

MINUTES OF THE MEETING
APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE
MONTANA STATE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
49TH LEGISLATIVE SPECIAL SESSION III

JULY 24, 1986

The meeting of the appropriations Subcommittee was called to order by Chairman Peck on June 24, 1986 at 7:05 p.m. in Room 104 of the State Capitol.

ROLL CALL: Rep. Peck, Rehberg, Miller and Spaeth were present.

TAPE 22:A:000

The purpose of the meeting was to hear testimony on HB 36, regarding the proposed sale of the Montana Youth Treatment Center in Billings, and report back to the full committee.

Rep. Peck said he had read the bill thoroughly and assumed the other committee members had done the same. He said he had also gone over Dr. Simmon's presentation and had come up with many issues and questions.

- 1) Page 2, lines 10 and 11: "...specializes in adolescent psychiatric treatment..."
- 2) Page 2, lines 12, 13 and 14: "For 30 days...may receive proposals..."
- 3) Page 3, lines 4 through 8: The question of the certificate of need review was raised again.
- 4) Page 4, lines 2, 3 and 4: "The buyer...operate... a mental health treatment facility."
- 5) Page 4, lines 12 and 13: "The Board...shall approve any exception..."
- 6) Page 4, lines 24 and 25, page 5, lines 1 and 2: "...under age 21. The buyer shall demonstrate successful participation...on accreditation of hospitals."
- 7) Page 6 is somewhat confusing in its entirety.
- 8) Dr. Simmon's proposal raises the question of why Montana adolescents are excluded from voluntary committment.

Appropriations Subcommittee

Page 2

June 24, 1986

Rep. Spaeth expressed concern that nothing seems to have been done other than ask one party if they would be interested in purchasing the M.Y.T.C. He said he could not support that position.

Rep. Rehberg raised questions about page 4, lines 14 through 17. He had concerns about who the qualified appraiser would be and who pays for the appraisal.

Rep. Miller said that when a building of considerable value is appraised, the seller has an appraisal, the buyer has an appraisal, and in this case the state would want to have its own appraisal.

Rep. Peck said there were four amendments to HB 36 that the Subcommittee should also consider:

- 1) Rep. Garcia's amendment (Exhibit 1).
- 2) Mr. Melvin's amendment (Exhibit 2).
- 3) Rep. Winslow's amendment (Exhibit 3).
- 4) Rep. Addy's amendment (Exhibit 4).

Rep. Peck (117) discussed Item 1, saying the issue has been raised if the language "...specializes in adolescent psychiatric treatment..." would limit or restrict bidders who may not want to limit themselves to that care.

Rep. Addy replied that the buyer should qualify as a provider of specialist quality care in adolescent psychiatric treatment. The buyer should not be able to run a general hospital and treat the adolescents as a sideline.

Rep. Spaeth noted that the word 'specialize' can be interpreted in different ways. It can mean a type of care provider who only provides adolescent treatment, or it can mean a care provider who among its specialties has adolescent psychiatric treatment.

June Johnson, the representative of the Rivendell Corporation, testified that there are programs that do admit adults and adolescents into the same program. She said that in the opinion of Rivendell Corporation that is incredibly inappropriate. They feel that adolescents require different, specialized services than do adults. The educational program, for instance, and there is a difference in the individual and group therapy treatment for the adolescent versus the adult population

There was some discussion over the terminology to be used, i.e., "...a care provider that offers specialized adolescent

Appropriations Subcommittee

Page 3

June 24, 1986

services..." or "...experience in providing specialized adolescent psychiatric care..." No action was taken at this time.

Rep. Peck (202) led the discussion to Item 2 and said that although it spoke of 30 days to receive proposals, there is a real 60 day total as a result of the statement.

Carroll South, Director of the Department of Institutions, explained that in 1975, when the facility at Twin Bridges was sold, a specific statute, 77-2-302, was put in to regulate the sale of a state institution. There is a requirement for a 60 day public notice. When this is combined with the 30 days in HB 36 that makes a total of 90 days.

