

HOUSE FINANCE COMMITTEE  
May 9, 2024  
2:07 p.m.

[2:07:24 PM](#)

CALL TO ORDER

Co-Chair Foster called the House Finance Committee meeting to order at 2:07 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Representative Neal Foster, Co-Chair  
Representative DeLena Johnson, Co-Chair  
Representative Julie Coulombe  
Representative Mike Cronk  
Representative Alyse Galvin  
Representative Sara Hannan  
Representative Andy Josephson  
Representative Dan Ortiz  
Representative Will Stapp  
Representative Frank Tomaszewski

MEMBERS ABSENT

Representative Bryce Edgmon, Co-Chair

ALSO PRESENT

Jasmine Martin, Staff, Senator David Wilson; Sylvan Robb, Director, Division of Corporations, Business, and Professional Licensing, Department of Commerce, Community and Economic Development; Senator Kelly Merrick, Sponsor; Kerry Crocker, Staff, Senator Kelly Merrick; Lisa Purinton, Director, Division of Statewide Services and Acting Legislative Liaison, Department of Public Safety; Lauree Morton, Deputy Director, Alaska Network on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault; James Holzenberg, Staff, Senator Forrest Dunbar; Nancy Meade, General Counsel, Alaska Court System.

PRESENT VIA TELECONFERENCE

Sandra Moller, Director, Division of Community and Regional Affairs, Department of Commerce, Community, and Economic

Development; Jennifer Athey, Acting Operations Manager, Division of Geological and Geophysical Surveys, Department of Natural Resources; David Kanaris, Forensic Science Laboratory Chief, Alaska State Crime Lab, Department of Public Safety; Tara Henry, Nurse, Anchorage; Maxine Doogan, Community United for Safety and Protection, Fairbanks.

SUMMARY

HB 223 TAX & ROYALTY FOR CERTAIN GAS

HB 223 was SCHEDULED but not HEARD.

HB 275 SEXUAL ASSAULT EXAMINATION KITS/TRACKING

HB 275 was HEARD and HELD in committee for further consideration.

CSSB 74(FIN)

PHYSICAL THERAPY LICENSURE COMPACT

CSSB 74(FIN) was REPORTED out of committee with nine "do pass" recommendations and one "no recommendation" recommendation and with one previously published fiscal impact note: FN2 (CED).

CSSB 75(FIN)

AUD. & SPEECH-LANG INTERSTATE COMPACT

CSSB 75(FIN) was REPORTED out of committee with with nine "do pass" recommendations and one "no recommendation" recommendation and with one previously published zero note: FN2 (CED).

SB 104 CIVIL LEGAL SERVICES FUND

SB 104 was HEARD and HELD in committee for further consideration.

CSSB 118(FIN) CRITICAL NATURAL RESOURCES; REPORTS

CSSB 118(FIN) was REPORTED out of committee with nine "do pass" recommendations and with two previously published fiscal impact notes: FN1 (DNR) and FN3 (CED).

Co-Chair Foster reviewed the meeting agenda.

[2:10:24 PM](#)

#sb74

CS FOR SENATE BILL NO. 74 (FIN)

"An Act relating to an interstate physical therapy licensure compact; relating to the licensure of physical therapists, physical therapist assistants, occupational therapists, and occupational therapy assistants; and providing for an effective date."

[2:10:31 PM](#)

JASMINE MARTIN, STAFF, SENATOR DAVID WILSON, relayed that the legislation allowed Alaska to enter into the Physical Therapy Interstate Licensure Compact. The compact had been adopted by over 30 states and would be one of Alaska's first licensure compacts. She thanked the committee for hearing the bill.

Co-Chair Foster asked the Department of Commerce, Community and Economic Development (DCCED) to review the fiscal note.

SYLVAN ROBB, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF CORPORATIONS, BUSINESS, AND PROFESSIONAL LICENSING, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, reviewed the DCCED fiscal note, OMB component 2360. The fiscal note showed a cost of \$117,500 in the first year and \$105,000 in the outyears. The cost was related to the hiring of an administrative assistant to assist with handling fingerprint cards. In addition to joining the physical therapy compact, the bill required fingerprint based background checks for physical therapists, physical therapy assistants, occupational therapists, and occupational therapy assistants.

