

MINUTES OF THE MEETING
SENATE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
February 12, 1981

The meeting of the Local Government Committee was called to order by Senator George McCallum on the above date in Room 405 at 12:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL: All members were present.

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL NO. 354:

AN ACT TO ELIMINATE REFERENCES TO THE BOARD
OF ATHLETICS.

Senator Steve Brown, District No. 15 and sponsor of the bill, said the Legislative Audit Committee recommended the Board of Athletics be abolished. There are a lot of problems with the board adopting rules within their scope of authority. The rules they were adopting were being ignored or not enforced. In five other states in the last few years there have been sunset reviews of the Board of Athletics. In three of these states they recommended termination of the board. Senator Brown has another bill which was also prepared by the audit committee giving power to cities and counties to set up a licensing fee program. He asks the committee to hold up action on this bill until we get the other bill. The bill gives local governments authority to say yes or no.

There were no proponents of the bill appearing before the committee. Senator McCallum then called for opponents.

Mary Lou Crawford of the Board of Athletics said the board opposes the abolishment. Without regulation of boxers and wrestlers there can be many things happening. The regulation provides they have a physical examination prior to participating in any event and also for matchmaking purposes.

Senator McCallum then called for questions from the committee.

Senator Conover said in some cities they hold the Golden Glove Boxing Tournaments. Does this bill have anything to do with those.

Senator Brown said no.

Senator Ochsner asked if this would cover the little community amateur boxing matches.

Senator Brown said no, this is for professional events.

Senator Ochsner asked what this is costing.

Senator Brown said it doesn't cost anything. It was funded out of gross proceeds, not to exceed 5% taken in from these events.

Senator O'Hara asked Ms. Crawford what their budget was last year.

Ms. Crawford said \$1200.

Senator Brown said they took in over \$6000 last year.

Representative Menahan, District No. 9 in Anaconda, said at this time the problems are in the officials. You have to have good regulation over those people. You have to have properly trained officials. He said we should have a commission of qualified people and registered officials.

Senator Hammond asked if this board has anything to do with the Golden Gloves.

Senator Brown said no. The committee does not want to take anything away. They just don't think we need the state to have anything to do with this.

Senator Hammond said we have other professional athletic events in the state, are they in anyway effected.

Ms. Crawford said the Board of Athletics deals with boxing and wrestling only.

Senator Van Valkenburg asked Senator Brown if this bill he is going to introduce provides for pure local option or if you are going to have professionals, there must be a local commission.

Senator Brown said yes. They will require physicals. He will try to get the committee a copy of the bill he referred to.

Senator McCallum asked if the board receives any compensation.

Ms. Crawford said travel is all they get.

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL NO. 353:

AN ACT TO PROVIDE FOR THE AUCTION OF JUNK
VEHICLES BY COUNTIES.

Senator Conover, sponsor of the bill, said when junk vehicles are brought into a junk vehicle graveyard, no one can take anything off of that car. It is crushed and taken away for recycling. Sometimes they have more value in parts than in scraps. The bill changes this by allowing the county to auction these off to the highest bidder. The bill provides the minimum bid accepted is not

to be less than the cost to the county for picking this vehicle up. This is to prevent a double cost to the county in case they strip the vehicle and leave it for the county to claim again. Counties are not required to have an auction at any particular time. The county could have an auction on a weekly, monthly or annual basis. Since the county will be undergoing all the costs, the bill provides the revenue collected from the auctions would go into the county's general fund. He did not know until yesterday that there had to be a fiscal note attached to this bill. His comments on the fiscal note are attached. (See attached Exhibit A.)

Bill Romine, representing the Montana Automotive Dismantlers and Recyclers Association, passed out an article from a magazine. (See attached Exhibit B.) This article covers the specific area Senator Conover is speaking on. The association supports this legislation. Over the years there have been many complaints made to the wrecking yards by people who assume the yards can buy out of the graveyards. They are not allowed to do this. We should be able to use these parts. There are two ways to approach this. One would be to allow only wrecking yards to bid on these vehicles. The other would be to guarantee the same vehicle was not abandoned twice and picked up twice at the county's expense. The minimum bid acceptable being not less than what it costs the county to pick it up is a good idea. He also has problems with the fiscal note. What preparation is going to occur? There are not going to be any reconditioning costs. Having to pick them up twice is taken care of by the provision of the minimum bid being not less than what it cost the county to pick it up in the first place. As far as the \$40 a ton figure, people are not going to buy this by the ton. All you have to do to advertise is post a notice, there isn't much of an expense there. The county sanitation officer would hold the auction, the counties already have one of those. This will give some income to the counties. He hopes the committee will give serious consideration to this bill.

