to the revolving door because the scoring system failed to consider the "right factors" like drug and alcohol use and recent arrests. He judged that someone who had been arrested could be released quickly because the prior arrest would not be considered in the current scoring system. He hoped the amendment would end the revolving door and preempt pretrial release when necessary.

Vice-Chair Ortiz pointed out that the language stated, "shall consider" versus "shall adopt."

Co-Chair Wilson interjected that the risk assessment tool was a work in progress. She explained that the amendment's use of shall consider left the ultimate discretion up to the judge.

Representative Carpenter inquired about the use of "shall consider." He wanted to understand the difference between "may consider" and "shall consider" and the impact of the word "consider." Representative LeBon thought that "shall" acted as a must and "may" left it open to consideration. Representative Carpenter asked what resulted with the use of the word "consider."

Co-Chair Wilson interjected that the word was sending a message to the courts regarding the legislature's wishes but how it was interpreted was up to the courts. She was unsure how to legislate the definition.

Representative LeBon voiced that he wanted to "tighten up" the statute and expand the consideration for pretrial factors to include prior or out of state records.

[9:12:56 AM](#)

Representative Sullivan-Leonard referenced prior committee discussion regarding returning discretion back to the judges and thought that the pretrial risk assessment was part of the "correlation" to provide discretion. She thought that "may" provided the discretion. She asked if Representative LeBon would allow a separate amendment to change from "shall" to "may."

Co-Chair Wilson requested to hear from the Court System.

[9:13:58 AM](#)

NANCY MEADE, GENERAL COUNSEL, ALASKA COURT SYSTEM, answered that the existing statute on page 32, beginning on line 22 included all the factors that the court shall consider when deciding whether a person could be released. She communicated that the court currently did consider all the factors. She furthered that the process dictated that the attorneys on both sides would present information to the judge since the statute mandated consideration of the

factors. She explained that the amendment eliminated the existing provision that the risk assessment was optional and would include the risk assessment score as one of the factors for consideration. Due to the provision in the current committee substitute (CS), the court was no longer bound by the risk assessment tool.

Representative Sullivan-Leonard deduced that the amendment was unnecessary. She thought that discretion was already available in the bill. She asked for comment. Ms. Mead cited page 34, lines 6 and 7, subsection (f) and related that without the amendment subsection (f) would remain in the bill. She detailed that the provision offered the choice to the court of whether to consider the pretrial risk assessment by using the word "may." The court was not bound by the assessment and could ignore it. The amendment did not bind the court, but the court did have to consider the risk assessment score.

[9:16:40 AM](#)

Representative Knopp stated that because of the shall consider language mandating the courts to employ the tool, he wondered whether a delay in receiving the tool was an issue. He referenced prior testimony regarding delays in receiving the risk assessment. Ms. Mead disclosed that the Pretrial Enforcement Division (PED) had an "excellent" track record of providing the risk assessment to the courts for arraignments in a timely manner. She was unaware of any delays. Representative Knopp had recalled testimony in recent days that sometimes the tool was not readily available but was unsure who the testifier was.

Co-Chair Wilson reminded the committee that the time period was changed in the CS from the 24 hour period to up to 48 hours [the amount of time a person could be held in jail after arrest]. She maintained that the change should address the concern.

Vice-Chair Johnston remembered that two risk assessment tools were in use: pretrial and one used by the Department of Corrections (DOC). She recalled that the committee's concern was related to how to retain the data from the risk assessment tool to make the tool more relevant. She wondered whether the amendment was a way to build in the data in order to improve the tool. Ms. Mead agreed that with the CS providing that the court "may" consider the

assessment, the data pertaining to pretrial release relative to the assessment would be lost. She judged that the use of the word "shall" in the amendment ensured that the tool was considered, and the effect could be quantified.

Representative Merrick spoke in strong opposition to the amendment. She wanted the elimination the risk assessment tool. She announced that returning to shall was unacceptable.

Representative LeBon provided wrap up on the amendment. He emphasized that the risk assessment tool would be added to the list of factors to be considered balanced against other factors utilizing the professional expertise of the judge.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion to adopt Amendment 3.

IN FAVOR: Ortiz, Knopp, LeBon, Johnston, Foster, Wilson
OPPOSED: Merrick, Sullivan-Leonard, Tilton, Carpenter, Josephson

The MOTION PASSED (6/5). There being NO further OBJECTION, Amendment 3 was ADOPTED.

[9:21:22 AM](#)

Representative LeBon MOVED to ADOPT Amendment 4, 31-GH1029\E.6 (Radford, 5/5/19) (copy on file):

Page 5 3, following line 21:

2 Insert a new subsection to read:

"(k) In establishing the program under U) of this section, the commissioner shall approve a risk assessment instrument that is objective, standardized, and developed based on analysis of empirical data and risk factors relevant to pretrial failure, that evaluates the likelihood of an offender's failure to appear in court and the likelihood of an offender's rearrest during the pretrial period, and that is validated on the state's pretrial population. The commissioner shall periodically reassess the risk assessment instrument for its effectiveness in determining the likelihood of an offender's failure to appear in court or rearrest during the pretrial period."

Representative Sullivan-Leonard and Co-Chair Foster
OBJECTED.

Representative LeBon stated that HB 49 proposed the elimination of the PED and integrated the division's duties within probation and parole. He delineated that the provision added the unintended consequence by deleting the language in AS 33.07.020. The language specified the design criteria for the pretrial risk assessment tool and required that the criteria was objective, standardized, and developed based on analysis of data and risk factors relevant to pretrial failure. The amendment carried over the original language regarding the objective and empirical design of the tool. In addition, the amendment required that the commissioner reassess the tool's effectiveness periodically. The provision ensured that data would still be collected regarding the effectiveness of the pretrial tool and enable the tool to become more predictive and reliable for judges when engaging in bail decisions. He asked for the committee's support.