Representative Galvin asked if the cost would be covered through fees.

Ms. Robb confirmed that the cost would be covered with designated general funds (DGF) through fees collected from licensees.

Representative Hannan asked if the state did not currently require fingerprints on the professionals covered under the bill.

Ms. Robb confirmed that the state did not [currently require fingerprints for professions covered under the bill].

Representative Hannan believed the state should require fingerprints for the individuals.

[2:12:52 PM](#)

Co-Chair Johnson MOVED to REPORT CSSB 74(FIN) out of committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying fiscal note.

There being NO OBJECTION, CSSB 74(FIN) was REPORTED out of committee with nine "do pass" recommendations and one "no recommendation" recommendation and with one previously published fiscal impact note: FN2 (CED).

#sb75

CS FOR SENATE BILL NO. 75(FIN)

"An Act relating to an audiology and speech-language interstate compact; relating to the practice of audiology and the practice of speech-language pathology; and providing for an effective date."

[2:13:45 PM](#)

JASMINE MARTIN, STAFF, SENATOR DAVID WILSON, relayed that the bill would allow Alaska to enter into the Audiologist and Speech Language Pathologist Interstate Compact. The compact became official in 2019 and had been adopted by over 20 states.

Co-Chair Foster asked the Department of Commerce, Community and Economic Development (DCCED) to review the fiscal note.

SYLVAN ROBB, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF CORPORATIONS, BUSINESS, AND PROFESSIONAL LICENSING, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, reviewed the DCCED zero fiscal note, OMB component 2360. The bill required fingerprint based background checks. She relayed that the number of audiologist and speech language pathologist

licensees was fewer than the number for the physical therapists and occupational therapists and the compact was not operational quite yet. She elaborated that a person [administrative assistant] was needed to cover the work under both bills and it made the most sense to put it where there were additional licensees.

Representative Hannan referenced Ms. Robb's statement that the compact was not yet operational. She asked if there was no compact in other states. She asked for detail.

Ms. Martin responded that the compact became official in 2019. The compact required a certain number of states to join before starting up entirely. She explained that the compact was the final stages and just began issuing privileges to practice.

Representative Hannan asked if there would be additional fiscal impacts once that occurred.

Ms. Martin replied, "No."

[2:15:55 PM](#)

Co-Chair Johnson MOVED to REPORT CSSB 75(FIN) out of committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying fiscal note.

There being NO OBJECTION, CSSB 75(FIN) was REPORTED out of committee with nine "do pass" recommendations and one "no recommendation" recommendation and with one previously published zero note: FN2 (CED).

#sb118

CS FOR SENATE BILL NO. 118(FIN)

"An Act relating to critical and essential minerals."

[2:17:10 PM](#)

SENATOR KELLY MERRICK, SPONSOR, reviewed the bill with prepared remarks:

Senate Bill 118 lays the groundwork for Alaska to maximize its potential in the critical minerals sector, while safeguarding environmental integrity and

fostering economic growth. Passing this bill will not only benefit Alaska but our nation's security.

Co-Chair Foster asked for a review of the fiscal notes.

[2:17:54 PM](#)

SANDRA MOLLER, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, COMMUNITY, AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (via teleconference), relayed that the fiscal note had changed and included \$40,000 [annual cost]. She highlighted the bill's requirement for the division to create a report to the legislature. The division did not have staff to complete the report and would contract the report requirements out.

Co-Chair Foster stated that the fiscal note was OMB component 2879. He asked if Ms. Moller's fiscal note was dated April 16, 2024.

Ms. Moller responded affirmatively.

Representative Galvin thought the report seemed very important to Alaska and the nation. She was surprised the report was not already done by the state in some form. She asked for detail.