Henry Lohr of Hank's Salvage and Recycling in Townsend spoke briefly in favor of the bill.

Ed McCaffree, representing the Montana Association of Counties, said he is for this bill for the reasons that have already been stated. Vandalism may be cut down with this bill. He feels the fiscal note is erroneous.

Senator McCallum then called for opponents of the bill.

Pete Frazier of the City-County Health Department in Great Falls spoke against the bill. (See attached Exhibit C.)

Larry Mitchell from the State Health Department said he was responsible for the fiscal note. It was difficult to determine the cost of collecting and storing vehicles. The figure of 650

tons was the best he could come up with, they deal in tons. He can see some advantage in letting people come in so they don't come in in the middle of the night to strip the cars but he feels there would still be vandalism amounting to approximately \$500 per year in each county. This bill goes too far in opening it to everyone. He doesn't understand how the vehicles would be sold, would you sell the whole vehicle for say \$40 or sell each part separately. Does the buyer salvage the parts inside the graveyard or outside so the county has to pick it up again. He would rather see this limited to only wrecking yards being able to bid. Mr. Mitchell believes it will cost more to support this. Most counties are picking up real junk that doesn't have anything on them to salvage, so they won't be getting any significant income for the counties. He doesn't like the idea of the revenue going to the county general fund. It should go to the junk vehicle fund.

Senator Conover closed by saying once a car gets in the graveyard, no one can touch it or take a part off it. Some of these cars are fairly new and do have salvageable parts. He feels this will make money for the counties. He is opposed to earmarking the revenue for the junk vehicle fund.

Senator McCallum then called for questions from the committee.

Senator Thomas asked what the exceptions were on page 3.

Bill Romine said all monies but monies under this auction.

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL NO. 359:

AN ACT TO ALLOW THE GOVERNING BODY OF A
FIRST-CLASS COUNTY TO PROPOSE BY RESOLUTION
NO MORE THAN THREE ALTERNATIVE FORMS OF LOCAL
GOVERNMENT.

Senator Norman, sponsor of the bill, said this bill deals with altering an existing form of county government in a first-class county through a resolution proposed by the county commissioners. The county commissioners would propose, by resolution, alternate forms. These forms would appear in the primary election on the ballot county-wide. Voters would select one form that would go on the ballot in the general election asking for a yes or no vote. This bill was written to say 3 alternative forms, he had originally had 2 forms in mind. This bill does not in any way disturb the present petition process, that goes on as is.

There were no proponents or opponents appearing before the committee. Senator McCallum read two statements of opposition received from Vera Cahoon of the Missoula County Freeholders Association and Julie Hacker of Bonner. He then called for questions from the committee.

Debbie Schmidt of the Legislative Council said there is a bill in a House committee that does the opposite of this bill. A lot of people are over in that committee and couldn't be here.

Senator McCallum asked if this was the same bill that was in the House last session.

Senator Norman said basically.

Senator McCallum said the objection before was that you could have resolution after resolution. He asked Senator Norman if he would object to only being allowed to have one every so often.

Senator Norman said that would be fine.

At this point Senator McCallum turned the hearing over to Vice-Chairman Jesse O'Hara as Senator McCallum had to attend another hearing.

Senator Ochsner asked if there is something in the reorganization of government that comes up every ten years.

Senator Norman said that was up in 1976.

Senator Ochsner asked if that would do the same thing you are asking for.

Senator Norman said yes, but it is his understanding when that comes up, do you want it continued as is or something else. It doesn't say what else.

Senator Hammond asked if this limits it to 3 choices to start with.

Senator Norman said he wanted this drafted with at least 2 but it was drafted that there must be 3. County commissioners will not put 10 on. They will keep it down to 2 or 3.

Senator Hammond said by using 3 you limit the chances of survival.

Senator Norman said he would not object to amending it to 2.

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL NO. 362:

AN ACT TO REVISE THE METHOD OF DISINCORPORATION
OF A MUNICIPALITY; PROVIDING FOR A DISINCORPORATION
ELECTION UPON TWO-THIRDS VOTE OF THE CITY GOVERNING
BODY.

