

ARIZONA STATE SENATE

45TH LEGISLATURE FIRST REGULAR SESSION

MINUTES OF COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY

DATE: February 27, 2001 **TIME:** 1:30 pm. **ROOM:** SHR 1

CHAIRMAN: Senator Richardson **VICE CHAIRMAN:** Senator Bee

ANALYST: Sheryl Rabin **COMMITTEE SECRETARY:** Tracey Moulton

INTERNS: Lou Bacchi; Joseph Martin Belson, Jr.

ATTENDANCE

BILLS

<u>Committee Members</u>	<u>Pr</u>	<u>Ab</u>	<u>Ex</u>	<u>Bill Number</u>	<u>Disposition</u>
Senator Aguirre	X			S.B. 1157	DISCUSSION/HELD
Senator Bundgaard	X			S.B. 1548	DISCUSSION/HELD
Senator Burns	X			S.B. 1238	DISCUSSION/HELD
Senator Cumiskey	X			S.B. 1255	DISCUSSIONHELD
Senator Rios	X			S.B. 1284	DISCUSSION ONLY
Senator Smith	X			S.B. 1511	HELD
Senator Bee, Vice Chairman	X			H.B. 2061	DPA
Senator Richardson, Chairman	X			H.B. 2085	DP
				H.B. 2279	DP
				H.B. 2473	DP

GOVERNOR'S APPOINTMENTS

<u>Name</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
Janice Wezelman	Commission on Trial Court Appointments – Pima County	CONFIRMATION

Tape 1, Side A

Chairman Richardson called the meeting to order at 1:33 p.m. and attendance was noted. For additional attendees, see Sign-In Sheet (Attachment A).

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Senator Richardson announced that there were no minutes available for approval.

EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

Janice Wezelman, Member, Commission of Trial Court Appointments – Pima County – CONFIRMATION

Senator Smith moved that the Committee on Judiciary recommend to the full Senate the confirmation of Janice Wezelman to the Commission of Trial Court Appointments–Pima County. The motion CARRIED with a roll call vote of 7-0-1 (Attachment 1).

CONSIDERATION OF BILLS

S.B. 1511 – local officers; merit system – HELD

Senator Richardson announced that S.B. 1511 would be held at the request of the sponsor.

H.B. 2061 – victim compensation; unclaimed property– DO PASS AMENDED

Joseph Belson, Research Intern, explained H.B. 2061 makes technical corrections to H.B. 2037 which was passed last year and directs the Arizona Department of Revenue (DOR) to deposit unclaimed victim restitution funds into the victim compensation and assistance fund.

Mr. Belson explained the Richardson amendment dated 2/26/01, 12:10 p.m.

Senator Richardson announced the following people were present in support of the bill: **Edwin Cook, Arizona Prosecuting Attorney’s Advisory Council; Gordon Mulleneaux, Arizona Association of Superior Court Clerks; Joy Marx-Mendoza, representing herself; John Blackburn, Arizona Criminal Justice Commission; Jeff Kros, Legislative Liaison, Arizona Department of Revenue.**

Senator Bee moved H.B. 2061 be returned with a DO PASS recommendation.

Senator Bee moved the Richardson amendment dated 2/26/01, 12:10 p.m. be ADOPTED (Attachment B). The motion CARRIED with voice vote.

Senator Bee moved H.B. 2061 be returned with an AS AMENDED, DO PASS recommendation. The motion CARRIED by a roll call vote of 7-0-1 (Attachment 2).

S.B. 1548 – death penalty; incompetent inmate – DISCUSSION ONLY

Sheryl Rabin, Research Analyst, explained S.B. 1548 prohibits the state from executing a death sentence against an incompetent inmate and outlines a court process used to determine whether an inmate who has been sentenced to death is mentally incompetent. This bill creates a two pronged test to determine an inmate's incompetency. First, the inmate must, as a result of a mental disorder, be unaware of the inmate's impending execution. Second, the inmate must be unaware that the execution will be for the crime of murder.

The bill prohibits the state from executing a death sentence against an incompetent inmate. Currently, the state does not execute incompetent inmates, but instead attempts to restore them to competency prior to execution. Under this bill there is no requirement to restore an incompetent inmate to competency.

