

## **MINUTES**

### **MONTANA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES 52nd LEGISLATURE - REGULAR SESSION**

#### **COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, LIVESTOCK, & IRRIGATION**

**Call to Order:** By CHAIR LINDA NELSON, on February 8, 1991, at 3:00 p.m.

#### **ROLL CALL**

**Members Present:**

Linda Nelson, Chair (D)  
Don Steppler, Vice-Chairman (D)  
Bob Bachini (D)  
Joe Barnett (R)  
Gary Beck (D)  
Jane DeBruycker (D)  
Roger DeBruycker (R)  
Jim Elliott (D)  
Marian Hanson (R)  
Harriet Hayne (R)  
Vernon Keller (R)  
Don Larson (D)  
Jim Madison (D)  
Ed McCaffree (D)  
John Phillips (R)  
John Scott (D)

**Staff Present:** Connie Erickson, Legislative Council  
Claudia Johnson, Committee Secretary

**Please Note:** These are summary minutes. Testimony and discussion are paraphrased and condensed.

#### **HEARING ON HB 549**

#### **Presentation and Opening Statement by Sponsor:**

**REP. ED GRADY**, House District 47, Canyon Creek, said this bill increases the responsibility of the counties regarding the proper use and storage of pesticides and mandates an increase in county weed management programs. The first change mandates that weed districts employ a fulltime weed supervisor. The board still has the authority to hire other employees as necessary to run an adequate weed control program. He said this will increase the professionalism of this position and allow a fulltime supervisor to manage a long-term program. He said there are 56 weed

districts in Montana. The counties have the option of forming multi county districts, Golden Valley County has hired the Musselshell County weed supervisor to do some of their control work. Out of the 56 weed districts, 26 have employed full time weed supervisors, 27 districts have halftime weed supervisors, and 3 districts do not have any supervisor. He said the half-time supervisors are usually hired to spray weeds in the summer, leaving the educational and other aspects of the program either to the county commissioners or local extension agents. These officials do not have the time to devote to the development of a long-term management program. This bill will ensure that the weed district supervisor obtains training to properly implement the noxious weed management program. The weed districts will be funded at levels to allow for adequate development and implementation of the weed management program. A permissive mill levy must be available for noxious weed control. The weed board is appointed by the county commissioners and have all the information necessary to recommend the cost of weed control to the commission for the final decision on the number of mills to be levied. Weed control expenses shall be paid by the county out of the noxious weed fund. The termination date is extended for liability restrictions and information on herbicides to 1995. This act is effective July 1, 1991. REP. GRADY said groundwater is very important to Montana and pesticides are a known factor in groundwater contamination. EXHIBIT 1 AND 2

Proponents' Testimony:

Lorraine Gillies, MT Farm Bureau, said the Montana Farm Bureau is dedicated to the goals and ultimate eradication of noxious weeds in Montana. She suggested that HB 549 be amended on page 3, line 20, to read "the board may" instead of "shall" hire a full time supervisor. EXHIBIT 3

Neil Peterson, Headwater's RC & D, Madison County, wanted to go on record in support of HB 549. He said this bill amends and approves the already excellent 1985 Montana County Noxious Weed Management Act.

Reeves Petroff, Gallatin County Weed District, in support of HB 549, said he is one of the 26 fulltime supervisors. EXHIBIT 4

Keith Rustad, Chairman, Madison County, supports HB 549. EXHIBIT 5

Charles Hahnkamp, Chairman Headwaters RC & D Area, Inc., Madison County, supports HB 549. EXHIBIT 9

David I. Moss, Chairman Beaverhead Co. Commissioners, Dillon, supports HB 549. EXHIBIT 10

Dave Burch, President-elect Montana Weed Control Association, said the revisions planned for the county noxious weed control act will strengthen weed management in Montana. EXHIBIT 6

Janet Ellis, Mt Audubon Legislative Fund, supports HB 549. This bill will provide the much needed training for weed district personnel, including the storage, disposal, and safe use of pesticides and their effect on the ground water.

