

## MARCH 28, 2025 (LEGISLATIVE POLICY COMMITTEE)

2 bills considered; 1 bill **OPPOSE** **SUPPORT**, 1 bill **NO CHANGE**.

- **HB 2706:** mental health; intensive treatment orders (*Hernandez, C.*) ([Text](#))
  - **Summary:** Creates a construct whereby a court that finds, by “*clear and convincing evidence*,” that a patient is “*seriously mentally ill*” or “*chronically resistant to treatment*” may enter an order for “*intensive treatment services*.” Specifies that this order must include a “*written intensive treatment services plan*” prepared by staff familiar with the patient’s case history and must be inclusive of (a) an “*intensive case manager*,” whose role involves in-person contact with the individual at a regular frequency and includes regular firsthand assessments to assess adherence to the treatment plan, (b) residential placement, (c) medically necessary nonemergency transportation, and (d) other treatment services. Permits the court to order periodic compliance hearings *and* permits the court to return the individual to inpatient treatment in cases of noncompliance. Contains statute that defines how an individual can be “*chronically resistant to treatment*.”
  - **Amendment?** Recently [amended](#) in the Senate Committee on Health and Human Services to specify that “**THE ORDER FOR INTENSIVE TREATMENT SERVICES SHALL INCLUDE ONLY TREATMENT SERVICES FOR WHICH THERE IS AN IDENTIFIED FUNDING SOURCE.**”
  - **Prior Context (March 14, 2025 LPC):** Responses from respondent counties varied, but tended towards concern. Specifically, two counties noted that this structure could result in additional costs to counties via (a) the need for an “*intensive case manager*” (*and the frequent contact between individual and case manager required*), (b) the need for additional evaluators (*and (i) the additional training that may be required for these individuals, and (ii) the need for more comprehensive evaluations*), and (c) the potential need for residential placement and other unspecified services. The two counties also noted that this could place additional demands on the courts via the necessary compliance hearings (*and related staff*). One county that responded noted that they weren’t sure what this would change, as the court may already have the authority to do much of this.
  - **Recent Context (March 28, 2025 LPC):** Recently (*Friday, March 20<sup>th</sup>*) CSA staff held a small stakeholder meeting with respondent counties to discuss and better understand the implications of **HB 2706**. That discussion led to the conclusion that many of the services detailed in the “*order for intensive treatment services*” (the *intensive case manager*, the residential placement and transportation, and the other unspecified services), would fall on the state as a part of the court-ordered treatment (COT) process – via AHCCCS – and not the counties. At the same time, some county professional staff shared that they believed the courts already had the ability to enact much of what the legislation contemplated and that this proposal seemed targeted at the treatment providers rather than the counties. Some staff on the call shared that they believed there would still be
  - **Discussion:** One Supervisor questioned whether the implementation of this construct in rural counties would result in individuals being transferred to larger counties with additional resources at higher costs. Staff noted that, while they couldn’t speak to the possibility of transfers, the cost for this treatment would fall on the state. The Supervisor asked whether if a bill of this nature, that increases costs to AHCCCS, would transitively increase costs to counties via

higher AHCCCS contributions. Staff responded that county payments to AHCCCS are relatively fixed, and have not changed significantly in decades. One Supervisor noted that, while the treatment would be a state cost, there would still be significant costs with respect to increased court throughput and for the providers. The Supervisor asked if a noncompliant individual would be arrested, which would perpetuate a vicious cycle and lead to the detention center being a de facto treatment center. Staff noted that, as written, the bill would result in a noncompliant individual being sent back to inpatient treatment. One Supervisor noted that they appreciated the intent of this bill, and believed it represented a start in addressing an important issue.

- **Disposition:** The LPC took **NO ACTION** on **HB 2706**.

- **SB 1257:** impaired person; court-ordered stabilization (*Leach*) ([Text](#))

