

MINUTES OF THE MEETING
FINANCE AND CLAIMS COMMITTEE
MONTANA STATE SENATE

January 10, 1983

The second meeting on the Senate Finance and Claims Committee met in room 108 of the State Capitol on the above date. Roll call was taken and the Chairman, Senator Hims1, called the meeting to order at 8:08 and asked if there was a subcommittee report on Senate Bill 44.

ROLL CALL: All members present except Senators Thomas and Regan who were in subcommittee meetings.

DISPOSITION OF SENATE BILL 44: Senator Story said that he had checked on the authority of county commissioners to give money to the districts and Senator Stimatz had checked on the ruling, he would present a statement paper from Lee Heiman, Staff Attorney to be attached to the minutes and would with that consideration move Senate Bill 44.

MOTION by Senator Story that Senate Bill 44 DO PASS. Voted, roll call vote, unanimous do pass by all members present.

CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE BILL 76: Representative Menahan said that House Bill 76 was much the same as last year with the exception of phones and some others he would mention. He said the Legislature pay was included only as voted on in 1981. He said the interim committees were funded at that rate. There was some discussion on the possibilities of legality of the interim pay increase, but the assurance that it is legal now since this is a newly elected assembly and if it was felt a change was necessary this was not the bill to make it in.

Mr. Menahan said the area of communications was questionable as yet in regard to cost. The change over to using the old Supreme Court offices had cost \$3500 for the month for moving phones and lines, and there is a PSC rate increase which will affect the Watt lines to be yet determined.

Mr. Menahan gave some figures on the cost of typewriter maintenance, copy machines, etc. Senator Hims1 received some information on the costs which is attached as exhibit 1, House Bill 76. Representative Menahan said basically the money was the same as any other year.

There were no further proponents, no opponents, and the Chairman asked if there were questions from the committee.

Senator Smith: In regard to the Legislature under the pay plan, you said you had talked to someone. The constitution says we

cannot change our pay while we are in session. When we vote for an increase in the pay plan it is automatically raised. Pat Driscoll is supposed to get us an opinion today.

Representative Menahan: If you don't pay it we will have to put it in another bill to take care of it. Only the people on the subcommittee would be in violation.

Senator Smith: This goes to July of '83? Menahan: '81 cannot vote for an '83 session. Only the interim would be in violation. This is a newly elected legislature.

Representative Menahan: In the previous session the watt line went onto State Administration part of the time. We will now be paying for our own bill so that will be a bit higher.

Senator Hammond: Looking into it further to see what can be done as far as the pay raise. We are going to put in a resolution that says we can stay at the same place in the pay plan but not in regard to a pay raise.

Senator Etchart: Will this affect the interim committees?
Menahan: Yes.

Senator Smith: Senator Lee is going down to take the Legislature out of the pay plan so that this does not happen again.

Representative Menahan: That should take care of it then. Our employees are paid under the pay plan and I would hope we can pass this out of committee so that the attaches can be paid.

Senator Himsel declared the hearing closed.

DISPOSITION OF HOUSE BILL 76: MOTION by Senator Van Valkenburg that House Bill 76 be concurred in. Voted, passed, vote attached. Senator Van Valkenburg to carry the bill.

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 19: Senator Kolstad, chief sponsor of Senate Bill 19, said this bill was requested by the Joint Subcommittee on Judiciary to try to help the court funding problem. The McKenzie case in Pondera county was a lot of money. He explained the maximum mill levy of 6 mills for the larger counties, 4 mills for the intermediate and 2 for the small ones, and how upon reaching the limit the counties could then apply for state grants. He said between the lack of money and the time involved in putting in an application many counties did not qualify or received very little.

David Ashley, Deputy Director for the Department of Administration said it is an increase part of the Governor's program for local governments. It is in the budget fund for \$3.5 million. I don't know how many counties had applied for grants. The counties were not able to receive more than approximately 29% in the second year of the program. We feel this bill will fund this amount. The current law sunsets in June of 1983 and this would extend it beyond then. (\$375,000 per year was

appropriated by the Legislature in 1981 and it funded 62% of the requests for 1981. Testimony sheet attached, exhibit 1.

Mike Stephens, MACO, said it is essentially the same as on the books. We are primarily interested in the funding of the district courts. It is really state courts. We feel there should be some assistance to the local governments for these bills. In 1980 we are looking at the state paying for 17% of the cost of the salary of the district judges and it has slipped to 12% so that we are now paying 88%.