Brian McNitt, Montana Environmental Information Center (MEIC), said the weed control districts are significant contributors to groundwater contamination because of their use of herbicides. Districts need well trained and qualified supervisors for these programs. Fulltime supervisors will take a longterm view of weed control programs. He hoped that the training would include integrated pest management control.

Pam Hackley, Chair, Lewis & Clark County Weed Board, supports HB 549. She said I-105 has forced the placement of the weed district program into special mill levies for voter approval. This has affected the program in several ways, e.g., funding levels are uncertain from year to year. EXHIBIT 7

Dave Pickett, Butte Weed Board, commended the sponsors of the bill. He said it will put more pressure on the board to take care of the program. The counties need to set their priorities on how and where they are going to spend their money.

Charlie Hahnkamp, Headwaters RC & D, supports HB 549. He said a good weed board would keep everyone in line.

Doug Johnson, Cascade County, Weed and Mosquito Management Program, wanted to go on record in support of HB 549. He said this would protect national forests and wilderness areas.

Opponents' Testimony: None

Informational Testimony:

Gordon Morris, Executive Director of Montana Association of Counties, said he is a no-ponent, but has come before the committee with some suggestions: 1) on page 3, line 1; reinsert the stricken language; and 2) strike line 21, on page 3. He said this bill mandates every county to hire a fulltime supervisor; he said there are some counties that do not need a fulltime supervisor. If the language stays in the bill, it would require a fiscal note because if the Legislature mandates a county hire a fulltime supervisor, then the Legislature would also need to find the necessary funding. He urged the committee to re-instate the original language on page 3, line 1, and strike the language on page 3, line 21, and leave it to the county commissioners to determine who to hire. He said the law states that the Legislature cannot mandate services without providing the funding for those services. He said even if the mills are increased from 2 to 5 mills, this will not provide the funding necessary to support this bill. He wanted to go on record to say "if the mills were changed to 10, the counties would not receive anymore than they are receiving at this current time, and the situation

in Lewis and Clark County will continue to occur". He told the Committee if they didn't think the county commissioners prioritizing budgets and levies, they are mistaken. He suggested that the levy remain at 2 mills and the stricken language on page 6, lines 2 through 4 be reinserted. He said why take away the right of the county commissioners, working with the weed board, to put the issue before the voters in an election. He said a proponent of the bill said the weed fund was a slush fund, used to purchase computers, etc., this is not true; one fund cannot be used to assist another fund.

Bob Stevens, MT Grain Growers Association, said he is a "no-ponent". They are in opposition to the 5 mill levy. He spends thousands of his own dollars to control weeds on his farm and does not feel the county does a good job.

Questions From Committee Members:

REP. BACHINI asked Pam Hackley if the amendments offered by Mr. Morris were accepted, how would she feel about the bill. Ms. Hackley said the mill levy language should be changed to "shall" to guarantee the money would go to the weed trust fund.

Mr. Pickett said the main issue of this bill is to hire a full-time supervisor. It is necessary to have a permanent and competent professional person. He said counties should work together and hire one fulltime person instead of two halftime employees if they cannot support a fulltime supervisor in each county. For example, Broadwater and Jefferson county could share a supervisor.

REP. BECK asked what the difference is between a weed manager and weed supervisor. Mr. Pickett said a weed manager is hired to do the actual weed control; a weed supervisor is the fulltime professional person that manages the programs.

REP. DEBRUYCKER (Roger) asked if the weed board can hire a supervisor from their weed funds. REP. GRADY said there isn't enough money in the weed funds for the counties to fill these positions.

REP. STEPPLER asked REP. GRADY where the 3 mills were going to come from referred to in EXHIBIT 2. It says "if a county increases the levy for the noxious weed fund by three mills, it will have to reduce other levies by 3 mills or substitute the 3 mills for mills that are exempt from the provisions of I-105". REP. GRADY said Mr. Morris alluded to that in his remarks. It doesn't mean they cannot go up to 5 mills in the weed program; it would have to come out of another program, if their mill levies are capped by I-105.

REP. STEPPLER asked Mr. Morris about substituting the 3 mills for mills that are exempt from the provisions of I-105. What mills are exempt from I-105? Mr. Morris replied that there are several

exempt mill levies: special improvement districts, city-county health boards, economic development, to name a few. He said if the assumption is to take the levies that are exempt and use them to fund the weed program, but in order to substitute mills, other programs would have to be reduced by a comparable number of mills.

