

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
HOUSE STATE AFFAIRS STANDING COMMITTEE

April 22, 2025

3:52 p.m.

DRAFT

MEMBERS PRESENT

Representative Ashley Carrick, Chair
Representative Andi Story, Vice Chair
Representative Rebecca Himschoot
Representative Ky Holland
Representative Sarah Vance
Representative Elexie Moore

MEMBERS ABSENT

Representative Kevin McCabe

COMMITTEE CALENDAR

PREVIOUS COMMITTEE ACTION

WITNESS REGISTER

ACTION NARRATIVE

[3:52:01 PM](#)

CHAIR ASHLEY CARRICK called the House State Affairs Standing Committee meeting to order at 3:52 p.m. Representatives Vance, Moore, Holland, Story, and Carrick were present at the call to order. Representative Himschoot arrived as the meeting was in progress.

^ALASKA POLICE STANDARDS COUNCIL

^ALASKA PUBLIC OFFICES COMMISSION

[3:52:52 PM](#)

CHAIR CARRICK announced that the first order of business would be confirmation hearings on the governor's appointments to the Fishermen's Fund Advisory & Appeals Council and the Commercial Fisheries Entry Commission.

[3:53:05 PM](#)

The committee took a brief at-ease at 3:53 p.m.

[3:53:34 PM](#)

}DANIEL CAROTHERS, Appointee* Alaska Police Standards Council* City & State* Testified as appointee to the Alaska Police Standards Council.{

-talked about his background and moving back to Juneau after, talks about experience working and running correctional facilities

-described the corrections council and talked about membership.

-talks about grant experience working in corrections and grew it into "what it is now", talks about doing polygraphs.

-talks about programs that were developed and joint operations with coast guard, talks about drowning rates before a pool was available.

-appreciated the time and open to question

[3:57:26 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE STORY said that she was grateful for his service to Alaska and asked if it was a re-appointment. She said that she appreciates her willingness to serve

MR. CAROTHERS responded that yes, it was a re-appointment and corrections is a big part of the state and always full of issues. Said he wants to help in whatever way, even small as possible. He said that one thing in corrections is dealing with fights and arguments and training people to de-escalate violence was good. He says he thinks he could be a help in the area.

[3:59:11 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HOLLAND said he appreciates the work he has been doing. He asked for his perspective, on what can be done to address recidivism and mentioned the growing cost of corrections. What insights he had and what goals he had for reappointment.

MR. CAROTHERS said this was the first time he was asked this question and appreciated it very much. He said one of the problems with corrections is asking for money, he said that looking at inmate profile right now, the department is doing well and corrections is going down. He said there are more Alaskan Natives incarcerated now than Caucasians, he said this is not a corrections problem but a wider issue. He remarked that this was an issue and they may be a way to address the disproportions of Alaskan Native inmates. He spoke about "mandatory good time" and it was based on the length of sentence. He said that it was changed to block time, he said that the good time can be taken away, he said this should not be changed but there were other issues. Said overcrowding is an issue and spurs behavioral problems. He said that if you could make the department look at punishment and control differently than it would do everything he just said. Save millions a year with fewer people in jail and having inmates that want to be good. He said in a tight confinement people fight over things like what tv channel. He said that if you could add to that statute then inmates could be alleviated. Change how people look at rehabilitation, community work service, basically cut time in half that would save millions and they would pay back the damage they did to the community with community service while in jail. He said nobody supervises current community service, said department of corrections could supervise. He said that he did this at Lemon Creek and one of problems in corrections would be a positive problem. Changing this statute and adding a "community service good time", less it is, less effective it would be. Imagine how much money it would save and inmates are still getting community condemnation but positive way. He said he has written many brochures on this to commissioners but it is politically hard to give prisoners "good time" and perspective of punishment. Add community work service as good time, reduce overcrowding, reduce costs and give corrections a tool to use.

[4:09:46 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HOLLAND said thank you for the comments and they reflect a great insight.

[4:10:05 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE VANCE said thank you and she agreed with his proposed model. She said that there are already many requirements for officers. More is being demanded from

officers. What would he recommend legislature to do to equip officers more.