Senator Van Valkenburg, District No. 50 and sponsor of the bill, said this bill does two things. It permits a city's governing

body, by vote of 2/3 of the members, to place the issue of disincorporation of the city on the ballot before resident voters. Present law permits the vote with respect to disincorporation if 20% of electors petition the board of county commissioners where the city is located to have election on the issue. The other thing the bill attempts to do in Section 2 would provide, if voters elect for disincorporation, the surplus assets of the city, after all debts had been paid, be distributed to taxpayers in the territory that was formerly the city rather than the county general fund. In another section of law it provides the election must be adopted by 60% of those voting in a simple majority that could approve disincorporation. There was an Associated Press article when this was first introduced implying this bill was designed to dovetail Senator Norman's bill that we just heard. It is not his intent nor Senator Norman's intent. Senator Norman's would facilitate consolidation, it is nothing at all like a proposal that would facilitate disincorporation of a city. This puts people that lived in that city in the same position as non-city residents. He doesn't think there is any connection between the bills in terms of trying to bring about some particular result. It should be made aware to everyone that people in the city, particularly in Missoula, consider their situation to be one of dire straights. We are here every session talking about an annexation proposal or proposal to deal with putting consolidation on the ballot in an easier fashion. This bill is necessary regardless of what happens on bills dealing with annexation. He doesn't think it is something solely necessary for Missoula but thinks other urban areas need serious consideration given to the concept of disincorporation. There is a feeling in Missoula that the city taxpayers are paying for services that other people are going to be demanding. The city can't go on like this forever. The city council ought to be able to debate serious questions if 2/3 of the members agree. He thinks it is really unfair, if disincorporation were to come about, that whatever monies collected would go to the general fund instead of going back to the people who paid for those assets. Cities over 30,000 or more have to seriously consider disincorporation. We want to leave rural areas rural but we have to seriously understand what is going on with urban areas. He hopes we will give serious consideration to this bill.

Dan Mizner of the League of Cities and Towns said the legislature has created most of these problems and the cities get the blame. This ought to be passed if no other legislation this year is passed. Let the people make the decisions.

There were no opponents appearing before the committee. Senator O'Hara then called for questions from the committee.

Senator Hammond asked if Senator Van Valkenburg was saying that funds of the incorporated cities should be divided among the people that leave the confines of that city.

Senator Van Valkenburg said there are some gas funds and alcohol funds.

Senator Hammond asked about bond issues and obligations.

Senator Van Valkenburg said that is already provided for in different statutes on disincorporation.

Senator Hammond asked if people outside would not have to accept those obligations.

Senator Van Valkenburg said that was correct.

Al Thelen, city administrator for the city of Billings, had come in late due to another hearing but was allowed to speak to the committee at this time. He said the city of Billings supports this bill. It provides an easier way for the city council to initiate incorporation. They are looking seriously at disincorporation in Billings. The people in the county's rural areas are not going to vote to consolidate. This allows city people to make that decision to get back on equal ground. It provides a vehicle to consolidate government to reduce expenditures.

Senator Conover asked Mr. Thelen if Billings is furnishing water and sewer outside the city limits.

Mr. Thelen said they do not furnish the sewer. In some cases they sell water to a district but not to individual owners. They do not provide water or sewer until they annex.

Senator Hammond said in a rural county, if a city like Malta decided to disincorporate and become part of the county, he sees serious inequities as far as what is going to happen to services in the rural areas such as road construction.

Mr. Thelen said what you are saying is people would control the government. I hope these fundamentals could only happen if a majority of the people decide that.

Senator Hammond said a few years ago we went from property owners voting on bond issues to everyone voting on them.

Senator O'Hara read comments of opposition from Julie Hacker of Bonner. (See attachment.)

Senator Hammond thinks this is getting away from local control.

Senator Van Valkenburg asked Ron Molin of the Missoula Chamber of Commerce to comment on this bill.

Mr. Molin said we should have more people, those right outside the city limits, sharing the costs of city services such as roads.

Senator Ochsner asked how Missoula voted on a change of government in 1976.

Senator Van Valkenburg said for city-county consolidation. they were defeated by 1,000 votes. It went down in the rural areas of the county.

Senator Conover asked if Missoula furnishes sewer and water outside the city limits.

Senator Van Valkenburg said they do not furnish sewer. The city does not own the water in Missoula, it is owned by a California company.

Senator Ochsner asked if the sewer was the city's.

Senator Van Valkenburg said it is the city's. It provides leverage to construction of subdivisions.

There being no further business before the committee, the meeting was adjourned at 2:05.


