Renewed focus on safety and permanency for children in the United States child welfare system has brought the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (ICPC) into the spotlight. While this attention confirmed the important role the ICPC plays in ensuring appropriate placements, it has also highlighted concerns that the ICPC processes cause unnecessary delays. States and other child welfare professionals have become increasingly dissatisfied with the ICPC as it is currently written and implemented. Some of the problems with the current compact include: (1) its overly broad language in terms of the definition and scope, (2) its inadequate procedures in addressing the needs of today's children, and (3) the current structure's lack of enforcement and accountability. In short, the ICPC is outdated for 21st century child welfare practice.

History of the ICPC

The current ICPC was drafted in 1960 and has been enacted by all states, the District of Columbia and the U.S. Virgin Islands. It ensures protection and services to children placed across state lines for foster care or adoption by establishing procedures that ensure placements are safe, suitable and able to provide proper care. It also assigns legal and financial responsibilities to those involved in making the placements.

The ICPC process entails a thorough home study conducted by the receiving state. This involves assessments of social and medical histories of the placement family, their backgrounds, parenting and discipline styles, employment and financial histories, physical evaluation of their home, criminal and child abuse background checks, personal and professional references, foster or adoptive parent training, and case worker recommendations. Once the placement is determined to be “not contrary to the welfare of the child” and the child is placed, the receiving state is responsible for ongoing supervision of the placement and for providing support services to the family and child and regular reports to the sending state agency and court. In addition, sending and receiving states must reach agreement on how services and supports will be financed. This can be complex because it involves the cooperation of several systems in both states, including education and mental health.

Complexities in the ICPC

Over its 44-year history and due to the broad scope of the compact’s language, the ICPC has come to include many populations of children. The compact currently covers foster children placed with a relative or other caregiver, children moving across state lines with their foster parents, children placed for adoption by a public or private agency or by a private attorney, children placed in residential treatment facilities by parents, parents placing children with non-relatives, and pregnant mothers who cross state lines to give birth and place their child for adoption.

The ICPC was formulated on the assumption that each state would send the same number of children as they received. Therefore, the financial burden to states of conducting home studies and providing post-placement supervision for children placed in their states would be offset by the similar costs borne by other states. However, data and anecdotal evidence show that today many states send more children than they receive, and some states receive many more children than they send. This disproportion has compromised the ability of some states to provide the necessary resources for home studies and on-going supervision. Adding to the demand on states’ resources is the fact that concurrent planning requires caseworkers to make multiple home study requests for one child. Each home study must be financed, but placement can occur with only one of the families studied.
Currently, interstate placements constitute about 5.5 percent of children served in foster care annually, and some 4 percent in care on any given day. The largest proportion of the children placed through the ICPC—about 40 percent—are placed with relatives in other states.

The court system adds another layer of complexity. A child cannot be removed from his home or placed in a foster or adoptive home without a judge's approval. Courts must ensure that reasonable efforts have been made to reunify a child with birth parents before a petition can be filed for termination of parental rights. They also must ensure that prospective adoptive parents are appropriate during an official waiting period of between three and 12 months before rendering a final decision.

Many of the factors that complicate the ICPC process underline struggles in the overall child welfare system, which continually contends with capacity, staffing, training and resource issues.

**Interstate Placements Today and in the Future**

Interstate placements are on the rise and are expected to continue to grow as relative placements and geographic barriers to adoption fade. A significant component of states' efforts to increase permanency and adoption for children in the child welfare system is the recognition that resource families for the children who need homes can be located anywhere in the United States. With the launch of the AdoptUSKids website and national recruitment campaign, states now have a vehicle that allows them to find prospective adoptive families from across the nation for waiting children. As of Sept. 30, 2001, 542,000 children in out-of-home placements, (60 percent) will be reunified with birth parents. The remaining will need permanent families. Most will be placed in homes close to their communities; for others, the most appropriate placement may be with a family in another state. Interstate placements offer a greater chance of adoption to children who may be difficult to place, since resource families from all states can be accessed and made aware of their need.

Data from the Adoption and Foster Care Analysis Reporting System (AFCARS) show that nationwide, the annual number of completed adoptions from foster care doubled between 1995 and 2000. Researchers expect the rate of growth in adoption from foster care will exceed the rate of growth of the foster care population for at least the next two decades.