MR. CAROTHERS said that he has been on the council for three years. He said that he would not consider himself an expert but there were education points that must be taught. Academy education and ongoing education, which the departments do. He said he does not know if the council can impact this much. Mental health, conflict resolution were "big ones". He said if there is a fight with two people arguing, it is good to go in with most power and pressure, go in soft and build up if you need to. He said that conflict resolution would be of great value. Said he did a statewide audit which corrections has and he believed in photographic evidence to back-up, they want training and if you visited craig and great risk in small places. don't have resources to keep staff safe. Talks about trooper getting stabbed and shot on Prince of Wales Island. Talks about bringing weapons into cell and do not understand risks involved. The training, conflict resolution.

[4:16:28 PM](#)

CHAIR CARRICK after ascertaining that there were no additional questions, moved to the next appointee.

[4:16:42 PM](#)

}WALT MONEGAN, Appointee* Alaska Public Offices Commission* City & State* Testified as appointee to the Alaska Public Offices Commission.{

-has been a police officer for almost 33 years, talks about his work background.

-started his service to the country and state when he was 19 and joined the service. Said he has been retired since 2018 but he still thinks he can support the next generation. Still interested in serving his state.

[4:18:59 PM](#)

CHAIR CARRICK asked if he was a re-appointment

MR. MONEGAN said it would first time

CHAIR CARRICK Speak to prior experiences related to elections in Alaska

MR. MONEGAN said that he has missed one voting opportunity. Wants people to trust the state and how elections are conducted. Said the way some other states operate elections erodes the trust in the state governments. Wants to ensure that things are done correctly

[4:20:35 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HOLLAND

MR. MONEGAN said there is a lot, said he spent a lot of youth living in Bush. Said that sometimes people feel like they don't get a fair shot. Said he wants to put this to rest, said he has been blessed with being innovative. More familiar he gets with APOC, there must be ways to refine it and make it better.

[4:22:24 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT said that he said there were examples in other states that he doesn't want to see in Alaska. Could he give any examples.

MR. MONEGAN said he doesn't recall which state but a situation in last general election where the ballots were questionable, it disrupts trust from citizens. Said that it was on eastern side of Rockies, talked about ballot boxes that had seals broken and a few other things.

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT said that APOC is not Division of Elections but he asked if he had a position on ranked choice voting and wasn't sure if it applies given an APOC appointment.

MR. MONEGAN said that ranked choice voting is a good thing, he had never registered for either party and sometimes voting on ballots for democrats or republicans. Said he was not glued to a party.

[4:26:38 PM](#)

CHAIR CARRICK opened public testimony for confirmation hearings. After ascertaining there was no one who wished to testify, she closed public testimony.

[4:27:32 PM](#)

The committee took a brief at-ease at 4:27 p.m.

[4:27:47 PM](#)

CHAIR CARRICK stated that the House State Affairs Standing Committee has reviewed the qualifications of the governor's appointees and recommends that the following names be forwarded to a joint session for consideration: Walt Monegan, Alaska Public Offices Commission; and Daniel Carothers, Alaska Police Standards Council. She said that signing the report regarding appointments to boards and commissions in no way reflects an individual member's approval or disapproval of the appointee, and the nomination is merely forwarded to the full legislature for confirmation or rejection.

[4:28:18 PM](#)

The committee took an at-ease from 4:28 p.m. to 4:31 p.m.

^#hb139

[4:31:22 PM](#)

CHAIR CARRICK announced that the next order of business would be HOUSE BILL NO. 139, "An Act relating to renting the governor's mansion; and providing for an effective date."

[4:31:51 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT moved to report HB 139 out of committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying fiscal notes. There being no objection, HB 139 was reported out of the House State Affairs Standing Committee.

^#hb104

[4:34:50 PM](#)

CHAIR CARRICK announced that the next order of business would be HOUSE BILL NO. 104, "An Act creating and relating to the address confidentiality program; and providing for an effective date."

[4:35:50 PM](#)

}TALIA EAMES, Staff* Representative Donna Mears* Alaska State Legislature* Juneau, Alaska* On behalf of Representative Mears, prime sponsor, presented HB 104.{ one behalf of Representative Mears, prime sponsor, presented HB 104.

-re-introduced HB 104 and what the proposed legislation would do.

[4:36:55 PM](#)

CHAIR CARRICK asked rep Mears to stay and went to amendments.

