

MINUTES

MONTANA SENATE  
51st LEGISLATURE - REGULAR SESSION  
COMMITTEE ON STATE ADMINISTRATION

Call to Order: By Chairman William E. Farrell, on February 7, 1989, at 10:00 a.m. in Room 331, Capitol.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Senator Hubert Abrams, Senator John Anderson, Jr., Senator Esther Bengtson, Senator William E. Farrell, Senator Ethel Harding, Senator Sam Hofman, Senator Paul Rapp-Svrcek, Senator Tom Rasmussen, Senator Eleanor Vaughn

Members Excused: None

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Eddy McClure

Announcements/Discussion:

Chairman Farrell announced he has a bill to present in another committee, and turned the meeting over to Vice Chairman Hofman.

HEARING ON SJR 7

Presentation and Opening Statement by Sponsor:

Senator Gene Thayer testified that SJR7 came about as a result of talking to Ms. Norma Ashby of Great Falls and, at this point, Senator Thayer read written testimony received from Ms. Ashby, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit 1.

Senator Thayer stated that Ms. Ashby has already talked to a number of people at the schools, who are very excited about this. He noted that, in one area, they are talking about 6,000 kids being involved. The kids will, in their schools, bake cakes which will be assembled into one large cake. They will all gather in a central building, ring their bells simultaneously, and then enjoy eating the cake afterwards. He reported that any profits received from the sale of the bells will be donated back to the Centennial Commission.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON STATE ADMINISTRATION

February 7, 1989

Page 2 of 9

Senator Thayer indicated he believes this is a good project, adding that the Lt. Governor's office is working on a bill that would establish this date as Montana Statehood Day. He noted this has already been proposed in Congress by Senator Burns, and it would appear on future calendars that November 8th is Montana Statehood Day. He indicated they will call it "Statehood" as opposed to Centennial, because Centennial only applies to this year.

Senator Thayer indicated he feels this project is the only project that has the ability to involve every person in the whole state, and that it would be at not cost. He noted almost every family has a bell of some sort in their home, and the kids can take the bell to school that day.

List of Testifying Proponents and What Group they Represent:

John Kinna, Lt. Governor's office

Testimony:

Mr. Kinna stated they are excited about this bell ringing, and hope that the enthusiasm so far displayed continues, that it will not result in hearing losses, and indicated it should be very well-received. He noted one of the things they hear many times from the people across Montana, who are having different celebrations, is that they wish they could do something that would involve a greater part of the state at the same time. He reported the Centennial Commission has sanctioned this event, and they think this is one of the events that will involve the entire state, at the same time, and everyone will feel the brotherly love and friendship of the entire state doing the same thing at the same time.

Mr. Kinna reiterated Senator Thayer's comments that Ms. Ashby is very excited this, she is a very creative person and, if this passes, she would be delighted to be the head bell-ringer. He added the school kids are very excited about it, and the Centennial Commission is also. He noted they think it will also be an integral part of the overall birthday that is planned for the all day and night long celebration, and urged the committee's support of SJR7. He added it has a lot of possibilities, and they appreciate the enthusiasm generated by this possibility, already.

Closing by Sponsor:

Senator Thayer stated he hopes that Mr. Kinna rang the committee's bell, and they will vote do pass on SJR7.

DISPOSITION OF SJR 7

Discussion:

Senator Bengtson offered a motion that SJR7 do pass.

Recommendation and Vote:

Motion passed by the committee that SJR7 do pass.

HEARING ON HJR 4

Presentation and Opening Statement by Sponsor:

Representative Larry Hall Grinde indicated he humbly comes before the committee with what is considered, in their terminology, a "fluff ball" bill. He noted they have had a lot of fun with this in the House, he has been chastised to a certain extent, but it has been a lot of fun for everyone.

Representative Grinde reported there are a handful of people that are very serious about this project, which was started in 1982 when a group of young men and women wanted more facilities for softball. He indicated that, in 1983, the State Softball Association wanted to start a hall of fame, and it was put out as a project that any community could apply for. Representative Grinde indicated that, because of the facilities they already had under way, Lewistown was awarded the state Softball Hall of Fame.

He noted the people did such a tremendous job for their community that no state monies were required, it was funded with private donations, some grant monies, as well as some matching funds from the city and the county. Representative Grinde noted that he thinks of most importance was that all of the labor on this project was donated; not one dollar was spent on labor. He added that farmers came in, he came in with his tractor, people from the business community participated, and it turned into a terrific civic project for them. He noted it is now completed, the dedication was held this past summer, and there were 10 inductees in the state Hall of Fame. Representative Grinde reported they have 4 fields, all of which are lighted and, in the center of this complex, there is a nice new building that will house a museum for the Softball Hall of Fame. He indicated that this next summer, except for one weekend, the facility is booked, either through

softball programs or with little league tournaments from the eastern part of the state.