KERRY CROCKER, STAFF, SENATOR KELLY MERRICK, responded that 30 other states had the report in addition to all of the Canadian provinces. He believed there was \$2 million in general funding in the state's capital budget for mapping. He agreed there should be a report for critical minerals.

Representative Hannan asked why the sponsor had chosen to have the report generated through DCCED instead of the Department of Natural Resources (DNR). She assumed the minerals and geologists were under DNR.

Mr. Crocker responded that the state had them in DCCED and DNR. He explained that DCCED had more of a role in innovation, marketing, and transportation. He detailed that one of the major factors pertaining to critical minerals was supply chain. He elaborated that when the United States Geological Survey (USGS) created the critical mineral list, supply chain was a major factor.

Representative Stapp thanked the sponsor for bringing the bill forward. He thought it was one of the more critical things the state could do to help fight communism worldwide.

[2:21:23 PM](#)

Co-Chair Foster asked for a review of the second fiscal note. He did not see DNR online. He thought the note looked fairly basic and asked Mr. Crocker for a review.

Mr. Crocker noted that he did not have a copy of the fiscal note on hand. He believed the DNR fiscal note showed the cost for personal services to create the report. He believed the cost was \$35,000.

Co-Chair Foster remarked that the fiscal note, OMB component 1031 showed a cost of \$45,000. He believed a representative from DNR was calling in.

JENNIFER ATHEY, ACTING OPERATIONS MANAGER, DIVISION OF GEOLOGICAL AND GEOPHYSICAL SURVEYS, DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES (via teleconference), reviewed the DNR fiscal note for \$45,000 in unrestricted general funds (UGF) in FY 25. The fiscal note reflected the cost to prepare a report to the legislature regarding the state's current and potential production of critical and essential minerals and related information such as permitting and exploration incentives. The staff position with appropriate scientific expertise selected to complete the work was federally funded. The note included a one-time UGF increment to allow the department to utilize the position for the short-term project and report to the legislature.

[2:24:15 PM](#)

Co-Chair Johnson MOVED to REPORT CSSB 118(FIN) out of committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying fiscal notes.

There being NO OBJECTION, CSSB 118(FIN) was REPORTED out of committee with nine "do pass" recommendations and with two previously published fiscal impact notes: FN1 (DNR) and FN3 (CED).

[2:25:32 PM](#)

AT EASE

[2:26:22 PM](#)

RECONVENED

#hb275

HOUSE BILL NO. 275

"An Act relating to sexual assault examination kits; establishing the sexual assault examination kit tracking system; and providing for an effective date."

[2:26:37 PM](#)

LISA PURINTON, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF STATEWIDE SERVICES AND ACTING LEGISLATIVE LIAISON, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY, introduced herself. She thanked the committee for hearing the bill. She asked a colleague to provide an overview of the legislation.

DAVID KANARIS, FORENSIC SCIENCE LABORATORY CHIEF, ALASKA STATE CRIME LAB, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY (via teleconference), relayed that the bill would require the Department of Public Safety (DPS) to develop and operate a sexual assault kit tracking system. Second, the bill would establish timeframes for all of the stakeholders who would handle a kit including medical providers, law enforcement, and the crime lab and testing. Third, the bill would enable victim survivors to track their kit through status updates in the system. Fourth, the bill added a section to the Victims Bill of Rights. He asked if Co-Chair Foster would like a review of the summary of changes.

Co-Chair Foster responded affirmatively.

Mr. Kanaris reviewed a summary of changes (copy on file). Amendment A.3 changed Section 1, page 2, line 3 and required law enforcement to send kits to an accredited laboratory within DPS within 20 days of receiving notice from the healthcare provider. The amendment decreased the current turnaround time for law enforcement by 10 days. Amendment A.4 changed Section 1, page 2, line 20 and required the laboratory receiving the completed kits to complete a DNA test on the sexual assault examination kit within 120 days (reducing the timeframe down from six months). Amendment A.5 added a new section to AS 12.61.010(a), the crime victim statute, to include the right for victims to be notified of the location and

testing date of the sexual assault examination kit. He asked if Co-Chair Foster would like a review of the sectional analysis.