[4:37:06 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE VANCE moved to adopt Amendment 1 to HB 104, labeled 34-LS0484\N.1, C. Radford, 4/11/25, which read as follows:

INSERT AM 1 HERE

[REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT] objected for purpose of discussion.

REPRESENTATIVE VANCE spoke to Amendment 1. She talked about eligibility of sex trafficking and given her experience, she has learned that many of them need protections because traffickers are still a threat. These people need protections. This amendment stays consistent with the bill regarding privacy, another measure of protection for victims.

[4:38:49 PM](#)

CHAIR CARRICK objected for the purpose of discussion and asked the bill sponsor for any comment regarding Amendment 1.

[4:38:58 PM](#)

}REPRESENTATIVE DONNA MEARS* Alaska State Legislature, Juneau, Alaska* As prime sponsor, answered questions during the hearing on HB 104. { as prime sponsor of HB 104, advised that since human trafficking and sexual offenses would already be covered under crimes against a person; therefore, Amendment 1 would not "cover anyone extra as they are already covered under these definitions."

CHAIR CARRICK removed her objection to Amendment 1. There being no further objection, Amendment 1 was adopted.

[4:39:47 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE VANCE moved to adopt Amendment 2 to HB 104, as amended, labeled 34-LS0484\N.2, C. Radford, 4/11/25, which read as follows:

INSERT AM 2 HERE

CHAIR CARRICK objected for the purpose of discussion.

REPRESENTATIVE VANCE said that Amendment 2 would add judicial officers and public defenders. She talked about involvement in risky cases and how protections may be warranted. Give public servants the option to use if they need it, feels that these cases may be low but offer anyways.

[4:41:04 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HOLLAND asked for clarification for whom would be included for judicial officers.

REPRESENTATIVE VANCE responded that he was correct, includes judges without specifically saying that. Said there could be others acting in another capacity.

[4:42:22 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT said that her concern is getting it started seems valuable but wasn't sure whether it should be expanded yet, how many people are we talking about.

REPRESENTATIVE VANCE said that she did not know but was open to making adjustments if there was concerns about broadening net. Wants to ensure that public servants are covered. Wants to bring it to forefront of conversation. Open to adjustments

[4:44:19 PM](#)

}NANCY MEADE, General Counsel* Office of the Administrative Director* Alaska Court System* Anchorage, Alaska* Answered questions during the hearing on HB 104.{ gave an example of who would be included and how many

[4:44:50 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT asked what

MEAD said no

[4:45:01 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HOLLAND talks about OPA office and other stuff and asked if they were in the same bucket. Asked about who should be grouped into this, how many in OPA that could be in same ballpark.

MS. MEADE said that she did not know exact number, assistant public defender not public defender. Policy choice

[4:46:40 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE VANCE said that based off experience in court system , do you feel as if this would be helpful. Doesn't want to clog up bill, based on your experience is it helpful

MS. MEADE said that she did not ask for this but there may be a judge somewhere that could use it. She said that the vast majority would likely not. Huge range of applicability, said that there are neutral to change.

[4:48:23 PM](#)

CHAIR CARRICK asked if the bill sponsor had thoughts or concerns

[4:48:33 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE MEARS said that the primary impetus of the bill is protections for victims of sexual violence and domestic. Further we cast the net, harder it is to get it. Casts net a little too wide, against amendment. Expanding later would be better, not now.

CHAIR CARRICK agreed that this may be too wide of a net.

[4:50:34 PM](#)

A roll call vote was taken. Representatives Moore and Vance voted in favor of Amendment 2. Representatives Holland, Himschoot, and Carrick voted against it. Therefore, Amendment 2 failed to be adopted by a vote of 2-3.

[4:51:34 PM](#)

CHAIR CARRICK announced that HB 104, as amended, would be [tabled]. [The committee took up the bill again as the final order of business.]

^#hcr2

[4:51:54 PM](#)

CHAIR CARRICK announced that the next order of business would be HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 2, Proposing an amendment to the Uniform Rules of the Alaska State Legislature relating to voting and abstention from voting.

