INFORMATION BRIEF
Minnesota House of Representatives
Research Department
600 State Office Building
St. Paul, MN 55155

Judie Zollar, Legislative Analyst
651-296-1554 November 2004

2004 Criminal Justice Legislation

This information brief summarizes new laws passed by the 2004 Legislature pertaining to DWI, corrections, domestic abuse and harassment, general crime, and other miscellaneous matters. It then provides a short overview of significant legislation considered, but not passed, by the 2004 Legislature.

Contents Page

Legislation Passed During 2004 Regular Session **2**

DWI Provisions 2
Corrections Provisions 7
Domestic Abuse and Harassment Provisions 10
General Crime Provisions 11
Miscellaneous Provisions 12

Major Legislative Items Pending at the End of 2004 Regular Session **13**

The author of these materials thanks her colleagues in the House Research Department for the use of their bill summaries in preparing this publication. The House Research Department analysts covering criminal justice issues include Judie Zollar, the author of these materials, Jim Cleary, Jeffrey Diebel, and Rebecca Pirius. All can be reached at 651-296-6753.

Legislation Passed During 2004 Regular Session

DWI Provisions

Reduction of Alcohol Concentration Level from .10 to .08 for DWI Offenses

The 2004 Legislature joined the majority of states in lowering the legal "per se" limit for alcohol concentration for DWI offenses from .10 percent to .08 percent. Minnesota would have lost millions of dollars of federal highway funding if it did not follow suit. (Minnesota has already lost highway funding dollars for delaying action to lower the alcohol concentration level, but this funding is recaptured by Minnesota's compliance with the federal requirement of a .08 alcohol concentration level within the time frame specified by the federal government.)

New .08 Alcohol Concentration Level

The new alcohol concentration limit applies to:

- driving, operating, or being in physical control of motor vehicles, off-road recreational vehicles, and motorboats in operation;
- operation of any type of military vehicle anywhere in the state; and
- hunting with a firearm or bow.

The .08 alcohol concentration level also applies to commercial vehicle driving, for the purpose of determining a violation of the general DWI law. (The alcohol concentration limit for commercial vehicle driving is zero-tolerance, resulting in a 24-hour out-of-service order, or, at .04, a commercial vehicle driver's license disqualification.)

The new alcohol concentration level also becomes the standard for determining the appropriateness of punitive damages in a civil cause of action. In addition, the .08 alcohol concentration standard applies to the penalties in the criminal vehicular homicide and injury laws for negligently operating a motorized vehicle.

The law is effective August 1, 2005, and applies to offenses committed on or after that date. Laws 2004, ch. 283; to be codified at Minn. Stat. §§ 97B.065, subd. 1; 97B.066, subd. 1; 169A.20, subd. 1; 169A.51, subd. 1; 169A.52, subds. 2, 4, and 7; 169A.53, subd. 3; 169A.54, subd. 7; 169A.76; 192A.555; and 609.21.

Purging of Certain First-Time DWI Violations

The law requires the Department of Public Safety to purge the driver's license record of a DWI violation after ten years if:

- the violation involved an offense or action with an alcohol concentration of .08 or more but less than .10,
- the violation was a first offense, and
- the driver has incurred no other impaired driving incident during the ten-year period.

An "impaired driving incident" includes any incident that may be counted as a prior impaired driving conviction or a prior impaired driving-related loss of license.

This provision does not apply to the driver's license record of a person to whom a commercial driver's license has been issued. This law is effective August 1, 2005. Laws 2004, ch. 283; to be codified at Minn. Stat. § 171.12, subd. 3.

Collection of and Report on Certain Alcohol-Related Traffic Stop and Test Results

From August 1, 2005, to July 31, 2006, peace officers administering alcohol concentration tests, including preliminary screening and chemical tests, of a person's blood, breath, or urine, must record:

- the initial reason for the interaction between the officer and the person tested, including, but not limited to, traffic violations, erratic driving, citizen tips, or traffic accidents; and
- the person's alcohol concentration.

The chief law enforcement officer of each law enforcement agency must then report the above information to the Commissioner of Public Safety, and the commissioner must report a summary of the information to the legislature by January 15, 2007. Laws 2004, ch. 283.

License Plate Impoundment

The legislature changed the term "significant relationship" to "family or household member" in the license plate impoundment law. This term is defined to mean:

- a parent, stepparent, or guardian;

- any of the following persons related by blood, marriage, or adoption: brother, sister, stepbrother, stepsister, first cousin, aunt, uncle, nephew, niece, grandparent, great-grandparent, great-uncle, great-aunt; or

- persons residing together or persons who regularly associate and communicate with one another outside of a workplace setting.