Don Peoples, Butte-Silver Bow and Urban Coalition, said the function of the district court is state in nature. The Legislative branch of the county government has very little to say about these courts. The state requires the counties provide help to the indigent persons, property costs have increased. The program in the past has been woefully under funded. We applied for \$186,000 and received \$96,000. We either pick up the costs with other revenues or issue warrants. He handed out a "fact sheet" which is attached as exhibit 2.

Darryl Meyer, Cascade County, said costs are going up. What did cost \$24,000 is now \$44,000. He said they wound up with a \$366,000 deficit.

There were no further proponents, no opponents, and the Chairman asked for questions from the committee.

Senator Etchart: I know Ravalli County had a case like that with the River of Life people. We had appropriated money to help out. The information I got was that they got practically nothing for the county. They filed late or some other such technicality.

Mr. Ashley said Jim Halvorson was the county attorney there. In the first year of the district court appropriation the situation as to whether the counties had to levy the full amount of mills before being eligible arose. The Department interpreted it as "yes", and that is how we interpreted it. Subsequent to that, Missoula raised the question and the Attorney General then said a county need not levy the maximum and that is how the program was administered in the second year.

Senator Stimatz: Could we request that Mr. Ashley furnish us with a list of how much each county requested and how much they received. Mr. Ashley said he would do so, and was requested to give the copies to the secretary.

Senator Keating: We had a bill for emergency funding for district courts. It was something over a million dollars to counties with excess costs.

Ashley: House Bill 500 did provide for emergency funding of district courts. In addition we have the subsequent language

we are discussing today.

Senator Keating: How much funded? Ashley: Same amount.

Keating: Wasn't there a like appropriation in addition?

Ashley: The Attorney General stated we follow H. B. 500 or the substantive rather than the restrictive language.

Senator Hims1: In other words we had two programs on board and the Attorney General decided which one to follow. Ashley: Yes.

Senator Keating: According to the statement of intent this bill provides the Department will set forth a defination of terms, standard grant application format, application forms, etc. Don't you already have forms for requesting grants and will you now have to get into more rule-making, more forms, etc.? Ashley: We do have copies of the grant forms. We do need comparative data to be able to allocate fairly between the counties.

Senator Smith: In the last session they were required to spend up to the 6 mills in some counties, 4 in others, etc. Will they still have to spend that much or will they be able to collect anyhow? Ashley: Yes, they have to spend the total.

Senator Hims1: There is a deadline for the application?

Ashley: The application deadline is July 20 as opposed to the 31. That gets the information in our Department to notify the counties in time for their budget.

Senator Van Valkenburg: In response to your answer to Senator Smith. They need to spend the equivalent of the maximum mill. If the county estimates its expenditure and they have 1/2 mill less than the maximum, get a big case and run into trouble they can spend the extra 1/2 mill and then be eligible. Ashley: Yes, but not until the next fiscal year.

Senator Van Valkenburg: The rule making authority. Will it help clarification? Ashley: Yes. Van Valkenburg: Senator Kolstad, what costs are included, psychiatric evaluation, and that type of thing, or what?

Senator Kolstad: The only exclusions are capital. Buildings, library costs are excluded.

Senator Van Valkenburg to Ashley: There are a couple areas of problems--would it be your idea that the rule making could set amounts? Ashley: We have had two Attorney General Opinions on eligibility costs. It said all costs are eligible except those specifically stated by the Legislature and in a subsequent opinion the Attorney General said all costs with the exceptions would be eligible.

Senator Dover to Mr. Stephens: You said the counties are willing to pay the audits. How much will it be for the additional court costs? Stephens: Right now we are trying to show our cooperativeness. The brunt is on the administration to see that this is carried out. The audit committee needs to charge, to be fair to them, they ought to be reimbursed. We are willing to support that. The audit costs are rather minimal, they would be a budget item and we would know someone has to be paid.

Senator Stimatz: Are counties and cities audited every year? Stephens: This is a different audit.

Senator Thomas: Are you going to set caps in the rule making for fees for public defenders, etc? Ashley: I don't think I can answer that. The Attorney General says no. Thomas: So that if we want it, we have to put it in? Ashley: If that is what the Legislature wants.

There were no further questions, and Senator Kolstad said he had no closing remarks, he felt the bill had been well covered.

Senator Hims1 declared the hearing closed on Senate Bill 19. (Copies of the Statement of Intent had been handed out and one is attached.