Rep. Rehberg presented alternate language for the time period needed. "...the Board of Land Commissioners shall publish at least once in any trade publication or newspaper of general national circulation, a notice stating the general terms of the sale and describing the facility involved. The notice shall fix a day not less than 60 days and not more than 90 days from the date of the first publication..."

Rep. Miller said it should not be dragged out any longer than absolutely necessary. He expressed the opinion that any large corporation with oomph could get a proposal together a little faster than 90 days.

Rep. Rehberg disagreed. He stated the subcommittee was talking about someone owning the facility and providing a service to the state of Montana for the next 30 to 50 years and he did not think we should play numbers games on whether it was 30, 60 or 90 days.

Mr. Melby (300), attorney for the Rivendell Corporation, said he believed there were only about a dozen companies who would be able to make a proposal to purchase the M.Y.T.C. He suggested that perhaps they could be contacted by a letter from the Department of Institutions, enclosing a copy of the bill, and spelling out the conditions of the sale. He felt any company able to propose would have the ability to do this in 60 to 90 days.

Mr. South said we were selling an institutional building, subject to section 77-2-302, and not the section for public lands. Section 77-2-302 does not require public advertising. The constitution only requires that the state receive fair market value for the building.

Appropriations Subcommittee

Page 4

June 24, 1986

Mr. South went on to say that he thought a personal mailing could be done a lot faster than advertising in a trade journal. He has five firms who have contacted him about the M.Y.T.C. and he felt there would not be more than seven or eight others who would be capable of making a proposal acceptable to the state.

Rep. Peck said he was leaning toward some requirement for public advertising.

Rep. Addy appreciated the concern that this sale be made as open a process as possible. He thought publication might well be the quickest way to advertise.

Rep. Peck went on to Item 3, the exemption of a certificate of need review.

Me. Melby (405) advised the subcommittee that he and others had had a long conversation with Dr. Drynan, Director of the Department of Health and Environmental Sciences, and he, Dr. Drynan, had advised that if the bill provides for a review committee composed of department directors, some legislative representation and perhaps a mental health professional who would review the proposals and make recommendations to the Board of Land Commissioners he felt the certificate of need review would be redundant.

Mr. South remarked that the M.Y.T.C. had already been certified once and any review would simply decide who would come in and take the place of the state of Montana.

Dr. Simmons noted that the certificate of need review did two things; 1) Determined if a facility was needed, and 2) Who would get the facility. Since the first question has been answered perhaps a truncated review might be held to answer the last half of the question.

Rep. Rehberg asked if the state had originally gone through the certification procedure.

Rep. Addy said the M.Y.T.C. had been given their certificate of need in 1982.

Rep. Winslow felt there was a need for the review, but that if Dr. Drynan did not require it in this instance, he said it should not be put in the bill and thereby set precedent.

Mr. Melby opposed this, saying that anyone could come and say there should have been a certificate of need review, file a lawsuit and the court would have to make the deter-

Appropriations Subcommittee

Page 5

June 24, 1986

mination. He felt the legislature should make it clear that there was no need for the review, under the circumstances, and this should be specified in the bill.

Rep. Winslow disagreed and said he did not think Mr. Melby's proposal would avoid going to court. He felt it was very dangerous to set precedent in law in this manner.

Rep. Rehberg asked if reference could be made to the review committee? That the exemption be left in under the caveat that it was a review committee that created the exemption?

Rep. Winslow (505) said he did not think that would afford protection against a lawsuit if anyone wanted to file one.

Rep. Addy stated that Rep. Rehberg's solution was that we are not exempting the buyer, but a mechanism in the bill will substitute for the normal certificate of need review.

Rep. Peck said that Rep. Rehberg seemed to have found some middle ground and asked that language be written up for recommendation to the full committee.

Rep. Peck brought up Item 4 and said that Dr. Drynan had suggested the language be changed to "...operate the facility as a psychiatric hospital..."

Rep. Winslow said that was correct; that the department did not license anything but hospitals and the phrase "...mental health treatment center..." could possibly be an outpatient facility.