[9:22:37 AM](#)

AT EASE

[9:24:26 AM](#)

RECONVENED

Representative Josephson stated his understanding of the amendment. He was trying to locate the language in Title 33.

[9:25:12 AM](#)

AT EASE

[9:25:33 AM](#)

RECONVENED

Co-Chair Wilson asked to hear from the Department of Law.

JOHN SKIDMORE, DIRECTOR, CRIMINAL DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF LAW, directed members to AS 33.07.020 subsection (5) that contained the amendment's language.

[9:26:05 AM](#)

AT EASE

[9:31:52 AM](#)

RECONVENED

Co-Chair Wilson provided a comment about the amendment. She maintained that the amendment was merely attempting to build a risk assessment instrument that was objective, standardized, and developed based on analysis of empirical data and risk factors. She read the amendment [included above]. She emphasized the commissioner's requirement to reevaluate the tool for "effectiveness in determining the likelihood of an offender's failure to appear in court or rearrest during the pretrial period." She pointed to testimony regarding pretrial releases where the individual reoffended. She noted that updated data regarding the tool was due in June 2019. The amendment validated the legislature's concern regarding the issue's importance. She supported the amendment.

[9:33:24 AM](#)

Co-Chair Foster WITHDREW his OBJECTION.

There being NO further OBJECTION, Amendment 4 was ADOPTED. [Note: Representative Sullivan-Leonard requested a reconsideration of Amendment 4 at 9:53 a.m. The amendment was voted on and adopted (7/4).]

Representative LeBon MOVED to ADOPT Amendment 5, 31-GH1029\E.7 (Radford, 5/5/19) (copy on file):

Page 36, lines 13 - 22:

Delete all material and insert:

"(1) has completed at least

(A) two years on probation if the person was convicted of a class A or class B felony that is not a crime under (5) of this subsection; or (B) 18 months on probation if the person was convicted of a crime that is not a crime

(i) under (a) of this paragraph; or

(ii) under (5) of this subsection;

(2) has completed all treatment programs required as a condition of probation;

(3) [HAS NOT BEEN FOUND IN VIOLATION OF CONDITIONS OF PROBATION BY THE COURT FOR THE PERIOD SPECIFIED IN (1) OF THIS SUBSECTION;

[(4)] is currently in compliance with all conditions of probation for all of the cases for which the person is on probation; and

(4)[(5)] has not been convicted of an unclassified felony offense, a sexual felony as defined in AS 12.55.185, or a crime involving domestic violence as defined in AS 18.66.990."

Page 54, lines 16 - 17:

Delete "consider recommending [RECOMMEND]"

Insert "recommend"

Delete all material and insert:

"(3) is currently in compliance with all conditions of parole for all of the cases for which the person is on parole and has not been found in violation of conditions of parole by the board for at least one year; and"

Representative Carpenter OBJECTED.

Representative LeBon immediately offered a conceptual amendment to correct errors.

Representative LeBon MOVED to ADOPT Conceptual Amendment 1 to Amendment 5. He cited page 1, line 5 and moved to change "5" to "4," on page 1, line 8 change the lowercase "a" to a capital "A", and on page 1, line 9, change the "5" to "4". In addition, he cited page 1, lines 21 through 23 that deleted all material. He reported that the changes corrected a drafting error. He delineated that paragraph 5 was deleted; hence the change to 4 and the lowercase "a" would indicate a reference to a subsection whereas; the reference should refer to capital "A" identifying a subparagraph indicating the qualifying crimes.

Representative Josephson OBJECTED for discussion.

Representative Josephson requested that Representative LeBon repeat the amendment. Representative LeBon reviewed the amendment.

Representative Josephson WITHDREW his OBJECTION.

There being NO further OBJECTION, Conceptual Amendment 1 to Amendment 5 was ADOPTED.

Representative Josephson asked for an at ease.

[9:36:54 AM](#)

AT EASE

[9:37:16 AM](#)

RECONVENED

Representative LeBon reviewed Amendment 5. He indicated that the amendment offered a review period for the recommendation of early termination of parole and probation. He elaborated that SB 91-Omnibus Crim Law & Procedure; Corrections [CHAPTER 36 SLA 16 - 07/11/2016] mandated early termination of parole and probation if a person had been on parole for at least one year and probation for at least two years, completed a treatment program, and had not been in violation of conditions of the probation or parole. The result of the statute removed the professional judgement of probation or parole officers and forced them to recommend early termination even if the offender required additional supervision. The current CS corrected the issue by changing "shall" to "may" allowing the probation or parole officer to exercise their professional judgement when determining early termination. He summarized that the amendment retained the language that the officers "may" consider recommending early termination but included the current statutory language that in order to be considered for early termination, the offender must complete 18 months of probation or two years, if convicted of a Class A or B felony (non-domestic violence, non sexual) and one year of parole.

[9:38:59 AM](#)

AT EASE

[9:42:11 AM](#)

RECONVENED

Co-Chair Wilson understood that members needed time, but she wanted any questions or answers discussed during an ease on the record.

Representative Josephson requested to hear from Mr. Skidmore.

Representative Josephson reviewed his understanding of the amendment. He surmised that the goal was to keep the

discretion with the probation and parole officer regarding early termination of probation and parole while retaining the language that established timelines for compliance with conditions of probation and parole. He asked whether he was correct.