Under S.B. 1548, if an inmate proves incompetent by a preponderance of the evidence, the sentencing court must strike the death sentence and enter in its place a sentence for life imprisonment, which is not subject to commutation, parole, community supervision, work furlough or work release.

The bill outlines the court process to be used in determining incompetency and specifies that an inmate is not incompetent merely because competence depends on continuing treatment, including the use of medication.

Jim Bush, Attorney, representing himself, testified in support of the bill and commented that this bill is regarding post conviction procedures. In Arizona there is no distinction between mental incompetency and mental retardation. He remarked that under current statute, the Department of Health shall provide competency restoration treatment to a prisoner found incompetent. This includes medication. After the prisoner recovers competency, the chief medical officer of the state shall certify that the prisoner is competent and execution can be carried out.

Mr. Bush stated that the Arizona State Supreme Court, in a case involving a woman who was in a chronic vegetative state, said that the court hold that the Arizona Constitution, Article 2, section 8, right of privacy, also provides for a right to refuse medical treatment. Mr. Bush stated the right to refuse medical treatment is a limited right. If the State has compelling interest, it has the right to override the decision to refuse medical treatment in four categories; to preserve life; to safeguard the integrity of the medical profession; to prevent suicide; and to protect innocent third parties. None of these address the issue of forcing medical treatment for the purpose of restoring competency and carrying out an execution.

Mr. Bush stated that two other State Supreme Courts have ruled that the constitutional right to privacy would be violated if the State were to sanction forced medication solely to facilitate an execution. Federal due process and the Arizona State Constitution require that an inmate can only receive forced medication when the inmate is dangerous to himself or others, and then, only when it is in the inmate's best interest. This creates a constitutional prohibition against forced medical treatment to restore competency.

Mr. Bush noted the medical profession code of ethics prohibits physicians from participating in an execution. Their council on judicial ethics has held that the treatment for restoration of competency amounts to participating in a lawful execution, unless: a commutation order has been

issued before commencing treatment, the prisoner is undergoing extreme suffering as a result of psychiatric or other illness, or medical intervention is intended to mitigate the level of suffering.

Senator Nichols, bill sponsor, testified that Mr. Bush has covered the legal aspect of the situation and commented that he was present more because he is a physician. He stated that it is a mark of a civilized society to have legislation of this nature.

Paul McMurdie, Maricopa County Attorney's Office, testified in opposition to the bill and commented that this bill does not change the standard in the present statute. He remarked that in order to restore someone to competency in a prison setting, it must be demonstrated that an inmate is a danger to himself or to others. This is a test that has been sent down from the Supreme Court and one that has been adopted by Arizona. This test does not need to be opened up. This bill has severe drafting errors that are not consistent with Arizona laws. The bill has the Superior Court issuing warrants of execution, which is incorrect because the State Supreme Court issues those warrants. It has a limitation of six months to refile, which he opined is unconstitutional, as the question has to be whether the inmate, at the time of execution, is competent. In the bill, the alternative to a death sentence is a life sentence. He pointed out that until 1992, and there was not a natural life sentence available, so this option would not be available to those inmates sentenced prior to 1992. The bill also has the Superior Court issuing stays of execution.

Mr. McMurdie commented that the position of the prosecuting community is simple. Doctors have a duty to treat if an inmate is so incompetent that the inmate does not meet the present standard. The collateral consequences are irrelevant to the doctor and they should be. A doctor is no different than any other citizen and they should not be able to take their medical ethics and change the law in the State of Arizona. A jury has convicted these individuals, a judge has determined that the death penalty is the appropriate sentence and the Arizona Supreme Court has reviewed the case and determined that death is the appropriate judgment based on what this individual did. He stated that the prosecuting community believes that the law should be carried out and the victims should have closure and a particular inmate should not thwart justice simply because they are able to get a psychologist or psychiatrist to indicate that they do not meet the competency standard.

Belton Meyer, M.D., Arizona Medical Association, testified in support of the bill and commented that an individual's position on capital punishment is the personal moral decision of that individual, however, as a physician, as a member of a profession that is dedicated to preserving life, when there is hope of doing so, should not be a participant in a legally authorized execution. This includes: an action that would assist, supervise or contribute to the ability of another individual to directly cause the death of a condemned individual or an action that could automatically cause an execution to be carried out on a condemned prisoner.