Representative Grinde indicated that not only do the recreational facilities to help youth and keep them off the streets, they enhance the economic stability of the community; the motels, restaurants, gas stations. He added that the 2 things he would like to reiterate is that this project is completed, and they will need no more funds; no state monies will be required.

List of Testifying Proponents and What Group they Represent:

None.

List of Testifying Opponents and What Group They Represent:

None.

Questions From Committee Members:

- Q. Senator Bengtson asked what is the advantage of having it officially designated as the site, other than to call attention to, and bestow some additional honor on those inducted.
- A. Representative Grinde responded that is the only reason. He noted these people deserve a little credit for the things that they have done.
- Q. Senator Rasmussen indicated they do need to have a site, and that would be the reason.
- A. Representative Grinde agreed. He indicated he does not think it is necessary to have a resolution, since it is by the state softball association, who has declared it through their organization, but it is nice.
- Q. Senator Rasmussen commented that the community raised money for a gymnasium complex, and they seem to be doing well in things like this.
- A. Representative Grinde responded that he is honored to represent his community. He noted that, over the last 10 years, they have build a hospital, a complex at the fairgrounds, and a high school was completed 2 years ago, through community donations with no tax money involved. He added they have a tremendous group of people working there.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON STATE ADMINISTRATION

February 7, 1989

Page 5 of 9

Closing by Sponsor:

Representative Grinde reported that, if the committee agrees, Senator Williams has agreed to carry this bill in the Senate. He added that he urges the committee to pass this "fluff ball" legislation to give some people back home a little credit.

DISPOSITION OF HJR 4

Discussion:

Senator Bengtson offered a motion that HJR4 be concurred in.

Recommendation and Vote:

Committee passed the motion that HJR4 be concurred in.

OTHER BUSINESS

SB 427

Senator Rasmussen asked if the committee could discuss the draft of the committee bill to revise the sunrise law, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit 3.

Senator Rasmussen indicated the bill essentially takes the fee out of the sunrise process, and provides that a group wanting to be licensed has to come before the Legislative Audit Committee. He noted the group will have to fulfill the requirements of the legislation by answering the questions, which are outlined on page 3 of the bill draft, prepare a report which fulfills those requirements, and make a presentation to the Legislative Audit Committee. Senator Rasmussen then indicated the Legislative Audit Committee will hold a public hearing allowing opponents to come in and testify. He noted that, once all this is done, the Legislative Audit Committee will make a decision as to whether they recommend that this group be able to proceed on to the Legislature, and have their bill introduced.

Senator Harding asked if this would be without any fees, and Senator Rasmussen responded that is correct. He added there will be more cost to the state, because the Legislative Audit Committee might have to meet an extra day or 2 to hear these things, but he does not think these groups should be charged anything because this is part of the cost of the Legislature. He noted no one else is charged for their bills during the

SENATE COMMITTEE ON STATE ADMINISTRATION

February 7, 1989

Page 6 of 9

session. Senator Rasmussen added a fiscal note may need to be requested for this bill, and open this up for discussion.

Senator Bengtson indicated that, if there is additional cost, it could be built into their fee for doing business, or their license fee later on, which is established by the board. Senator Rasmussen responded that the farmers who come in with a bill, that takes the Legislature's time, don't have to pay, nor do the environmentalists, or industry, so he doesn't see why another group should have to pay, and doesn't feel these other groups should be charged.

Senator Vaughn asked if there has been any comment from the Audit Committee in regard to this. Senator Rasmussen indicated that Eddy McClure has worked with the Audit Committee, and asked if she had anything to add. Ms. McClure reported she has worked with Mr. Seacat, and gave a copy to Senator Jacobson. She indicated the group will get a bill draft and, if the Committee's report is unfavorable, that report would go along with their bill to the Legislature. She added there is nothing to prevent the group from getting a bill draft. Ms. McClure noted the group would estimate what the costs of licensing would be, that they might include how they are going to do that, as the emphasis is on the applicant determining costs, and this is basically taking the Auditor out of it. Senator Rasmussen stated the Auditor does not want to be in this thing.