Mr. Skidmore answered that the amendment left in place "may" versus "shall" on page 36, line 11, which made the provision a mandate and not a recommendation. The amendment would include sideboards on the recommendation allowing a probation officer to make a recommendation only if the person had completed 2 years of probation if convicted of a Class A or B felony and 18 months if the individual was convicted of a crime that was neither a Class A or B felony. The amendment included an addition of the timeframe and was more restrictive than the prior provision in terms of when an early release recommendation was possible. Representative Josephson wondered whether the timelines existed prior to SB 91. Mr. Skidmore would have to look at the statute as written prior to SB 91. The bill reversed the statute from SB 91.

[9:46:28 AM](#)

Co-Chair Wilson asked Representative Josephson to stick to discussions regarding the amendment and not comparisons to laws prior to SB 91.

Representative Josephson believed he had been speaking to the amendment.

Representative Knopp surmised that without the amendment, a probation officer may recommend to the court that the probationary period be terminated and with the amendment, the same provision applied but the defendant had to complete conditions set to a timeline before early release could be considered. He concluded that the amendment prohibited early release unless certain conditions were met. He asked whether he was correct. Mr. Skidmore replied in the affirmative.

Representative Merrick pointed to page 54, lines 16 and 17 of the bill. She asked about the ramifications of the change.

Co-Chair Wilson asked Representative LeBon for clarification.

Representative LeBon replied that on page 54, lines 16 and 17 of the amendment deleted the word "recommend" and the words "consider recommending" were added.

[9:49:16 AM](#)

AT EASE

[9:50:18 AM](#)

RECONVENED

Representative LeBon replied that the lines cited on page 54 would not be deleted.

Co-Chair Wilson read the subsection as follows:

(7) upon determining that a probationer under the supervision of the officer meets the requirements of AS 12.55.090(g), consider recommending [RECOMMEND] to the court [AS SOON AS PRACTICABLE] that probation be terminated, and the probationer be discharged from probation;

Co-Chair Wilson asked whether the language reflected Representative LeBon's intent. Representative LeBon responded in the affirmative.

Representative Sullivan-Leonard pointed out that the language in Amendment 5 should be removed.

Representative Knopp answered that the language had been deleted in the conceptual amendment and did not change the language on page 54 of the CS. Co-Chair Wilson agreed with Representative Knopp's assessment.

[9:51:38 AM](#)

Co-Chair Foster WITHDREW his OBJECTION to Amendment 5 as amended.

Representative Sullivan-Leonard OBJECTED.

Representative LeBon provided closing comments on the amendment. He reiterated his previous statements regarding the amendment. He added that the early termination program provided an incentive for the probationer or parolee under the given timeframe but was balanced by the professional judgement of the probation and parole officers.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion.

IN FAVOR: Ortiz, Josephson, Johnston, Knopp, LeBon, Wilson,
Foster

OPPOSED: Merrick, Sullivan-Leonard, Tilton, Carpenter

The MOTION PASSED (7/4). There being NO further OBJECTION
Amendment 5 was ADOPTED as AMENDED.

[Note: Representative Tilton requested a reconsideration of
Amendment 5 at 11:00 a.m. The amendment was adopted
unanimously.]

[9:53:04 AM](#)

Representative Sullivan-Leonard requested reconsideration
for her vote on Amendment 4.

There being NO OBJECTION, a new vote was called for
Amendment 4.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion.

IN FAVOR: Ortiz, Josephson, Johnston, Knopp, LeBon, Foster,
Wilson

OPPOSED: Merrick, Carpenter, Sullivan-Leonard, Tilton

The MOTION PASSED (7/4).

Co-Chair Wilson MOVED to ADOPT Amendment 6, 31-GH1029\E.8
(Marx/Radford, 5/5/19) [note: due to length of amendment it
is not included here - see copy on file for details].

Co-Chair Foster OBJECTED for discussion.

Co-Chair Wilson explained that the amendment was a response
to concerns regarding the post release of inmates. The
amendment required that the management plan [reentry plan]
for each prisoner begin at least 90 days before release on
furlough, probation, or parole. The amendment included a
provision that DOC coordinate with community reentry
coalitions or other providers of reentry services if
available. She read from page 4 of Amendment 6, lines 3
through 12:

(12) provide to the legislature, by electronic means,
by January 10 preceding the first regular session of

each legislature, a report summarizing the findings and results of the program established under (7) of this subsection; the report must include:

- (A) the number of prisoners who were provided with written case plans under (8) of this subsection;
- (B) the number of written case plans under (8) of this subsection initiated within the preceding year; and
- (C) the number of written case plans under (8) of this subsection that were updated in the preceding year."

Co-Chair Wilson indicated that she had visited Lemon Creek Correctional Center [Juneau] and spoke with many inmates within 18 months of their release and none of them were aware of a reentry plan. She furthered that the fiscal note for the provision was zero.

Co-Chair Foster WITHDREW his OBJECTION.

Representative Sullivan-Leonard OBJECTED.

[9:56:32 AM](#)
AT EASE

[9:59:11 AM](#)
RECONVENED

Co-Chair Wilson restated her previous explanation of the amendment. She read from the amendment [page 2, lines 7 through 8]:

- (7) establish a program to conduct assessments of the risks and needs of offenders sentenced to serve a term of incarceration of 90 (30] days or more...

Co-Chair Wilson indicated that the amendment required 90 days after an individual had been sentenced versus 30 days. In addition, DOC was required to provide the case plan to the prisoner within 90 days after sentencing.

Representative Carpenter remarked that the amendment was substantial. He requested a 30 minute at ease for further discussion. Co-Chair Wilson denied the request but offered "a few more minutes."

Representative Josephson supported the amendment. He believed in the benefits of reentry programs.

10:01:07 AM

Co-Chair Foster WITHDREW his OBJECTION.

Representative Carpenter OBJECTED.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion.