[4:52:34 PM](#)

}REPRESENTATIVE DONNA MEARS* Alaska State Legislature* Juneau, Alaska* As prime sponsor, introduced HCR 2.{
-said that we are all familiar with how conflict of interest works and when there may be a potential interest it is declared.
-often the conflict doesn't get on record. Resolution would change rules on unanimous consent to uniform vote.
-said it would be clearer when conflict of interest is around and how to approach it without looking guilty

[4:54:21 PM](#)

}COREY ALT, Staff* Representative Donna Mears* Alaska State Legislature* Juneau, Alaska* On behalf of Representative Mears, prime sponsor, presented HCR 2.{ on behalf of Representative Mears, prime sponsor, presented HCR 2.
-said what is a conflict of interest. When those interests collide there is a conflict.
-talks about conflict of interest.
-talked about broad class and when specific to person
-said some conflicts don't fit
-why the procedures exist...right to representation for all matters. Don't allow to skip votes, same time members voting on issues with personal interest undermines that right.
-talks about a system that appears to provide.
-talks about de-conflicting personal interests, in fact it does not, worked with leg research to find example where a member was excused from voting. Not an effective system.
-how other states do this, most states 48/49 require any member with conflict to not vote, abstaining can also be up to the member. By-vote would move Alaska into by-vote. Vote is taken whether conflict is legit.
-new system would be a majority vote. Member would be excused, why is this better than current system? Increase transparency, never gets into records, would require members to explain conflicts, members also seek to avoid voting.
-members would hopefully gain some more familiarity.

[5:02:59 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HOLLAND said that he has been one of the mystifying parts of legislation for many years. He asked for clarification whether it was non-debatable. Is the person who is declaring request to abstain, are

MR. ALT said that yes

REPRESENTATIVE HOLLAND was looking for clarification that it is non-debatable motion.

MR. ALT

REPRESENTATIVE HOLLAND asked another question

MR. ALT said that he could not answer

REPRESENTATIVE MEARS said that she thinks it applies

[5:04:58 PM](#)

CHAIR CARRICK remarked on the voting dynamics, in a scenario with 21 people, every vote matters. Let's say you have an education bill and a member who is declared by body to have a conflict, it could change outcome along caucus lines. She asked for how this politically could change what could happen.

REPRESENTATIVE MEARS responded that the conflict of interest statute is very narrow and person would be self-selecting to identify that conflict. If they truly have a conflict that was voted as a conflict, they should not be voting.

CHAIR CARRICK asked

REPRESENTATIVE MEARS said that

MR. ALT said that it would be 21, friendly to take an amendment on this need be

CHAIR CARRICK said it should be a 25- or 30-person vote. One variation of, body of 21 decides to conflict out one of their members.

MR. ALT said if it is the will of the committee

[5:09:11 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT said that she comes from a small town and you want to know her business, ask the neighbors. Could a member call a conflict on another.

MR. ALT said no

[5:09:45 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE VANCE said that the heart of this is for members to know when they should declare a conflict of interest and most declarations are not a "true conflict of interest". Wants to ensure no look of propriety but aren't real conflicts. Said there are financial gains that need to happen to be a real conflicts. Whole purpose of having this in rules is to hold themselves accountable. Said public does weigh in on issues, need to keep in mind that if that individual has a true conflict, how they respond as a body is almost as important because public will hold others accountable. All about public trust. Talked about vote threshold, can you describe the conversation with leg legal. What was the conversation

MR. ALT said that this conversation came from a conversation with staffers. The conversation with legal was brief,

[5:13:56 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HOLLAND said that the process used to, presiding officer has a set of questions to go through, put on record for what conflict is. He valued this process, draws it out. Is there any thought into where this declaration is followed by presiding officer to put a uniform set of responses on record. Objectively clarify things.

MR. ALT said the focus on crafting bill was to not take additional time on floor and this was not a priority but he sees how it could be useful. Couple of states that require members.

REPRESENTATIVE MEARS added that they also have more resources in legislature, rely a lot on integrity of members to do work.

[5:16:46 PM](#)

CHAIR CARRICK thanked the bill sponsor and her staff.

[HCR 2 was held over.]

^#hb104

[5:17:02 PM](#)

CHAIR CARRICK announced that the final order of business would be a return to HOUSE BILL NO. 104, "An Act creating and relating to the address confidentiality program; and providing for an effective date."

[5:17:14 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE STORY moved to report HB 104, as amended, out of committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying fiscal notes. There being no objection, CSHB 104(STA) was reported out of the House State Affairs Standing Committee.
#

[5:18:37 PM](#)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the committee, the House State Affairs Standing Committee meeting was adjourned at 5:18 p.m.