This change also makes the definition of "family or household member" consistent in both the plate impoundment and vehicle forfeiture law. Laws 2004, ch. 235; to be codified at Minn. Stat. §§ 169A.60, subds. 1 and 14; 169A.63.

Vehicle Forfeiture

The 2004 Legislature made a number of substantive and technical changes to DWI forfeiture law. A motor vehicle is subject to forfeiture when used to commit a DWI offense and in certain situations where a person's driver's license has been cancelled or restricted and the person drives in violation of that cancellation or restriction. A motor vehicle also is subject to forfeiture if used in such a way that the use of the vehicle results in revocation of a person's driver's license.

The legislature added and amended vehicle forfeiture definitions, changed both judicial and administrative procedures related to seizure of a motor vehicle, and set forth certain standards and limits on forfeiture.

Definitions

Owner. The definition of "owner" no longer means the registered owner according to state records. Instead, the registered owner is presumed to be the owner of the vehicle according to state records, but this presumption can be rebutted. The new definition of "owner" is broader and means a person legally entitled to possession, use, and control of a motor vehicle. The law continues to include within the definition of "owner" a lessee of a motor vehicle if the lease agreement has a term of 180 days or more. In addition, new language is added to state that, if two or more people own a motor vehicle jointly, each owner's interest extends to the whole of the vehicle and is not subject to apportionment.

Family or Household Member. This term is defined in the same manner as it is defined in the license plate impoundment law (see page 3).

Designated Offense. The legislature clarified the definition of one type of "designated offense." Under the new definition, a designated offense occurs when a person's driver's license is canceled as inimical to public safety *and not reinstated*. Prior to this change, the statute did not include a requirement that the driver's license had not been reinstated.

Security Interest. A security interest is defined to mean a bona fide security interest perfected and based on a loan or other financing that, if a vehicle is required to be registered, is listed on the vehicle's title.

Claimant. A "claimant" is defined as an owner of a motor vehicle or a person claiming a leasehold or security interest in a motor vehicle. Laws 2004, ch. 235; to be codified at Minn. Stat. § 169A.63, subd. 1.

Limitations on Vehicle Forfeiture

The law providing limitations on vehicle forfeiture is amended in several ways. Under the changes, a vehicle will be presumed forfeited in certain cases, but a claimant or offender will have an opportunity to raise and prove certain affirmative defenses.

A vehicle is presumed subject to forfeiture if the offender fails to appear for any scheduled court appearance. This provision applies to any court appearance the offender misses. Previously, this provision applied only if the offender failed to appear for trial.

This provision also provides that a vehicle forfeiture is not subject to denial or reversal based on the outcome of an administrative driver's license review. Under prior law, in some cases a seized vehicle had to be returned if an offender's driver's license revocation was reviewed and overturned. Review could occur either judicially (asking a judge to overturn the revocation) or administratively (asking DPS to overturn the revocation). Because administrative review could be sought anytime up to a year after revocation, the forfeiture action was essentially held in limbo for a year (exposing the prosecuting authority to liability for a completed forfeiture). This change limits the "window" for seeking review to 30 days, which is the time period during which an individual must seek judicial review. Laws 2004, ch. 235; to be codified at Minn. Stat. § 169A.63, subd. 7.

"Innocent Owner" Defense

The standard for establishing the "innocent owner" defense is changed. Previously, the vehicle was subject to forfeiture if the owner knew or should have known of the unlawful use or intended use. Under the new law, a motor vehicle is not subject to forfeiture if its owner can demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence that the owner did not have actual or constructive knowledge that the vehicle would be used or operated in any manner contrary to law or that the owner took reasonable steps to prevent the offender's use of the vehicle.

If the offender is a family or household member and has three or more prior impaired driving convictions, the owner is presumed to know of any vehicle use by the offender that is contrary to law. The law defines vehicle use that is contrary to law as driving without a license, driving without proof of insurance, violating a license restriction, driving while intoxicated, underage drinking and driving, and violating the open bottle law. Laws 2004, ch. 235; to be codified at Minn. Stat. § 169A.63, subd. 7.