REP. PHILLIPS asked how much money does the weed trust fund generate on an annual basis. Mr. Morris said the herbicide surcharge brings in almost \$400,000 per year; half goes into the permanent trust and the other half goes into the Department of Agriculture. The vehicle weed tax brings in \$1.1 million for the department. Counties may keep 3 percent of the proceeds to cover costs of collection. Mr. Morris said the trust fund will be capped at \$2.5 million on June 30, 1993. Any revenue coming in after that will go into grants for weed management projects.

REP. BACHINI read from the regarding 2 or more counties sharing a noxious weed supervisor; A weed management district shall be formed in every county of the state and shall include all the land within the boundaries of the county except that a weed management district may include more than one county through agreement of the commissioners of the affected counties.

REP. BECK asked what the trust fund money is set aside for. REP. GRADY said once the trust fund reaches \$2.5 million, the interest can be spent for noxious weed management projects.


REP. BACHINI asked if Legislature were to mandate a multi-county fulltime supervisor, would the Legislature still be responsible to take care of that supervisor. Mr. Morris said if the Legislature were to mandate two or more counties to combine and hire one supervisor, it would be responsible. Mr. Morris said the weed boards around the state have a responsibility to be doing that very same thing and should take the responsibility on themselves.


#### Closing by Sponsor:

REP. GRADY said the mandatory provision in the bill to hire a fulltime supervisor in each county is necessary to put into place the weed management program. He said part-time weed supervisors are doing maintenance on vehicles etc., where a fulltime weed supervisor would be receiving training and taking classes on noxious weeds during the winter to prepare for the summertime. He said this bill does not break I-105. The tougher language in the bill is to force the counties into making weed programs a priority.

ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment: 5:00 p.m.

  
LINDA NELSON, Chair

  
CLAUDIA JOHNSON, Secretary

LN/cj

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## AGRICULTURE, LIVESTOCK AND IRRIGATION COMMITTEE

ROLL CALL

DATE 2-8-91

NAME	PRESENT	ABSENT	EXCUSED
REP. DON STEPLER, VICE-CHAIRMAN	✓		
REP. BOB BACHINI	✓		
REP. JOE BARNETT	✓		
REP. GARY BECK	✓		
REP. JANE DEBRUYCKER	✓		
REP. ROGER DEBRUYCKER	✓		
REP. JIM ELLIOTT	✓		
REP. MARIAN HANSON	✓		
REP. HARRIET HAYNE	✓		
REP. VERNON KELLER	✓		
REP. DON LARSON	✓		
REP. JIM MADISON	✓		
REP. ED MCCAFFREE	✓		
REP. JOHN PHILLIPS	✓		
REP. JOHN SCOTT	✓		
REP. LINDA NELSON, CHAIR	✓		

EXHIBIT 1  
DATE 2-8-91  
HB 549

## **COUNTY NOXIOUS WEED CONTROL ACT**

**Title 7, Chapter 22**

**Sections**

**7-22-2101 through 7-22-2153**

**AND**

**RULES**

**Rules 4.5.201 through 4.5.203**

State of Montana  
Department of Agriculture  
Environmental Management Division  
Agriculture/Livestock Building  
Capitol Station  
Helena, MT 59620-0205  
(406) 444-2944



**Senate Members**  
PAUL F. BOYLAN  
VICE CHAIRMAN  
GARY C. AKLESTAD  
DELWYN GAGE  
J.D. LYNCH

**Executive Director**  
ROBERT B. PERSON

**Legal Director**  
GREGORY J. PETESCH



**Montana Legislative Council**  
**Legal Services Division**  
Room 138 • State Capitol  
Helena, Montana 59620-1706  
(406) 444-3064  
FAX (406) 444-3036

EXHIBIT 2  
DATE 2-8-91  
HB 549  
**House Members**  
RALPH S. EUDAILY  
CHAIRMAN  
JAN BROWN  
RED MENAHAN  
JOHN MERCER