- **Summary:** Creates a construct whereby an admitting officer of an evaluation agency may petition the court that an “*impaired person*” be committed to the agency for “*court-ordered stabilization*” not to exceed five calendar days. Defines an “*impaired person*” as “*an individual who, as a result of intoxication, withdrawal, or substance-induced symptoms, has impaired judgment causing the individual to be incapable of making or communicating rational decisions with regard to the individual’s safety, health, or basic personal needs, such as food, clothing, shelter, or medical care.*” Provides the criteria that an individual must fulfill, and the admitting officer must detail, to be eligible. Requires that the “*impaired person*” be appointed counsel, who must meet with the individual within twenty-four hours, and that the “*impaired person*” be given an opportunity for a hearing to determine whether they should be involuntarily detained at the court’s “*earliest opportunity.*” Requires the “*impaired person*” to be offered treatment that may be administered with their consent, except that – for their safety or the safety of others – mechanical or pharmacological restraints may be employed. Requires their reassessment daily to determine if they are still impaired, and requires their release if they are found to not be impaired. Subject to the individual’s right to refuse, requires them to be given physical care and treatment. Requires the evaluation agency to prepare a plan for the individual’s release. Includes civil liability for the Chief Medical Officer of the agency if the individual is released, and requires the County Attorney to represent the person who filed the petition for court-ordered stabilization. Charges all costs to AHCCCS.

- **Amendment?** The proponents will be bringing forth a floor amendment to **(a)** limit the applicability of the legislation to counties with a population of between 1 million and 1.5 million, **(b)** sunseting this policy at the end of 2027, and **(c)** requiring reporting.

- **Prior Context (*March 20, 2025 BOD*):** A Supervisor from a county supportive of this proposal noted that they had a longstanding working group on the topic, and noted that their Board’s support of this proposal was unanimous. Further, they noted that some of their staff – specifically with individuals dealing with substance abuse – felt that they did not have enough time under the current structure to effect change. The Supervisor noted the various criteria that the staff member of an evaluation agency must find that the individual meets for the construct to be effective, and noted that proponents have been very responsive. One Supervisor noted that they appreciated the proponent county having taken on such a large task, but noted that – despite this being an evident problem in many communities – they were unsure whether this

structure would drive the necessary results and thought that this could result in substantial expense for counties suffering from capacity issues. This Supervisor also questioned whether the state would be willing to fund AHCCCS to the extent necessary to complete this program. Another Supervisor noted concern regarding the civil liberty implications of the bill, and shared concerns regarding a lack of capacity in rural areas and the likelihood of state payment. They noted support for the concept, as well as the need for additional days. A third Supervisor shared their support for additional substance abuse treatment, such as the additional five days, but shared the dilemma inherent with individuals without AHCCCS coverage but also without coverage by private insurance. A proponent Supervisor noted the relation of the bill's five days with the time necessary to clear methamphetamines from their system, as well as other Title 36 processes. They specified that it is not the intent of proponents to lead to additional involuntary transfers, as these individuals will already have been taken to an evaluation agency on an emergency basis. Another Supervisor noted concern that the construct was not permissive.

- **Recent Context (March 28, 2025 LPC):** Staff noted that the bill's proponents planned for an amendment on the House Floor that would limit the applicability of the structure to the interested county – via language that directly implicated counties with populations between 1 million and 1.5 million – and limited the usage of the construct through the end of 2027. Staff noted that this addressed the concerns of permissibility.
- **Discussion:** One Supervisor noted that the bill seemed reasonable. Staff on the call noted that there would be a report, which would help counties see what does and doesn't work. Another Supervisor noted interest in the pilot program to see if it has wider applicability.
- **Disposition:** The LPC **SUPPORTED SB 1275.**

### **MARCH 20, 2025 (BOARD OF DIRECTORS)**

3 bills considered; 1 bill **SUPPORTED**, 1 bill **OPPOSED**, 1 bill **NEUTRAL**.

- **SB 1073: NOW:** cities; towns; counties; public notice (*Petersen*) ([Text](#))

- **Summary:** As struck in the Senate Committee on Government, repeals statute requiring a county Board of Supervisors to contract for “*advertising, publication, and printing*” and substitutes language stating that a county shall satisfy any statutory requirement for advertising, publication, or printing via publication on the county's official website.
- **Amendment?** The proponents planned to bring forth an amendment that made publication on the county's website optional – or publication via a newspaper – optional. In essence, it becomes the county's choice.
- **Context:** This bill comes as the Senate Government Chairman's response to the Association's priority **SB 1217**, which would have made more moderate reforms to public notice statute and was not sufficiently impactful to garner a hearing in the Senate.
- **Discussion:** One Supervisor noted that they believed this bill should be supported. Another Supervisor noted that this was the opportunity to achieve a priority that the counties have pursued for years, and appreciated the permissive nature of the proposed amendment.
- **Disposition:** The LPC voted to **SUPPORT** the **strike-everything amendment to SB 1073.**

- **SB 1257:** impaired person; court-ordered stabilization (Leach) ([Text](#))