Procedures Related to Seizure of Motor Vehicle

Notice of Seizure. The forfeiture law is amended to add a provision requiring the prosecuting authority to serve a notice of seizure on the registered owner. This process eliminates the requirement that the prosecuting authority file a separate complaint naming the vehicle as a defendant. Laws 2004, ch. 235; to be codified at Minn. Stat. § 169A.63, subd. 2.

Administrative Forfeiture Procedures. The law is changed to state that a vehicle seizure notice may be made within a reasonable time after seizure and does not need to occur at the exact time of seizure.

If a claimant files a claim in conciliation court for recovery of the seized vehicle, a copy of the claim must be served personally or by mail on the prosecuting authority having jurisdiction over the forfeiture. This claim must be served within 30 days following service of the notice of seizure and forfeiture. In addition, the claimant's complaint must raise any affirmative defenses the claimant may have that the vehicle was improperly seized.

The law eliminates the provision allowing combination of a forfeiture hearing with a driver's license revocation hearing. Laws 2004, ch. 235; to be codified at Minn. Stat. § 169A.63, subd. 8.

Judicial Forfeiture Procedures. The changes to the judicial forfeiture procedures clarify that an action for forfeiture is a civil in rem action and is independent of any criminal prosecution. The Rules of Civil Procedure apply to forfeiture actions.

Prosecutors no longer must file a separate complaint against a vehicle if the vehicle owner does not do so, but have the option of doing so. In addition, a prosecutor may file an answer to a properly served demand for judicial determination, including an affirmative counterclaim for forfeiture. The prosecuting authority, however, need not file an answer.

The forfeiture law is amended to make clear that a judicial determination in a forfeiture action must not take place before the criminal prosecution for the designated offense, unless the prosecuting authority consents to it. The district court administrator must schedule the hearing as soon as practicable after adjudication in the criminal prosecution. The hearing is to the court without a jury.

The law provides a presumption that a vehicle used in the commission of a designated offense or designated license revocation is subject to forfeiture. The claimant bears the burden of proving any affirmative defense.

If the vehicle is to be returned to the owner, the owner must show proof of ownership, valid driving privileges, and insurance. The owner also must pay any storage costs. The law requires the return of filing fees to the person who filed the demand for judicial determination. The court also may order sanctions, and reimbursement fees or sanctions must be paid from other forfeiture proceeds of the law enforcement agency and prosecuting authority involved. Laws 2004, ch. 235; to be codified at Minn. Stat. § 169A.63, subd. 9.

Security Interest

This provision establishes that a prosecuting authority's costs for seizure, tow, forfeiture, and sale have precedence over a security interest. A security interest must be established by its holder by clear and convincing evidence. The law eliminates language requiring the prosecuting authority to notify a secured party at least three days prior to the sale of the vehicle.

If a secured party has knowledge of an offender's illegal acts, the changes in this paragraph place the burden of proof on the secured party to demonstrate that it took reasonable steps to terminate use of the vehicle by the offender. This provision will likely be invoked only in rare circumstances, as it is uncommon for a secured party to have knowledge of an offender's illegal behavior. Laws 2004, ch. 235; Minn. Stat. § 169A.63, subd. 7.

Corrections Provisions

Nonconsensual Collection of Inmate Blood Sample

This law authorizes an expedited process and eliminates the need for a court order if a corrections employee is subjected to a significant exposure to bloodborne pathogens through contact with an inmate.

Criteria for Involuntary Release of Medical Information or Blood Sample

If a corrections employee experiences a significant exposure to an inmate's blood, the head of a correctional facility must ask the inmate to consent to the release of medical information on bloodborne pathogens or to a blood test for bloodborne pathogens. If the inmate refuses to consent to and cooperate with the release of medical information or collection of a blood sample, the head of a correctional facility may order an inmate to release this information or to provide a blood sample for testing. An inmate may be compelled to release this information or submit to a blood test if:

- the correctional facility imposes appropriate safeguards against unauthorized disclosure and use of medical information or blood samples;
- a qualified physician determines that a significant exposure has occurred to the corrections employee;
- a qualified physician has documented that the corrections employee has received vaccinations for preventing bloodborne pathogens, provided a blood sample, and consented to testing for bloodborne pathogens;
- the qualified physician determines bloodborne pathogen test results are needed from the inmate for beginning, continuing, modifying, or discontinuing medical treatment for the corrections employee;
- the head of the correctional facility receives affidavits from qualified physicians treating the corrections employee and the inmate, attesting that a significant exposure has occurred; and
- the head of the corrections facility finds a compelling need for the medical information or test results.