Co-Chair Foster relayed that he would move to public testimony.

[2:29:59 PM](#)

Co-Chair Foster OPENED public testimony.

TARA HENRY, NURSE, ANCHORAGE (via teleconference), shared that she had previously testified and had submitted written testimony. She was available for questions related to the timeframe from a medical perspective. She explained that forensic nursing groups were not supportive of a seven-day deadline and were hoping for a 10 to 14-day timeframe due to the extensive amount of work after a sexual assault exam was completed and the timing it took to complete the 60 plus pages of documentation required in order to finalize a sexual assault kit.

Representative Josephson looked at page 3 of the bill, which specified the healthcare provider gathering the evidence shall gather the kit and notify the appropriate law enforcement agency within seven days. He asked if it was the portion of the bill Ms. Henry was referencing.

Ms. Henry responded affirmatively. She explained that after forensic nurses completed examinations there was a 60-page document to fill out the medical forensic documentation. She explained that it took several hours to complete the documentation. She detailed that a seven-day timeframe was not long enough for nurses to see patients and finish all of the documentation due to the timing of their shifts. She elaborated that if nurses had to meet the seven-day deadline it would force staff to work beyond their regularly scheduled 12-hour shifts or to come in to work on their days off. Financially, the requirement would burden hospitals with overtime costs and would result in would increase burnout and staffing shortages. Hospitals represented by union nurses would end up facing union grievances. She relayed that forensic nurses would support a longer timeframe of 10 to 14 days, which would allow them to finish charting without overtime.

Co-Chair Foster asked Ms. Purinton for any comment on the topic.

[2:34:41 PM](#)

Ms. Purinton replied that DPS understood the concerns. The intention of the bill was to ensure that time frames were set up for each aspect of the tracking process in order to make the process more transparent for victims and to allow them to identify where their kits were in the process (from the time they consent to an exam to the time the kits were processed by the lab). The tracking software started from the time the kits were logged from the manufacturer though the time the lab finished testing of the kit. The portion currently missing was from the medical providers because everyone else had a specified timeframe. For example, law enforcement would have 20 days under the legislation and the lab had 120 days. The timeframe for the medial providers was not meant to make anyone miss timelines. The goal was to include established timeframes in order for the kits to be completed as quickly as possible. There was a companion bill in the Senate and the timeframe for medical providers had been extended. She explained that training the previous summer for all participants (law enforcement, advocacy groups, and medical providers) used the seven-day timeframe, which would need to be adjusted if it was the will of the committee.

[2:36:42 PM](#)

Representative Hannan asked Ms. Henry if the forensic nurses had expressed their concern to DPS that a seven-day timeframe was unrealistic and that a 14-day timeframe was not objectionable.

Ms. Henry responded that DPS had worked with a forensic nurse named Angie Ellis. Initially for the training the nurses started with a seven-day deadline to determine whether the timeframe was reasonable. The training started the past July and nurses had determined that meeting the seven-day deadline was very difficult. She reported that the process was taking nurses closer to 10 to 14 days. Other forensic nurses including the forensic nurse expert consulted by DPS expressed concerns to the crime lab and department. The nurses had submitted letters of opposition voicing their concerns.

Representative Hannan stated her understanding that DPS wanted some timeline for medical providers because there currently was not one.

Ms. Purinton responded affirmatively. There was currently no timeline for medical providers.

Representative Hannan asked for verification that if the House version of the bill included the Senate's 14-day timeline it would satisfy DPS's concern that there was a timeline allowing victims to understand the parameters and track the process.

Ms. Purinton agreed. The department was trying to ensure there was transparency for victims.