- **Summary:** Creates a construct whereby an admitting officer of an evaluation agency may petition the court that an “*impaired person*” be committed to the agency for “*court-ordered stabilization*” not to exceed five calendar days. Defines an “*impaired person*” as “*an individual who, as a result of intoxication, withdrawal, or substance-induced symptoms, has impaired judgment causing the individual to be incapable of making or communicating rational decisions with regard to the individual’s safety, health, or basic personal needs, such as food, clothing, shelter, or medical care.*” Provides the criteria that an individual must fulfill, and the admitting officer must detail, to be eligible. Requires that the “*impaired person*” be appointed counsel, who must meet with the individual within twenty-four hours, and that the “*impaired person*” be given an opportunity for a hearing to determine whether they should be involuntarily detained at the court’s “*earliest opportunity.*” Requires the “*impaired person*” to be offered treatment that may be administered with their consent, except that – for their safety or the safety of others – mechanical or pharmacological restraints may be employed. Requires their reassessment daily to determine if they are still impaired, and requires their release if they are found to not be impaired. Subject to the individual’s right to refuse, requires them to be given physical care and treatment. Requires the evaluation agency to prepare a plan for the individual’s release. Includes civil liability for the Chief Medical Officer of the agency if the individual is released, and requires the County Attorney to represent the person who filed the petition for court-ordered stabilization. Charges all costs to AHCCCS.
- **Context:** Staff had received a number of concerns from respondent counties, spanning areas of *due process*, staff and evaluation agency capacity, cost, and the necessity of accompanying long-term treatment.
- **Discussion:** A Supervisor from a county supportive of this proposal noted that they had a longstanding working group on the topic, and noted that their Board’s support of this proposal was unanimous. Further, they noted that some of their staff – specifically with individuals dealing with substance abuse – felt that they did not have enough time under the current structure to effect change. The Supervisor noted the various criteria that the staff member of an evaluation agency must find that the individual meets for the construct to be effective, and noted that proponents have been very responsive. One Supervisor noted that they appreciated the proponent county having taken on such a large task, but noted that – despite this being an evident problem in many communities – they were unsure whether this structure would drive the necessary results and thought that this could result in substantial expense for counties suffering from capacity issues. This Supervisor also questioned whether the state would be willing to find AHCCCS to the extent necessary to complete this program. Another Supervisor noted concern regarding the civil liberty implications of the bill, and shared concerns regarding a lack of capacity in rural areas and the likelihood of state payment. They noted support for the concept, as well as the need for additional days. A third Supervisor shared their support for additional substance abuse treatment, such as the additional five days, but shared the dilemma inherent with individuals without AHCCCS coverage but also without coverage by private insurance. A proponent Supervisor noted the relation of the bill’s five days with the time necessary to clear methamphetamines from their system, as well as other Title 36 processes. They specified that it is not the intent of proponents to lead to

additional involuntary transfers, as these individuals will already have been taken to an evaluation agency on an emergency basis. Another Supervisor noted concern that the construct was not permissive.

- **Disposition:** The LPC **OPPOSED** SB 1275.
- **HB 2389:** business personal property; exemption (*Carter*) ([Text](#))
  - **Summaries:** Eliminates all locally-assessed business personal property from taxation starting in TY 2032.
  - **Context:** Does not affect centrally-assessed business personal property, such as mines and telecommunications. Further, is mitigated by a policy passed several years ago that effectively eliminated business personal property tax for property purchased after TY 2022. Staff found, taking that prior policy into account, that there would be a *de minimis* amount of taxable personal property remaining in TY 2032 (*when the bill would become effective*). Supplies on-hand would not depreciate, and so would be affected, but do not constitute a significant amount of the property tax base. The effect would be the elimination of between 0.2% and 0.4% of total tax collections in TY 2032. The bill was amended in the House to solve an issue, specific to Graham County, where one classification of business personal property makes up a significant amount of that property's tax base.
  - **Discussion:** One Supervisor noted that this was reminiscent of "*death by 1,000 cuts*" by reducing the tax base in small increments over time.
  - **Disposition:** The LPC took a position of **NEUTRALITY** on HB 2389.