Although adoptions have increased substantially, at any given time about 8,000 children are waiting to be adopted but have no immediate adoption prospects. Currently, interstate placements constitute about 5.5 percent of children served in foster care annually, and some 4 percent in care on any given day. The largest proportion of the children placed through the ICPC—about 40 percent—are placed with relatives in other states. This significantly exceeds the national figures showing that relatives care for 25 percent of all children in foster care. Moreover, children who are placed interstate are twice as likely to be placed in pre-adoptive homes as in-state children. In fact, data show that two-thirds of children placed in another state are adopted by the families with whom they were placed.

**The Road to Change**

In March 2004, the American Public Human Services Association's (APHSA) state human services leadership adopted a policy resolution directing a rewrite of the ICPC. While the association members agreed that there are a number of interim steps that can be taken to improve the interstate placement process, true reform required revisions to the actual language of the ICPC itself. APHSA, in response to this resolution, assembled a development and drafting team composed of a diverse group of state human service administrators, child welfare directors, compact administrators and a large number of national child welfare organizations to provide recommendations for addressing the issues in the compact and its implementation. After intensive meetings and extensive communication with the states and outside stakeholders, APHSA disseminated two drafts of the rewritten compact—the Interstate Compact for the Placement of Children—for review and comment. The comments and concerns of the states and stakeholders have been compiled and integrated by APHSA staff and the Drafting Team. The third and final draft is forthcoming, with revisions completed by December 2005. APHSA is working with its members to have the compact introduced in state legislatures in 2006.

— Liz Oppenheim is the director of Interstate Affairs at the American Public Human Services Association and oversees the administration of the ICPC and the Interstate Compact on Adoption and Medical Assistance (ICAMA).

---

1. The AFCARS Report. Data submitted for FY2001, 10/1/00 through 9/30/01.
Interstate Compact for Juveniles
Strengthening the Juvenile Compact for the 21st Century

by John J. Mountjoy

The Interstate Compact for Juveniles, a new interstate agreement, significantly updates the 50-year-old mechanism for tracking and supervising juvenile parolees and probationers that move across state borders. Providing enhanced accountability, enforcement, visibility and communication, the new compact seeks to update a crucial, yet outdated tool for ensuring public safety and preserving child welfare.

The Interstate Compact on Juveniles was established in 1955 to manage the interstate movement of adjudicated youth, the return of non-adjudicated runaway youth, and the return of youth to states where they were charged with delinquent acts. The Compact was written before the interstate-highway system, before readily accessible air transportation and well before computer technology revolutionized communication. Likewise, the population managed by the Compact has dramatically grown and changed over the past five decades. This evolving juvenile population, combined with an outdated compact structure, has given root to growing public safety and juvenile welfare concerns in the states. “The juvenile population has changed in a number of ways. The prevalence of firearms in youth crimes, the accessibility of street drugs, such as methamphetamines and the sheer growth in mobility and transportation issues have all contributed to juvenile offenders being more severe and the resultant increase in the states role,” says Ray Wahl, Utah’s Juvenile Court Administrator and member of the Juvenile Compact Advisory Group.

In 1999, the federal Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) conducted a detailed survey of the states uncovering many contentious issues within the current Compact, and asked for recommendations to address these growing concerns. Since that time, The Council of State Governments (CSG) and OJJDP have developed both advisory and drafting groups that created the new Interstate Compact for Juveniles.

The Interstate Compact for Juveniles addresses many deficiencies and inconsistencies within the current juvenile compact system, including enforcement, administration, finances, communications, data sharing and training. The new Compact also establishes an independent compact operating authority, the Interstate Commission, which will be positioned to address future interstate problems and issues as they arise. For reasons of public safety, the welfare of juveniles, and the protection of victims, it is in the best interest of all states and territories to consider this Compact.

What is a compact?
Simply stated, a compact is an agreement between two or more states for cooperative effort, mutual assistance, management, and regulation of public policy matters by the states, which transcend the boundaries of one state. Authorized under Article I of the U.S. Constitution and dating as far back as the 1780s, compacts have been created to address a wide variety of issues that arise among the states. Many of the earliest compacts were designed to settle boundary disputes. Throughout the 20th century, compacts became increasingly relied upon to manage and regulate state concerns in diverse areas such as environmental resource management, multi-state taxation, transportation, corrections, crime control and juvenile justice. States ratifying compacts are bound to observe the terms of the agreement until the compact is formally renounced by the state. Compact provisions take precedence over conflicting state laws and inconsistent provisions of existing laws of a compact state.

