

Minutes of the Joint Legislative Oversight Committee

November 6, 2001

House Majority Caucus Room

Boise, Idaho

Co-chair Representative Debbie Field called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Committee members Co-chair Senator Betsy Dunklin, Senators Grant Ipsen, Stan Hawkins, and Bert Marley, and Representatives Maxine Bell, Margaret Henbest, and Donna Boe attended. Staff members Nancy Van Maren and Margaret Campbell also were present, as were other OPE staff intermittently throughout the meeting.

Co-chair Field welcomed Senator Betsy Dunklin as a new co-chair of JLOC, filling the vacancy left by Senator Lin Whitworth, and Senator Bert Marley as a new committee member.

REPORT RELEASE: *A REVIEW OF THE PUBLIC WORKS CONTRACTORS LICENSING FUNCTION IN IDAHO*

Ms. Van Maren reviewed the evaluation request. **Representative Henbest moved to receive the report, signaling its ability to be distributed. Representative Boe seconded the motion and, without objection, it passed by unanimous consent.**

Mr. Ned Parrish, Principal Performance Evaluator, presented a summary of the findings and recommendations of the report. Co-chair Field called on Mr. Dave Munroe, Administrator, Division of Building Safety, to respond to this evaluation of a function within his agency. Munroe thanked the committee for the evaluation, indicating he thought it was straightforward and concise, and would help make the bureau more efficient. He commented on each recommendation in turn. Munroe said the board had started looking at ways to develop licensing standards and would consult with other states on standards for judging applicant work experience. He also said board staff had begun verifying work history information submitted by applicants. Munroe said he had not taken any licensing cases to the board since August. He felt, concerning the issue of consulting the board on complaint cases, there should be a way to do it statutorily. He would consider working with Legislators to propose statutory amendments next session. He also distributed a conflict of interest policy he would ask board members to sign at the next meeting.

In response to questions, Mr. Parrish clarified how recent law changes had shifted licensing responsibilities from the board to the staff. The report recommended the board, which is now primarily charged with rulemaking, develop formal criteria for licensing as guidance to staff. Senator Hawkins asked Mr. Munroe what he and the board planned to do to modify the process for issuing licenses. Munroe responded that the board had met to discuss how the process could be modified. However, he felt the transition would be difficult because staff were now responsible for licensing, but they did not have the experience and qualifications of the board. He felt it was important for the board to continue to be involved in some way because of members' construction expertise. Mr. Parrish said statutory changes made in 2001 included a

provision requiring the board to begin hearing appeals of the administrator's licensing decisions in July 2002, and could limit board involvement in the initial decision-making process.

Representative Henbest asked whether she understood correctly that even though the law changes transferring responsibility went into effect in July, the board had continued reviewing applications until August—and that the board was resisting the transfer of responsibility to staff? Further, was Mr. Munroe saying that the board was “really strong” and the staff “unqualified”? Mr. Munroe responded that he and his staff began making the majority of licensing decisions in July and only took a small number of cases to the board after that to encourage a “smooth transition.” He also said the board was willing to make the changes required by statute, but had questioned whether the staff had the needed knowledge and expertise. Munroe indicated he shared their concerns about staff but said they would find ways to make the program work until current staff leave and are replaced with more qualified staff.

In response to questions, Mr. Munroe said the division “started yesterday” to develop the rules for the statutory change that became effective July 1 and would be working on them this winter. Members asked why there had been such a delay, to which Munroe responded that they didn't start discussing needed rule changes until the law change went into effect, that time was short to get the rules ready for consideration during the 2002 session, and that some of the board members needed time to learn about rulemaking.

Co-chair Field asked if the division had contacted the Tax Commission to see about getting the data OPE had concluded would be helpful. Munroe said he had contacted the Tax Commission, but they were not willing to provide the data. He said he needed to work with Legislators to come up with legislation to address this.

The committee discussed the recommendation to modify Idaho Code to grant the administrator clear authority to respond to complaints of unlicensed practice. Ms. Van Maren clarified that while 62% of all complaints involved unlicensed contractors, the division had no clear authority to act on these cases.