Chairman George McCallum

ROLL CALL

LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE

47th LEGISLATIVE SESSION - - 1981

Date 2/12/81

NAME	PRESENT	ABSENT	EXCUSED
Senator George McCallum	✓		
Senator Jesse O'Hara	✓		
Senator H. W. Hammond	✓		
Senator J. Donald Ochsner	✓		
Senator Bill Thomas	✓		
Senator Max Conover	✓		
Senator Fred Van Valkenburg	✓		

Each day attach to minutes.

FEBRUARY 12, 1981

COMMITTEE ON

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

BILL NO. SB362

VISITOR'S REGISTER

[illegible]

(Please leave prepared statement with Secretary)

NAME: MARY Lou Crawford DATE: 02-12-81

ADDRESS: Halonde Bldg Helena

PHONE: 449-3737

REPRESENTING WHOM? BOARD of Athletics

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: SB 354

DO YOU: SUPPORT? AMEN? OPPOSE? X

COMMENTS: on behalf of the Board of Athletics,

we oppose abolishing the Board of Athletics and
all regulations concerning professional boxing & wrestling,
without regulation, injuries may occur to boxers as no
one will be regulating to determine fitness of
boxers and even matching of boxers & wrestlers.
Regulation must be maintained to
safeguard the boxers & wrestlers and to
protect the public from fraud.

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY.

NAME: William L. Remine DATE: 2-12-81

ADDRESS: P.O. Box 1691 Helena MT

PHONE: 442-2220

REPRESENTING WHOM? Mont. Automotive Dismantlers & Recyclers Assn.

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: S.B. 353

DO YOU: SUPPORT? X AMEND? _____ OPPOSE? _____

COMMENTS: the public should be allowed to purchase autos and parts
from the county graveyards. If they are not, the material
will be crushed & sold for scrap. It makes more sense to use
second hand parts, than to crush, smelt & manufacture re-built
parts for the same purpose. It is also cheaper. This bill should
Reduce vandalism, which now occurs. It should not be expensive,
since the county sanitarians can handle the sale. The notice
need only be posted at the site. Also, since the minimum bid will
be too cost to the county in picking up the auto, even if the buyer
steals it and then abandons it, the county will be out only the
one time cost of picking up the auto. Finally, since the county
will be doing all of the work, it will receive the funds.

NAME: _____ DATE: _____

ADDRESS: _____

PHONE: _____

REPRESENTING WHOM? _____

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: 25-1

DO YOU: SUPPORT? AMEND? OPPOSE?

COMMENTS: _____

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY.

NAME: Ed McLaFFEE DATE: 2-12-81

ADDRESS: Thornton

PHONE: 356-2251

REPRESENTING WHOM? Mont. Assoc. of Co.

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: S.B. 353

DO YOU: SUPPORT? ☒ AMEND? ☐ OPPOSE? ☐

COMMENTS: _____

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY.

NAME: PETE FRAZIER DATE: 2/12/91

ADDRESS: 1130 17TH Ave S Great Falls

PHONE: 961-6700 ext 545

REPRESENTING WHOM? City - Co. Health Dept

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: SB 353

DO YOU: SUPPORT? _____ AMEND? ✓ _____ OPPOSE? _____

COMMENTS: _____

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY.

NAME: _____ DATE: 1-2-81

ADDRESS: _____

PHONE: 2-55-11

REPRESENTING WHOM? _____

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: _____

DO YOU: SUPPORT? _____ AMEND? _____ OPPOSE? _____

COMMENTS: _____

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY.

NAME: Julia Karber DATE: 2-12-81

ADDRESS: Star Rte Bonner 59823

PHONE: 244-5521

REPRESENTING WHOM? self

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: SB 359

DO YOU: SUPPORT? _____ AMEND? _____ OPPOSE? X

COMMENTS: This law appears to be more of
the same misleading by bad managers
who think financial problems can
be solved by consolidating profits.

Here is an example of removing
more of the peoples rights by
taking away the petition process.
Obviously it is easier for the state
Council to pass a resolution than a 20% of the
voters petition.
This bill should be killed!

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY.

NAME: Tom Wilson DATE: 2/12/51

ADDRESS: 1111 1st St. - Room 707

PHONE: 244-5551

REPRESENTING WHOM? Wm. H. Lawrence Person

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: 1-1-1-1

DO YOU: SUPPORT? AMEND? OPPOSE? 1/

COMMENTS: I am not sure about the
proposition. I am not sure about the
proposition. I am not sure about the
proposition. I am not sure about the
proposition. I am not sure about the
proposition. I am not sure about the
proposition. I am not sure about the
proposition. I am not sure about the
proposition. I am not sure about the
proposition. I am not sure about the

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY.