**Attorneys**  
LEE HEIMAN  
VALENCIA LANE  
JOHN MACMASTER  
EDDY MCCLURE  
DAVID S. NISS  
**Legal Researcher**  
BARTLEY J. CAMPBELL  
**Paralegal**  
DOUG STERNBERG

February 5, 1991

Representative Edward J. (Ed) Grady  
Star Route  
Canyon Creek, MT 59633

Dear Representative Grady:

I am writing in response to your inquiry as to whether House Bill No. 549 breaks the property tax freeze, popularly known as I-105, imposed under Title 15, chapter 10, part 4, MCA. House Bill No. 549 is not a violation of or an exception to Title 15, chapter 10, part 4, MCA.

Section 4 of House Bill No. 549 amends section 7-22-2142, MCA, to increase the number of mills that may be levied by a county for the noxious weed fund from 2 to 5 mills. Title 15, chapter 10, part 4, MCA, does not limit the number of mills that can be levied for a specific program. Title 15, chapter 10, part 4, MCA, limits the actual dollar amount of taxes imposed on an individual piece of property in each taxing unit. See 15-10-402(4) and 15-10-412(2), MCA.

The amendment to section 7-22-2142, MCA, contained in House Bill No. 549 is not exempt from or listed as an exception to Title 15, chapter 10, part 4. If a county increases the levy for the noxious weed fund by three mills, it will have to reduce other levies by 3 mills or substitute the 3 mills for mills that are exempt from the provisions of Title 15, chapter 10, part 4, MCA.

Sincerely,

  
Gregory J. Petesch, Director  
Legal Services Division

1036gpga



**MONTANA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION**

502 South 19th • Bozeman, Montana 59715  
Phone: (406) 587-3153

EXHIBIT 3  
DATE 2-8-91  
HB 549

BILL # HB549; TESTIMONY BY: Lorraine Gillies

DATE 2/8/91; SUPPORT Support; OPPOSE \_\_\_\_\_

*Madam Chair*

~~Mr. Chairman~~, Members of the Committee:

For the record, I am Lorraine Gillies, representing Montana Farm Bureau.

Farm Bureau is dedicated to the control and ultimate eradication of noxious weeds in Montana. It is our opinion that HB549 rightly requires the county weed board to be more responsible for an effective weed management plan, but the bill oversteps the legislature's proper roll. We are opposed to the legislature burdening small counties with programs they do not need and can ill afford. Raising the levy 3 mill may not be necessary in counties that do not require a full time supervisor.

We suggest an amendment be made--on page 3, line 20 to read, "The board may" in stead of "shall employ a full time supervisor."

Farm bureau will support HB549 with this proposed amendment.

Thank you for your consideration.

SIGNED: Lorraine Gillies

Testimony of  
Reeves Petroff  
Weed District Supervisor  
-- Gallatin County --  
In Favor of  
HB 549

February 8, 1991

Montana's economy is intrinsically tied to the health of our land. Agriculture is a major contributor to our economy as is recreation, timber, mining and other uses of the land.

The invasion of noxious weeds has presented an additional burden to land managers who need to manage their land in order to derive economical rewards while maintaining the ability of that land to contribute to our well-being. This means maintaining environmental quality.

About 50% of Montana's 47,000,000 rangeland acres is susceptible to invasion by knapweed alone. This biological pollution holds the possibility of weakening our natural resource base by replacing native ecosystems. Oddly enough, there also exists the possibility that conventional treatments for controlling noxious weeds can pollute water systems. The improper and unplanned use of herbicides can seriously impact the environment and damage the credibility of those agencies and people who apply them. In this case, the cure can be worse than the disease.

Improving Montana's Weed Law by the passage of HB 549 can only improve the focus and safety of the Montana's noxious weed effort. Planning is a pain-in-the-neck but specific goals are essential to a well-directed and financially accountable weed program for Montana.

Training others, receiving training, and development of safety procedures is sometimes a hassle but necessary in order to protect worker, public and environmental safety in Montana. Cooperating with other people, agencies and other counties is sometimes uncomfortable but is necessary so that there is no duplication of effort. Stable funding is essential in order to maintain the momentum of the weed control effort to date.