Representative Henbest moved to forward the evaluation to the germane committees (Commerce and Business), and request a report back from the division at the next JLOC meeting on its progress on addressing the report recommendations. Also, she moved that legislation to give the administrator authority to respond to complaints of unlicensed practice be drafted and forwarded to the germane committees. Representative Boe seconded the motion. In response to a request from Senator Ipsen, and with the concurrence of the second, **Representative Henbest amended the motion to add that JLOC request the germane committees report back what they planned to do in response to the report's recommendations. The amended motion passed unanimously by voice vote.** Representative Field clarified that JLOC should review and approve the draft legislation before it was forwarded to the germane committees.

The committee took a short break and celebrated Senator Ipsen's birthday.

REPORT RELEASE: A DESCRIPTIVE COMPILATION OF STATE AGENCY FEES

Ms. Van Maren introduced the team who worked on compiling state agency fees. She said a comprehensive list of the fees was too lengthy to include in the report, but was available by request. **By unanimous consent, the committee approved release of the report.**

Mr. Jim Henderson, Senior Performance Evaluator, presented a summary of the compilation. In response to questions, Henderson said the compilation took approximately 2,500 hours to compile and was the only compilation of its kind in the state. Co-chair Field thanked him and the other team members for their hard work on this project.

In discussion, Representative Henbest noted that it was interesting there were fees that *could* be levied that weren't, and that there was a lack of consistency in fees where you might expect consistency (e.g., across the Health Districts).

Senator Ipsen said this report illustrated the "fifth leg" of the taxation stool. He said fees came up every session and they were "mind boggling." The compilation showed fees were "huge."

In discussion, committee members asked about mechanisms to adjust fee levels if agencies had "over collected" and had fund balances that were too high, and how efficient currently-charged fees were. Are fees paying for themselves? Van Maren clarified that although this compilation was not evaluative, the database now existed that would allow certain questions to be answered for some subset of all fees: Are fees collected effectively? Are fee levels set so that fund balances remain at appropriate levels? Could there be improvements to the process to change a fee level?

In response to further questions, Mr. Henderson said it was not possible to determine the fee burden on the average taxpayer. It was suggested that one way to look at the fee burden on the average Idahoan (as opposed to taking a gross average, which would include highly specialized fees) would be to look more carefully at the fees for goods and services.

Senator Ipsen excused himself from the meeting.

Representative Henbest summarized that: (1) all legislative committee chairs should know that the database existed and that further information or analysis of the database could be requested to respond to committee questions; (2) there were obsolete fees—perhaps a message could be sent to agencies alerting them to do some housekeeping to eliminate obsolete fees while going through rule making?; and (3) it would be helpful to know how much it cost to collect a fee. Senator Dunklin added that it would be helpful to have someone from OPE provide information about fees to the committee chair training that was coming up, as there was a strong emphasis on fees and rules review. **By unanimous consent, the committee asked the co-chairs to send a letter to all germane committee chairs alerting them to this database and explaining that OPE could further analyze the fee information in response to their questions, possibly outlining in an attachment several questions that could be answered. In addition, the co-**

chairs would send a letter to leadership offering the fees data at the chairman training in December.

Members also suggested it would be beneficial to keep the information up to date, but were uncertain which agency could have that responsibility. It was suggested that the database could be offered to each agency and the Governor's Office.

REVIEW/APPROVAL OF EVALUATION SCHEDULE

Ms. Van Maren summarized previous committee action on topic requests, including possible subsequent "phases" of the state fees review. In response to questions, she said it would be best to do any further review of state agency fees while the database was current.

The Idaho Department of Agriculture's Domestic Cervidae Program

Van Maren reviewed a request received from the Idaho Wildlife Federation for an evaluation of the Department of Agriculture's domestic cervidae (e.g., elk, several species of deer) program. The request outlined concerns that the Department of Agriculture had not done enough to ensure the containment of Chronic Wasting Disease (CWD).

Co-chair Field called on Senator John Andreason to address the committee. Senator Andreason said that as chairman of the Commerce Committee, it was clear to him that we needed to protect the wild game hunting industry in Idaho in such a way that we can also have game farms. He had been working on the concerns about CWD for some time, and it appeared to him that the department was not willing to take all the steps necessary to guarantee herd safety.

Co-chair Field called on Jack Fisher, President, Idaho Wildlife Federation, to address the committee. Mr. Fisher said he had spoken with the department. He felt the program was not being managed as strongly as rule required and the department didn't seem interested in managing the program well.

Representative Bell asked why this was an issue for JLOC. It appeared that the department could handle it. Had the federation brought its concerns to the department? If the department wasn't doing its job, then something needed to be changed, "by somebody giving them more resources or leaning on them some other way."