Mr. South objected by saying the state wanted the purchaser to operate under the Mental Health Act, under Title 53, and they are described as a mental health facility in that act. The M.Y.T.C. is licensed now as a psychiatric hospital for adolescents; but the licensure and what we are doing, in subsection 2 at least, are totally different.

Mr. South read a statement from the Mental Health Act: "The only way that this facility will remain subject to review by the Mental Disabilities Board of Visitors is if it is a mental health treatment facility as defined under Title 53." He said if we strike that wording there is a good possibility the facility would no longer be subject to review by the Board of Visitors.

Rep. Rehberg (600) inquired if the state was getting into a box by requiring the hospital license be approved by the Department of Health, or was the Department of Health

operating under the Mental Health Act?

Mr. South replied that the M.Y.T.C. is presently licensed as a psychiatric hospital, but under Title 53 it is also a mental health facility and should remain that way. The Mental Health Act is very specific as to what has to be done in terms of patient rights, how a patient gets into the facility, et cetera.

Mr. Melby suggested compromise language of "...the buyer shall agree to maintain a hospital licensed as a psychiatric hospital ... and shall operate the facility as a mental health treatment facility pursuant to Title 53, chapter 21."

Rep. Peck introduced Item 5, the exception authority that would be granted to the Board of Land Commissioners.

Rep. Spaeth said that basically if this is passed the Board of Land Commissioners can do anything they want. They can override anything the committee says or does. The exemption should be for lines 8, 9, 10 and 11 only.

TAPE 22:B:000

Rep. Peck brought up the matter of page 4, lines 14 through 17.

Rep. Rehberg said he felt the subcommittee should address the qualifications of the appraisal, who pays for it, and who it is going to be done by. He went on to say that it is seldom a seller gets a price believed to be adequate, and particularly now at the bottom of the market.

Mr. Melby suggested language to the effect that a buyer would pay for all the closing costs, including the cost of the appraisals.

Rep. Peck asked Rep. Rehberg and Mr. Melby to get together and draft language pertaining to the appraisal if the state should have to reacquire the property at any time.

Rep. Peck presented Item 6 for discussion, saying he felt there was a problem in limiting care to patients under 21, because it might eliminate potential purchasers.

Mr. Melby said the language dealing with inpatient psychiatric services for individuals under the age of 21 is language lifted out of the federal regulations. That is a special part of the medicare and medicare regulations for H.F.C.A. certification.

Appropriations Subcommittee

Page 7

June 24, 1986

Mr. South stated that the early survey option is in the bill because any purchaser will have to go through some type of renovation, staffing and some training before they will feel comfortable about asking for a survey team from either H.J.A.H. or H.C.F.A. This will probably be 60 to 90 days after the purchase. If the survey team comes in and the facility is deemed certified as of that date, there will be costs for providing services to the children presently at the M.Y.T.C. during that 60 to 90 day period. Rivendell has told the Department of Institutions that they are prepared to absorb those costs if they are the purchaser.

He went on to say the department was concerned that if the early survey option was not in the bill, and certification did not come for several months, that the purchaser would be looking for reimbursement from the general fund during the period of time it took to receive medicare certification.

Rep. Peck (107) asked if this language would be an impediment to potential buyers.

Mr. South replied that it was not an impediment. If the purchaser has the organization, the staff and the ability to go through early survey option there should be no problem. The department plans to reduce HB 500 on the very day that the facility is sold. That presupposes that there will be no contract between the state and any purchaser for any of the mandated court committed beds. Anyone who purchases the facility will have to absorb those costs until such time as the facility is medicare certified. Mr. South said it was in the best interest of the state to make sure that whoever purchased the M.Y.T.C. could get their act together very quickly and become certified. Rivendell has agreed to do that and he suggested that any other purchaser would have to do the same thing.

Rep. Rehberg commented that sometimes some people have an easier time getting through an abbreviated form of review than others, and if it help perhaps making it an 'and/or' term then the state would be protected. It would be understood, of course, that the purchaser accepted the responsibility for the present patients at the M.Y.T.C.