IN FAVOR: Tilton, Josephson, Johnston, Knopp, LeBon,
Merrick, Ortiz, Wilson, Foster

OPPOSED: Sullivan-Leonard, Carpenter

The MOTION PASSED (9/2). There being NO further OBJECTION,
Amendment 6 was ADOPTED.

Co-Chair Wilson MOVED to ADOPT Amendment 7, 31-GH1029\E.9
(Radford, 5/5/19) [note: due to length of amendment it is
not included here - see copy on file for details].

Co-Chair Foster OBJECTED for discussion.

Co-Chair Wilson explained that the amendment related to the
collection and testing of rape kits and was a technical
fix. The provisions were from a bill [HB 20 SEXUAL ASSAULT
EXAMINATION KITS] that was previously heard in committee.
She relayed that the original bill excluded provisions
regarding testing the kits. She emphasized the importance
of testing the kits, which included provisions regarding
the victim's ability to opt out of testing. She did not
want the backlog of testing to continue. The amendment
clarified the legislature's intent regarding the kits.

Co-Chair Foster WITHDREW his OBJECTION.

Representative Carpenter OBJECTED. He wanted more time to
consider the amendment.

Co-Chair Wilson explained that the amendment pertained to a
past bill HB 20 and had been previously discussed.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion.

IN FAVOR: Josephson, Johnston, Knopp, LeBon, Ortiz, Foster,
Wilson

OPPOSED: Tilton, Carpenter, Merrick, Sullivan-Leonard

The MOTION PASSED (7/4). There being NO further OBJECTION,
Amendment 7 was ADOPTED. [Note: Representative Merrick

requested a reconsideration of Amendment 7 at 11:11 a.m. The amendment was adopted unanimously.]

Representative Sullivan-Leonard and Representative Carpenter requested an at ease.

[10:03:59 AM](#)

AT EASE

[10:06:23 AM](#)

RECONVENED

Representative Carpenter MOVED to ADOPT Amendment 8, 31-GH1029\E.18 (Wallace/Radford, 5/5/19) (copy on file):

Page 35, line 1:

Delete "or"

Insert "[OR]"

Page 35, line 2, following "AS 11.46.400":

Insert"; or

(7) a theft offense under AS 11.46.100"

Representative Josephson OBJECTED for discussion.

Representative Carpenter explained the amendment that would add theft to a list of offenses that would restrict credit for pretrial confinement.

Co-Chair Wilson requested to hear from Mr. Skidmore.

Mr. Skidmore answered that AS 11.46.100 included the definition of theft and was not specific to the types of theft crimes.

Representative Knopp asked about including the definition of theft. He surmised that the definition did not specify the type of offense and classification of crime. He deduced that if the amendment passed the details of the offense would not be known to the judge when restricting credit.

Mr. Skidmore reviewed the definition of theft in AS 11.46.100. He delineated that the statute referenced the crimes found throughout the chapter on theft and identified the specific statutes: AS 11.46.160, AS 11.46.180, AS 11.46.190, AS 11.46.200, AS 11.46.210. He cited the following:

- (2) the person commits theft of lost or mislaid property under AS 11.46.160;
- (3) the person commits theft by deception under AS 11.46.180;
- (4) the person commits theft by receiving under AS 11.46.190;

Mr. Skidmore elaborated that none of the theft categories included the value of the property. He was uncertain how the courts would interpret the amendment that failed to specify which theft crimes a judge could revoke pretrial electronic monitoring (EM) credit. The other subsections of statute in HB 49 referenced the specific crime and the elements associated with it.

[10:09:25 AM](#)

Representative Josephson MOVED to ADOPT Conceptual Amendment 1 to Amendment 8. He moved to delete the amendment and insert only vehicle theft in the first degree AS .11.46.360.

Representative Carpenter requested an at ease.

[10:10:24 AM](#)

AT EASE

[10:11:30 AM](#)

RECONVENED

Representative Josephson MOVED to withdraw Conceptual Amendment 1.

Representative Knopp OBJECTED to Amendment 8.

Representative Carpenter provided wrap up on the amendment. He surmised that currently the crimes that restricted pretrial confinement credit were "serious." He listed the crimes: Felony crime against a person; crimes involving domestic violence and sexual offenses; delivery of controlled substances; and burglary and arson in the first degree. He believed that the public was being victimized by theft and was left with the message that theft was not taken seriously. He wanted all forms of theft to be included in the list of crimes restricting pretrial credit. He believed that the amendment mirrored the "relief" the public demanded.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion.

IN FAVOR: Merrick, Tilton, Sullivan-Leonard, Carpenter,
Johnston, Wilson

OPPOSED: LeBon, Ortiz, Josephson, Foster

The MOTION PASSED (7/4). There being NO further OBJECTION,
Amendment 8 was ADOPTED.

[10:14:00 AM](#)

Representative Carpenter MOVED to ADOPT Amendment 9, 31-
GH1029\E.19 (Marx/Radford, 5/5/19) (copy on file):

Page 35, line 1:
Delete "or"
Insert "[OR]"

Page 35, line 2, following "AS 11.46.400":
Insert"; or
(7) vehicle theft under AS 11.46.360 or 11.46.365"

Co-Chair Wilson OBJECTED for discussion.

Representative Carpenter explained that Amendment 9 was the
same as Amendment 8 but was specific to vehicle theft.

Vice-Chair Ortiz understood that all forms of theft were
added under the previous amendment. He thought that
included vehicle theft. Representative Carpenter replied
that vehicle theft was listed separately from the other
theft statutes.

Representative Sullivan-Leonard spoke in support of the
amendment. She remarked that vehicle theft comprised the
highest rate of crime in her district.

Co-Chair Wilson WITHDREW her OBJECTION.
There being NO further OBJECTION, Amendment 9 was ADOPTED.

