LAW & COURTS COMMITTEE
February 28, 2019
Minutes

Members Present:  Crenshaw, Koenig, Polsdofer, Schafer, Slaughter, and Trubac.

Members Absent:  Celentino.

Others Present:  Russel Church, Rick Terrill, Tim Dolechanty, George Strander, Mark Bilodeau, Mary Sabaj, Tammy Liston, Amy Prieskorn, Julie Hartner, Tyler A Smith, and others

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Koenig at 6:01 p.m. in Personnel Conference Room D & E of the Human Services Building, 5303 S. Cedar Street, Lansing, Michigan.

Approval of the February 14, 2019 Minutes

MOVED BY COMM. CRENSHAW, SUPPORTED BY COMM. SLAUGHTER, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 14, 2019 LAW & COURTS COMMITTEE MEETING.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioner Celentino.

Additions to the Agenda

1. A.D.A.M.
   a. Resolution to Authorize an Agreement with TEL Systems to Upgrade Technology and Provide Maintenance Support for the Probate Court Courtrooms

Limited Public Comment

None.

1. A.D.A.M. –
   b. Drug & Alcohol Monitoring (Presentation)

Mark Bilodeau, Alcohol Drug Administrative Monitoring Partner, stated that he was here to present on Alcohol Drug Administrative Monitoring, Inc. (ADAM), which had been formed in 2004. He further stated that his partners had brought him in because of his business experience.

Mr. Bilodeau stated that originally, ADAM had offered monitoring 24/7 for relatively cheap, and that after receiving welcoming responses from Da’Neese Wells, Chief Probation Officer, Beryl Frenger, Former Chief Probation Officer, and the Prosecutor’s Office, ADAM opened an office
in the Lansing area. He further stated that before that, all substance testing was done by Project Century, which was only open three days a week.

Mr. Bilodeau stated that the original office was on Northwind Street north of Grand River Avenue, and that the partners had taken turns staffing the office while working in Oakland County as well. He further stated that ADAM opened a second office in Holt six months later.

Mr. Bilodeau stated that Ms. Frenger had found out that the County was funding Project Century, and appeared before the Board of Commissioners, resulting in County funding for ADAM as well. He further stated that the Holt office had then been moved into the City of Lansing.

Mr. Bilodeau stated that he had learned many things about testing options, and testing procedures of various degrees of reliability, including sweat patches and onsite Ethyl Glucuronide (EtG) screens, neither of which was found to be reliable. He further stated that confirmations run on the results were often inconsistent, so ADAM would not offer those tests to clients or courts.

Mr. Bilodeau stated that ADAM had switched EtG testing to laboratory-only, and worked closely with labs, including Redwood Toxicology. He further stated that Ethyl Sulfate (EtS) testing had later been developed, which acted as an additional confirmation of EtG test results.

Commissioner Schafer asked what an EtG test was.

Mr. Bilodeau stated that an EtG test was a urine-based alcohol test.

Mr. Bilodeau stated that the testing saved several days of waiting, and that in the past, some courts had reported a delay in receiving lab results. He further stated that in response, ADAM moved all of its reporting operations into Mr. Bilodeau’s main office in Waterford in order to process labs the same day they were received, and that testing now included an independent confirmation along with positive results to eliminate delays associated with retesting.

Mr. Bilodeau stated that the only delays now were out of ADAM’s control, because laboratories did not test on weekends. He further stated that ADAM usually could turn around a negative test result within two days, and that results were available to courts online, or by fax if requested.

Mr. Bilodeau stated that the EtG test was the most popular test, apart from the instant tests. He further stated that a six-panel test confirmation cost $26 per confirmation, but that the EtG tests were able to save clients money by eliminating requirements for confirmation of positive results.

Mr. Bilodeau stated that he had seen clients come in with fines and costs and obligations, and the low cost of these tests helped them out that way. He further stated that he had been doing this for fourteen years now, operating six offices in four counties, and that ADAM offered a 401(k) retirement account to its employees.

Mr. Bilodeau stated that over the years, the testing array had expanded tremendously, and that currently ADAM could test for just about anything tests were manufactured for. He further stated
that ADAM had adapted to the needs of specialty courts, which included a lot of invoicing, which in turn created more work on ADAM’s end.