Ms. McClure indicated that Senator Jacobson understood Senator Rasmussen's point, but wanted some kind of fee included to separate the serious from the non-serious. Senator Rasmussen indicated he visited with Senator Jacobson, who expressed that opinion, but that he does not agree with her.

Senator Anderson asked how many people would this affect, and if it would be very many each year. Senator Rasmussen responded he does not know, indicating he believes there are 6 licensing bills up at this time. Ms. McClure indicated there are more like 14 bills that might be affected by sunrise, one way or the other. Senator Rasmussen noted it would be anyone's guess, but there could be up to 14, if that is any indication.

Senator Harding asked what would this do to those bills that are already introduced, and Senator Rasmussen responded it would not affect them, that this bill would be for the future because it isn't passed yet, and those bills would all die. Senator Harding added they would die because they would not meet the \$6,500. Vice Chairman Hofman indicated, if passed,

SENATE COMMITTEE ON STATE ADMINISTRATION

February 7, 1989

Page 7 of 9

it would take effect 2 years from now. Senator Rasmussen corrected that, saying it would actually take effect this fall, and they could start coming in any time they wanted for the next 2 years. Senator Vaughn asked if they would then have to wait 2 years before it could be approved, and Senator Rasmussen responded that is correct. Senator Harding added the groups would have to do more research, and are placed in a position of having to do more than just come in a present a bill. Senator Rasmussen agreed, and indicated it places the burden of responsibility on their shoulders to justify their need to the Legislative Audit Committee. Senator Vaughn indicated that would be a place to weed out some of those that have been concerned about coming in.

Senator Abrams asked if the Legislative Audit Committee has the responsibility of supporting a measure to establish another board, of making that determination, and will the committee then compile this information and propose a new board. Ms. McClure stated the committee will either determine the group has met the criteria, and established that there is a need for a new board or licensing profession, or that they have not; that the opponents have shown that the information is not correct. Senator Abrams then asked, in the event the committee does not accept it, and the group has lost that opportunity, then what. Ms. McClure indicated she assumes that an unfavorable recommendation would go along with the bill draft to whatever hearing they went to. Senator Abrams then asked if the bill draft would continue on. Senator Rasmussen responded it would, if they chose it to. Ms. McClure stated the group would still want a bill draft, but the unfavorable report from the Legislative Audit Committee would go along with it, and the Legislature will be alerted to the fact that the Legislative Audit Committee does not think there is a need for it. Ms. McClure then indicated the committee asked for 180 days, or some kind of time frame for these groups to come to the committee. She then asked, if the group does not meet the 180 days criteria, does not submit their report in that time frame, if that is basis for not being allowed to put in a bill draft. Senator Rasmussen indicated he does not know, and does not have an answer to that. Ms. McClure indicated this is something that might be looked into. Senator Abrams asked if the Legislative Audit Committee has the right to recommend that a group come under an existing board, or establish a new one. Ms. McClure stated the committee would indicate if they think, for example, the Board of Medical Examiners could expand to handle a certain group, but they have to come to a decision that the information presented by the group does not meet the criteria that

there is a definite need for a new board, or that no other board can handle what they are doing.

Senator Abrams pointed out that the bill provides that the committee has the discretion to hold, or to not hold, a public hearing, and quoted the bill draft, on page 5, as saying "may, in its discretion". Ms. McClure stated she thinks the intent was to say "must", but acknowledged that it does say "may". Senator Abrams further pointed out that it allows discretion. Senator Rasmussen indicated that is a point, whether "shall" should be put in. Ms. McClure indicated that the discretion point is, if they only need 1 public hearing, that is fine but, if they need another hearing, they did not want to be mandated to have 2 or 3 more. She noted perhaps it should read "must at its discretion". Senator Abrams stated he has no problem with allowing them the discretion, because the need may or may not arise for a public hearing, and they should be allowed that discretion.

Senator Rasmussen indicated, in order to allow the process the work through, a public hearing, inviting the public to come and testify is necessary. Ms. McClure indicated the rationale for "may" is that the hearings could be combined with some of their open meetings, that the meetings of the Audit Committee are not necessarily a hearing, but they could open the meeting after finishing their business, at their discretion, to save money. Senator Rasmussen pointed out that would still be a public hearing, that they could have a public hearing at 3:00, and a meeting at 9:00 in the morning. Senator Bengtson indicated that, at a hearing, sometimes a hearing officer is required, and it gets very formal. Vice Chairman Hofman stated he believes the opportunity for the public to come and express an opponents point of view should be mandated, adding they have to be afford that. Ms. McClure offered to check with the Audit Committee and see what they prefer. Vice Chairman Hofman asked if Ms. McClure would look it over, confer with Senator Rasmussen, and come up with some recommendations today or tomorrow. Senator Rasmussen asked what the official process is to get this bill introduced, pointed out that the committee has already voted once, and asked if the committee must vote again. He then asked if, since the committee has now discussed the language, the bill is ready to go.