[2:39:31 PM](#)

MAXINE DOOGAN, COMMUNITY UNITED FOR SAFETY AND PROTECTION, FAIRBANKS (via teleconference), shared that the group represented Alaska's current and former sex workers, sex trafficking victims, and allies. She testified in opposition to the bill because she was concerned about the insufficient attention to the privacy of sexual assault victims. The group was specifically concerned about the law enforcement and DNA database's access to victims' DNA. She highlighted a case in San Francisco where the police kept a rape victim's DNA and used it to crossmatch on a burglary case five years later. She relayed that did not support keeping DNA on file after sexual assault examination kits were processed for law enforcement agencies to access whenever they want. She stated it created an untenable situation for sexual assault victims to have to choose between getting justice or maintaining their privacy. The group hoped that the bill would include a provision to protect rape victims' DNA from being used by contractors responsible for the databases for various things. Additionally, she believed the bill should be restrictive on how law enforcement could access DNA. She was disappointed that the bill did not include those things thus far.

Co-Chair Foster recessed the meeting for House floor session.

[2:41:53 PM](#)

RECESSED

[5:18:27 PM](#)

RECONVENED

Co-Chair Foster continued with HB 275. He asked to hear a review of the fiscal note before returning to public testimony.

[5:21:10 PM](#)

Ms. Purinton reviewed the DPS fiscal note, OMB component 527 dated May 4, 2024. She explained that the bill required DPS to have sexual assault kit tracking software. She detailed that the department took advantage of federal funding available to secure the software for the sexual assault exam tracking application. The department had procured the software and it was implemented in the field. The federal funding also fully funded two staffing positions to enable the department to deploy, implement, and develop the training and management of the software.

Ms. Purinton relayed that unfortunately the grant funding was expiring in September 2024 and the fiscal note would cover the cost for the ongoing licensing and maintenance of the application and to continue with one of the two positions. She explained that now that the application was fully deployed, DPS believed it could manage the application, training, and outreach with one position. The FY 25 costs were partially offset to cover the first fiscal year that would still be covered by the federal grant and the \$177,500 would continue for the remaining personal services costs for FY 25. The funding would cover the single position and ongoing maintenance and licensing costs for the application, in addition to some travel and handouts related to law enforcement training and other stakeholders using the application throughout the state. The outyears included ongoing costs for the position and incremental annual cost for the software licensing at roughly \$1,000 per year.

Co-Chair Foster returned to public testimony. He thanked Ms. Morton for coming to testify.

[5:24:34 PM](#)

LAUREE MORTON, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, ALASKA NETWORK ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND SEXUAL ASSAULT, thanked the committee for

hearing the bill. She shared that the Alaska Network on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault (ANDVSA) fully supported the legislation. She was thankful for individuals who had not had the hard experience of sexual violence and the experience of gathering evidence from intimate parts of their body. She stood with those who had had the experience. She hoped everyone could agree that the ability for a person to see the progress of the evidence as it moved through the system was critical. She stressed that it should be a victim's right. She asked members to imagine being able to use the small mercy to see the status and location of the kit at any time. She stated that the bill would enable individuals to check the status of their kit without having to call someone in the system, wait to hear back, or worse to have their request get lost in the shuffle of the other person's busy day. Establishing the right to know the status and location of the evidence and putting in statute the mechanism to enact that right was a small critical step with a huge impact on the wellbeing of someone who had experienced sexual assault.

Ms. Morton underscored that the bill would give individuals a piece of their autonomy that was ripped away. She appreciated that the tracking also provided for a systems review to allow the state to see where the process ran smoothly, where missteps appeared, and may indicate what could be done better. The agency was invested in seeing the system improved timeframes to get the evidence through the process and believed the timeframes established were good first steps. Additionally, ANDVSA realized that with more information the timeframes may need to be loosened but hopefully they would be shortened. She thanked the committee for its time and support for the victims of sexual assault. She urged the swift passage of the bill. She added that for the last 20 years she had been one of the trainers for sexual assault response teams. She was available for any questions about the process.