The Current Compact: History and Shortcomings
Established in 1955, the Interstate Compact on Juveniles provides the procedural means to regulate the movement across state lines of juveniles who are under court supervision. Specifically, the Compact provides for the monitoring and/or return of any juvenile who:
- Has run away from home without the consent of a parent or legal guardian;
- Is placed on probation or parole and wants to reside in another state;
- Has absconded from probation or parole or escaped from an institution and is located in another state;
- Requires institutional care and specialized services in another state; and/or
- Has a pending delinquency, neglect, or dependency hearing and runs away to another state.
As currently written and/or utilized, the Interstate Compact on
juveniles is not an effective instrument for use by the juvenile jus-
tice system of today. Some of its language and methods are anti-
quated, its rules and procedures are not widely agreed to, fol-
lowed, or understood and its structure and overall management is
powerless to meet the real needs of juveniles within the modern
justice system. According to Wahl, “If a troubled youth does not get
appropriate supervision, interventions and treatment early, they
will continue their delinquent behavior and ultimately become the
responsibility of the adult system. Once that happens, the chance
to make a difference in the life of that child is greatly diminished.”

Specifically, not all states maintain identical contextual lan-
guage, an obvious prerequisite for effective and binding interstate
agreements. Since the adoption of the original Compact, three
different amendments have been proposed by the Compact
administrators, which have not been adopted by all of the states,
creating even more inconsistency. Rules of the current Interstate
Compact on Juveniles are problematic for juvenile justice practi-
tioners and the judicial system, and are also potentially detrimen-
tal to juveniles themselves. In addition, the current Compact con-
tains no enforcement mechanism for the Compact rules nor is
there a method for guaranteeing compliance among the comp-
pacting states. Lastly, the current Compact encounters serious
problems within the juvenile justice system such as processing
time, lack of official universal rules and a lack of information
exchange. “Part of the problem is timely exchange of informa-
tion,” says Doylestown, Pennsylvania Police Chief Stephen W hite,
a member of the Juvenile Compact Drafting Team. “The system is
not currently set-up to adequately share information not only on
juveniles but also adults.”

To further complicate the existing system, rules and procedures
are promulgated and maintained without vested authority by the
Association of Juvenile Compact Administrators (AJCA), a volun-
tary membership organization composed of the appointed comp-
pact administrators or their designee. Although AJCA operates
under language contained in the Compact, no provisions are given
for staffing, national coordination and compliance or funding.

Road to Change

In 1999, the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) and OJJDP
conducted a national survey to collect statistics on interstate activ-
ity and to solicit opinions from officials at various organizational
levels. The survey targeted three specific audiences: compact
administrators, juvenile justice agency administrators, and field staff
of juvenile justice agencies. The three most common recommendations to improve the Compact were:

- Develop better enforcement and accountability measures;
- Provide more training to local and state juvenile justice officials;
- Improve the speed and quality of communication through the use
  of technology.

Beginning in June 2000, CSG and OJJDP began the development
and facilitation of an Advisory Group to examine and determine a
future course of action regarding the Interstate Compact on
juveniles. Composed of twenty-four policy experts representing a
broad and diverse group of institutions and organizations, the
Advisory Group met twice in 2000-2001 with the purposes of:
reviewing and analyzing information from the OJJDP survey and
developing strategies and recommendations for a future course of
action leading to an improved compact.
One of the most valuable aspects of interstate compacts is their ability to compel states to adopt a set of common standards and practices. Through built-in enforcement mechanisms, controversy among member states and affected groups is reduced. Less controversy over the terms of the agreement as well as the obligations assumed under it improves the chances of satisfactory performance by members of the compact. In addition, good faith which is generally presumed among parties to a contract also applies to the states which are members of an interstate compact. Good faith provides some assurance that the compact obligations will be properly performed and discharged.

While these factors led to increased performance, as in all legal relationships ignorance of compact provisions and rules; differences of opinion and practice, as well as member states' occasional recalcitrance requires the issue of enforcement to be considered in the compact context. Of particular importance is the increasing prevalence of interstate compacts that create ongoing interstate administrative agencies.