Representative Carpenter MOVED to ADOPT Amendment 10, 31-
GH1029\E.20 (Marx/Radford, 5/5/19) (copy on file):

Page 34, line 31:
Delete "to a person under 19 years of age"
Insert "[TO A PERSON UNDER 19 YEARS OF AGE]"

Co-Chair Wilson OBJECTED for discussion.

Representative Carpenter explained that the amendment would remove the age restriction, "under 19 years of age" from statutes pertaining to the delivery of a controlled substance and included the provision on the list of pretrial credit restrictions. He believed that age was not a factor that should be considered.

[10:16:25 AM](#)

AT EASE

[10:18:32 AM](#)

RECONVENED

Co-Chair Wilson invited Representative Carpenter to further clarify the amendment.

Representative Carpenter clarified that the amendment only applied to electronic monitoring and not to pretrial confinement.

Representative Josephson commented that certain offenses might be captured that was undesirable such as marijuana, which was legal.

Co-Chair Wilson WITHDREW her OBJECTION.

There being NO further OBJECTION, Amendment 10 was ADOPTED.

[10:20:11 AM](#)

Co-Chair Wilson MOVED to ADOPT Amendment 11, 31-GH1029\E.22 (Marx/Radford, 5/5/19) (copy on file):

Page 63, line 18, following "1 1.71.030(a)(8)":
Insert", 11.71.030(c), 11.71.030(e), 11.71.040(a)(11)"

Vice-Chair Johnston OBJECTED for discussion.

Co-Chair Wilson requested to hear from the Department of Law (DOL). She relayed that the amendment contained corrections identified by DOL.

Mr. Skidmore reviewed the amendment. He explained that the amendment was a "cleanup to the repealer section," which necessitated the repeal of three additional subsections. He

identified AS Sec. 11.71.030.(E) and elucidated that the statute referred to precursors for methamphetamines for distribution or manufacture that were reduced to a "lower level" and the CS returned them to a higher crime. Without the repealer, the provisions would be duplicated in statute at two levels of crime.

Vice-Chair Johnston WITHDREW her OBJECTION.

Representative Sullivan-Leonard OBJECTED. She asked for additional clarity.

Mr. Skidmore restated his explanation and emphasized that the repealer related to the lower level of crime. He referred to page 63, line 18 of the CS that contained the repeler. He noted that out of the three statutes listed, the first two related to methamphetamines and the third pertained to distribution by weight categories. He clarified that the repealer accomplished the same concept for weight categories and eliminated them completely. He indicated that the repealers accomplished the completion of a return to pre-SB 91 laws for drug distribution or dealing.

Representative Sullivan-Leonard MAINTAINED her OBJECTION.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion.

IN FAVOR: Knopp, LeBon, Merrick, Ortiz, Sullivan-Leonard, Tilton, Carpenter, Josephson, Johnston, Wilson, Foster

OPPOSED: None

The MOTION PASSED (11/0). There being NO further OBJECTION, Amendment 11 was ADOPTED.

[10:24:44 AM](#)

Co-Chair Wilson MOVED to ADOPT Amendment 12, 31-GH1029\E.24 (Radford, 5/5/19) [note: due to length of amendment it is not included here - see copy on file for details].

Co-Chair Foster OBJECTED for discussion.

Co-Chair Wilson relayed that the amendment had been brought to her by the Department of Law.

Mr. Skidmore explained the amendment. He elucidated that the first page corresponded to adjusted section numbers. Beginning on page 2, the amendment changed the language regarding the availability and use of third-party custodians during pretrial. Currently, third-party custodians were only available in a community where a pretrial enforcement officer was not available. The amendment included third-party custodians to the list of options the court could consider for pretrial release regardless of whether a pretrial enforcement officer was available to the community. He emphasized that the provision was in the governor's bill and was essential, allowing the courts to have as many tools as possible to change the bail system.

Co-Chair Foster WITHDREW his OBJECTION.

There being NO further OBJECTION, Amendment 12 was ADOPTED.

[10:26:25 AM](#)

Co-Chair Wilson MOVED to ADOPT Amendment 13, 31-GH1029\E.25 (Marx/Radford, 5/5/19) (copy on file):

Page 27, line 12, following "11.71.040(a)(4),":
Insert "11.71.040(a)(12),"

Vice-Chair Johnston OBJECTED for discussion.

Co-Chair Wilson relayed that the amendment had been brought forward by the Department of Law.

Mr. Skidmore explained that the amendment would insert an additional reference to a drug statute into another proposed drug statute. The action conformed to changes proposed to drug laws and without the change it was impossible to amend the statute. The omission was due to a drafting error.

Vice-Chair Johnston WITHDREW her OBJECTION.

There being NO further OBJECTION, Amendment 13 was ADOPTED.

Co-Chair Wilson MOVED to ADOPT Amendment 14, 31-GH1029\E.26 (Radford, 5/5/19) (copy on file):

Page 40, line 22, following "AS 11.41.455(c)(1),":

Insert "indecent viewing or production of a picture under AS 11.61.123(0(1)),"

Page 41, line 4, following "degree,":
Insert "sexual abuse of a minor in the third degree under AS 11.41.438(c),"

Page 41, line 5, following "degree,":
Insert "indecent viewing or production of a picture under AS 11.61.123(0(2)),"

Co-Chair Foster OBJECTED for discussion.

Mr. Skidmore explained that the amendment contained the specific references to statutes pertaining to indecent viewing. The amendment was necessary to correct a drafting error and the sentences could not be changed without it.

Co-Chair Wilson noted that the amendment had been brought forward by the administration.

Co-Chair Foster WITHDREW his OBJECTION.