Co-chair Field called upon Dr. Philip Mamer, Veterinary Medical Officer, Department of Agriculture. Dr. Mamer said the department had met with the Idaho Wildlife Federation and others to discuss their concerns, and were aware that the federation was not happy with the department's proposed rules. In response to questions, Mamer said the department had received responsibility for domestic elk from the Department of Fish and Game six years ago when CWD was not an issue. Nationally, there was very little known about the transmission of CWD, and, therefore, there were differences in opinion as to what should be done to prevent it. The department did not want to increase expenses for elk farmers unnecessarily.

The Handling of Investigations by the Bureau of Occupational Licenses and Conflicts of Interest in the Boards It Serves

Ms. Van Maren summarized Representative Gary Young's request for an evaluation of the Bureau of Occupational Licenses. Representative Young's concerns originated with a Board of Cosmetology case, but related to other boards within the bureau. Specifically, how well did the bureau handle investigations for the boards and how were conflicts of interest handled? Van Maren clarified that although the bureau had made a request of the Office of the Attorney General to review the Board of Cosmetology case, a broader evaluation would not conflict with or duplicate the AG's review.

Co-chair Field called on Ms. Rayola Jacobson, Chief, Bureau of Occupational Licenses, to address the committee. Ms. Jacobson said she began drafting a conflict of interest policy shortly after joining the bureau October 15. She said that at her request, bureau staff were investigating the concerns Representative Young had raised and would provide her a report November 15.

The Board of Medicine's Evaluation of Pre-Litigation Screening Panels

Ms. Van Maren reviewed the request for an evaluation of pre-litigation screening panels.

State Agency Management of Passenger Vehicles, Follow-up Report

Ms. Van Maren reviewed the status of the request for a follow-up evaluation of state agency management of passenger vehicles: with JLOC's encouragement, in Fall 2000, the Governor had issued an executive order to agencies to improve vehicle management; JLOC had decided to reconsider a follow-up evaluation of agency vehicle management a year after the executive order was issued. In addition, Senator Hal Bunderson had requested a vehicle evaluation that JLOC considered at its May 2001 meeting.

Idaho Child Care Program

Ms. Van Maren reminded members that JLOC had asked for an evaluation of ICCP to begin once resources became available. Co-chair Dunklin restated the primary concerns behind the evaluation request. In response to questions, Van Maren stated that the scope OPE developed, as always, would come back to JLOC for approval.

Co-chair Field said the office did not have any evaluations underway and would be able to begin two, possibly three, new evaluations, depending on scope and needed resources.

Senator Hawkins asked the committee to consider another topic—the payment of non-resident tuition at Idaho universities. He said he was concerned that Idaho schools were “magnets” for non-residents students because they could easily become residents (and pay resident rates). What percent of the students in Idaho's universities started out as non-residents but changed residency status while enrolled? How many initial non-residents gain residency but then move out of the state after graduation? If our fees start out already low and it's easy to establish

residency, are we unnecessarily encumbering the state's tax system, given the state support that goes to higher education? How strict are the residency policies and how do they compare to other states' policies?

In response to committee suggestions that his questions were more oriented to policy analysis than evaluation and that he could possibly get answers from Budget and Policy (LSO), Senator Hawkins said he had asked "for years" for information from college presidents, Legislative Council, the Board of Education, and the law library. Budget and Policy analysts tended to provide numbers and statistics that were readily available rather than analysis, such as how other states are doing things, etc.

Committee members discussed to what extent OPE should be asked to do policy analysis, with Co-chair Field urging the committee to remember that their primary charge was oversight. Some members asked whether JFAC could ask Budget and Policy to do more policy analysis to meet Legislators' needs. Representative Bell said she thought Budget and Policy staff could provide "raw figures" along with their other responsibilities, but she thought Senator Hawkins was speaking about policy, and JFAC tried not to deal with policy as much as they dealt with finances. Senator Hawkins said Budget and Policy staff can get the numbers, but didn't get to what was behind the numbers, such as the impact of policies held in other states.

Senator Dunklin moved to remove the evaluation of school readiness programs from the list of requested evaluations. She said that while the questions posed still needed to be answered, this was not the best venue for a review. **Without objection, her motion passed by unanimous consent.**

Representative Henbest moved to do a follow-up evaluation of state motor vehicle management as first priority. Representative Boe seconded the motion.