NAME: Julie Hacker DATE: 2-12-81

ADDRESS: Star Rte. Bonner 59823

PHONE: 244-5521

REPRESENTING WHOM? self

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: AB362

DO YOU: SUPPORT? AMEND? OPPOSE? X

COMMENTS: This is a very great attack
on the democratic process.

The people should have to
appeal to the gov't in the
way they want to be governed.
Petition is the process, only!

Don't give local gov't
any more power. Missoula
City & County are already
abusing what they have. They
are poor financial managers

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY.

NAME: _____ DATE: _____

ADDRESS: _____

PHONE: _____

REPRESENTING WHOM? _____

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: _____

DO YOU: SUPPORT? _____ AMEND? _____ OPPOSE? _____

COMMENTS: _____

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY.

Exhibit A

I would also like to question the Fiscal Note that accompanies this bill and was prepared by Larry Mitchell. The fiscal note says that this will result in a net loss of approximately \$13,000 per year to county government.

Mr. Mitchell's figures estimate the income from the sale of junk vehicles to be \$26,000, a figure that may be low but that I will accept (I feel this is somewhat hard to determine. Mr. Mitchell's figure is based on the minimum bid per vehicle.) He estimates the costs of the auctions, etc. to be \$11,200. Taking only these two figures, this would leave a profit of \$14,800 to the communities.

Mr. Mitchell, however, estimates that this bill will increase vandalism to the extent that \$28,000 will be needed to cope with the problem. I do not follow Mr. Mitchell's reasoning. This bill does not relax the laws that prevent a person from breaking into a county junkyard. In fact, this bill encourages the sale of the vehicles and public inspection at regulated dates. It would seem that a person wanting a part off of a car would wait for an auction rather than risking imprisonment or a substantial fine. Anyway you look at it, this matter is one of speculation that I do not feel should have been included in this fiscal statement.

Other communities have tried this type of a program. Prince George County, Maryland has been operating this program for only six months. They started with a budget of \$167,000 and have already made \$106,000 in six months. The head of the program, Andrew Beall, felt that the program will make enough at this month's auction to completely pay off the original \$167,000 after which time the remaining sales monies will be profit to the county.

The program is very popular, especially with the private wrecking yards and citizens who do their own automobile work.

I feel that this bill can have a positive financial impact on the counties, despite what the fiscal note states.

2-10-67

Under the present law, junk vehicles which are placed by the county in a county vehicle graveyard cannot be sold to the general public. Instead, periodically the Solid Waste Division of the Department of Health and Environmental Sciences hires a crusher which goes to the graveyard and crushes all the vehicles, which are then sold for scrap metal.

In many instances, the vehicles in the county graveyard have more value as parts than they do as scrap. Over the years, the general public has attempted to buy parts or junked vehicles from the county graveyards, but they have been prevented from doing so under the present law. This Bill changes that law by allowing the counties to auction off the vehicles and parts to the highest bidder. The minimum bid for a vehicle would be the cost to the county in taking possession of the vehicle originally. The purpose of this is to prevent a double cost to the county in the event that the person who buys the vehicle subsequently strips it, and then leaves it abandoned again. There is a notice provision for the auction, but the notice only has to be posted at the graveyard site, which should not be a burden upon the county, as far as costs are concerned. It is also important to note that the counties are not required to have an auction at any particular time. In other words, the county could have an auction on a weekly basis, or monthly, or for that matter, only once or twice a year.

Finally, because the county will be undergoing all the costs and expenses of the operation of the auction, and because it is a local matter, the Bill also provides that the revenue produced from the auction would be paid into the county general fund.

It is not contemplated that there will be a great many auctions over the year, or that very many vehicles will be sold out of the county graveyards, but the option should be left open so that vehicles with some value can be sold to the general public and not merely crushed into scrap.

ABANDONED CAR PROGRAM

Citizens complaints spur county action

Recently, when Prince Georges County Police Sergeant Andrew Beall was called by a landlord to citation a car which had apparently been abandoned on the parking lot, he ran a routine check on the other cars there. Before he left, he had posted 91 notices.

According to legislation passed by the Prince Georges County Council this summer, "abandoned vehicle" has been redefined. The police are authorized to post notices on vehicles which are "partially dismantled, non-operating, wrecked or junked, unlicensed or bearing an expired license," and may impound the vehicles after 48 hours.