[5:27:32 PM](#)

Co-Chair Johnson remarked that there had been a number of bills and legislation around sexual assault kits. She recalled former Representative Geran Tarr's bill, and she thought the legislature had funded a substantial amount of money to ensure backlogs were cleared up. She had called the state crime lab at the time and had asked how many kits they had waiting to be processed. She shared that the

number had been minimal compared to what the legislature had been told. She stated that the crime lab had not had a chain of custody for some of the other kits because exams were taken in small village or town police departments and sometimes victims had decided they did not want the kit processed. She stated it had turned into something where kits had been tested but there were no charges pressed and the kits had lost chain of custody. She thought the crime lab was basically caught up and that a lot of money had been spent to get to that point.

Ms. Morton responded that the crime lab had done a significant amount of work in getting caught up with the backlog. She relayed that after Representative Tarr's first bill that gave the crime lab one year to start getting the kits in order, the timeframe was reduced to six months. She relayed that the timeframe in the bill was reduced to 120 days (four months). She reported that the crime lab believed it may be able to reduce the time a bit more, but not down to immediately because the tests run took time to develop. The four months and perhaps a bit quicker seemed to be an appropriate timeframe. The bill was about kits moving forward. She confirmed that in the past a kit may stay with the Municipality of Anchorage or Juneau, but currently all kits were sent to and held in the state crime lab. Some of the kits were directly processed and sometimes victims had the evidence gathered in an anonymous kit. She explained that anonymous kits were not processed unless the victim decided to move forward. She noted that in some cases kits were processed and somewhere along the way a victim decided they no longer wanted to cooperate with law enforcement. She clarified it did not mean the kit information could not be used.

Ms. Morton relayed that a perpetrator's DNA evidence went into the national CODIS [Combined DNA Index System], but the victim's DNA did not. The crime lab had a process about whether they kept victim DNA to perhaps determine the difference between a victim's DNA and a perpetrator's DNA. She explained that there was an information form that was filled out so that victims were given the opportunity to understand how the system worked and how information was contained, which victims had to agree to. She stated that a lot of progress had been made since former Representative Tarr first took up the issue. She shared that there was a framework called "the six pillars" of appropriately responding to sexual assault; Alaska had instituted five of

the pillars. The sixth pillar was to put the crime victim right into statute, which would be implemented by the bill. She reiterated that progress had been made and the backlog had been reduced. She believed more staff had been hired and that one of the fiscal notes talked about the need for a given number of staff. Strides had been made in being able to better move forward with cases.

[5:33:58 PM](#)

Co-Chair Johnson asked for verification that DNA was not tested in a scenario where a sexual assault was reported but law enforcement chose to not follow up or charge anyone. She asked if the DNA was kept as evidence. She wondered if DNA collected from anyone by law enforcement was kept on record somewhere.

Ms. Morton responded that someone from the crime lab would need to answer the question. She clarified that she had been speaking about anonymous reporting kits where the victim chose not to go forward with the testing of a kit. She was not talking about law enforcement and whether or not they were pursuing cases.

Co-Chair Johnson considered the federal funding that had been received for the two positions and associated work. She wondered if the expectation had been that federal funding would be received and the state would later take on the funding responsibility. She remarked that it would still cost some money to continue on with the work.

Ms. Purinton responded that Mr. Kanaris, the state crime lab chief, could answer the questions pertaining to the grants. She relayed that one of the pillars was one of the recommendations to address the significant issue with the past backlog was to implement a tracking mechanism allowing transparency for victims to address all of the questions and issues where kits were sitting on a shelf somewhere and not processed timely. The bill would provide the transparency to allow a victim to track their kit once it was taken. She explained that it added transparency for victims that did not exist before. The department wanted the requirement codified in law in order to ensure the application to better serve victims was continued in perpetuity.

[5:37:42 PM](#)

Co-Chair Johnson considered artificial intelligence and a number of things that legislators had not thought about having to deal with before and believed that at some point a genetic privacy law would likely be needed. She wondered about the intended outcome was when the federal funding had been initially applied for. She asked if it was the intent that data would be collected, and a project would be completed where the only work going forward was information entered into a system when a report was taken. She observed that the state was picking up [the funding responsibility for] a position. She asked for background information.