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 24: Senator Kolstad explained Senate Bill 24 and said he was requested to carry this bill by the Joint Subcommittee on Judiciary. This bill would have the state pay $\frac{1}{2}$ of the salary of a deputy district attorney. At the present time the state pays $\frac{1}{2}$ the salary of each County Attorney and the subcommittee would like to see them pay more. The amount of assistance for a deputy county attorney would be \$1 for each person residing in the county. There are 32 counties that employ deputies and the estimated cost is \$1.4 million.

Robert Deschamps, County Attorney, Missoula, spoke for the bill. He said this bill corrects one of the greatest wrongs. Montana has recognized the need to pick this up. The problem is the large counties are being substantially penalized and small counties are getting a windfall. The Legislature subsequently did a study on this. The range of total contribution to the salary of budgets, range from 4% in Missoula to 40% in some of the small ones. Of the large counties (just 7 of the larger)--out of 37,000 cases had 26,000 of the crimes committed in their boundries. Population directly relates to the amount of crime you will have. Therefore population seems to be the most fair distribution.

Mike McGrath, County Attorney for Lewis and Clark County, said the state recognizes that county attorneys prosecute all crimnal offenses in the name of the State of Montana. We

bring actions for fraud of medicaid, state auditors office, state department of revenue, welfare, food stamps, unemployment compensation, etc. When the parent providing child support is in another state, we bring action for non-support but receive no reimbursement for those. The state does pay $\frac{1}{2}$ of the salary of the county attorney, but my budget is approximately \$210,000. The state pays about \$19,000, or about 8%. We have a relatively small budget--3 $\frac{1}{2}$ deputies.

Bob McCarthy, County Attorney for Butte Silver Bow said that in addition to what had been said this bill will still leave the larger counties carrying the greatest share of the burden.

Ted Lympus, Flathead County Attorney, said the vast amount of work is mandated by the Legislature and the fiscal assistance is woefully inadequate.

Don Peoples, Chief executive, Butte Silver Bow and Urban Coalition said the urban areas are paying the brunt of the cost and urged passage of the bill.

There were no further proponents, no opponents, no questions from the committee, and Senator Kolstad said he had no closing remarks since he felt the bill was well covered.

Senator Hims1 declared the hearing closed.

Senator Hims1 told the committee the telephone is available whenever convenient to the committee members.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:11 a.m.



Senator Hims1, Chairman

ROLL CALL

FINANCE AND CLAIMS COMMITTEE

48th LEGISLATIVE SESSION - - 1983

Date 1/10/83

NAME	PRESENT	ABSENT	EXCUSED
Senator Etchart, VC	✓		
Senator Dover	✓		
Senator Keating	✓		
Senator Smith	✓		
Senator Thomas			✓
Senator Van Valkenburg	✓		
Senator Stimatz	✓		
Senator Story	✓		
Senator Ochsner	✓		
Senator Haffey	✓		
Senator Jacobson	✓		
Senator Regan			✓
Senator Lane	✓		
Senator Aklestad	✓		
Senator Hammond	✓		
Senator Tveit	✓		
Senator Boylan	✓		
Senator Himsl, Chairman	✓		

47th - Second Special Session

VISITORS' REGISTER

SENATE AND ~~HOUSE~~ COMMITTEE

FJC

BILL

SB 24

DATE

1/10/83

SPONSOR

SEN. [unclear]

NAME	REPRESENTING	RESIDENCE	SUPPORT	OPPOSE
N. M. RATH	CIVIL RIGHTS	HELENA	X	
THREE BOUSLIMEN	URBAN COALITION	HELENA	X	
Don Peoples	Urban [unclear]	Bozeman	X	
Don Ashley	Day A	Helena		
Mike [unclear]	MAC	Helena		
L. Deschamps III	County Attorney	Missoula	X	
J. FRED BOURDEAU	County Attorney	GREAT FALLS	X	
Don [unclear]	Cascade County	Great Falls	X	
Ted B. Lyman	Flathead County Attorney	Kalispell	X	
Kenie McRitt	Dorothy Eck	Bozeman	X	
Bob Avez	AP			
Martin Stander	Intern / Lt. Gov. Off.		X	
John Maynard	Asst. Atty. Gen'l.	Helena	X	

IF YOU CARE TO WRITE COMMENTS, ASK SECRETARY FOR LONGER FORM.