The law requires the head of the correctional facility to determine whether a compelling need exists by weighing the officer's need for the exchange of medical information or blood collection

and test results against the interests of the inmate, including, but not limited to, privacy, health, safety, or economic interests. In addition, the head of the correctional facility must consider whether release of medical information or involuntary blood collection would serve or harm public interests.

For the purpose of this law, a qualified physician is a licensed physician who is employed by or under contract with the correctional facility to provide services to employees and inmates and who is an infectious disease specialist or consults with an infectious disease specialist or a hospital infectious disease officer. Laws 2004, ch. 252; to be codified at Minn. Stat. § 241.336, subd. 3.

State and Local Correctional Facility Plans

The law also requires each state and local correctional facility to adopt a plan for the education and treatment of corrections employees and inmates, consistent with plans established by the Department of Corrections. The plans also must establish policies and procedures for ensuring that corrections employees and inmates are:

- routinely offered and provided voluntary vaccinations to prevent bloodborne pathogen infections,
- routinely offered and provided with voluntary post-exposure prophylactic treatments for bloodborne pathogen infections, consistent with current United States Public Health Service guidelines, and
- ensured voluntary access to treatment for bloodborne pathogen infections, consistent with current United States Public Health Service guidelines for corrections workers or inmates who are determined to have a bloodborne pathogen infection, as determined by current law.

Plans must be adopted by July 1, 2006. The Commissioner of Corrections and director of each local correctional facility must provide written notice to each inmate through the inmate handbook, or a similar document, of the provisions of this law. Laws 2004, ch. 252; to be codified at Minn. Stat. § 241.336, subd. 3.

Multiple Occupancy Prison Cells and Security Classifications

This law changes the number of security levels at which correctional facilities are classified from six to five. Under previous law, there were two "close custody" designations, one at level four and one at level five. The act deletes one of the close custody levels, thereby making maximum-security facilities (previously level-six facilities) level-five facilities and eliminating the different standards that previously applied to restrictions on multiple occupancy of level-five close custody facilities. Under this law, the Department of Corrections may designate multiple occupancy cells at all level-one through -four institutions if the occupancy does not exceed the limits of facility infrastructure and programming space. The law still requires that each inmate in a maximum-security facility (now level-five facility) be confined in a separate cell. Laws 2004, ch. 156; to be codified at Minn. Stat. § 243.53, subd. 1.

Interstate Compact for Adult Offender Supervision

Extension of "Old" Interstate Compact for Supervision of Probationers and Parolees

In 2002, the legislature passed a new interstate compact for supervision of adult offenders. At the time, the legislature decided to leave the old interstate compact for the supervision of probationers and parolees in effect until July 2004 so that it would continue to have an interstate agreement in place to manage interstate movement of offenders with states that had not yet enacted the new compact.

This year, the legislature acted to keep the old compact in place for two additional years, until July 1, 2006. Without this extension, Minnesota would not have a procedure for handling interstate transfers of offenders with certain states. This extension allows those jurisdictions that have not adopted the new compact time to do so. Minnesota will continue to use the new compact with those states that have adopted it. Laws 2004, ch. 155 (amending Laws 2002, ch. 268, § 8).

Retaking an Offender Subject to the Interstate Compact

Detention of Offender. The legislature amended the new interstate compact to allow Minnesota officials to take custody of and detain an offender without approval of the offender's sending state. The offender may be detained for up to 12 days prior to a probable cause hearing on an alleged probation or parole violation. If it appears to the hearing officer or officers that the sending state is likely to retake or reincarcerate the offender, Minnesota may detain an offender after a probable cause hearing for such reasonable period of time as may be necessary to arrange for retaking or reincarceration.

Hearing Procedures. The above-referenced hearing must be held unless the offender waives the hearing. A record of the proceedings must be made and preserved. After the hearing, the appropriate judicial or administrative authorities in Minnesota must notify the compact administrator of the sending state if Minnesota believes retaking or reincarceration of an offender is appropriate given a probation violation. Minnesota officials also must provide the sending state with a copy of the hearing record and disposition recommendations stemming from the hearing.

Offender's Rights. An offender subject to a hearing under this provision has certain designated rights. The offender:

- must be provided reasonable, written notice of the nature and content of allegations to be made, including notice that the hearing's purpose is to determine whether probable cause exists to believe the offender has committed a violation that may lead to revocation of parole or probation;
- must be allowed, prior to the hearing, to obtain the advice of any person whose assistance the offender reasonably desires;
- must have the right to confront and examine those individuals who have made allegations against the offender, unless the hearing officer determines that such

confrontation would present a substantial present or subsequent danger of harm to the individual(s); and

- may admit, deny, or explain the violation alleged and present proof, including affidavits and other evidence, in support of the offender's contentions.