Pass HB 549 and you increase the level of professionalism and safety that needs to be associated with programs administered by government agencies.

Pass HB 549 and you show the people of Montana that you care about the quality of governmental employees.

Pass HB 549 and you show the people of Montana that you care about their environment.



EXHIBIT 5  
DATE 2-8-91  
HB 549

## Madison County Weed Control

P.O. Box 278  
Virginia City, MT 59755

February 6, 1991

TO: Chairperson Nelson and members of the House Agriculture Committee.

RE: HB 549, Representative Grady: A Bill for generally revising the County Weed Management Act.

### TO THE RECORD

My name is Keith Rustad/Neil Peterson. I am the Chairman/Coordinator for the Madison County Weed Board.

The Madison County Weed Board wishes to go on record in support of HB 549.

Madison County and its Weed Board are basically in line with HB 549's intentions. Madison County does recognize that the sections pertaining to employing a full time supervisor and meeting the training direction may be hard for some counties to meet at this time. Madison County's Weed Board also recognizes and believes that counties and the Department of Agriculture, through discussion, should be able to reach an equitable agreement regarding these sections of HB 549.

The Madison County Weed Board does want to stress to the Department of Agriculture, if HB 549 becomes a signed Act, they need to work and assist the counties to met the intent of HB 549.

HB 549 does provide the needed emphasis for county weed boards to become active and aggressive to the noxious weed situation not only in their county, but on a statewide perspective. This is the key in our interpretation of HB 549 and the main grounds for our support.

Weed Management Programs are expanded and encompassing more activities then just weed spraying. Weed Management is in an era of rapidly expanding information and technical data. To keep pace with this data the Montana's Weed Act must also be continually upgraded to keep in step. HB 549 is viewed as an accomplishment towards this goal.

I request the committee to give HB 549 an approving report.



EXHIBIT 6  
DATE 2-8-91  
HB 549

POST OFFICE BOX 1911 • BOZEMAN, MONTANA 59771

WRITTEN TESTIMONY FOR HB 549  
MONTANA WEED CONTROL ASSOCIATION  
DAVE BURCH, PRESIDENT ELECT

The revisions planned for the county noxious weed control act will strengthen weed management in Montana. There are a few points I would like to talk about:

1) The training for Weed District Supervisor, must be strengthened, this would create a higher level of professionalism in the ranks of County Weed Supervisors. Supervisors are not just people who spray weeds, the job of County Weed Supervisor is more of an administrative and manager, as weed control has evolved from a 6 month spray program to a management program of noxious weeds. A management program does include spraying but it also includes a variety of different control practice and it is to important not to have trained people to fulfill the position of County Weed District Supervisor.

2) Full time Supervisors positions: I believe that what I just explained also covers this as well, but the job of County Weed Supervisor is to important to be part time. The training and level of a part time person is not adequate to manage a weed management program. This is also a way for County Weed Districts to maybe have a cooperative weed program between 2 or more Counties. It would enable them to combined monies and hire a full time Supervisor, which would enable them to have a comprehensive and suitable weed management program.

3) Weed Management Programs: This would make weed districts specify pesticide management goals and procedures which are not found in all County Weed Management plans as of present. This will help the Weed Districts become more professional in running a sound and solid program.

4) Funding: County Commissioners would need to provide sufficient funds for weed programs and could appropriate general fund and or levy up to five mills. This would change from the 2 mill limitations now. Weed Districts would still be able to hold a special mill levy to go over the 5 mill levy, in some cases 5 mills would still not be enough to adequately fund a District. This is where Weed Districts should combined and split the cost of a full time person and still have an effective spray program in the summer, but also it would enable them to have a full time person to manage the Noxious Weed Program for that County.

In summary, the changes would be good for Weed Control in the state of Montana, as it would enhance what is already happening for Weed Control, and as Law makers we hope you see the need to further the Weed Control program and this bill would surely do this.

Thank you.

Dave Burch  
Weed Supervisor



EXHIBIT 7  
DATE 2-8-91 Glenn Bristow  
HB 549 Weed Manager

The Lewis and Clark County Weed Board **supports** the passage of **HB 549**.