Senator Bengtson offered a motion to introduce a committee bill to revise the sunrise law.

Motion passed by the committee to introduce a committee bill to revise the sunrise law.



ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment At: 10:40 a.m.

  
WILLIAM E. FARRELL, Chairman

WEF/mhu  
SJR7.027

ROLL CALL

STATE ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

51ST LEGISLATIVE SESSION

DATE: February 7, 1989

NAME	PRESENT	ABSENT	EXCUSED
HUBERT ABRAMS	✓		
JOHN ANDERSON, JR.	✓		
ESTHER BENGTON	✓		
WILLIAM E. FARRELL	✓		
ETHEL HARDING	✓		
SAM HOFMAN	✓		
PAUL RAPP-SVRCEK	✓		
TOM RASMUSSEN	✓		
ELEANOR VAUGHN	✓		

SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

February 7, 1989

MR. PRESIDENT:

We, your committee on State Administration, having had under consideration SJR 7 (first reading copy -- white), respectfully report that SJR 7 do pass.

DO PASS

Signed: *Farrell*  
William E. Farrell, Chairman

2-7-89  
11:30  
ECRSJR07.207

SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

February 7, 1989

MR. PRESIDENT:

We, your committee on State Administration, having had under consideration HJR 4 (third reading copy -- blue), respectfully report that HJR 4 be concurred in.

Sponsor: Grinde (Williams)

BE CONCURRED IN

Signed:   
William E. Farrell, Chairman

2-7-89  
11:35  
29

Testimony from Norma Ashby, Coordinator, Montana Statehood Centennial  
 Birthday Bell Project.

SENATE STATE ADMIN.

EXHIBIT NO. 1

Feb. 3, 1989

DATE 2/7/89

BILL NO. SJR 7

Greetings!

On Sept. 17, 1977, I was in Philadelphia for the 200th Anniversary of the U.S. Constitution. At 4 p.m. that afternoon, the exact minute the Constitution had been signed 200 years earlier, not only did church bells ring in Philadelphia, but throughout the nation.

I was impressed with the significance of that nation-wide bell-ringing and decided it would be an idea well worth adopting for Montana's Statehood Centennial Birthday. Thus the idea of a Statewide Birthday Bell-ringing Project in Montana was born.

Sanctioned by the Montana Statehood Centennial Commission, it will take place on Nov. 8, 1989 at 10:40 a.m., the exact minute President Benjamin Harrison signed and issued the proclamation declaring Montana as the 41st State 100 years ago.

Not only will church, school and fire bells be rung, but the ringing of individual bells will be encouraged. Special Montana Heritage Bells in brass have been cast by Creative Casting in Lewistown and will be marketed statewide in early March. Sponsors of the Montana Heritage Bell are Buttrey and D.A. Davidson & Co. in cooperation with KRTV, Great Falls; KTVQ, Billings; KPAX, Missoula; and KXLF, Butte.

As part of this project, we have found a representative historic Montana bell to place on permanent display in the State Capitol.

In excellent condition with a beautiful tone, it will be donated by the Brent Bliss Family of Great Falls and Dutton in honor of Elmer B. Bliss, late Power area farmer.

All expenses associated with permanently displaying the bell in the Capitol, including building a frame, transporting and installing the bell and providing a plaque noting the exact minute and date that Montana became a state, and acknowledging the benefactors and sponsors of the project, will be funded by private sources. No state monies will be involved.

We feel this bell will be a lasting reminder of Nov. 8, 1989, when all Montanans joined together in celebrating the State's 100th Birthday of Statehood.

I ask approval of our Joint Resolution that the Legislature authorizes the permanent display of a Montana Statehood Centennial Bell in an appropriate location in the Capitol, preferably on the south balcony overlooking the rotunda, to honor the 100th birthday of the State of Montana.

EXHIBIT NO. 2

DATE 2/7/89

BILL NO. SJR 7

STATE ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

WITNESS STATEMENT

To be filled out by a person testifying or a person who would not like to stand up and speak but wants their testimony entered into the record.

NAME: John Kinna

DATE: 2-7-89

Address: Lt. Gov. office

Phone: 444-3111

Representing whom? Lt. Gov.