A growing number of compacts are formed for the purpose of providing both regional and national legal channels for intergovernmental action. These compacts address parole and probation, juvenile (etc.); the collection of standardized information and information sharing systems; and the coordination and cooperation with other interstate compacts including the Interstate Compact for Adult Offender Supervision and Interstate Compact for the Placement of Children.

In summary, the Interstate Compact for Juveniles provides the framework for promoting public safety, ensuring the welfare of juveniles, and protecting victims within the states through enhanced control and a better structure for the interstate movement of juveniles. "The bottom line is that all juveniles are worth being redeemed, no matter what they may have done. I think that if you handle the problem [when these individuals are] juveniles and you can handle it effectively state to state, these juveniles will not end up in the adult system. This gives the juvenile a chance, more adequately protects the community and in the end, saves states money," says Chief White.

— John J. Mountjoy is director of CSG's National Center for Interstate Compacts.

For more information on the Interstate Compact for Juveniles, including updates, links, model language and downloadable resources, please visit: www.csg.org, keyword: juveniles.
Interstate Compact for Adult Offender Supervision has shown, one of the critical problems to avoid is “...creating compact agencies with so little authority that they are inescapably ineffectual.”3

In this regard, the ICAOS is a foremost example of the use of the compact device to create a supra-state administrative agency to regulate an issue of regional and national concern. In 1998 the National Institute of Corrections and The Council of State Governments made a concerted effort to amend and completely replace the 1937 Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Probationers and Parolees. The result of that process was the creation of ICAOS. The importance of this organization must be viewed in the context of its policy implications and its legal standing. In light of Cuyler vs. Adams4 and subsequent cases, the ICAOS, and the administrative rules adopted by its newly formed Interstate Commission, function as “the law of the United States” applicable to the member states under both the terms of the compact and through the operation of the Supremacy Clause.5 Adoption of the ICAOS has “nationalized” and “federalized” the movement of adult offenders who have state convictions, while simultaneously retaining policy direction and operational control in member states. The difference between the old and the new compact, however, rests in the creation of a formal and powerful administrative and enforcement structure that can supersede individual state autonomy.

Other issues which have raised enforcement problems in the field of interstate compacts include financial obligations of states which are parties to compacts. In Virginia v. West Virginia,6 the Supreme Court considered what has been characterized as the most prolonged litigation directly involving obligations assumed under a compact.7 This case arose from the unwillingness of West Virginia to pay a portion of a debt of the Commonwealth of Virginia that it had assumed during the Civil War by means of a compact agreement as part of the final settlement after its separation from Virginia. The importance of this decision is the U.S. Supreme Court’s decision that it would enforce a compact although the precise means that it would employ are not described in the decision. Ultimately, West Virginia performed its obligations to pay the debt it had assumed under the terms of the compact but only after lengthy litigation. Since the obligation to perform was a financial one, it was necessary for the legislature of West Virginia to appropriate the required funds in order to satisfy the legal liability.

Similarly, in State of West Virginia ex. rel. Dyer vs. Sims, State Auditor,8 the Auditor of West Virginia refused to release funds to support the operation of the Ohio River Sanitation Commission. The funds were appropriated by the state legislature to satisfy its financial obligation to an interstate compact to control pollution in the Ohio River system. West Virginia and seven other states were parties to the contract. The litigation was initiated by the auditor in order to compel the required dues payments to be remitted to the compact commission. The U.S. Supreme Court held that West Virginia’s enactment of the compact statute contractually bound the state to comply with its terms, including the financial obligations under its terms and that it could not unilaterally change those terms or refuse to perform its obligations without being in breach of the agreement.
Many of these principles were revisited earlier this year by the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky. It entered a permanent injunction prohibiting a state from breaching an administrative rule that establishes mandatory criteria for the transfer of adult offenders under supervision pursuant to the terms of the Interstate Compact for Adult Offender Supervision. The Court, citing Carchman v. Nash, supra, held that a congressionally sanctioned compact, “The administrative rules adopted by the Commission function as a law of the United States applicable to the member states under the terms of the Compact and through the operation of the Supremacy Clause.” “Thus, obligations imposed by a congressionally sanctioned compact and a duly authorized interstate commission are enforceable on the states. See West Virginia ex rel. Dyer v. Sims, 341 U.S. 22, 30 (1951).”