Mr. South reiterated that the Department of Institutions did not envision any contract between the department and any purchaser of the M.Y.T.C. for the patients after the date of purchase. Wording of this type would perhaps clarify this issue.

Rep. Peck said he thought the subcommittee members would

feel more comfortable if it was clearly worded in the bill. He asked Mr. South and Mr. Melby to get together on the wording of appropriate language.

Rep. Peck admitted to being basically confused about Item 7.

Mr. South said it was there to correct existing law, or rather what would be a pointless reference in existing law. If the M.Y.T.C. is sold there would be no point in having language and statutes referencing the M.Y.T.C. It will cease to exist as far as state law is concerned.

Rep. Peck presented the issue raised by Dr. Simmons, the fact that adolescents are not allowed to commit themselves for treatment.

Mr. Melby (210) testified that the mental health commitment law does provide for the voluntary commitment of minors, but in practice there is only one place where they can be committed, the M.Y.T.C. The statutes governing the M.Y.T.C., however, preclude any type of commitment other than involuntary.

He noted that Warm Springs, by law, cannot take adolescents. M.Y.T.C., by law, cannot take voluntary commitments. That is the problem. When the statutes dealing with M.Y.T.C. are removed then adolescents can be treated at M.Y.T.C. under the mental health laws.

Rep. Peck asked if there were further issues to be discussed by the subcommittee.

Rep. Spaeth said he had a question regarding page 3, line 18. "The buyer shall agree..." He said he has found that health care providers generally have a lot of subsidiarys, wholly owned corporations that even legal counsels within subsidiarys cannot fathom their whole relationship. What would happen if we have a buyer who transfers to a subsidiary and that subsidiary goes out of existence?

Mr. Melby replied that the answer was on page 4, line 14 where it is set out that the original purchaser may not transfer title without the consent of the State Land Commission. The protection is already in the bill.

Rep. Rehberg (268) raised the question of earnest money. He felt that checks at the end are good, but money on the table is better. He asked if the state was protected in case a purchaser was selected and then could not find financing or for some other reason was unable to consummate the purchase.

Appropriations Subcommittee

Page 9

June 24, 1986

Mr. Melby suggested that all proposals be accompanied by a 2% performance bond. If the selected purchaser fails or refuses to perform the bond would be forfeit.

Rep. Peck (336) asked the subcommittee to address the matter of the four amendments that had been presented for review.

Rep. Spaeth said he felt that Rep. Garcia's amendment, (Exhibit 1) should be rejected. The facility will still be there and the city of Billings will continue to receive the same benefits they are now getting.

Rep. Rehberg said he would support the amendment. He said there may be some benefit to the tax rolls, but that there would be no individual benefit to the programs that had originally donated the land. He felt the Billings Housing and Community Block Grant fund should be replenished so that other programs could be brought in.

Rep. Miller moved that the amendment be rejected.

By voice vote the motion CARRIED, with Rep Rehberg dissenting.

Rep. Peck (412) presented the amendment proposed by Mr. Melvin, the union representative (Exhibit 2).

Ms. Johnson said she understood there was no formal contract with the union, just a general agreement. She went on to say that Rivendell was willing to deal with the union but their primary concern would always be to maintain a first loyalty to the patients.

Rep. Peck told Mr. Melvin they could not put in the law a recommendation for a collective bargaining agreement that did not, as yet, exist.

Mr. Melvin replied that he was recognized as the certified agent and would have to establish a local in Billings.

Rep. Miller suggested that a portion of Mr. Melvin's amendment, that part regarding the M.Y.T.C. employees who wish to remain state employees, could be added to Rep. Addy's amendment as No. 9.

Rep. Addy said it would change the fiscal note somewhat, but it was technically possible. He said he appreciated what Mr. Melvin was trying to do and he had no problem with Rep. Miller's suggestion.

Rep. Peck asked Mr. Melvin how he felt about Rep. Addy's

Appropriations Subcommittee

Page 10

June 24, 1986

proposal that "...the buyer will accept applications from all M.Y.T.C. employees who desire to continue employment with the purchaser. Between substantially qualified applicants present employees of M.Y.T.C. shall be given preference in hiring by the purchaser."