There being NO further OBJECTION, Amendment 14 was ADOPTED.

Co-Chair Wilson MOVED to ADOPT Amendment 15, 31-GH1029\E.27 (Radford, 5/5/19) (copy on file):

Page 54, line 31, following "conditions":
Insert "when a petition to revoke probation is filed"

Co-Chair Foster OBJECTED for discussion.

Co-Chair Wilson asked to hear from Mr. Skidmore and indicated the amendment was offered on the administration's behalf.

Mr. Skidmore reviewed the amendment. He voiced that the purpose of the amendment clarified when the report that was associated with a revocation of probation was due. The amendment was necessary to correct a drafting error.

Co-Chair Foster WITHDREW his OBJECTION.

There being NO further OBJECTION, Amendment 15 was ADOPTED.

10:30:24 AM

AT EASE

10:32:28 AM

RECONVENED

Representative Josephson MOVED to ADOPT Amendment 16, 31-GH1029\E.12 (Radford, 5/5/19) (copy on file):

Page 23, line 15:

Delete "schedule IV A, VA, or VIA"

Insert "schedule IV A or VA (IV A, VA, OR VIA]"

Page 26, line 20:

Delete "or"

Page 26, line 26, following "paragraph":

Insert"; or

(13) violates AS 11.71.050(a)(1) and, within the preceding five years, has been convicted of a crime under

(A) this paragraph; or

{B} a law or ordinance of this or another jurisdiction with elements similar to a crime under AS 11.71.050(a)(1)."

Co-Chair Foster OBJECTED for discussion.

Representative Josephson explained the amendment. He shared that he had discovered many issues of concern related to marijuana in the bill. He maintained that the amendment returned the current proposed felony to a misdemeanor act. The act provided pertained to anyone with any amount marijuana who was 18 years old or older and at least three years younger than the person delivering the substance. He cited page 23, line 15 of the CS and indicated that it was currently a Class B felony to share any amount of a scheduled 6A controlled substance or marijuana. He exemplified that if a 21 year old offered a drag of marijuana off a pipe or joint to an 18 year old, the act was a class B felony for the older individual. He believed that the penalty was drastic. The amendment turned the offense into a misdemeanor and paralleled the Title 4 statutes on providing alcohol to a minor. The provision made it a Class C felony for a second offense. The amendment reduced the penalties and was aligned with other law.

Co-Chair Wilson asked to hear from the Department of Law. She asked whether the bill was recriminalizing marijuana.

Mr. Skidmore replied in the negative.

[10:34:55 AM](#)

AT EASE

[10:35:30 AM](#)

RECONVENED

Mr. Skidmore pointed to page 23, line 15 of the CS. The subsection on line 15 cited "schedule IV A, VA, or VIA" specifying "the delivery of a controlled substance to a person under the age of 19 years of age who is at least three years younger than the person delivering the substance." He commented that the statute did not recriminalize marijuana and verified that marijuana was legal over the age of 19 regarding possession and clarified that the crime applied to providing marijuana to an underaged individual. He understood that the amendment eliminated the age requirement and was condoning providing marijuana for someone underage.

Co-Chair Wilson asked if what Mr. Skidmore had stated was Representative Josephson's intent.

Representative Josephson replied, "not exactly." He clarified that it would still be illegal to provide anyone a schedule VI A controlled substance but eliminated language that allowed for any amount of marijuana provided to someone who was three years younger and under the age of 21 by an adult 21 or older to be considered a Class B felony. He corrected Mr. Skidmore's statement that 19 was the legal age for marijuana possession; the age was 21. He believed the penalty was extreme. He noted that the amendment lessened the offense to a Class A misdemeanor comparable to the Title 4 law of furnishing alcohol to a minor.

[10:38:33 AM](#)

Representative Knopp felt that one ounce of marijuana was a substantial amount. He asked for Representative Josephson's thoughts. Representative Josephson answered that an ounce was unacceptable and would be a Class A misdemeanor, which

was the current law. He wanted to eliminate the higher penalty for a provision with a lesser amount of marijuana.

Co-Chair Wilson believed that the state's high schools were dealing with the issue. She did not want to send the message that it was okay to provide marijuana to minors.

Vice-Chair Ortiz clarified that the sponsor was not claiming offering marijuana to youth was acceptable. He determined that the goal of the amendment was to change the offense to the same as the delivery to alcohol. He indicated that the facts were clear that alcohol had greater negative impacts on the population versus marijuana.

Co-Chair Wilson would be amenable to making changes to alcohol laws as well.

Mr. Skidmore clarified that the amendment did not make it legal to provide marijuana to underage individuals. A higher level statute found on page 23, dealt with misconduct involving controlled substances in the third degree that was classified as a Class B felony. He reported that it was a class B felony to provide marijuana to someone under the age of 19. He agreed that 21 was the legal age related to marijuana. He pointed to page 25, that established the act of providing marijuana to another person outside of the regulatory regime, which was a Class C felony under misconduct involving a controlled substance in the fourth degree. He pointed out that the two laws related to the issue and noted that the current CS drew a strong distinction between when it was legal or illegal to provide marijuana to someone under the age of 19. The amendment would eliminate the higher penalty for distribution under the age of 19, which meant that any distribution would be dealt with in the same manner regardless of age.

[10:42:36 AM](#)

Vice-Chair Ortiz asked about the system and how things were prosecuted or not prosecuted. He asked whether there was merit to changing the amendment from a felony to a misdemeanor. Mr. Skidmore responded that he was present as a representative of the administration. He had his own personal views on marijuana that he could not speak to at present. He observed that from a prosecutor's standpoint

that the CS established a harsher penalty to someone providing marijuana to persons under the age of 19 versus selling marijuana outside of the regulatory scheme. He could not comment on whether the amendment was a good or bad idea.