Members stated they wanted to ensure agencies had time to implement previous recommendations and the Governor's Executive Order, and asked specifically about Fish and Game's motor vehicle management system. In response to questions, Ms. Van Maren said the Executive Order did not include a monitoring provision. She also indicated the evaluation would be a significant undertaking because it involved gathering data across agencies.

The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

Senator Hawkins moved to conduct an evaluation of non-resident tuition for higher education as *third* priority, summarizing key questions: Are our non-residency features similar to other states? Are they having the effect of attracting non-residents to the state, draining resources? Representative Bell seconded the motion.

Representative Boe said she thought it important to remember the evaluation of programming for female inmates and their children. She thought it should be second priority. Senator Hawkins said he also thought it should be second priority.

Senator Marley said he would debate against the motion because a *second* priority needed to be determined before a third priority was voted on. Representative Henbest suggested that, given the tight budget year, it might be a good idea to do a scoping paper on the university topic, including an estimate of the time it would take to complete, and then decide whether to go forward from there.

Representative Bell asked if it would be too much of a load to keep the tuition topic in the wings and ready to begin. She said the request for an evaluation of Chronic Wasting Disease should be dropped from the list because the topic was not appropriate for JLOC. Senator Hawkins clarified that he only meant for OPE to get started on his topic with any time left over.

Senator Dunklin offered a substitute motion that OPE develop a scoping paper on the issue of non-resident tuition for higher education for full consideration at the next meeting. Senator Marley seconded the motion. The motion passed by majority voice vote, with Senator Hawkins recorded as voting no.

Senator Dunklin moved to conduct an evaluation of the Idaho Child Care Program as second priority. Senator Marley seconded the motion, “for the sake of discussion.” In response to questions, Van Maren said part of this evaluation would be policy analysis. Senator Dunklin said the primary focus should be how to get the most “bang for the buck.”

Representative Boe said an evaluation of programming for female inmates and their children would dovetail nicely with an evaluation of child care programs. Ms. Van Maren reiterated a concern about getting data: given the lack of programs in Idaho to evaluate, an evaluation would look at other states’ successes, which, in turn, would be difficult because few states had evaluated their own programs.

Co-chair Field again cautioned the committee about selecting topics that were primarily policy analysis, and drew the committee’s attention to the function’s mission statement—oversight.

The motion passed by majority voice vote, with Senator Hawkins recorded as voting no.

Representative Boe moved to conduct an evaluation of programming for female inmates and their children as third priority. Senator Dunklin seconded the motion.

Representative Henbest said she supported the motion, but said she was concerned about JLOC being asked to do policy analysis. Still, how was the Legislature to make good decisions without policy-related information? Somehow, someone needed to “pick up the ball,” whether it was this committee, Budget and Policy Analysis, or germane committee staff—the Legislature needed more information to make informed decisions.

Co-chair Field reiterated that JLOC was charged with *oversight* of agency programs. She said this was the first time she recalled that JLOC was considering asking OPE to do an evaluation that was really policy analysis. Senator Dunklin suggested the co-chairs write a letter to leadership urging that they consider the policy analysis “gap” that needed to be filled.

Senator Hawkins said, looking through the list of completed evaluations, several evaluations had been completed that contained policy analysis. "If all we're going to do is check agencies for compliance," then let the financial auditors do it. He thought JLOC *did* have the ability to do policy analysis, and that analyzing what happens in other states is a good idea. He said he thought JLOC should "tread lightly" on policy matters, but definitely "go there." This was the only committee that could get to the bottom line, looking, for example, at the best delivery [of a state service] intended under the law.

Representative Henbest said she agreed with Senator Hawkins that policy analysis was important; there appeared to be a "gray zone" between policy analysis and oversight. Perhaps the committee needed a clone so it could do both? As related to the motion, an evaluation of programming for female inmates could look into the void [of programming] and ask why there was a void.

The motion passed by majority voice vote.

In response to questions, Ms. Van Maren said potential topics for evaluation stay on a list for nine months before they "expire." However, members can bring back a topic at any time.

Representative Henbest moved to drop the potential evaluation of the Board of Medicine's pre-litigation screening panels from the list. The motion passed by unanimous consent.