Rep. Addy commented that it should read "...substantially equally qualified applicants..."

Mr. Melvin felt the employees were not being guaranteed anything with that wording, that it was only a tie breaker. He said the present employees deserved preference because of the months they have spent at the facility.

Mr. South (500) said he believed that whoever purchases the facility will use the present employees. It would be in their own best interest to do so.

Rep. Peck asked what would be the governing state regulation if an employee was caused to relocate?

Mr. South said there was no general state regulation. It depended on departmental policy. The Department of Institutions paid for relocation expenses of the staff who went from Warm Springs to Billings. That precedent has been set. If the department has to pay relocation expenses again, an estimate would have to be made of how much it would cost and the appropriation for M.Y.T.C. reduced accordingly.

Rep. Addy said that some of the employees did not want to withdraw from P.E.R.S. at this time. They would prefer to seek other positions with the state.

Mr. Melvin said those were the people he had in mind, those with many years of state service. He thought that perhaps ten employees would fit that description.

Rep. Peck admitted to confusion regarding the wording "...who wish to remain state employees would provide...and any retraining necessary to qualify for a similar position within the agency..." He thought that retraining would be a major cost item if certain specific assignments were to be chosen.

Mr. Melvin said he assumed they would be similar positions and that retraining would be minimal.

Rep. Miller (600) said he would like to attach Item 9 of Mr. Melvin's amendment to Rep. Addy's amendment and eliminate Items 1 through 8 of Mr. Melvin's proposal.

Rep. Spaeth said he would support that compromise.

Rep. Rehberg asked for time to think about it.

Mr. South asked what was meant by 'shall'? He asked if it meant he had to guarantee a job to every person who was not hired by the purchaser and said that would be difficult, particularly with the budget cuts now being enacted. Relocation expenses would be small compared to job guarantees.

Rep. Spaeth suggested putting in "...similar vacant position."

Mr. Melvin thought that would be reasonable under the circumstances. He asked if 'substantially equal' could be struck and the present employees given preference. He thought this would be in the best interest of the provider and would help staff morale at this time.

Rep. Peck said the state could not obligate an independent buyer in that manner.

TAPE 22:A:000

Rep. Rehberg said Mr. Melvin's suggestion would not be fair to the purchaser, especially under the rules and laws in the area of employee termination.

Ms. Johnson testified that Rivendell gives credit for experiential training in all positions and they currently substitute experience and training for degree work. Every employee would be looked at individually. She felt those employees who are there, who have experience in direct patient care with the very patients Rivendell would inherit, would certainly have preference. It would make the transition easier for the patients as well as the remainder of the staff.

Rep. Peck asked Ms. Johnson if she would not oppose striking "...substantially equally qualified..." and leave "...present employees of M.Y.T.C. shall be given preference..."

Ms. Johnson said she would prefer "...substantially equally qualified..." but if necessary she would accept the other language. She said she expected that most of the current employees have experiential training that would substitute for any kind of minimum standards Rivendell has for credentials in those areas.

Rep. Spaeth (100) stated that if "...substantially equally qualified..." was struck the present employees would have

absolute preference. He suggested striking the word 'equally' and leave "...substantially qualified..." which would be approaching equally.

Dr. Simmons thought the bidders were being over protected. He urged the subcommittee to respond to the loyalties they might have to the employees, write the language that way, and as long as it was in the document the potential purchasers would know what they were walking into.

Mr. Melby commented that sounded like a lot of lawsuits in the offing.

Mr. Melvin said that obviously he would like recognition for the bargaining unit but he then asked about a preference with the proviso that it not jeopardize accreditation. A preference would recognize the value of trained employees and still leave the purchaser an out if it was needed.

Mr. Melby said he would like some kind of qualifier because it eliminated a lot of disputes. Something like 'substantially qualified' gives a lot of leeway for argument.

Mr. South said he would prefer the first option 'substantially qualified.'