COPIED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY

1001
4/13/83
4/10/83

1981-83 FEED BILL COMPARISON

	House		Senate		Legislative Council		Legislative Publications	
	1981	1983	1981	1983	1981	1983	1981	1983
Personal Services								
Salaries	\$ 732,843	\$ 907,391	\$ 502,143	\$ 623,291	\$157,476	\$ 79,714	\$ 0	\$ 0
Benefits	257,964	329,245	136,660	177,723	15,924	7,385	0	0
Per Diem	486,000	481,500	243,000	240,750	0	0	0	0
Total Pers. Serv.	1,476,807	1,718,136	881,803	1,041,764	173,400	87,099	0	0
Operating Expense								
Contracted Services	25,000	25,000	15,000	15,000	29,885	252,500	180,646	142,603
Supplies & Material	15,000	15,000	12,000	12,000	72,350	1,600	400	397
Communications	35,000	57,000	30,000	43,500	25,034	40,716	5,000	5,000
Travel	64,956	82,288	40,489	49,628	100	0	0	0
Rent	14,741	14,000	28,907	13,285	39,632	3,418	0	0
Repair & Maintenance	10,000	10,000	3,200	3,200	500	0	0	0
Other	2,350	2,250	1,550	2,250	13,540	0	354	0
Total Oper. Expense	167,047	205,538	131,146	138,863	181,041	298,234	186,400	148,000
Capital Expense								
Equipment	15,000	15,000	5,000	5,000	1,500	1,505	0	0
GRAND TOTAL	\$1,658,854	\$1,938,674	\$1,017,949	\$1,185,627	\$355,941	\$386,838	\$186,400	\$148,000
		(16.9% Inc.)		(16.5% Inc.)		(8.7% Inc.)		(20.6% Dec.)

81-83 Feed Bill Comp.
SHAR2

4/16/83

1983 FEED BILL

	Public Infor.	Bill Dist. Center	Print Room	Business Office	Total 1983 Council	Legis. Publica.	House	Senate	Total Feed Bill
<u>Personal Services</u>									
Salaries	\$21,196	\$27,750	\$ 21,976	\$ 8,792	\$ 79,714	0	\$ 907,391	\$ 623,291	\$1,610,396
Benefits	1,950	2,565	2,048	822	7,385	0	329,245	177,723	514,353
Per Diem	0	0	0	0	0	0	481,500	240,750	722,250
Total Pers. Serv.	23,146	30,315	24,024	9,614	87,099	0	1,718,136	1,041,764	2,846,999
<u>Operating Expense</u>									
Contracted Services	2,400	0	250,000	100	252,500	142,603	25,000	15,000	435,103
Supplies & Material	100	1,000	0	500	1,600	397	15,000	12,000	28,997
Communications	20,350	20,183	183	0	40,716	5,000	57,000	43,500	146,216
Travel	0	0	0	0	0	0	82,288	49,628	131,916
Rent	200	0	0	3,218	3,418	0	14,000	13,285	30,703
Repair & Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0	0	10,000	3,200	13,200
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,250	2,250	4,500
Total Oper. Expense	23,050	21,183	250,183	3,818	298,234	148,000	205,538	138,863	790,635
<u>Capital Expenses</u>									
Equipment	650	300	555	0	1,505	0	15,000	5,000	21,505
GRAND TOTAL	\$46,846	\$51,798	\$274,762	\$13,432	\$386,838	\$148,000	\$1,938,674	\$1,185,627	\$3,659,139

1983 Feed Bill
SHAR2

10L 3
11) 1
4 619

TESTIMONY ON SENATE BILL NUMBER 19
PRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION

The district court grant program was created by the 1979 legislature, however, funding for the program was not made available until the 1981 legislative session appropriated \$750,000 for the 1983 biennium. In the event that requests exceed the appropriation, the grant legislation requires that each grant be reduced an equal percentage so that the appropriation is not exceeded.

The need for continuing grant assistance for county district courts is demonstrated by the fact that in 1981, 13 counties asked for \$605,132 and received 62% of their requests. In 1982, 21 counties asked for \$1,277,000 and received 29% of their requests.

The primary reason behind the committee's bill is to provide for the continuation of the program's enabling legislation beyond its current June 30, 1983 sunset date.

In addition, Senate Bill 19 reflects proposed changes in the current law which have arisen from the Department of Administration's experience in administering the district court grant program over the past two years.

The major revisions to current law found in Senate Bill 19 are made to clarify the eligible district court costs and the method of distributing grant funds.

The bill has the support of the Administration as well as the Montana Association of Counties and the Urban Coalition.

exh 2
People
SB 19

DISTRICT COURTS

FACT SHEET

ISSUE:

The state mandates the governing of district courts. The legislative branch of county government has very little, if any, authority in the operation of the courts. Court reporters' and probation officers' salaries are set by statute. Several counties levy taxes over and above the statutory limit for funding district courts as a result of court order.