Mr. Bilodeau stated that courts were getting their invoices on or before required dates, and that ADAM offered online testing results. He further stated that there had been only a 10% increase in prices over fourteen years, and that ADAM charged an extra $1 per hour when the tests were invoiced out because of the extra work involved.

Chairperson Koenig stated that the Committee had some questions.

Commissioner Crenshaw stated that most of ADAM’s clients were coming to ADAM because of court orders. He further asked what would happen if a client could not afford the fees.

Mr. Bilodeau stated that some courts paid for testing with grant funding, entirely or to a certain percentage. He further stated that ADAM kept very low prices, but clients had to pay to get their test.

Mr. Bilodeau stated that many clients had to call hotlines early in the morning to see if they had to test that day, and that ADAM employees advised clients to put aside a little money to make sure they could comply with court drug testing requirements.

Commissioner Crenshaw asked what would happen if a client could not pay at all.

Mr. Bilodeau stated that ADAM would then report it out as a “no money no test.”

Discussion.

Commissioner Schafer asked whether ADAM did blood or urine testing.

Mr. Bilodeau stated that ADAM tested urine, breath or saliva, and that occasional hair follicle tests were conducted. He further stated that hair follicle specimens were collected either at the Waterford office or the South Lansing office by himself or one other employee, because the procedure could accidentally injure clients if done incorrectly.

Commissioner Schafer asked during what hours ADAM was open.

Mr. Bilodeau stated that ADAM was open 365 days a year, from 6:30 a.m. to 9:30 a.m., and 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. He further stated that on major holidays, only the morning hours were available.

Commissioner Schafer asked what happened if a client tested negative.

Mr. Bilodeau stated that ADAM’s onsite testing was presumptive, and that there was always a percentage of possibility for false results. He further stated that some courts allowed clients to admit to use, and that if a false positive result was retested and came up negative, ADAM refunded the client.
Commissioner Schafer stated that ADAM’s involvement was primarily with the court system, at least for purposes of the services the Committee was interested in. Mr. Bilodeau agreed, and stated that there were a lot of driver’s license assessments, and that clients had to submit a ten-panel drug screen to the Secretary of State during that process. He further stated that most often, results were sent to the client’s counselor, who prepared a report and sent it to the Secretary of State.

Mr. Bilodeau stated that ADAM sometimes sent results directly to clients in a sealed package, which the client would give to the magistrate, still sealed.

Commissioner Schafer asked whether a chain of custody was maintained.

Mr. Bilodeau stated that clients watched as their samples were taken and packed up. He further stated that seals were placed onto the specimen and the package, and that if seals were broken when received by the lab, the lab would immediately notify ADAM.

Commissioner Schafer stated that he remembered Project Century very well, and that he had heard good things about ADAM. He further stated that ADAM was said to be very affordable.

Discussion.

Mr. Bilodeau stated that ADAM was a good program for those who needed it, and that while some clients were initially combative, they usually eventually relaxed a bit and complied.

Commissioner Slaughter asked whether ADAM had reporting requirements to County courts regarding accuracy or any other type of reporting.

Mr. Bilodeau stated that results were sent immediately to the court, and that positives and no-shows were reported immediately online or via fax. He further stated that ADAM had an automated email system for results reports, and that their software also allowed him to view statistics on how many positive results there were compared to how many total samples were tested.

Chairperson Koenig asked what the rate of false positives and negatives was.

Mr. Bilodeau stated that he did not had actual numbers, but the rate was very minimal. He further stated that he always compared new tests with known positives.

Chairperson Koenig stated that all tests had a range of reliability, and were never 100% accurate. She further asked what the range was on tests used by ADAM.

Mr. Bilodeau stated that in his office, he might see three or four false results a year out of thousands, and that ADAM did about 1,000 six-panel tests onsite per month. He further stated that some false positives were due to medications, and that ADAM sent sample to the lab in those instances.
Commissioner Slaughter asked whether there were industry standards for the reliability range.

Mr. Bilodeau stated that there were industry standards for drug testing, and that ADAM tried to attain that standard. He further stated that most clients were in the criminal justice system, and that ADAM let the courts and officers know everything, even while some did not want to see test numbers that were below a certain cutoff.