Rep. Peck asked if it was acceptable in that form, to put Mr. Melvin's #9 after Rep. Addy's #8, and insert the word 'vacant' between similar and position in the last line.

All members of the subcommittee were in agreement on the suggestion.

Rep. Peck said there was a great deal of discussion about Rep. Winslow's amendment (Exhibit 3) dealing with the membership of the review committee.

Rep. Rehberg said he supported the amendment. He felt that if the word 'members' was changed to 'member' he saw no problem with the amendment.

Rep. Spaeth. proposed an amendment to the amendment. He asked to delete Item 3 in its entirety.

Rep. Rehberg opposed the suggestion of Rep. Spaeth. He said there were side effects to having the M.Y.T.C. in the city of Billings and they are not all good effects. There are certain responsibilities the city of Billings will inherit. He felt that somebody from the city of Billings should be on the review committee.

Appropriations Subcommittee

Page 13

June 24, 1986

Rep. Peck (210) noted that Item 3 should be deleted on a 3 to 1 vote.

Rep. Spaeth said he would like to see two members of the House and Senate, from the Yellowstone County area, be appointed in the usual manner for interim committees, a member from each party. He asked that this be inserted as Item 2 in place of the language there at present.

Rep. Miller moved that this be brought forward to the full committee.

All members of the subcommittee voted IN FAVOR of the motion.

Rep. Miller (300) said he would like to have a representative from the community of mental health centers on the review board. He suggested this be inserted as Item 3 of the Winslow amendment.

A voice vote CARRIED this motion.

Mr. South commented that the bill should be wary of using the word 'bid'. He said it talked about a 'bid process', but "...having an opportunity to purchase..." or "...submit a proposal..." might be a better way to go.

Rep. Rehberg said he would like to have included somewhere in the bill wording to the effect that the review committee could not show partiality or favoritism in making its decision. He said he had found that language in existing state statutes.

Rep. Rehberg went on to propose that under 4(b) there should be inserted "...the reviewing body may not show any partiality or favoritism in making its decision..."

Rep. Spaeth (400) asked about rewriting line 3 from "...have a chance..." striking the remainder of the sentence and inserting "...to submit a proposal to purchase..."

Rep. Spaeth moved that with those changes Rep. Winslow's handwritten amendment be adopted.

A voice vote CARRIED the motion.

Rep. Peck noted that in the amendment presented by Rep. Addy that on page 3, line 24, after 'youth' the remainder of line 24 and line 25 in its entirety should be struck.

Appropriations Subcommittee

Page 14

June 24, 1986

Rep. Addy said that language was being struck and "...the buyer or any subsequent transferee must present reasonable documentation in compliance with this condition. Failure to provide may result..." would be inserted in lieu of that other language.

Rep. Peck said that with the changes made HB 36 was ready to return to the full committee in the morning. He asked the subcommittee members to meet in Room 104 at 8:00 a.m. on June 25, 1986. He would have someone from the Legislative Council there to go over HB 36 as amended with them.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:25 p.m.


RAY PECK, Chairman

Amendments to HB 36

Prepared by Mary MaCue for Rep. Rod Garcia

1. Page 3, line 2.

Following: "must be"

Strike: remainder of line 2 through line 3

Insert: "distributed as follows: (a) \$100,000 to the Billings housing and community development block grant fund; (b) the remainder to the state general fund."

Those employees who have many years of service with the state of Montana, and who wish to remain state workers are concerned that there will be no positions available to which they can apply. They also do not know if relocation assistance will be available if they are able to transfer to another state institution.

To summarize, there is widespread concern among MYTC employees that continuity of treatment will suffer, their careers and livelihoods are facing an uncertain future, and that their loyalty and devotion to providing an essential service has not been reciprocated. They have not received adequate consideration in the process, and fear that they will be forced to incur an unacceptable personal cost.

What is needed is meaningful recognition and commitment from the state of Montana that the MYTC employees on both the direct care and clinical staffs deserve a fair deal. They need to be assured of continued employment at the same or equivalent seniority, earnings and benefits.