Senator Richardson announced the following people were present in support of the bill: **Monsignor Edward Ryle, Arizona Catholic Conference; Max Dine, representing himself; Samantha Fearn, Chamber of Commerce; Joy Marx-Mendoza, representing herself; Marjorie Mead, representing herself; Kathy Saile, Franciscan Renewal Center; Joe Abate, Arizona Psychiatric Society; Julie Scott, Mental Health Association of Arizona; Cheryl Collier, Mental Health Association of Arizona; Sherri Walton, Mental Health Association of Arizona; Eleanor Eisenberg, Arizona Civil Liberties Union.**

Senator Richardson announced the following people were present in opposition to the bill: **Michael Haener, Attorney General's Office; Edwin Cook, Arizona Prosecuting Attorney's Advisory Council.**

Senator Richardson announced that S.B. 1548 would be heard again in the next Judiciary Committee meeting with two amendments.

H.B. 2085 – courts; fees; waiver and deferral – DO PASS

Ms. Rabin explained H.B. 2085 clarifies the standards and processes for deferral and waiver of court fees and costs. In 1997 the Legislature combined the statutes into one statute relating to fee deferrals and waivers, prioritized deferrals over waivers and made it more difficult for a person to obtain a waiver. Furthermore, the legislation required applicants for fee deferrals to consent to judgment being entered against the applicant for all fees and costs that are deferred but remain unpaid after 30 calendar days. The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) reports that some courts would rather not have a consent to judgment signed in all deferral cases because when fee obligations are of small amounts, an entry of judgment and collection are not cost effective. Furthermore, the law has created implementation problems for the courts because the standard for granting a waiver is "permanent inability to pay," but the statute includes no definition of that phrase. Both the AOC and the Arizona Association of Superior Court Clerks state that defining the phrase will allow for additional consistency among the courts.

Senator Richardson announced the following people were present in support of the bill: **Gordon Mulleneaux, Associate Clerk, Arizona Association of Superior Court Clerks; and David Sands, Administrative Office of the Courts.**

**Senator Bee moved H.B. 2085 be returned with a DO PASS recommendation.
The motion CARRIED by a roll call vote of 6-1-1 (Attachment 3).**

H.B. 2279 – probate – DO PASS

Ms. Rabin explained H.B. 2279 modifies Arizona probate law to improve consistency with the Uniform Probate Code. The National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws (NCUSL) is a non-governmental body that was formed in 1892 for the purpose of promoting uniformity in state laws "on all subjects where uniformity is deemed desirable and practicable." The commissioners of the NCUSL oversee the preparation of Uniform Laws that all states are encouraged to adopt. The Uniform Laws are legislative proposals for state legislatures to consider. One of the Uniform Laws is the Uniform Probate Code. Like other states, Arizona has Governor-appointed commissioners on the NCUSL. An Arizona Uniform Laws Commissioner and the State Bar of Arizona have identified changes in the Uniform Probate Code that they believe should be adopted into Arizona law. H.B. 2279 makes Arizona law more consistent with both existing and new Uniform Probate Code provisions.

Senator Richardson announced the following people were present in support of the bill: **Roger Curley, Probate and Trust Law Sections of the State Bar; Ron Johnson, State Bar of Arizona; and Jim Bush, Arizona Uniform Laws Commission.**

**Senator Bee moved H.B. 2279 be returned with a DO PASS recommendation.
The motion CARRIED by a roll call vote of 8-0-0 (Attachment 4).**

H.B. 2473 – extreme DUI; alcohol concentration. – DO PASS

Lou Bacchi, Research Intern, explained H.B. 2473 decreases from 0.18 to 0.15 the blood alcohol content (BAC) required to convict a defendant of extreme driving under the influence (DUI). The bill provides that a person with a BAC of 0.15 or greater who operates or is in physical control of a vehicle is guilty of driving under the extreme influence of intoxicating liquor. The 0.15 BAC is a recommended safety threshold recognized by the National Traffic Safety Board, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration and The Century Council, which represents the liquor industry.

Steve Tyrrell, Mothers Against Drunk Driving, testified in support of the bill.

Shannon Slattery, Maricopa County Public Defender’s Office, testified in opposition to the bill and commented that the Public Defender’s Office and the defense community at large is not in favor of drinking and driving. She stated that they are in favor of fair laws that give adequate notice to the public about what constitutes drinking and driving and what they are dealing with when they socialize.