Hearings in Other States. This law also states that other states are authorized to hold similar hearings and that, upon receipt of the record of a parole or probation violation hearing held in a another state pursuant to a law substantially similar to this provision, the record of that hearing has the same standing and effect as though the hearing were held in Minnesota. Minnesota officials must fully consider any recommendations contained in or accompanying the record in disposing of the matter. Laws 2004, ch. 155; to be codified at Minn. Stat. § 243.1605.

Collection of Sex Offender Treatment Co-payments

This law authorizes the Commissioner of Corrections to authorize sex offender treatment providers to charge and collect treatment co-pays from offenders in their programs, based on a fee schedule approved by the commissioner. These fees must be used to fund the costs of treatment. Laws 2004, ch. 134; to be recodified at Minn. Stat. § 241.272, subd. 8.

Domestic Abuse and Harassment Provisions

Certain Orders Effective Upon Referee's Signature

This provision makes clear that an ex parte order issued under the Domestic Abuse Act or a temporary restraining order issued under the civil harassment law is effective upon a referee's signature, thereby eliminating the requirement that the respondent must be served with the order before it is effective. (The law includes a procedure whereby law enforcement may serve the respondent with the order and allow the respondent time to leave the area before finding the respondent in violation of the order.) Laws 2004, ch. 145; to be codified at Minn. Stat. § 518B.01, subd. 7.

Extension or Grant of Subsequent Order for Protection

This law adds a new basis for a court to extend the terms of an existing order for protection or to grant a new order for protection when a prior order is no longer effective. Under the law, the court may extend or grant a new order for protection when the respondent who is the subject of the order is incarcerated and about to be released from incarceration.

An individual seeking relief under this statute must apply for relief and the order may be issued only after notice to all parties and a hearing. The petitioner, however, does not need to show that physical harm is imminent to obtain an extension or subsequent order. Laws 2004, ch. 164; to be codified at Minn. Stat. § 518B.01, subd. 6a.

Access to Domestic Abuse Incident Reports

Under this law, the victim and victim's attorney must be given access to a domestic abuse incident report prepared by police in response to a report of domestic abuse. The data practices law also is amended to allow release of this information to victims and their attorneys. Laws 2004, ch. 290; to be codified at Minn. Stat. §§ 13.43, subd. 5; 629.341, subd. 4.

General Crime Provisions

Assault of Peace Officer or Probation Officer

This law creates a new type of fourth-degree assault and provides a three-year felony penalty when a person intentionally throws or otherwise transfers bodily fluids or feces at or onto a peace officer. This conduct would not otherwise meet the standard for an assault. The penalty applies only when the officer is effecting a lawful arrest or executing any other duty imposed by law. The law also creates another type of fourth-degree assault and provides a gross misdemeanor penalty when a person engages in the same conduct against a probation officer. The penalty applies only when the probation officer or other qualified person employed in supervising offenders is engaged in the performance of a duty imposed by law, policy, or rule. Laws 2004, ch. 184; to be codified at Minn. Stat. § 609.2231, subds. 1 and 3.

Harm to a Service Animal by a Dog

Service animals are animals individually trained or being trained to do work or perform tasks for the benefit of an individual with a disability. This law imposes a misdemeanor penalty and restitution requirements on persons who intentionally or negligently permit a dog to run uncontrolled off the owner's premises or fail to keep the dog properly confined and controlled, with the result that the dog causes bodily harm to a service animal or otherwise causes a service animal to be unable to perform its duties.

The restitution requirements for which a person may be responsible include the service animal user's loss of income, veterinary expenses, travel costs, other expenses of temporary replacement assistance services, and replacement costs, including retraining of a service animal. The person also is responsible for costs and expenses incurred by the school, agency, or individual providing a replacement for a service animal that is no longer able to safely or dependably perform its duties.

The law allows a defendant to raise provocation as an affirmative defense to a charge of a dog harming a service animal. Finally, the law specifically states that it does not impact any civil remedies available for the same conduct. Laws 2004, ch. 159; to be codified at Minn. Stat. § 609.226, subds. 3 and 4.