BACKGROUND:

Funding district courts and related activities at the county level has become increasingly critical in recent years. Property tax revenue to fund district courts has increased 69.7% since 1978. In FY 1982 property taxes financed 67% of the courts' budget. Twelve counties use only general fund monies to fund district courts. Forty-four counties levied a tax, and 33 of these supplement from other funds. Twenty-five are at their maximum levy. In FY 1973 counties financed 71% of a \$2.4 million budget; in FY 1980 counties financed 83% of an \$8 million budget; and in FY 1982 counties financed 87% of a \$12 million budget.

FACTS:

1. The current grant-in-aid program is totally inadequate and limiting. The state appropriated \$375,000 per year for FY 1981 and FY 1982. For FY 1981 the state was \$230,000 short and for FY 1982 \$538,000 short. All indicators show that more and more counties will be requesting state grant-in-aid.

2. Fees are charged for services such as marriage license fees and fees for filing of documents which are distributed in compliance with state statute. The county gets 40% of the fees the clerk of court collects, and the state 60% to distribute to the judges retirement and state general fund. Of the fees sent to the state, the state general fund received \$183,000 in FY 1979, \$243,000 in FY 1980, and \$214,000 in FY 1981. Counties must receive most of the fees collected to offset costs.

110
4/10
new
SB 19
COURTS/2

SOLUTIONS

The state should totally or substantially fund the courts as 22 other states do.

As a step in that direction, one approach is an adequately funded state grant-in-aid program. The state grant in aid should be fully funded for expenditures in excess of the revenue generated by six mills, including costs of registering warrants, law libraries, capital outlay, and building costs.

SENATE MEMBERS

PAT M. GOODOVER
CHAIRMAN
CARROLL GRAHAM
JOSEPH P. MAZUREK
JESSE O'HARA

HOUSE MEMBERS

JOHN VINCENT
VICE CHAIRMAN
BURT L. HURWITZ
REX MANUEL
BOBBY SPILKER



Montana Legislative Council

State Capitol
Helena, MT. 59620

(406) 449-3064

DIANA S. DOWLING
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
CODE COMMISSIONER
ELEANOR ECK
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT
ROBERTA MOODY
DIRECTOR, LEGISLATIVE SERVICES
ROBERT PERSON
DIRECTOR, RESEARCH
SHAROLE CONNELLY
DIRECTOR, ACCOUNTING DIVISION
ROBERT C. PYFER
DIRECTOR, LEGAL SERVICES

TO: Senate Finance and Claims Committee
FROM: Lee Heiman, Staff Attorney *ll*
DATE: January, 10, 1983
RE: Relationship of SB 44 to County General Fund Fire Finance

Opinion: It is my opinion that the requirement in SB 44 amending section 7-6-2218, MCA, that appropriations of federal or state funds to fire districts with a repayment provision does not conflict with section 7-33-2209, MCA, authorizing a county to spend up to \$15,000 of general fund money for fire control activities.

Reasoning: The provisions of SB 44 relate only to county appropriations of federal or state money received by the county. Typically this is federal revenue sharing money. The federal government limits the use of revenue sharing money by a local government to governmental functions of that local government. The operation of a fire district is not a governmental function of a county. A fire district has an elected board of trustees, establishes its own budget, and sets a tax levy for the operation of the district. A county may not appropriate its funds to a fire district. A county may, for fire control, spend up to \$15,000. The \$15,000 is not money that a county appropriates to fire districts, it is for county fire control, and if the county commissioners feel that the best way to perform fire control in the county is through fire districts it may contract with one or more districts in the county to perform county fire control.

Federal revenue sharing money is intended to help all residents of a local government by easing their tax burden. The attorney general, in several opinions relating to various districts, has held that such districts, because they serve only the people in the district, and not the county as a whole, are not proper recipients of county appropriations of federal revenue sharing money.

Senate Bill 44 would allow limited appropriations of federal revenue sharing money to fire districts. The limits are intended to insure that all county residents, in the long run, receive the benefit of revenue sharing money. If the district is county-wide then obviously all county residents receive services of the district and the appropriation is for the benefit of all the residents. If the district is not county-wide then only those people within the district receive a benefit.

The repayment provision allows a county to appropriate money to a district, when, because of the status of the district, a

loan may be required. This may involve the building of a fire station, purchasing a truck, or other capital expenditure. This is important when the amount needed may be too small for bonding or bank loans are not appropriate. This may arise because of the expansion of an existing district or the formation of a new district.