Ms. Slattery commented that up 70% of the people in the community can identify that there are drinking and driving limits, but less than 50% can accurately identify what they are by jurisdiction.

Tape 1, Side B

Senator Richardson announced the following people were present in support of the bill **Marjorie Mead, National Organization of Women; Janice Goldstein, Arizona Trial Lawyers Association; Mike Petchel, Arizona Police Association; Ed Wren, Phoenix Law Enforcement Association, Arizona Highway Patrol Association; Lee Fairbanks, M.D., representing himself.**

Senator Bee moved H.B. 2473 be returned with a DO PASS recommendation. The motion CARRIED by a roll call vote of 4-3-1(Attachment 5).

S.B. 1157 – threatening; intimidating; criminal justice employees - DISCUSSION/HELD

Mr. Bacchi explained the strike-everything amendment to S.B. 1157 provides that threatening or intimidating a known elected official of the state, a county, a city or other political subdivision of the state is a class 6 felony.

Senator Burns commented that she questioned whether the subject strike-everything amendment is germane to the bill title.

Senator Richardson announced S.B. 1157 would be held until next week.

S.B. 1238 – inmates; early release; drug treatment – DISCUSSION/HELD

Senator Richardson announced that testimony would be heard on the bill and the bill will be heard and voted upon in the next meeting.

Ms. Rabin explained the strike-everything amendment to S.B. 1238 requires the Arizona Department of Corrections (ADC) to develop and implement a residential drug treatment pilot

program. Under the amendment, ADC contracts with a private entity inside or outside of the state to provide the drug treatment services. Judges are permitted to order a person convicted of any specified nonviolent offense to a sentence in a residential facility that provides services through the pilot program. The amendment appropriates \$2.2 million from the state general fund in FY 2001-2002 to ADC to fund a facility under the program. The pilot program would be repealed on July 1, 2004.

Jeff Taylor, The Grace Place, testified in support of the bill and commented that sentencing judges are limited on how they can sentence a drug offender. There are differing levels of probation, house arrest and the offender keeps re-appearing in court because he has an untreated drug problem. He stated that he has spoken to many judges throughout the State who have stated that they would prefer to have sentencing options that include long-term residential treatment.

Mr. Taylor noted that he testifies from a perspective of being an addict and noted that at his last arrest and sentencing, he was given a choice to go to the Department of Corrections or a long-term residential facility. He commented that long-term residential facilities are more than dealing with not doing drugs, but it is about being a good parent, literacy and other barriers that stand in front of people who are doing drugs in order to cope with their lives. He stated that two years ago, he developed a diversion program with Coconino County. He noted that of the 28 offenders that were sent to his facility, to date 20 are out of prison.

Mr. Taylor remarked that there are some other drug diversions programs that are having significant decreases in recidivism and a savings to the counties of the State. He urged the Committee to consider the bill favorably.

Nancy Hughes, Assistant Director, Community Directions, Arizona Department of Corrections (ADC), testified in opposition to the bill and commented that the intention of the bill and the amendment is one the Department would support, but opined that in their current format, they will not be able to accomplish its goal. She distributed a handout entitled "Arizona Department of Corrections Substance Abuse Services" (Attachment C). Her testimony was based on the handout.

Senator Petersen, bill sponsor, testified that the bill is about diversion programs and noted that diversion programs have proven to work nationally. Unfortunately, because of lack of funding, he noted there are no diversion programs in existence at this time. He stated that the costs of drug diversion programs are approximately half of incarceration. He noted that this plan of action should be considered as a solution to this problem.

Shannon Slattery, Maricopa County Public Defender's Office, testified in support of the bill and commented that the State is very nearly in a crisis situation with how drug offenders can be treated after they are released from incarceration. Drug abuse and addiction is a lifetime cycle, the same as alcoholism. Once an individual has the skills to deal with the problem, people can become productive citizens and provide services to communities. In the drug court program, it has been discovered that inpatient rehabilitation is necessary for many of these people who have been addicted to drugs for many years. She opined that this is something that has to be addressed.

Jerry Landau, Maricopa County Attorney's Office, testified in opposition to the bill for a number of reasons. He stated that the Office believes in diversion programs for first time offenders and drug treatment and funds being appropriated for drug treatment, but it must be in the appropriate context. He stated that the Office believes that this bill takes the State back to before truth in

sentencing. He stated the language is combining first offenders with multiple offenders and is lacking definitions of “violent offenders”.