Representative Merrick opposed the amendment. Her district had been clear that it wanted to be tough on crime and drugs. She did not support lessening the offense.

Co-Chair Foster WITHDREW his OBJECTION.

Representative Merrick OBJECTED.

Representative Josephson provided wrap up on the amendment. He reiterated that presently, the offense of providing even one drag off a marijuana cigarette to someone aged 18 by a 21 year old was a Class B felony that equated to up to 10 years in jail and was comparable to punishment for sexual assault. He believed the statute was extreme.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion.

IN FAVOR: LeBon, Ortiz, Josephson, Johnston, Foster
OPPOSED: Merrick, Sullivan-Leonard, Tilton, Carpenter, Knopp, Wilson

The MOTION to adopt Amendment 16 FAILED (5/6).

Representative Josephson MOVED to ADOPT Amendment 17, 31-GH1029\E.10 (Marx/Radford, 5/5/19):

Page 64, line 4:
Delete "2011"
Insert "1981"

Co-Chair Foster OBJECTED for discussion.

Representative Josephson explained the amendment. He disclosed that conservatives who had stated they were protective of gun rights like the National Rifle Association (NRA) and the administration wanted to "dial back" the number of years information regarding involuntary commitment or mental illness must be submitted to the Department of Public Safety (DPS).

[10:47:57 AM](#)

Representative LeBon asked about the fiscal impact of the amendment.

Representative Josephson replied that someone had informed him that it was in the range of \$150,000. He stated that Ms. Mead had testified that the court system would require two additional staff to comply with the statute. He believed a federal grant would be forthcoming.

Co-Chair Wilson was uncomfortable with the amendment. She shared that she chose the extended date. She was unaware of any federal grant dollars and the fiscal note reflected that. She had not heard from the NRA regarding the matter. She was not supportive of placing the length of time in statute.

Representative Sullivan-Leonard asked to hear from Ms. Mead. She inquired whether there would be difficulty in obtaining information back to 1985 or 1990. She noted that the information existed, but it was on microfiche. Ms. Mead replied that the reason the Chair chose 2011 was to align with the date all the court's records subsequent to the date were available electronically. The court could do the electronic search with existing staff. However, for records before 2011, the court's information was mixed, with some information electronic and on CourtView and some not. Prior to 2002, nothing was available electronically which would mean reviewing paper files and microfiche. She estimated that around 21,000 files could have a mental issue order. She concurred that they would need additional staff to perform the review.

Representative Sullivan-Leonard asked if the compiled data would have to be put into the system under CourtView or merely available to those seeking information. Ms. Mead answered the court would provide information about the individuals to DPS in order to upload it to their databases and work with the federal database. The individuals with mental issue adjudications would be included in a database and ultimately be excluded from purchasing a firearm.

[10:52:29 AM](#)

Vice-Chair Johnston heard from DPS that there could be a great number of federal funds coming to the state for the purpose under discussion. She asked whether the court

intended to compile records prior to 2011 if federal funds were forthcoming. Ms. Mead answered that the availability of federal funds was tentative and would not warrant canceling a fiscal note. She elucidated that the information desired was confidential by law. Therefore, if the proposed 2011 law was adopted it would act as an exception to the confidentiality law and the court system will comply, but prior to that date the court would not have the authority to do so. Vice-Chair Johnston asked whether the 2011 date made the state compliant with federal law. Ms. Mead answered she was uncertain what the federal law was. She offered that it was illegal under federal law for a person that had been mentally committed to purchase a firearm. The federal government wanted the state to supply the information to them. She was uncertain whether the 2011 date made the state compliant. Vice-Chair Johnston thought the law was in response to the Virginia Tech [Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, commonly known as Virginia Tech] shooting [April 16, 2007]. Ms. Mead was uncertain why the federal government had passed the law.

[10:54:58 AM](#)

Representative Merrick supported the amendment. She thought that if it meant that one person's life was saved, it was irrelevant how difficult and time consuming it was to compile the information.

Representative Carpenter pointed to the date of December 31, 2019 for completion of the data transfer. He wondered if the completion date granted enough time to finish the task if looking back to 1981. Ms. Mead answered in the negative. She stated that the fiscal note specified it would take one year. Representative Carpenter suggested offering a conceptual amendment to change the completion date if the 1981 date was adopted.

Co-Chair Wilson asked Ms. Mead how much more time the Court System would need to compile the information from 1981. Ms. Mead discerned that a completion date of December 31, 2020 was adequate.

Representative Carpenter MOVED to ADOPT Conceptual Amendment 1 to Amendment 17. He moved to change the date from December 31, 2019 to December 31, 2020 on line 2 of the amendment.

There being NO OBJECTION, Conceptual Amendment 1 was ADOPTED.

Co-Chair Foster WITHDREW his OBJECTION to Amendment 17 as amended.

There being NO further OBJECTION, Amendment 17 was ADOPTED as AMENDED.

[10:57:46 AM](#)

AT EASE

[11:00:39 AM](#)

RECONVENED

Representative Tilton requested a reconsideration on her vote for Amendment 5.

There being NO OBJECTION, it was so ordered.

[11:01:03 AM](#)

AT EASE

[11:02:18 AM](#)

RECONVENED

Co-Chair Wilson explained that they would reconsider Amendment 5.

Representative Josephson questioned the interpretation of Amendment 5. He pointed to subsection 3, lines 12 through 14 of the amendment and noted that the language was being deleted.