Mr. Kanaris responded that when the department applied for the competitive grant in 2020, the funding was meant as seed money designed for inventory tracking and reporting to help setup a kit tracking system to help the lab conduct inventories and to make easier reporting of statistics showing where kits were in the process at any given time. The system was in place and operational and the department was asking for continued funding in order to continue providing the service, primarily for victims to make sure they were able to track their kits.

Representative Galvin noted that one of the earlier testifiers expressed concerned about the privacy of the victims' data. She wondered what happened with the victim data.

Mr. Kanaris understood that the testifier had highlighted a past case in San Francisco. He characterized it as a horrifying case that was an ethical violation using a victim's sample to search against current offenses. The national DNA index system CODIS hosted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), was extremely strict around what could and could not go into the database. He explained that the department had to follow all of the FBI guidelines, which were publicly available. He relayed that victim samples could not go into the database. He detailed that if the department violated the rule, it would run the risk of not having access to CODIS, which was a situation it would never risk. Some states allowed a local version of a DNA database. He elaborated that those states were predominately the larger states with multiple labs that input into the CODIS system. He informed members that those states were probably the most at risk of having a victim put into the system. He explained that because the state

crime lab was the only crime lab in Alaska, it did not have a true local [DNA] database. The only kind of local database in Alaska was a staff elimination database. He detailed that all of the crime lab staff with access to the DNA lab had the DNA on file in a mini database. He elaborated in the event of a contamination or when some other DNA was detected, it was searched against the staff elimination database. There were some other vendors who may have their DNA put in as well; however, there were no victim DNA samples in the staff elimination database. The crime lab had written policies about what kind of samples could be included.

[5:42:52 PM](#)

Representative Galvin thought the information was very important. She hoped that everyone was clear that the data was safe.

Co-Chair Foster set an amendment deadline of Friday, May 10 at 5:00 p.m.

HB 275 was HEARD and HELD in committee for further consideration.

[Note: Co-Chair Foster closed public testimony on HB 275 at approximately 5:52 p.m.]

[5:43:45 PM](#)

AT EASE

[5:47:04 PM](#)

RECONVENED

#sb104

SENATE BILL NO. 104

"An Act relating to appropriations to the civil legal services fund."

[5:48:01 PM](#)

Co-Chair Foster asked for a brief recap of the bill.

JAMES HOLZENBERG, STAFF, SENATOR FORREST DUNBAR, explained that the bill would give the Alaska Legal Services Corporation a slightly larger cut of filing fees and

damages awarded to the state. The amount was set at 25 percent back when the original idea had been floated. He explained that the number had been reduced to 10 percent and had remained at that level for the past several decades. He detailed that the Alaska Legal Services Corporation was striving to serve a growing number of low income applicants. Since 1984, the number of Alaskans eligible for legal services had more than doubled from 41,000 to over 128,850. He reported that the state's contribution to the Alaska Legal Services Corporation was only a fraction of what it was about 40 years ago. The bill aimed to stabilize funding for the corporation and to help ensure that civil legal aid was available to all Alaskans.

Co-Chair Foster asked for a review of the fiscal notes.

NANCY MEADE, GENERAL COUNSEL, ALASKA COURT SYSTEM, reviewed Judiciary's zero fiscal note, OMB component 768. She relayed that all of the filing fees collected by the court system went straight into the general fund for the legislature to appropriate as it saw fit. She explained that whether the legislature took 10 percent or 25 percent of the filing fees to provide to the Alaska Legal Services Corporation had no impact on the court system's operations.

Co-Chair Foster noted that the other fiscal note was from the Department of Commerce, Community and Economic Development. He believed the individual from the department was in another meeting.

Co-Chair Foster relayed that the committee would come back to the remaining fiscal note at another time.

SB 104 was HEARD and HELD in committee for further consideration.

Co-Chair Foster CLOSED public testimony on HB 275.

Co-Chair Foster RECESSED the meeting [note: the meeting never reconvened].

#  
ADJOURNMENT

[5:52:31 PM](#)

The meeting was adjourned at 5:52 p.m.