Mr. Landau remarked that the bill takes multiple offenders out of the mandatory imprisonment sections of statute, which cuts into truth-in-sentencing and the criminal code. He stated that once the offender is released from prison, after care is needed and should be available as well, but the responsibility and accountability of the offender should not be undercut with the removal of prison sentencing.

Eleanor Eisenberg, Arizona Civil Liberties Union, testified in support of the bill and commented that the bill starts to restore judicial discretion. The bill does not state that a person has to be permitted to go into treatment centers, but rather it states that a judge “may” order it.

Senator Richardson announced **George Taylor, representing himself**, was present in support of the bill.

Senator Richardson announced the following people were present in opposition to the bill: **Edwin Cook, Arizona Prosecuting Attorney’s Advisory Council; and Dr. Robert Olding, Department of Corrections.**

S.B. 1255 – injuries; firefighters; peace officers– DISCUSSION/HELD

Ms. Rabin explained S.B. 1255 eliminates the doctrine known as “the fireman’s rule” that states that a property owner or occupant is not liable for unintentional injuries suffered by firefighters or police officers in responding to a problem on the property.

The doctrine known as “the fireman’s rule” states that a property owner or occupant is not liable for unintentional injuries suffered by firefighters or police officers in responding to a problem on the property. In cases currently barred by the fireman’s rule, the rationale is assumption of the risk, the idea that emergency personnel are prohibited from recovering damages when they have been hurt by the very hazards that they were employed to confront. Assumption of the risk is normally a defense, but in cases that fall under the fireman’s rule, the rule prevents the plaintiff from even bringing the case forward.

Jurisdictions throughout the country have adopted various exceptions to the fireman’s rule. In 1996, New York adopted legislation similar to S.B. 1255. The New York law eliminates the rule as a defense to a negligence claim from an emergency personnel employee except that a municipal employer could continue to cite the rule.

Proponents of eliminating the fireman’s rule state that an injured plaintiff or the family of a deceased emergency personnel member should not be barred from filing a civil suit because the court would still have the authority to prohibit the plaintiff from collecting damages under the assumption of the risk doctrine. Those who believe the fireman’s rule should remain intact state that liability for injuries sustained by emergency personnel should not be borne by the intended beneficiaries of their services.

Senator Bee moved H.B. 2473 be returned with a DO PASS recommendation.

Senator Bee moved the following verbal amendment Page 1, line 7, after “public” insert “or private”. The motion CARRIED by a voice vote.

Mike Petchel, Arizona Police Association, testified in support of the bill and commented that there is a unique set of employees that do not enjoy the ability to file a legal claim for damages, due to the negligence or intentional acts of a responsible third party. Those workers are police officers, fire fighters, paramedics and emergency service personnel. This bill would change what has developed in the courts as a common law doctrine that precludes these employees, or their family members or survivors.

Senator Bee commented that fires could be perceived as being negligent acts, but it is the job of fire fighters to fight them and noted his uncertainty if the bill is needed at this time.

Mr. Petchel commented that under current statute, if a third party knowingly handled hazardous materials and was negligent with the legal storing of those chemicals and a fire caused by this negligence injured people, the injured people could sue that person successfully, except for injured police officers and fire fighters.

Tape 2, Side A

In response to Senator Smith, Mr. Petchel commented that a police officer or fire fighter could receive disability pension for injuries that ended their careers, which would equal roughly half of their salary.

Michael Napier, Arizona Police Association, Phoenix Law Enforcement Association, testified in support of the bill and noted that the bill requires not only the willful, wanton, intentional action of a negligent act, but requires one of the listed instances in the bill.

Senator Richardson announced that S.B. 1255 would be held.

Senator Richardson announced the following people were present in support of the bill: **Eric Edwards, Arizona Association of Chiefs of Police; John Blackburn, Arizona Criminal Justice Commission; Don Isaacson, Rural Metro/Southwest Ambulance; and Ed Wren, Phoenix Law Enforcement Association, Arizona Highway Patrol Association.**

S.B. 1284 – dangerous crimes against children; drugs – DISCUSSION ONLY

Senator Richardson stated that S.B. 1284 is for discussion only, as it is an omnibus bill and there may be a germaneness issue.