(3) [HAS NOT BEEN FOUND IN VIOLATION OF CONDITIONS OF PROBATION BY THE COURT FOR THE PERIOD SPECIFIED IN (I) OF THIS SUBSECTION;

Representative Josephson interpreted the language in subsection 3. He surmised that if the probationer or parolee had violated conditions, a decision on early termination would be delayed. He indicated that eliminating the subsection left subsection 4 intact. He underlined [subsection 4] lines 15 through 16 that stated:

4)] is currently in compliance with all conditions of probation for all of the cases for which the person is on probation; and...

Representative Josephson interpreted that the two concepts were different. He deduced that deleting the language in subsection 3 was "significant." He asked for Mr. Skidmore's point of view.

Co-Chair Wilson reminded Representative Josephson that the action was a policy call and Mr. Skidmore could inform the committee only on the effects of the amendment.

Mr. Skidmore responded that Amendment 5 deleted the current provision in the bill on lines 13 through 22 and replaced it with the amendment. He elaborated that Amendment 5, lines 3 through 11 were the only provisions that were different from the bill. The amendment would affect the CS on page 36, lines 13 through 20; lines 3 through 11 of the amendment would be added to the CS. He interpreted the provision to mean that the offender had to serve 2 years of probation for Class A or B felonies and at least 18 months for other crimes that at the discretion of the probation officer, could be eligible for early termination. He determined that was the only significant change in the proposal.

There being NO further OBJECTION, Amendment 5 was ADOPTED.

[11:06:26 AM](#)

AT EASE

[11:07:12 AM](#)

RECONVENED

Representative Josephson MOVED to ADOPT Amendment 18, 31-GH1029\E.13 (Wallace/Radford, 5/5/19) (copy on file):

Page 42, line 31:
Delete "30 [10]"
Insert "IO"

Page 43, lines 2 - 6:
Delete all material and insert:
"(2) 90 days if the conviction is for a violation of
(A) AS 11.61.116(c)(1) and the person is 21 years of
age or

older; [OR]
10 (B) AS 11.61.120(a)(6) and the person is 21 years
of age or older; or
(C) AS 11.61.220(a)(4)(B) or (C); or"

Co-Chair Wilson OBJECTED for discussion.

Representative Josephson MOVED to ADOPT Conceptual
Amendment 1 to Amendment 18 to delete the top three lines
of the amendment.

Co-Chair Wilson OBJECTED for discussion.

Vice-Chair Ortiz asked about the impact of the proposed
deletion.

Representative Josephson explained that the intent of the
amendment was to increase two types of Class B misdemeanors
to 90 day penalties and the top lines did not reflect his
intent.

Co-Chair Wilson clarified that it was not the intent of the
sponsor to include lines 1 through 3.

Co-Chair Wilson WITHDREW her OBJECTION.

There being NO further OBJECTION, Conceptual Amendment 1 to
Amendment 18 was ADOPTED.

Representative Josephson explained the amendment as
amended. He reported that in SB 91, most of the Class B
misdemeanors were decreased from 90 days to 10 days except
for harassment in the second degree and sending an explicit
image of a minor. He delineated that the amendment added
bringing a gun to a courthouse. He alerted the committee
that the court system lacked an adequate security system in
single judge sites. He was alarmed about the policy
perception the state was taking. In addition, the amendment
included bringing a gun to a domestic violence shelter,
which he characterized as "sacred places." He maintained
that if a person inadvertently forgot they had a concealed
weapon it would mitigate the offense. He felt that the
current situation could be construed as the state having
little concern about bringing a gun to a domestic violence
shelter. He shared that the amendment had been offered in
the House in the fall of 2017 and had failed 20-20. He

asked the committee to consider the serious nature of the crimes.

Co-Chair Wilson asked members to be careful about stating other's intent.

11:11:50 AM

Co-Chair Wilson WITHDREW her OBJECTION.

There being NO OBJECTION, Amendment 18 was ADOPTED as AMENDED.

Representative Merrick asked for reconsideration on vote to Amendment 7. There being NO OBJECTION, it was so ordered.

There being NO OBJECTION, Amendment 7 was ADOPTED.

11:15:17 AM

Vice-Chair Johnston MOVED to REPORT CSHB 49(FIN) out of committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying fiscal notes with the ability for Legislative Legal Services to make technical and conforming changes.

Representative Sullivan-Leonard OBJECTED.

Representative Josephson announced his support for the bill.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion.

IN FAVOR: Carpenter, Josephson, Johnston, LeBon, Ortiz, Knopp, Tilton, Foster, Wilson
OPPOSED: Merrick, Sullivan-Leonard

The MOTION PASSED (9/2). There being NO further OBJECTION, it was so ordered.

CSHB 49(FIN) was REPORTED out of committee with five "do pass" recommendations, five "amend" recommendations, and one "no recommendation" recommendation; and two new fiscal impact notes from the Department of Administration, two new fiscal impact notes from the Department of Corrections, four new indeterminate notes from the Department of Corrections, one new fiscal impact note from the Alaska Judicial System, one new fiscal impact note from the

Department of Public Safety, and with one previously published zero impact note: FN1 (DHS); and one previously published fiscal impact note: FN6 (LAW).

#hb68

HOUSE BILL NO. 68

"An Act relating to the division of labor standards and safety; relating to the division of workers' compensation; establishing the division of workers' safety and compensation; and providing for an effective date."

[11:17:04 AM](#)

GREY MITCHELL, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF WORKERS' COMPENSATION, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT, introduced the bill. He explained that HB 68 would merge the Division of Labor Standards and Safety with the Division of Workers' Compensation as of July 1, 2019. The new division would be called the Division of Workers' Safety and Compensation. The merger would decrease costs and improve efficiencies.

HB 68 was HEARD and HELD in committee for further consideration.

#

ADJOURNMENT

[11:17:40 AM](#)

The meeting was adjourned at 11:18 a.m.