Appearing on which proposal? SJR 7

Do you: SUPPORT?  AMEND?  OPPOSE?

Comments:  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY

Unproofed Draft  
Printed 2:33 am on February 6, 1989

SENATE STATE ADMIN.  
EXHIBIT NO. 3  
DATE 2/7/89  
BILL NO. DRAFT 251

LCSUNRISE  
[58427]

\*\*\* Bill No. \*\*\*\*\*

Introduced By \*\*\*\*\*

By Request of Senate State Administration Committee

A draft for a bill entitled: "An act to revise the 'sunrise' provisions relating to licensing of proposed new boards and professions; amending sections 2-8-203 through 2-8-205, 2-8-207 and 2-8-208, MCA; and repealing section 2-8-206, MCA."

Be it drafted for sponsor approval . . . . .

Section 1. Section 2-8-203, MCA, is amended to read:

"2-8-203. Committee review and report. (1) The Except as provided in subsection (5), the committee shall review and assess the merits of any proposal to:

(a) establish a new licensing board;

(b) initiate a legislative or executive department study of the need for a new licensing board; or

(c) add to the duties of an existing licensing board responsibility for licensing another occupation or profession.

(2) Any proposal subject to review under subsection (1) must be submitted, in the form of a legislative ~~proposal~~ report, to the committee at least 180 days before the first day of the next regular legislative session.

(3) The committee shall conduct the review required by

# Unproofed Draft

Printed 2:33 am on February 6, 1989

SENATE STATE ADMIN.

EXHIBIT NO. 3

DATE 2/7/89

BILL NO. DRAFT pg 2

subsection (1) only if the ~~proposal~~ report includes:

[SB 427]

~~(a) a written request by a senator whose term will not expire before the next regular legislative session or by a senator or representative who is not opposed in the next general election;~~

~~(b)~~ (a) the information required by 2-8-204(1); and

~~(c)~~ (b) a completed application as provided in 2-8-205.

~~(4) Within 90 days after the proposal is received, the~~ The committee shall prepare a ~~draft~~ report to the legislature for its next regular session. The report must include but is not limited to:

~~(a) the committee's findings with respect to each of the criteria in 2-8-204;~~

~~(b)~~ an (a) the applicant's estimate of the cost to the state of licensing the occupation or profession and a proposed schedule of fees that will recover the cost of the licensing program as required by 37-1-134; and

~~(c)~~ (b) the committee's recommendation as to whether the profession or occupation should be licensed by the state.

~~(5) If the volume of requests makes it impossible to prepare all the required reports within 90 days, the committee may extend the time for preparation of a report to a maximum of 120 days from the date a request is received~~ The provisions of [this part] do not apply to an agency, profession, or occupation that is required to be licensed or regulated by federal law.



## Unproofed Draft

Printed 2:33 am on February 6, 1989

EXHIBIT NO. 3DATE 2/7/89BILL NO. DRAFT 053

Section 2. Section 2-8-204, MCA, is amended to read: [SB 427]

"2-8-204. Criteria for committee assessment. (1) The applicant shall demonstrate to the committee and if necessary furnish additional information requested by the committee to show that:

(a) the unregulated practice of the occupation or profession creates a direct, immediate hazard to the public health, safety, or welfare;

(b) the scope of practice is readily identified and easily distinguished from the scope of practice of other professions and occupations;

(c) the occupational or professional group has an established code of ethics, a voluntary certification program, or other measures to ensure a minimum quality of service;

(d) practice of the occupation or profession requires specialized skill or training, and nationally recognized standards of education and training exist;

(e) the proposed qualifications for obtaining a license are justified;

(f) the public will benefit from the proposed regulation of the occupation or profession;

(g) public support for the proposed licensure exists;

(h) licensing will not significantly increase the cost of services to the public; and

(i) no other board licenses a similar or closely related occupation or profession.

Unproofed Draft  
Printed 2:33 am on February 6, 1989

SENATE STAFF ADMIN.

EXHIBIT 3

DATE 2/7/89

BILL NO. DRAFT pg 4

(2) ~~In assessing the merits of the proposal for a new licensing board, the committee~~ The applicant shall also evaluate the applicant's information for each of the factors listed in subsection (1) and in addition determine or estimate:

(a) the number of existing practitioners and the approximate number of people who would be licensed in the future;

(b) the number of people who are likely to use the services of the occupation or profession;

(c) the manner and degree of improved quality of service;

(d) the degree to which licensing will facilitate clients' access to reimbursement for government assistance programs;

(e) whether a substantial majority of the public has the knowledge or experience to evaluate the practitioner's competence;

(f) whether the public can effectively be protected by other means; and

(g) whether licensing will:

(i) significantly increase the cost of goods and services provided by the occupation or profession;

(ii) adversely affect the scope of practice of other professions and occupations, whether regulated or not; or

(iii) exclude existing practitioners or otherwise reduce the number of practitioners in Montana.