Representative Bell asked unanimous consent to drop the evaluation of the Department of Agriculture's domestic cervidae program from the list of potential topics, and send a letter to the germane chairs requesting follow-up with the Department of Agriculture.

Senator Dunklin said she thought this was a serious issue and wanted some assurance that it would be handled properly. Senator Marley and others said they thought leaving it on the list should be incentive to the agency to address outstanding concerns. Representative Henbest asked that the topic be left on the list through the approval of the department's new rules.

Representative Bell withdrew her request for unanimous consent.

Without objection, staff were asked to monitor what happens during the session and send a letter to the germane committees alerting them that JLOC had considered this evaluation, were concerned, and may again consider an evaluation in the future.

The committee took a break for lunch.

CONSIDERATION OF REQUESTED DRAFT STATUTORY CHANGES RE: STATE BOARD OF MEDICINE

Mr. Ned Parrish reviewed the report recommendations behind the draft statutory changes the committee had requested for consideration. Co-chair Field asked Representative Henbest and

Senator Ipsen, given their assignments to health and welfare committees, to work with Ms. Nancy Kerr, Executive Director, Board of Medicine, on this legislation. When asked for her comments on the legislation, Ms. Kerr said she had just received a copy and the board would be able to review it at a meeting in December. Representative Henbest asked Kerr to contact her with any comments or questions.

Senator Marley moved to approve the statutory changes as written. Representative Boe seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

THE STATE BOARD OF MEDICINE'S REPORT TO COMMITTEE ON HANDLING SENSITIVE INFORMATION AND HEALTH CARE PROVIDER PROFILING SYSTEM

Mr. Jim Henderson provided the committee background information about the two outstanding recommendations from this report, both of which were directed to policymakers. Co-chair Field asked Ms. Kerr to address the committee. Kerr summarized the board's report on its survey of other states' profiling programs.

Representative Henbest asked Kerr if she was correct in understanding that her cost estimates were for bringing the profiler system in-house? If so, would statute allow this? Kerr said it would save money and there was no statutory requirement that the board use a vendor instead.

Ms. Van Maren clarified that the issue of concern from the evaluation was that there was no verification of the profiling system data, not that the system was handled by a vendor or could be maintained less expensively. Representative Henbest asked if the Idaho Medical Association had opposed verification, and Kerr said that was her recollection. Representative Henbest asked if there was a need for statutory change to strengthen the system, noting that she believed the information provided needed to be verified.

Without objection, a request that Representative Henbest keep this issue in mind as she and Senator Ipsen meet with the Board of Medicine was passed by unanimous consent.

PROGRESS REPORTS: *EMPLOYEE MORALE AND TURNOVER AT THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION AND INMATE COLLECT CALL RATES AND TELEPHONE ACCESS*

Mr. Ned Parrish summarized the department's efforts to resolve outstanding recommendations from the fourth progress report on OPE's evaluation of employee morale and turnover. Of the six previously outstanding recommendations, three were "in progress" and three "resolved."

Co-chair Field called on Mr. Tom Beauclair, Director, Department of Correction, to address the committee. Beauclair said the problems identified in the report were symptoms of a dysfunctional organizational culture he was working to change. He was committed to professionalizing the department, although change was a process, not an event, and the department faced challenges associated with incredible growth. In summary, the department had improved hiring practices, had flattened the organizational structure, and was committed to

improving relationships with stakeholders. Co-chair Field thanked Mr. Beauclair for his attendance and efforts to address outstanding recommendations.

Representative Henbest moved to request a progress report in six months. Representative Boe seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Paul Headlee, Performance Evaluator, reviewed the status of key findings from the inmate phone rate report, saying all OPE's recommendations had been made requirements of the RFP. However, implementation of the recommendations was "in process" until a phone vendor had been chosen and the contract signed.

Mr. Tom Brock, Department of Correction, said the bids were due by November 15. A committee would review them and the director would select the vendor. In response to questions, Brock said the department had asked for set rates for all facilities and would "look at the lowest rates." Mr. Don Drum, Department of Correction, said the RFP replaced the commission with a franchise fee, the level of which had been determined by the department based on funding needs. He reassured members that revenues from this fee went through the JFAC budgeting process. Representative Henbest asked if families were still going to bear the high cost of collect calls. Drum said the vendors had indicated the rates would be lower. If that did not occur, the department would reconsider—and could shift funding sources (for services paid for by phone revenues) if needed.