Sgt. Beall was one of the persons responsible for the new definition. The legislation was sponsored by David Hartlove, chairman of the Prince Georges County Council's task force on litter, and authorized a loan of \$38,000 to the county police for the creation of an abandoned car program. The funds were appropriated out of the land reclamation enterprise funds.

Before the new program was established, auto recyclers could tow away abandoned cars which had been properly cited by



Prince Georges County Police Sergeant Andrew Beall at county storage lot for abandoned vehicles.

police and landlords. However, no formal program existed.

Since the program was begun, Beall has had 3,000 complaints from inside the beltway from citizens who were reporting abandoned cars in their neighborhoods. Beall said that the program had been started not only to get the cars off the street, but also to make people get Maryland tags.

The program's costs, which are to be covered by auction sales, include the cost of four salaries, postage, newspaper announcements of sales and towing. The county owns the abandoned car storage lot.

The one contract for towing is awarded to the lowest bidder with the best equipment and is held by Raley's Towing. The towing company charges a flat rate of \$23 per vehicle and \$25 per ton for trucks.

Since July 1, the police have had 800 cars towed to the lot. 169 of these cars were sold at the first auction and grossed the county \$15,000. Prices ranged from \$1 for a partial frame to \$1200 for a truck. The average prices were \$65 to \$75. At the second auction in late September 220 vehicles were offered for sale. Auto recyclers have responded well to the program, Beall said.

Auctions are scheduled for the last Saturday of every month starting at 10 a.m. at the police vehicle storage compound on Ritchie-Marlboro Road in Upper Marlboro. There are no registration fees for admittance and no minimum bids. The county will accept checks from licensed wreckers and scrap dealers.



JOIN A GROWING LINE the MATRA PARTS EXCHANGE

MONTHLY CHARGE: \$130.00

The Parts Exchange, a cooperative line managed by its members, is an activity of the Maryland Auto & Truck Recyclers Association (MATRA). Parts Exchange members must be members of MATRA. Deposit of \$322.50 required. Includes deposit of \$130.00, installation of \$62.50 and first month's rent of \$130.00.

REGISTRATION FORM

Name _____

Phone _____

Company _____

Street _____

City. State _____

Zip _____

ENCLOSED IS MY CHECK FOR _____

Mail to MATRA, 302 First Avenue, Baltimore, Md. 21227

Are you a MATRA member? If not, please send dues of \$150 (direct member).

LMB/C

TESTIMONY TO AMEND SB 353

Mr. Chairman, Committee members, my name is Pete Frazier. I am Environmental Health Coordinator with the City-County Health Department in Great Falls. I also serve as Director of the Junk Vehicle Disposal Program in Cascade County. I appreciate the opportunity to testify on SB 353.

I certainly agree with the concept of allowing Counties to sell junk vehicles collected and stored in the County Junk Vehicle Graveyards and to keep the revenue received from the sale of the vehicles. However, I can foresee several problems that will undoubtedly surface, should SB 353 pass as written. First, to allow any individual to purchase a junk vehicle and/or component parts, through the bid process, will mean that all the junk cars the County Junk Vehicle Disposal Program spent money to remove from the countryside will be hauled back out into the communities from which they were just removed. Then the County will again have to enforce the junk vehicle law and require these same cars to, again be removed. Secondly, by allowing any individual to purchase component parts or junk vehicles from the county graveyard, through the bid process, the government will be in direct competition with private wrecking facility operators, who make their livelihood from sales of component parts. Third, to require a separate bid on each separate vehicle could be an administrative nightmare, since many county junk vehicle graveyards will have well over 200 vehicles requiring disposal. The time and cost to auction each vehicle separately could become excessive. Due to these potential problems I recommend the wording in lines 24 and 25 of page 2 and lines 1-13 on page 3 be changed to read as follows:

"Each County Motor Vehicle Graveyard may periodically contract to dispose of, by crushing or recycling, junk vehicles accumulated in the County Junk Vehicle Graveyard. All bids must be for all vehicles and component parts available in the yard at the time of bid publication. Bids shall be sealed and submitted to the Board of County Commissioners. Notice of bid must be published once a week for three (3) consecutive weeks in a daily or weekly newspaper. The bid notice must indicate the number of vehicles for sale, location of vehicle yard, date and time of bid opening, and name of an individual available to provide opportunity for bidders to view available vehicles. All revenue from the disposal of the vehicles shall be deposited with the County Treasurer of the County in which the vehicle graveyard is located. Revenue shall be used only for capital expenditures and operation costs associated with junk vehicle and solid waste disposal purposes within that County."

Should you have any questions I will be happy to answer them.

Thank you.