Miscellaneous Provisions

Ban on Obscene or Pornographic Work in Sex Offender Treatment Programs

This law requires the Commissioner of Human Services to prohibit certain civilly committed individuals from having or receiving material that is obscene or pornographic, as defined by criminal law provisions. The ban applies to persons committed as sexually dangerous persons and persons with sexual psychopathic personalities while these persons are receiving services in any secure treatment facilities operated by the Minnesota sex offender program or any other facilities operated by the commissioner. Laws 2004, ch. 134; to be codified at Minn. Stat. § 246B.04, subd. 2.

Disclosure of Certain Personnel Information about School Employees

This law creates mandatory disclosure requirements for certain private data about school employees related to acts of violence toward, or sexual conduct with, a student. The data is subject to release only if an investigation conducted by or on behalf of the school district or law enforcement agency affirms the allegations of violence or sexual conduct in writing prior to the release of the information and the investigation resulted in resignation of the school employee. The superintendent of a school district or a person having administrative control of a charter school has responsibility for releasing this information to a requesting school district or charter school.

The new employee reference disclosure law (see immediately below) also requires disclosure of certain illegal conduct by school employees (as listed in that law), as well as information related to acts of violence toward or inappropriate sexual contact with a student that resulted in disciplinary action.

The law eliminates a requirement in prior law that information about acts of violence and inappropriate sexual conduct could be released only with the written informed consent of the school employee. The new employee reference disclosure law, however, requires a superintendent or person having administrative control of a charter school to disclose any criminal information in writing and to contemporaneously send a copy of the disclosure by regular mail to the employee's last known address. Laws 2004, ch. 137; to be codified at Minn. Stat. §§ 13.43, subd. 16; 181.967, subd. 5.

Disclosure of Employment Reference Information Related to Illegal Conduct

A new law specifies that no action may be maintained against an employer by an employee or former employee when the employer discloses certain information to a prospective employer or employment agency, as provided by the law, unless the employee or former employee demonstrates by clear and convincing evidence that:

- the information was false or defamatory, and
- the employer knew or should have known the information was false and acted with malicious intent to injure the current or former employee.

The information that may be disclosed includes some basic information (dates of employment, compensation and wage history, job description and duties, employer-provided training and education) and information about certain illegal conduct. Under the law, a private or public employer may disclose information about acts of violence, theft, harassment, or illegal conduct documented in the personnel record that resulted in disciplinary action or resignation and the employee's written response, if any, contained in the personnel record. A private or public employer that discloses information about illegal conduct must disclose the information in writing and contemporaneously send a copy of the disclosure by regular mail to the employee's last known address.

Under the law, a private employer is any employer not covered by chapter 13, the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act; a public employer is an employer covered by the data practices act. Laws 2004, ch. 137; to be codified at Minn. Stat. § 181.967.

Flags Flown at Half-Staff Following Certain Deaths

Under Minnesota law, each American flag and Minnesota flag flown on the grounds of the Capitol area must be flown at half-staff following the death of a public safety officer killed in the line of duty or the death of Minnesota military personnel killed in the line of duty. The governor has authority to determine the length of time that the flags are to be flown at half-staff. Public safety officers include peace officers, corrections officers, fire fighters, and various other public safety personnel. Laws 2004, ch. 173; to be codified at Minn. Stat. § 1.51.

Major Legislative Items Pending at the End of 2004 Regular Session

The 2004 Legislature grappled with a number of other significant policy issues in the criminal justice area, but passed only a fraction of the legislation it considered. The House and Senate each passed criminal justice omnibus bills containing major substantive changes in the criminal justice area. Due to a widespread breakdown in reaching agreement on key legislative issues, however, the House and Senate never met in conference committee to reconcile differences in the bills.

The legislature considered, but did not pass into law the following:

- increased and indeterminate sentencing of sex offenders
- predatory offender registration law changes to track homeless offenders

- community notification law changes to ensure proper notification occurs when offenders cross state lines
- increased penalties for methamphetamine crimes
- restrictions on sales and possession of precursor substances used to manufacture methamphetamine
- measures to protect children and the environment from methamphetamine-related crimes
- funding to cover a deficiency in the State Public Defender's budget for the current biennium due to a Minnesota Supreme Court case declaring unconstitutional the legislature's 2003 law requiring co-pays from criminal defendants
- legislation dealing with many other issues

For more information on legislative initiatives that passed into law or failed to become law, please contact judith.zollar@house.mn. For general information about criminal justice legislation, visit the criminal justice area of our web site, www.house.mn/hrd/issinfo/crime.htm.