#### Status of bills processed by the Legislative Policy Committee:

##### GOVERNOR'S ACTION

- **SIGNED**
  - **SB 1286:** counties; board; administrative review; approval (*Gowan*) (**SUPPORTED** at January 31<sup>st</sup> LPC)
- **VETOED**
  - **SB 1011:** early voting; ballot deadlines; certificates (*Petersen*) (**FOR INFORMATION** at January 16<sup>th</sup> BOD)
- **AWAITING TRANSMISSION**
  - **SB 1231:** training; newly elected constables (*Payne*) (**OPPOSED** at February 7<sup>th</sup> LPC)

##### TO BE HEARD: SECOND CHAMBER FLOOR

- **SB 1036:** public resources; influencing elections; penalties (*Kavanagh*) (**OPPOSED** at February 7<sup>th</sup> LPC)
- **HB 2017:** voting centers ban; precinct size (*Keshel*) (**OPPOSED** at January 24<sup>th</sup> LPC)
- **HB 2368:** auditor general; records; financial institutions (*Gress*) (**SUPPORTED** at January 24<sup>th</sup> LPC)
- **HB 2651:** voting equipment; requirements; origin (*Montenegro*) (**OPPOSED** at February 20<sup>th</sup> BOD)
- **HB 2722:** public resources; expenditures; prohibition (*Carter*) (**OPPOSED** at March 7<sup>th</sup> LPC)
- **HB 2774:** small modular reactors; co-location (*Carbone*) (**OPPOSED** at February 20<sup>th</sup> BOD)



## TO BE HEARD: SECOND CHAMBER CAUCUS/RULES

- **SB 1048:** counties; cremation; indigent deceased persons (*Kavanagh*) (Substantially similar bill, **HB 2065**, **SUPPORTED** at **January 16<sup>th</sup> BOD**)
- **SB 1053:** wildlife; firearms discharge; structures; distance (*Rogers*) (**FOR INFORMATION** at **February 7<sup>th</sup> LPC**)
- **SB 1097:** elections; voting centers; polling places (*Hoffman*) (**OPPOSED** at **February 20<sup>th</sup> BOD**)
- **SB 1144:** jail facilities excise tax; extension (*Payne*) (**SUPPORTED** at **January 16<sup>th</sup> BOD**)
- **SB 1145:** special districts; construction; payments (*Carroll*) (**OPPOSED** at **January 31<sup>st</sup> LPC**; **NEUTRAL** by staff after amendment)
- **SB 1150:** wind farms; construction; policies; procedures (*Gowan*) (Substantially similar bill, **SB 2223**, **OPPOSED** at **February 7<sup>th</sup> LPC**)
- **SB 1241:** animal bites; owner contact information (*Kavanagh*) (**SUPPORTED** at **January 31<sup>st</sup> LPC**)
- **SB 1257:** impaired person; court-ordered stabilization (*Leach*) (**OPPOSED** at **March 20<sup>th</sup> BOD**, **SUPPORTED** at **March 28<sup>th</sup> LPC**)
- **SB 1308:** sober living homes (*Carroll*) (**FOR INFORMATION** at **February 7<sup>th</sup> LPC**)
- **SB 1706:** state contracts; federal government; applicability (*Gowan*) (Substantially similar bill, **HB 2763**, **SUPPORTED** at **February 14<sup>th</sup> LPC**)
- **SCR 1008:** municipalities; counties; fee increases; vote (*Petersen*) (Substantially similar bill, **SB 1013**, **OPPOSED** at **January 16<sup>th</sup> BOD**)
- **HB 2104:** emissions; voluntary vehicle repair; timeline (*Griffin*) (Substantially similar bill, **HB 2105**, **SUPPORTED** at **February 20<sup>th</sup> BOD**)
- **HB 2222:** settlement agreements; report; approval (*Marshall*) (**OPPOSED** at **January 24<sup>th</sup> LPC**)
- **HB 2389:** business personal property; exemption (*Carter*) (**NEUTRAL** at **March 20<sup>th</sup> BOD**)
- **HB 2433:** county treasurers; continuing education (*Gress*) (**FOR INFORMATION** at **January 24<sup>th</sup> LPC**; **OPPOSED** on **February 7<sup>th</sup> LPC**; **SUPPORTED** by staff after amendment)
- **HB 2389:** business personal property; exemption (*Carter*) (**FOR INFORMATION** at **February 20<sup>th</sup> BOD**; **NEUTRAL** at **March 20<sup>th</sup> BOD**)
- **HB 2606:** appropriation; local border support (*Nguyen*) (**NEUTRAL** at **January 24<sup>th</sup> LPC** (w/ direction to **SUPPORT** w/ amendment relating to other costs))
- **HB 2689:** cancer insurance; public safety; retirees (*Livingston*) (**NEUTRAL** (w/ amendment) at **February 20<sup>th</sup> BOD**)
- **HB 2722:** public resources; expenditures; prohibition (*Carter*) (**OPPOSED** at **March 7<sup>th</sup> LPC**)
- **HB 2927:** public meetings; records; requirements; penalties (*Carbone*) (**OPPOSED** at **February 14<sup>th</sup> LPC**; **NEUTRAL** by staff after amendment)
- **HB 2928:** accessory dwelling units; requirements (**OPPOSED** at **February 14<sup>th</sup> LPC**; **NEUTRAL** by staff after amendment)
- **HCR 2002:** voting centers; precinct size (*Keshef*) (**OPPOSED** at **January 24<sup>th</sup> LPC**)