Chairperson Koenig stated that governmental agencies were ADAM’s main customers.

Mr. Bilodeau stated that Chairperson Koenig was correct.

Chairperson Koenig asked whether ADAM did testing for the Michigan Department of Corrections.

Mr. Bilodeau stated that they did, and that ADAM was affiliated with county probation departments. He further stated that it could get confusing at times when separate entities like State and County agencies got into conflicts about release of client information.

Mr. Bilodeau stated that ADAM always tried to protect its clients’ legal rights.

Commissioner Schafer asked how ADAM tested for medical marijuana usage.

Mr. Bilodeau stated that medical marijuana had been available for years, and that it was the same test for recreational marijuana and medical marijuana. He further stated that marijuana stayed in the system for a long time, and that testing could not determine whether an individual was under the influence of the drug without drawing blood because marijuana traces were stored in fat cells and released over time.

Mr. Bilodeau stated that he had noticed that over the years marijuana had become concentrated into more potent forms, and that because of that, clients could test positive for marijuana for months after their last use. He further stated that some courts demanded that clients test at a zero level or get a “not detected” result before they would sign off.

Mr. Bilodeau stated that sometimes clients tested positive at low levels for months after using marijuana. He further stated that once courts received a zero result, any further positive test results would mean there had been re-use.

Discussion.

Chairperson Koenig asked what the most common trick to beat ADAM’s tests was.

Mr. Bilodeau stated that dilution, no-showing, and fake urine were common tricks. He further stated that ADAM policy required that the person administering the test needed to be able to see the urine exiting the body.
Chairperson Koenig asked whether Mr. Bilodeau felt there was anything ADAM could do to improve.

Mr. Bilodeau stated that he always tried to keep aware of new things in testing and substances, including things like K2 and opiates. He further stated that ADAM was limited by demand for tests, because manufacturers did not produce tests unless they believed they would sell.

Mr. Bilodeau stated that he stayed on top of things, and that he usually had a copy of High Times or other similar materials in his office in order to keep up on new developments and test-cheating methods.

MOVED BY COMM. SCHAFER, SUPPORTED BY COMM. SLAUGHTER, TO APPROVE A CONSENT AGENDA CONSISTING OF THE FOLLOWING ITEMS:

2. **Sheriff’s Office**  
   b. Resolution to Allow the Ingham County Sheriff’s Office to Enter into a Subcontract Agreement with the City of Lansing for the 2019 Byrne JAG State Grant

3. **Public Defenders Office**  
   a. Resolution Creating Positions for the Public Defenders Office

4. **Community Corrections** – Resolution to Authorize a Contract with Prevention and Training Services for MRT Programming as Authorized by the Justice Millage

5. **9-1-1 Dispatch Center**  
   a. Resolution for the Renewal of the 9-1-1 Telephone Support Agreement with Carousel Industries Inc.  
   b. Resolution to Authorize Software Purchase Agreement with Tritech for Inform CAD Routing Server and Implementation Services to Enhance the 9-1-1 Center Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) System  
   c. Resolution to Authorize Purchase of Scheduling Software/Services for the 9-1-1 Center  
   d. Resolution to Approve a Contract and Join the MPSCS (Michigan Public Safety Communications System) to Include System Monitoring and Infrastructure Maintenance  
   e. 9-1-1 Center Update

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioner Celentino.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE ITEMS ON THE CONSENT AGENDA CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioner Celentino.

1. **A.D.A.M.**  
   a. Resolution to Authorize an Agreement with TEL Systems to Upgrade Technology and Provide Maintenance Support for the Probate Court Courtrooms
MOVED BY COMM. CREN SHAW, SUPPORTED BY COMM. SLAUGHTER, TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION.

Commissioner Crenshaw stated that he had no issue with the resolution. He further stated that he thought that when RFPs went out that the supporting documents showing bids were supposed to be included with the resolution.

Commissioner Crenshaw stated that he was under the impression that these materials would be sent from the Purchasing Department. He further asked whether the Probate Court had worked with the Purchasing Department while drafting the resolution.

George Strander, Circuit Court Administrator and Former Probate Register, stated that about two years ago, he and several other interested parties had reviewed bids from four providers – TEL, Biz, Soundcom and CDW. He further stated that TEL came in lowest, and that the Probate Court had worked with them for years since then.