The fundamental principle in this regard is not that enforcement problems will not arise, but that an interstate compact is a contractual legal instrument that can be enforced, if the need arises, more effectively than other less formal arrangements, administrative alliances or uniform laws.

— Richard L. Masters is general counsel to the Interstate Commission for Adult Offender Supervision and is involved with the National Center for Interstate Compacts on a range of interstate initiatives. He is the co-author of a new interstate compacts book, to be released by the American Bar Association, in January 2006.

2. Buenger & Masters, supra. at 112.
6. 246 U.S. 565 (1918).

Interstate Compact: National Activity Update

2005 was a year of significant national interest for compact related legislation at both the federal and state levels. More than 100 interstate compact bills were introduced in the states with 42 enacted. At the federal level, approximately 25 bills relating to interstate cooperation are active in the 109th Congress. The bills at both levels cover a variety of policy areas including taxation, insurance regulation, criminal justice, transportation, healthcare and the environment.

Listed below are the interstate compacts enacted by states in 2005. For a complete listing of all compacts introduced, please visit: www.csg.org, keyword: interstate compacts.

1. Arkansas HB1317—enacts the Interstate Compact for Juveniles; signed into law, 4/6/05.
2. Colorado SB244—endorses the use of telemedicine and provides that medical services and other health care services rendered via telemedicine are reimbursable under the “Colorado Medical Assistance Act”; signed into law, 5/26/05.
3. Florida HB577—enacts the Interstate Compact for Juveniles; signed into law, 5/26/05.
4. Georgia HB264—Commission on Interstate Cooperation; changes provisions; signed into law, 5/10/05.
5. Idaho HB96—National Crime Prevention & Privacy Compact-adopts; signed into law, 3/21/05.
6. Idaho HB120—Interstate Insurance Product Regulation Compact-adopts; signed into law, 3/21/05.
7. Idaho HB147—Multistate Highway Transportation Agreement-adopts; signed into law, 3/18/05.
8. Indiana SB634—Interstate Insurance Product Regulation Compact-adopts the IPRC compact; signed into law, 5/4/05.
9. Kansas SB59—W ide Life Violator Compact-adopts the W LC; signed into law, 4/6/05.
10. Kansas SB219—Pest Control Compact-adopts; signed into law, 3/21/05.
11. Kansas SB268—Interstate Insurance Product Regulation Compact-adopts; signed into law, 4/8/05.
12. Kentucky HB46—enacts the Interstate Compact for Juveniles; signed into law, 3/18/05.
13. Maryland SB186—State Government / International and Interstate Compacts and Agreements—Filing and Publication requirements; signed into law, 5/26/05.
14. Maryland SB760—Interstate Insurance Product Regulation Compact-adopts the IPRC compact; signed into law, 5/26/05.
15. Maryland HB241—National Crime Prevention & Privacy Compact-adopts; signed into law, 5/26/05.
16. Massachusetts SB1030—Interstate Compact for Adult Offender Supervision-adopts; signed into law, 10/27/05.
18. Mississippi HB764—Interstate Corrections Compact-adopts the national ICC; signed into law, 3/15/05.
19. Nebraska LB16—Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement-amends portions of N.E.'s agreement, repeals other sections and declares an emergency; re: the agreement; signed into law, 3/9/05.
20. Nebraska LB119—Interstate Insurance Product Regulation Compact-adopts the IPRC compact; signed into law, 3/9/05.
21. Nevada SB43—enacts the Interstate Compact for Juveniles; signed into law, 5/19/05.
22. Nevada SB136—revises provisions of the Interstate Compact for Jurisdiction on the Colorado River; signed into law, 5/18/05.
23. Nevada SB518—replaces Interstate Civil Defense and Disaster Compact with Emergency Management Assistance Compact; signed into law, 6/13/05.
24. New Jersey A3473—Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement-adopts; signed into law, 3/9/05.
25. New York A8366—enacts the Interstate Mining Compact; signed into law, 8/30/05.
26. North Carolina HB673—Interstate Insurance Product Regulation Compact-adopts the IPRC compact; signed into law, 7/12/05.
27. North Carolina HB1346—enacts the Interstate Compact for Juveniles; signed into law, 7/19/05.
28. North Dakota HB1166—Interstate Mining Compact-adopts the IMC compact; signed into law, 3/11/05.
29. North Dakota HB1065—Midwest Interstate Passenger Rail Compact-adopts the MIPRC compact; signed into law, 3/31/05.
30. Oregon HB2156—National Crime Prevention & Privacy Compact-adopts the NC PPC compact; signed into law, 3/31/05.
31. Rhode Island HB5961—Interstate Insurance Product Regulation Compact-adopts; signed into law, 7/15/05.
32. South Carolina HB3142—enacts the Nurse Licensure Compact; signed into law, 5/26/05.
33. South Dakota SB48—authorizes the director of the Division of Banking to enter into any interstate agreement or compact with authorized representatives of other jurisdictions.
to provide for the administration of state banking laws; signed into law, 3/3/05.
34. Tennessee HB1460—sunsets the states participation in the Southeast Interstate Low-
level Radioactive Waste Compact; signed into law, 5/4/05.
35. Texas SB371—Interstate Pest Control Compact; signed into law, 5/27/05.
36. Texas HB706—enacts the Interstate Compact for Juveniles; signed into law, 6/18/05.
37. Texas HB2613—Interstate Insurance Product Regulation Compact-adopts; signed into
law, 6/18/05.
38. Utah SB91—enacts the Interstate Compact for Juveniles; signed into law, 3/16/05.
39. Vermont HB352—Interstate Insurance Product Regulation Compact-adopts; signed into
law, 6/18/05.
40. Washington HB1032—Interstate Insurance Product Regulation Compact-adopts the
IIPRC compact; signed into law, 4/20/05.
41. Wyoming SF17—adopts the Interstate Pest Control Compact; signed into law, 2/17/05.
42. Wyoming SF30—adopts the National Crime Prevention & Privacy Compact; signed into
law, 2/17/05.