If the repayment provision was not used in SB 44 there is a good possibility that an outright appropriation would be held to violate the terms of revenue sharing and a county would not be able to make any appropriations to fire districts.

Section 7-33-2209, MCA, allows a \$15,000 appropriation for fire control activities from the county general fund. This general fund authority is not changed by SB 44. Under the provisions of 7-6-2218, MCA, whether amended by SB 44 or not, for the county to appropriate the \$15,000 because it is a general county service.

SB 44/Ana/LEE4

7-33-2209. Finance of fire control activities. (1) The county governing body is authorized to appropriate funds for the purchase, care, and maintenance of firefighting equipment or for the payment of wages in prevention, detection, and suppression of fires.

(2) If the general fund is budgeted to the full limit, the county governing body may, at any time fixed by law for levy and assessment of taxes, levy a tax at such rate as in their judgment will be necessary to raise such needed sum, not to exceed \$15,000.

History: En. Sec. 3, Ch. 173, L. 1945; amd. Sec. 1, Ch. 40, L. 1955; amd. Sec. 1, Ch. 337, L. 1971; amd. Sec. 1, Ch. 73, L. 1977; amd. Sec. 14, Ch. 397, L. 1977; R.C.M. 1947, 28-603(5).

Statement of Intent: LC 14

A statement of intent is required for this bill because it grants rulemaking authority to the Department of Administration for the purpose of administering the state grant to district courts programs.

Section 1 of this bill requires the Department of Administration to prescribe rules and forms necessary to effectively administer the program. It is contemplated that the rules will address the following:

- a. definition of terms;
- b. standard grant application format;
- c. circumstances for permitting time extension of grant application;
- d. form and timing of grant award notification; and
- e. procedures for adjusting grant awards following audit.

Statement of Intent: LC 14

A statement of intent is required for this bill because it grants rulemaking authority to the Department of Administration for the purpose of administering the state grant to district courts programs.

Section 1 of this bill requires the Department of Administration to prescribe rules and forms necessary to effectively administer the program. It is contemplated that the rules will address the following:

- a. definition of terms;
- b. standard grant application format;
- c. circumstances for permitting time extension of grant application;
- d. form and timing of grant award notification; and
- e. procedures for adjusting grant awards following audit.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

January 10 19 83

M. President

We, your committee on Finance and Claims

having had under consideration House Bill No. 76

(Bardanouve) Van Valkenburg

Respectfully report as follows: That House Bill No. 76

BE CONCURRED IN
DO PAS

SENATE COMMITTEE

FINANCE AND CLAIMS

Date 7/10HBBill No. 76 Time 8:24

Name	YES	NO	ABSENT	EXCUSED
Senator Etchart, VC	✓			
Senator Dover	✓			
Senator Keating	✓			
Senator Smith	✓			
Senator Thomas	✓			
Senator Van Valkenburg	✓			
Senator Stimatz	✓			
Senator Story				
Senator Ochsner	✓			
Senator Haffey	✓			
Senator Jacobson	✓			
Senator Regan				
Senator Lane	✓			
Senator Aklestad				
Senator Hammond	✓			
Senator Tveit	✓			
Senator Boylan		✓		
Senator Himsl, Chairman	✓			

Sylvia Kinsey
SecretarySenator Himsl
ChairmanMotion: 16

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

January 10 19 83

MR. President

We, your committee on Finance and Claims

have had under consideration Senate Bill No. 44

HJMSL

Respectfully report as follows: That Senate Bill No. 44

DO PASS

Senator Himsel

Chairman.

SENATE COMMITTEE

FINANCE AND CLAIMS

Date

1/10S B

Bill No.

44

Time

8:11

Name	YES	NO	ABSENT	EXCUSED
Senator Etchart, VC	✓			
Senator Dover	✓			
Senator Keating	✓			
Senator Smith	✓		✓	
Senator Thomas			✓	
Senator Van Valkenburg	✓			
Senator Stimatz	✓			
Senator Story	✓			
Senator Ochsner	✓			
Senator Haffey	✓			
Senator Jacobson			✓	
Senator Regan			✓	
Senator Lane	✓			
Senator Aklestad	✓			
Senator Hammond	✓			
Senator Tveit	✓			
Senator Boylan	✓			
Senator Himsl, Chairman	✓			

Sylvia Kinsey
Secretary

Senator Himsl
Chairman

Motion:

16