Ms. Rabin explained S.B. 1284 classifies administration of flunitrazepam, gamma hydroxy butyrate (GHB) or ketamine hydrochloride to a person less than 18 years of age as a dangerous crime against children.

Ms. Rabin explained the Richardson amendment dated 2/23/01, 3:00 p.m., (Attachment D) is being brought in response to a court of appeals case that required calculation of community supervision time to be calculated in a manner that gives the benefit to the defendant.

Jerry Landau, Maricopa County Attorney's Office, testified that he was present for Judge Ron Reinstein, Maricopa Superior Court, who had asked him to testify to this amendment. He commented that this amendment would allow the ADC to do the calculation rather than having the courts do it.

Ms. Rabin explained the Richardson amendment dated 2/26/01, 9:15 a.m. (Attachment E) makes the destruction of juvenile court records easier than under current law.

Mr. Landau testified that he was also present for Judge Warner of the Pima County Superior Court, who has asked him to testify to this amendment. He stated that Judge Warner asked Senator Solomon if there was anything that could be done to look at the destruction of juvenile court records. He stated that this amendment would allow an juvenile adjudicated delinquent for a class 4, 5, 6 or some class 3 non-dangerous felonies, to have his records destroyed at the age of 19, instead of 25.

Ms. Rabin explained the Richardson amendment dated 2/23/01, 2:45 p.m. (Attachment F) deals with visual depictions of what appear to be minors involved in sexual conduct. The amendment deals with computerized images altered or created to give the impression that the image is that of a minor.

Cindi Nannetti, Maricopa County Attorney's Office, testified in support of the amendment and noted that this amendment is consistent with the Child Pornography Prevention Act (CPPA) that Congress adopted in 1996.

Eleanor Eisenberg, Arizona Civil Liberties Union, testified in opposition to the Richardson amendment dated 2/23/01, 2:45 p.m. and noted that the definition of minor is incomprehensible. A virtual minor is not a minor and therefore this cannot be illegal. She opined that this amendment does not meet society's interest and asked the Committee to re-evaluate the amendment with a critical eye in view of the First Amendment and the 9th circuit decision.

Senator Mitchell, bill sponsor, testified to the underlying bill and commented that the drugs listed are "date rape" drugs. He stated that he sponsored the bill because of some of the experiences that some people have had with these drugs.

Jonathan Paton, representing himself, testified in support of the bill and commented that this bill puts sexual predators on notice that poisoning a child with flunitrazepam, gamma hydroxy butrate (GHB) or ketamine hydrochloride will put them in prison for a long time. In addition, these drugs kill children and this problem needs to be addressed. He urged the Committee's support.

Sally Drachman, representing herself, testified that a year ago, she attended a party and was given a drink with a drug in it. She drank only a few sips of the drink and immediately became unresponsive and unconscious.

In response to Senator Aguirre, Ms. Drachman replied that the person that gave her the drug was never apprehended or charged.

Shannon Slattery, Maricopa County Public Defender's Office, testified that she was not present in opposition to the bill, but rather with specific concerns. She commented that the Office is concerned with the differences in ages with regard to this offense versus the standard dangerous crimes against children, which is usually capped at the age of 15. She stated that this

offense also falls within the juvenile transfer provisions under 501-B in that it is a class 2 guideline and that anyone over 14 years of age stands the potential of being sent up to the adult court and facing 20 years of mandatory time if convicted. She stated that there currently is statute that prescribes for an enhanced penalty of the use of this kind of chemical in the commission of an assault or sexual assault.

Peggy Drachman, representing herself, testified in support of the bill and noted that she was the mother of Sally Drachman. She explained that she was notified of her daughter's condition and upon arrival at the hospital she discovered her daughter had lapsed into a coma. She stated that her daughter's condition was so severe that she was given last rites. She remarked that these drugs are not just used for "date rape," but are used for a number of different offenses.

Senator Richardson announced the following people were present in support of the bill: **Marjorie Mead, National Organization of Women; Eric Edwards, Arizona Association of Chiefs of Police; and Joy Marx-Mendoza, representing herself.**

Senator Richardson reiterated that a number of the bills heard today in Committee would be heard and voted upon in the next meeting.

Without objection, the meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tracey Moulton
Committee Secretary

(Tapes and attachments on file in the Secretary of the Senate's Office/Resource Center, Room 115.)