At the federal level, several bills dealing directly with interstate
compacts or impeding upon traditional interstate issues are under
consideration. Some bills, such as the REAL ID Act (HR-418), have
already been enacted into law. These bills cause concern among the
states about addressing increased demands for enhanced driver’s
license security. For a complete listing of these bills, please visit:
www.csg.org, keyword: interstate compacts.

1. S.131—A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to reduce air pollution through expansion of
cap and trade programs, to provide an alternative regulatory classification for units subject
to the cap and trade program; Committee on Environment and Public Works, 3/3/05.
2. S.S18—To provide for the establishment of a controlled substance monitoring program
in each State; passed Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, 7/29/05.
program, including: (1) energy efficiency; (2) renewable energy; (3) oil and gas; (4) coal;
(5) Indian energy; (6) nuclear matters and security; (7) vehicles and motor fuels, includ-
ing ethanol; (8) hydrogen; (9) electricity; (10) energy tax incentives; (11) hydropower and
goethermal energy; and (12) oil and gas leasing on the Arctic Coastal Plain (Arctic
4. H.R.368—A bill to establish and rapidly implement regulations for State driver’s license
and identification document security standards; Latest Major Action: Subcommittee on
Immigration, Border Security, and Claims, 3/2/05.
5. H.R.418—A bill to establish regulations for State Issued Driver’s Licenses and enhance
terrorism and asylum issues related to travel and immigration. Requires states to join the
as yet undefined “Driver’s License Agreement” under development by AAMVA; Latest
Major Action: signed into law, 5/11/05 (under H.R.1268).
6. H.R.553—A bill to authorize certain States to prohibit the importation of solid
waste from other States, and for other purposes; authorizes compact for such activ-
ity; Latest Major Action: Subcommittee on Environment and Hazardous Materials,
2/25/05.
7. HR.620—To require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a
study on the development and implementation by States of security measures for
driver’s licenses and identification cards and a study on the consequences of denying
driver’s licenses to aliens unlawfully present in the United States, and for other
purposes; Latest Major Action: Subcommittee on Highways, Transit and Pipelines,
2/9/05.
8. H.R.1132—To provide for the establishment of a controlled substance monitoring program
in each State; signed into law, 8/11/05.
9. H.R.1481—To ensure reliability of electric service to provide for expansion of electric-
ity transmission networks in order to support competitive electricity markets to
modernize regulation, and for other purposes; Subcommittee on Energy and Air
Quality, 4/22/05.
10. H.R.2064-To assure that development of certain Federal oil and gas resources will
occur in ways that protect water resources and respect the rights of the surface own-
ers, and for other purposes. Last Major Action: House Transportation and
Infrastructure, 5/4/05.