## TO BE HEARD: SECOND CHAMBER STANDING COMMITTEE

- **HB 2704:** tax; distribution; county stadium district (*Weninger*) (**OPPOSED** at **February 14<sup>th</sup> LPC**)
- **HB 2706:** mental health; intensive treatment orders (*Hernandez, C.*) (**OPPOSED** at **March 14<sup>th</sup> LPC**; **NO ACTION** at **March 28<sup>th</sup> LPC**)
- **HB 2918:** tax rates; reduction (*Olson*) (**OPPOSED** at **February 14<sup>th</sup> LPC**)

## WILL NOT MOVE FORWARD

- **SB 1013:** municipalities; counties; fee increases; vote (*Petersen*) (**OPPOSED** at January 16<sup>th</sup> BOD)
  - **STRUCK** with a completely different subject.
- **SB 1065:** appropriation; reduction; courts (*Finchem*) (**OPPOSED** at February 14<sup>th</sup> LPC)
  - *Never passed its first chamber.*
- **SB 1073:** cities; towns; counties; public notices (*Petersen*) (**SUPPORTED** at March 20<sup>th</sup> BOD)
  - *Was never heard in second chamber standing committee.*
- **SB 1100:** Maricopa County; division; new counties (*Hoffman*) (**OPPOSED** at January 24<sup>th</sup> LPC)
  - *Never passed its first chamber.*
- **SB 1101:** Maricopa County; new counties; division (*Hoffman*) (**OPPOSED** at January 24<sup>th</sup> LPC)
  - *Never passed its first chamber.*
- **SB 1148:** CORP; defined contribution (*Payne*) (**OPPOSED** at January 24<sup>th</sup> LPC)
  - *Never passed its first chamber.*
- **SB 1199:** jury; termination of parental rights (*Payne*) (**OPPOSED** at January 24<sup>th</sup> LPC) (JURY TRIAL)
  - *Never passed its first chamber.*
- **SB 1223:** ACJC; continuation (*Kavanagh*) (**SUPPORTED** at January 31<sup>st</sup> LPC)
  - *Was never heard in first chamber standing committee.*
- **SB 1243:** open meetings; call to the public (*Kavanagh*) (**OPPOSED** at February 7<sup>th</sup> LPC)
  - *Was never heard in second chamber standing committee.*
- **SB 1273:** deputy sheriff; detention officer; salary (*Payne*) (**OPPOSED** at January 31<sup>st</sup> LPC)
  - *Was never heard in first chamber standing committee.*
- **SB 1284:** fireworks; aerals; licensure; penalties (*Gowan*) (**OPPOSED** at January 31<sup>st</sup> LPC)
  - *Was never heard in first chamber standing committee.*
- **SB 1288:** police vehicles; inspection; requirements (*Gowan*) (**OPPOSED** at January 31<sup>st</sup> LPC)
  - *Was never heard in both first chamber standing committees to which it was assigned.*
- **SB 1352:** rezoning; administrative act; referral prohibited (*Gowan*) (FOR INFORMATION at February 14<sup>th</sup> LPC)
  - *Never passed its first chamber.*
- **SB 1365:** PSPRS; member contributions (*Kavanagh*) (**OPPOSED** at February 7<sup>th</sup> LPC)
  - *Never passed its first chamber.*
- **SB 1407:** property tax assessment; greenhouses (*Dunn*) (**OPPOSED** at February 20<sup>th</sup> BOD)
  - *Proponents would not be able to draft satisfactory amendment in time, will continue with conversations in interim.*
- **SB 1434:** attorney discipline; jury trial (*Finchem*) (**OPPOSED** at January 24<sup>th</sup> LPC) (JURY TRIAL)
  - *Never passed its first chamber.*
- **SB 1442:** appropriation; secure behavioral health residential facilities (*Werner*) (**SUPPORTED** at February 7<sup>th</sup> LPC)
  - *Was never heard in second chamber standing committee (however, as a “money bill,” will be negotiated as part of the budget).*