Representative Bell asked why the department allowed open-end use of phones, to which Beauclair responded that this was common nationally.

Representative Henbest moved that JLOC hear back the outcome of the RFP and outcome of the franchise fee level and phone rates, acknowledging that these had potential budget implications. Without objection, the motion passed by unanimous consent.

REPORT ON DOC'S NICI BOOT CAMP AND RETAINED JURISDICTION EVALUATION

Ms. Lewissa Swanson provided a background summary of the request for information on the comparative effectiveness of the 120-day and 180-day retained jurisdiction programs at NICI. Co-chair Field called on Naala Evans and Steve Bellomy, Department of Correction, to address the committee. Ms. Evans said the department had concluded there were no significant differences in recidivism between the 120-day and 180-day boot camp programs. Mr. Bellomy added that there was a cost savings to the state by reducing the program to 120 days.

In discussion, Representative Henbest asked if there was an effort within the department to assess outcomes on an ongoing basis, to which Bellomy replied there was—in addition to internal program evaluation. She said it wouldn't be necessary to report back to JLOC again, **so asked unanimous consent to close follow-up on this issue. Without objection, the motion passed by unanimous consent.** Representative Boe asked the department to share its data with the Judiciary and the Parole Commission.

Given time constraints, Co-chair Field announced that the Department of Health and Welfare's progress report on Idaho's Medicaid Program would be postponed until the next meeting.

REQUESTED REPORT ON IMPROVEMENTS TO OVERSIGHT OF BIG HORN SHEEP LOTTERY

Mr. Paul Headlee, Performance Evaluator, reviewed the outstanding recommendation that the Department of Fish and Game work with other agencies involved in wildlife disease research. He said the recommendation was "in process" but would be completed when the final agreement was signed. Co-chair Field called on Rod Sando, Director, Department of Fish and Game, for comment. Sando said the MOU was circulating, awaiting signature.

In response to committee questions about the state's response to the threat of Chronic Wasting Disease, Sando said his department had "weighed in" on the rules about a year ago. He thought our Department of Agriculture had some of the best rules in the nation. He said the two departments collaborated, sharing a veterinarian.

Representative Henbest moved to request a final progress report from the Department of Fish and Game at the next meeting, stating that it sounded like the MOU would be final early in the session. **The motion passed by unanimous consent.**

ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES

Co-chair Field welcomed two new performance evaluators to OPE: A.J. Burns and Chris Shoop.

FY2003 Budget Request

Co-chair Field announced that the co-chairs would present OPE's budget to JFAC during the 2002 legislative session, as Ms. Van Maren would be leaving state employment prior to session. The budget for FY2003 was a maintenance request that included replacement items only. She said that in the past, the JFAC chairs did not vote on JLOC's budget request due to a conflict of interest.

Representative Henbest moved to accept the budget request and Representative Boe seconded it. The motion passed by majority voice vote. Representative Bell abstained, as a Chair of JFAC, and Senators Hawkins and Marley were recorded as voting no, given their membership on JFAC.

Status Report on Director Search

Co-chair Field updated the committee on efforts to combine Legislative Audits under JLOC. Her research had shown that most states were combined, independent offices. Also, Senator Bunderson had organized and chaired, with the Speaker's approval, a taskforce to look at all options. The taskforce met for the first time October 11, shared research information, and proposed four organizational options. Co-chair Field presented findings to Legislative Council at their meeting October 18 and stressed to them that the function required independence. Of the

four options proposed by the taskforce, two were valid because they maintained independence. The other two options combined the function under Legislative Services, which would compromise independence.

A week later, Speaker Newcomb disbanded the taskforce and requested the organizational structure to remain status quo. On Monday, November 5, leadership restarted the taskforce, with the direction of combining the two offices to be independent under an oversight committee. Field said she would co-chair the taskforce with Senator Bunderson. Senator Dunklin clarified that JLOC had originally created a search committee for a new director to make recommendations to Legislative Council, which would then hire the new director as provided under statute.

Co-chair Field thanked Ms. Van Maren for her excellent service in helping to establish this function in the state. She thanked her for returning to the office after the birth of her baby to work part time until the office could transition to a new director, and presented her with a token of the committee's appreciation. Ms. Van Maren said that while her goal was to work until a new director could take over, it appeared the process would take longer than originally anticipated. She anticipated that her resignation would take effect at the end of the year.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.