Mr. Strander stated that the Board of Commissioners had already approved similar systems for all courtrooms at the Veterans’ Memorial Courthouse except Courtroom 1. He further stated that the draft resolution was identical to the one that had been passed the previous year, apart from changes to dates.

Commissioner Crenshaw stated that it sounded as if it had been a four year process from RFP to now this resolution.

Mr. Strander agreed, and stated that Resolutions #10-017 and #17-215 had been part of the same process as the current resolution. He further stated that he had transitioned to be the Court Administrator, but that the new Probate Register was on maternity leave.

Mr. Strander stated that the Probate Court should probably have put the resolution before the Committee earlier, but that Judge Shauna Dunnings was in judicial training in late March to early April, and that the system needed to be ready when she began holding hearings.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioner Celentino.

2.   Sheriff’s Office
   a. Resolution to Authorize Contracts with Identified Service Providers as Authorized by the Justice Millage

MOVED BY COMM. CREN SHAW, SUPPORTED BY COMM. S LAUGHTER, TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION.

Commissioner Schafer stated that he wanted to know who the individuals were who were providing services under this resolution, which created an agreement with It Takes a Village Educational Consulting, LLC. He further stated that there had been several past commissioners who were involved with restorative justice, and he wanted to know whether they were involved with the subject of this resolution.
Commissioner Crenshaw stated that Greta Trice was the owner and lead facilitator of It Takes a Village Educational Consulting, LLC, and she used to be the Director of Resolution Services, which received a juvenile justice grant for many years.

Commissioner Schafer stated that former Commissioners Anne Smiley and Lynne Martinez had a relationship with restorative justice organization in mid-Michigan. He further stated that he wanted to make sure that past commissioners were disclosing their involvement in County matters.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioner Celentino.

3. Public Defenders Office
   b. Resolution to Authorize a Lease Agreement with 320 North Washington Partners and Ingham County

MOVED BY COMM. CRENSHAW, SUPPORTED BY COMM. SLAUGHTER, TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION.

Commissioner Schafer stated that he wanted to compliment how the whole process of setting up the Public Defender had been conducted. He further stated that he had had a lot of questions, but that he had arrived early and spoken with Rick Terrill, Facilities Director, about them.

Commissioner Schafer stated that $19 per square foot seemed high at first, but he had since learned that utilities, maintenance, and parking were included in that price. He further stated that he wanted to compliment County staff on their work on this process, and that all of his questions had been answered.

Commissioner Schafer stated that the building would work out as a great facility.

Mr. Terrill stated that he had been involved in this project, along with Teri Morton, Deputy Controller. He further stated that there was an excellent team at the Public Defender, and that Russel Church, Chief Public Defender, and Amy Prieskorn, Public Defenders Office Administrator, had been doing the heavy lifting.

Ms. Prieskorn stated that she did not want to exclude Tammy Liston, Executive Assistant.

Commissioner Schafer stated that he was very impressed.

Mr. Church stated that the recent regional outage in Verizon cellphone data service had occurred partly because of demolition on the building in which the Public Defender would be housed, or at least indirectly because of it. He further stated that there were no contracts imposing liability, so the Committee should not worry.

Commissioner Crenshaw stated that he used to work in the same building when it had housed a pager business. He further asked how many parking spaces were included in the lease agreement.
Mr. Church stated that fourteen of the eighteen spaces on the property were part of the agreement.

Commissioner Crenshaw asked where other employees would park.

Ms. Prieskorn stated that they were expected to park at the North Grand parking ramp.

Commissioner Crenshaw stated that that could be expensive.

Commissioner Schafer stated that they should carpool.

Chairperson Koenig asked when the Public Defenders Office would be able to use the premises as intended.

Mr. Church stated that one of the attractive things about the lease was that it included the whole second floor and about one-third of the first floor. He further stated that the landlord had stated that the Public Defender could use the rest of the first floor while renovations were being made.

Mr. Church stated that the landlord had said that the remodel would be finished in 60 to 90 days. He further stated that the landlord did work for the State of Michigan, and that he was comfortable with him when he committed to a timeframe.