(3) The committee shall consider in its assessment each of the factors in subsections (1) and (2) and shall include in its ~~final~~ report specific findings with respect to each of those

# Unproofed Draft

Printed 2:33 am on February 6, 1989

SENATE STATE ADMIN.

EXHIBIT NO. 3

DATE 2/7/89

BILL NO. DRAFT p25

factors.

Section 3. Section 2-8-205, MCA, is amended to read:

"2-8-205. Procedure. (1) The committee shall adopt an appropriate form for use by applicants, containing a copy of this part and requiring applicants to list:

- (a) proposed qualifications of licensed practitioners;
  - (b) disciplinary procedures that would be applied to practitioners;
  - (c) proposed requirements for continuing education, if any;
- and

(d) the information required by 2-8-204.

(2) After the committee has initiated its review under 2-8-203, it may request any additional information it considers necessary to complete its assessment of the proposal.

(3) The committee may in its discretion hold one or more public hearings during which the applicant and members of the public will have an opportunity to testify.

~~(4) At least 21 days before its final report is presented to the legislature, the committee shall provide an opportunity for the applicant to review a preliminary draft of the report and prepare a response. The committee shall consider all responses in preparing its final report.~~

(5) (4) At least one copy of the ~~final~~ report must be kept on file with the legislative auditor and made available for public inspection.

**Unproofed Draft**  
Printed 2:33 am on February 6, 1989

SENATE STATE ADMIN.

EXHIBIT NO. 3

DATE 2/7/89

BILL NO. DRAFT ps6

Section 4. Section 2-8-207, MCA, is amended to read:

"2-8-207. Consolidation of existing boards. Any person or organization may propose consolidation of two or more existing boards. The provisions of 2-8-202 through ~~2-8-206~~ 2-8-205 apply to such a proposal, except that:

(1) the committee shall designate a representative of each of the occupations or professions regulated by the licensing boards proposed for consolidation, and each representative must be treated as an applicant for purposes of 2-8-202 through ~~2-8-206~~ 2-8-205; and

(2) the committee shall weigh the merits of the proposed consolidation against the merits of retaining a separate licensing board for each affected occupation or profession and in its ~~final~~ report recommend to the legislature:

- (a) the proposed consolidation;
- (b) continuation of the existing licensing boards; or
- (c) a modification of the proposed consolidation.

Section 5. Section 2-8-208, MCA, is amended to read:

"2-8-208. Boards or licensing functions instituted by initiative. (1) If an initiative to establish a new licensing board or to add a new licensing responsibility to the duties of an existing licensing board is approved by the electorate, the committee shall:

- (a) review the initiative to assess the degree to which it

# Unproofed Draft

Printed 2:33 am on February 6, 1989

SENATE STATE ADMIN.

EXHIBIT NO 3

DATE 2/7/89

BILL NO DRAFT 17

meets the criteria in 2-8-204(1);

(b) request that the petitioners provide sufficient information from practitioners or other persons to make the determinations required by 2-8-204(2); and

(c) evaluate the petitioner's initiative in terms of:

(i) clarity and conciseness;

(ii) conformity to existing statutes and principles of administrative law; and

(iii) specificity of the delegation of authority to promulgate rules and set fees.

(2) The committee shall prepare a report to the next session of the legislature. The report must include:

(a) the committee's findings with respect to each of the criteria in 2-8-204;

(b) an estimate of the petitioner's cost to the state of licensing the occupation or profession and a proposed schedule of fees that will cover the cost of the licensing program as required by 37-1-134;

(c) the committee's recommendation as to whether the initiative should be amended; and

(d) if amendments are recommended, a legislative proposal.

(3) Committee recommendations for amendments to the initiative must be incorporated in a bill introduced during the next session of the legislature ~~by request of the committee.~~

NEW SECTION. Section 6. Repealer. Section 2-8-206, MCA,

# Unproofed Draft

Printed 2:33 am on February 6, 1989

SENATE STATE ADMIN.

EXHIBIT NO. 3

DATE 2/7/89

BILL NO. DRAFT pg 8

is repealed.

-End-