The best way to accomplish this is by including in the authorizing language of H.B. 36 -- the following requirements as a term and condition of this sale:

(8) The buyer shall ensure the orderly and just transition of Montana Youth Treatment Center employees from state to corporate employment by continuing recognition of the current collective bargaining units, agents and agreements in effect at the time of the sale.

(9) Montana Youth Treatment Center employees who wish to remain state employees shall be provided relocation assistance of up to \$1,000 and any retraining necessary to qualify for similar positions within the agency.

There was a similar situation in Butte when the public hospital was sold to a private corporation. The NLRB recognized the bargaining units that transferred with the sale. This will allow for the orderly and just transition of MYTC employees from state to corporate employment, and will ensure continuity of care and treatment necessary for a positive outcome for the youth at MYTC.

Thank you.

Amendments to HB 36, white (introduced) copy

Prepared by Mary McCue for Rep. Cal Winslow

1. Page 2, line 20

Strike: Subsection (3) in its entirety

Insert: "(3)(a) A review committee comprised of the following members shall review the proposals for purchase and recommend a purchaser to the board after meeting and discussing the factors set forth in subsection (b):

(i) the directors of the departments of institutions, health and environmental sciences, and social and rehabilitation services;

(ii) members of the house of representatives and senate from the districts where the Montana youth treatment center is located;

(iii) a representative of the city where the Montana youth treatment center is located, appointed by the city council; and

(iv) a representative of local health care professionals where the Montana youth treatment center is located, appointed by the governor.

(b) The review committee shall consider:

(i) the various proposals for purchase;

(ii) conditions of the sale of the Montana youth treatment center, including the quality of care to be provided, continued state responsibilities, treatment costs, accreditation standards, contractual relationships with the state and other governmental entities and the terms of those contracts, and other matters pertaining to the administration of the Montana Youth treatment center; and

(iii) other matters relating to the sale and subsequent services and costs of a privately operated facility.

AMENDMENTS TO HB 36, INTRODUCED COPY
Before the House Appropriations Committee

1. page 3, line 24
after "youth." strike the remainder of line 24, and strike line 25
in its entirety.

page 4, line 1, strike "license"

page 3, line 24 insert: The buyer or any subsequent transferee must keep reasonable documentation of compliance with this condition. Failure to comply with the provisions of this section may result in the loss of hospital licensure.

2. page 17, line 17
after: "is"
delete: "filed by"
insert: delivered to

3. page 17, line 17
after "buyer"
insert: "."
delete: "with the Yellowstone County clerk and recorder."

#

VISITORS' REGISTER

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

BILL NO. 7-18-21-29-32-36-43 DATE June 24, 1986
and 46

SPONSOR _____

NAME (please print)	RESIDENCE REPRESENTING	SUPPORT	OPPOSE
Lynn Winslow	Client Assistance Program	21	
Don Ingels	MT Chamber of Commerce	32 X	
George Allen	MT Retail Assn	32	
Gene Huntington	Labor Industry	32	
Ben [unclear]	SRS	21	
LEE HICKEL	S.R.S.	21	
NORMA HARRIS	"	21	
RAY Hoffman	Health	21	
DENNIS M. TAYLOR	DDD/SRS	21	
Sandra Luchau	Dept. of Agriculture	21	
Keith Kelley	" " "	21	
Wendy Kordasberg	Labor & Industry		
Clyde Mar-heid	DDPAC	21	
Don Judge	Montana State AFL-CIO	32	
Steve Bennyhoff	CLF	21	
Bob Frazier	PFP	21	
Jeff McVitt	Montana Health Assn	36	

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

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

VISITORS' REGISTER

Appropriations Sub- COMMITTEE

BILL NO. HB 36

DATE June 24 1986

SPONSOR ADDY

NAME (please print)	RESIDENCE REPRESENTING	SUPPORT	OPPOSE
Howard J. Simmons	SELF 2850 COLTON BILLINGS		X
Paul Melvin	MT Federation of Teachers		X
Pat Melby	Rivendell	X	
Jack Sands			

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

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.