Chairperson Koenig asked whether the remodel would be finished within 90 days.

Mr. Church stated that it would be finished by mid-June at the latest.

Mr. Terrill stated that once they had a signed lease, they could use the space on the first floor. He further stated that he had talked with Tim Dolehanity, Controller, about what he and Ms. Prieskorn would work through the following day, in order to get the deal wrapped up and get a contract over to the Chairperson of the Board of Commissioners for signatures.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioner Celentino.

3. Public Defenders Office
   c. Public Defenders Office Update (Informational Item)

Mr. Church stated that the Public Defenders Office was still optimistic about the timeline that had been established, and wanted to get into District Court in late March and early April, with Circuit Court soon after that. He further stated that the attorneys that would be hired to appear in Circuit Court might need more time to close down their private practices.

Mr. Church stated that the Public Defenders Office had received 65 applicants for the 26 available positions, and that they planned to interview 85% of them. He further stated that they would interview everyone who had applied who was on the Circuit Court contract list.
Mr. Church stated that he had left a few applications off the interview list because he did not see the passion, and that each interviewee would be given 30 minutes to convince him why they should be one of the 26. He further stated that his mind was blown by how many good candidates had applied, and that it would be hard to make some of the hiring decisions.

Mr. Church stated that the Public Defenders Office would be very busy doing interviews.

Chairperson Koenig asked how many interviews would be done.

Mr. Church stated that 55 or 56 of the 65 to 68 applicants would be interviewed, and that the job listing had not closed yet, so more applications might still be received. He further stated that most of the people who he did not choose to interview were left off due to their work history, and that holding five jobs in two years was a bad sign.

Commissioner Schafer stated the Public Defenders Office would need to work overtime if it wanted to do more than 50 half-hour interviews in three days.

Mr. Church stated that the interviews would probably spill over into additional days. He further stated that he wanted to introduce Tammy Liston, Public Defenders Office Executive Assistant, and that she used to be in charge of assigning and facilitating the court appointed people.

Mr. Church stated that Amy Prieskorn, Public Defenders Office Administrator, worked for the Prosecutor’s Office with him, and had worked for the State for a short time. He further stated that Ms. Prieskorn had worked with the OnBase case management program, and that she was good with technology.

Mr. Church stated that the only glitch now was the software, and that the vendor stated they were the only people in the country that did a case management system specifically designed for indigent delivery service programs. He further stated that the Federal Defender used the same vendor, and the whole state of Tennessee.

Mr. Church stated that he had spoken with a few people he knew from his time working in Tennessee about the system, and they were satisfied with it. He further stated that the State had an open competition clause for government contracting which Mr. Church wanted to ask them to waive, but that in this case there was only one vendor that was experienced.

Chairperson Koenig stated that the County also had a policy with additional requirements for allowing sole-source contracts.

Discussion.

Commissioner Slaughter stated that he had taken a tour of the Prosecutor’s Office, and that he had spoken with Mr. Church as well. He further stated that it would be important to figure out how to capture data and statistics about Public Defender cases, and that he hoped the Public Defender’s data and the Prosecutor’s data would sync up.
Mr. Church stated he was not sure whether the data would sync up with Prosecutor's, and that the OnBase system was mainly a document manager.

Ms. Prieskorn stated that the Prosecutor's database did not come from OnBase, but rather had to come from wherever they stored their data.

Commissioner Slaughter stated that he had intended to ask about tracking specific categories with regard to Public Defender cases.

Ms. Prieskorn stated that the State had a list of categories that the Public Defender planned to track and compile data on.

Mr. Church stated that he was not interested in the Prosecutor's data and the Public Defender's looking alike. He further stated that he wanted a report stating how busy the Office was, and wanted the data to be comparable to other public defenders' offices.

Mr. Church stated that another system called ACT had been developed, but could not be implemented because it was owned by the Prosecuting Attorneys' Association.

Ms. Prieskorn stated that the Prosecutor's Office used to use an Excel spreadsheet to track data, and that ACT was an archaic system at best now, from which prosecutors had to pull data in pieces.

Chairperson Koenig stated that the Prosecutor's Office was interested in doing some more broad thinking, and wanted to find out how defendants got to where they were. She further stated that it sounded as if the Public Defender planned to look mainly for basic information.