- **SB 1455:** election officials; oversight; candidates (*Farnsworth*) (**OPPOSED** at February 20<sup>th</sup> BOD)
  - **FAILED** in H-FMAE.
- **SB 1593:** municipal; county; measures; standing (*Rogers*) (**OPPOSED** at March 14<sup>th</sup> LPC)
  - *Was never heard in second chamber standing committee.*
- **SB 1712:** retirement; judges; elected officials (*Gowan*) (**OPPOSED** at February 7<sup>th</sup> LPC)
  - *Was never assigned to committee.*
- **SCR 1004:** prohibit tax; monitoring; vehicle mileage (*Hoffman*) (**OPPOSED** at January 24<sup>th</sup> LPC; **NEUTRAL** by staff after amendment; **SUPPORT** at February 14<sup>th</sup> LPC)
  - *Was never first read in the second chamber.*
- **HB 2043:** harassment; intent; defense (*Kolodin*) (**OPPOSED** at January 24<sup>th</sup> LPC, **NEUTRAL** by staff after amendment)
  - *Was never heard in second chamber standing committee.*
- **HB 2049:** administrative decisions; security proceedings; hearings (*Kolodin*) (**OPPOSED** at January 24<sup>th</sup> LPC) (**JURY TRIAL**)
  - *Was never heard in second chamber standing committee.*
- **HB 2061:** administrative proceedings; jury trials (*Fink*) (**OPPOSED** at January 24<sup>th</sup> LPC) (**JURY TRIAL**)
  - *Was never heard in first chamber standing committee.*
- **HB 2065:** counties; indigent deceased persons; cremation (*Gress*) (**SUPPORTED** at January 16<sup>th</sup> BOD)
  - *Was never heard in second chamber standing committee; struck onto SB 1048 (which continues to move).*
- **HB 2105:** violation; open burning; enforcement (*Griffin*) (**SUPPORTED** at February 20<sup>th</sup> BOD)
  - *Was never heard in second chamber standing committee; struck onto HB 2104 (which continues to move).*
- **HB 2152:** right to jury; domestic relations (*Keshel*) (**OPPOSED** at January 24<sup>th</sup> LPC) (**JURY TRIAL**)
  - *Was never heard in second chamber standing committee.*
- **HB 2191:** religious institutions; development; allowed use (*Livingston*) (**OPPOSED** at February 7<sup>th</sup> LPC)
  - **FAILED** on HOUSE THIRD.
- **HB 2223:** wind farms; construction; policies; procedures (*Marshall*) (**OPPOSED** at February 7<sup>th</sup> LPC)
  - *Never passed its first chamber; struck onto SB 1150 (which continues to move).*
- **HB 2416:** unlawful act; government official; challenge (*Kolodin*) (**OPPOSED** at February 7<sup>th</sup> LPC)
  - *Was never heard in first chamber standing committee.*
- **HB 2599:** condominiums; construction defects; action (*Blackman*) (**FOR INFORMATION** at February 7<sup>th</sup> LPC)
  - *Was never heard in first chamber standing committee.*
- **HB 2660:** affordable housing tax credits; extension (*Wilmeth*) (**SUPPORTED** at January 24<sup>th</sup> LPC)
  - *Was never heard in first chamber standing committee.*
- **HB 2708:** trial by jury; regulatory proceedings (*Kolodin*) (**OPPOSED** at January 24<sup>th</sup> LPC) (**JURY TRIAL**)
  - *Was never heard in first chamber standing committee.*



- **HB 2713:** homeowners' association dwelling actions (*Blackman*) (**FOR INFORMATION** at **February 7<sup>th</sup> LPC**)
  - *Was never heard in first chamber standing committee.*
- **HB 2763:** state government; federal contracts; applicability (*Volk*) (**SUPPORTED** at **February 14<sup>th</sup> LPC**)
  - *Never passed its first chamber; struck onto **SB 1706** (which continues to move).*
- **HB 2926:** TPT; reimbursement; residential development (*Carbone*) (**OPPOSED** at **February 14<sup>th</sup> LPC**)
  - **~~STRUCK~~** to completely different subject