Ms. Prieskorn stated that the Michigan Indigent Defense Commission grant would require the Public Defender to provide certain data to the State.

Chairperson Koenig asked whether the Public Defenders Office was thinking more broadly.

Mr. Church stated that that could be built in if there was sufficient lead time. He further stated that there were some issues to confront as to the changing landscape in fees and costs, and distinction between partial indigency and full indigency.

Mr. Church stated that as part of process, the Public Defender needed to know whether the defendant was indigent or not. He further stated that there was one category he would like to ask the vendor to customize the software to track, and that they had already built a model with most criminal codes programmed into it.

Mr. Church stated that anything his Office asked the vendor to customize that would be beneficial to the vendor would be done free of charge.

Chairperson Koenig asked how much the Public Defender's data system would cost.
Mr. Church stated that the cost would be $2,400 per month for licenses for all attorneys.

Chairperson Koenig asked Mr. Church to keep coming back to tell the Committee what was happening. She further stated that she wanted to be able to respond to press inquiries with accurate information.

Discussion.

6. **Board of Commissioners – Resolution Reaffirming Support for Legislation to “Raise the Age” for Juvenile Offenders in Michigan**

MOVED BY COMM. CRENSHAW, SUPPORTED BY COMM. SLAUGHTER, TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTION.

Commissioner Slaughter stated that the resolution reaffirmed the County’s support for the Raise the Age Initiative. He further stated that Michigan was one of only four states that tried 17-year-olds as adults, and the initiative would raise that age to 18.

Commissioner Slaughter stated that he thanked Commissioners Koenig, Schafer and Crenshaw for supporting the resolution in the previous year. He further stated that to his knowledge, the County would be the first Michigan county to pass a resolution supporting the Raise the Age Initiative in 2019.

Chairperson Koenig stated that the resolution appeared to be identical to the previous year’s.

Commissioner Slaughter stated that it was essentially identical.

Commissioner Schafer stated that Commissioner Slaughter’s dynamic presentation to the Board of Commissioners before he had been elected made the difference.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. Absent: Commissioner Celentino.

**Announcements**

Commissioner Schafer stated that he was very disappointed in an email from the Sheriff’s Office earlier in the day about training. He further stated that the conflicts over training sources created problems with costs and coverage, and that Sheriff Wriggelsworth may be feeling pressure due to the Jail Medical process, the training issues, and the court consolidation process.

Commissioner Schafer stated that he respected his colleagues’ concerns, but that Sheriff Wriggelsworth had been very transparent. He further stated that if the same transparency standard were applied to all County offices and departments, the Board of Commissioners would find matters to look into everywhere.
Chairperson Koenig stated that she did not disagree, and that the Sheriff’s Office had been as very transparent. She further stated that transparency was not the problem, but that the problem was the close nexus between Undersheriff Andy Bouck and the MACNLOW company.

Chairperson Koenig stated that she had been trying to think of a way to separate Undersheriff Bouck’s business interests from the Office effectively. She further stated that the County should look elsewhere if at all possible.

Commissioner Schafer stated that he just wanted Sheriff’s staff in the County doing their jobs, instead of traveling for training.

Public Comment

Julie Hartner, Plant Justice Grow Peace Member, asked whether the Raise the Age Initiative was being brought up in Congress.

Commissioner Slaughter stated that there were currently two bill packages in the State legislature, one in each house. He further stated that each package would implement several fixes to address the issue, and that the Board of Commissioners’ resolution was meant to reaffirm its support.

Ms. Hartner stated that she had hear the Raise the Age Initiative would cost $61 million to implement, and that that figure was outrageous and just negative.

Commissioner Slaughter stated that he had not heard that, but that estimates from various organizations had been published. He further stated that he had not heard any specific figures.

Ms. Hartner stated that it would probably be good to have a reliable cost estimate ready, so it could be referred to in response to statements in opposition.

Commissioner Crenshaw stated that the State House of Representatives and State Senate fiscal agencies would do an analysis of the bill packages, and that anyone interested in cost estimates or other fiscal information could go to their websites and sign up for email updates.

Discussion.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

BARB BYRUM, CLERK OF THE BOARD