### **Background**

In Lewis and Clark County, I-105 has forced the placement of the Weed District program onto annual special mill levys for voter approval. This has affected our program in several ways:

1. Our funding levels are uncertain from year to year
2. The Board and Weed District staff have spent valuable time and money preparing alternate budgets and programs
3. This crisis planning occurs in April and May when we should be attacking weeds
4. This hinders responsible long range planning, and
5. Jeopardizes our ability to meet the spirit and letter of the County Noxious Weed Control Act.

### **Why we support HB 549**

We believe that the proposed changes will help to:

1. Stabilize our budget by:
  - a. Directing the County Commissioners to specifically fund the noxious weed program
  - b. Allowing that funds may come through the general fund, a mill levy or both mechanisms
  - c. Raising the mill levy ceiling to 5 mills
  - d. Specifying that the tax proceeds from a levy be used solely for the weed program
2. Ensure and increase the quality of the weed control program by:
  - a. Requiring the Board to employ a full-time supervisor for the weed program
  - b. Providing for adequate training of the Supervisor

On behalf of the Lewis & Clark County Weed Board thank you for your consideration and support of HB549. If you have any questions, please call me.

Pam Hackley, Chair, Lewis & Clark County Weed Board

**HEADWATERS**  
Resource, Conservation and Development Area, Inc.  
305 W. Mercury, Suite 211  
Butte, Montana 59701  
(406) 782-7333 • FAX # 782-9675

EXHIBIT 8  
DATE 2-8-91  
HB 549

February 6, 1991

TO: Chairperson Nelson and members of the House Agriculture Committee.

RE: HB 549, Representative Grady: A Bill for generally revising the County Weed Management Act.

**TO THE RECORD**

My name is Neil O. Peterson. I am the Chairman for the Headwaters RC&D Range Weed Committee of Southwest Montana.

The Range Weed Committee wishes to go on record in support of HB 549.

HB 549 amends and improves the already excellent 1985 Montana County Noxious Weed Management Act. There is no question that there will be counties in Montana that will find it hard, financially, to employ a full time supervisor and meet training objectives in the near future. But, the name of the game is compromise and those counties working with the Department of Agriculture should find a pathway for meeting the intent of HB 549.

My interpretation of the intentions of HB 549 is to provide targets. It then becomes the responsibility of the County Weed Boards to establish the means to reach such targets.

I believe HB 549 does provide the emphasis, to the County's Boards of Commissioners and Weed Boards, that noxious weeds are a serious problem to all residents of the state. The 1985 Noxious Weed Act is an excellent and workable act, but improvement and new direction is always required to keep pace with continuing changes occurring in any resource program.

Weed Management is really a facet of land and resource management. The days of just spraying road right-of-ways is behind us. Today's weed fighters must be cognizant of weed prevention; weed early detection; weed suppression tools; chemical; biological and cultural; monitoring after treatment; public relation/awareness; groundwater protection and other resource activities.



HB 549  
Page 2.

Weed management, to be successful and beneficial, must be dynamic in its approaches to managing the noxious weed situation. Weed management has and needs to continue to be aggressive in all activities pertaining to the weed/resource management program.

HB 549 is an effort for the continuing need of improving the professionalism of weed management. I would hope that all future legislative sessions will keep its awareness of weed management and the need for dynamic improvements. Montana is and needs to continue to be a leader in the program of weed management.

I ask the committee to consider and give HB 549 a positive reading.

Thank you.

**HEADWATERS**  
Resource, Conservation and Development Area, Inc.  
305 W. Mercury, Suite 211  
Butte, Montana 59701  
(406) 782-7333 • FAX # 782-9675

EXHIBIT 9  
DATE 2-8-91  
HB 549

February 7, 1991

Representative Ed Grady  
House of Representatives  
Capitol Station  
Helena, MT 59602

Dear Representative Grady,

The Headwaters RC&D Area, Inc., of Butte, MT, is voting for  
HB549 to revise county weed control laws.

The Headwaters is in full support of this bill.

Sincerely,

  
Charles Hahnkamp, Chairman  
Headwaters RC&D Area, Inc.

EXHIBIT 10  
DATE 2-8-91  
HB 549

BEAVERHEAD  
*County Commissioners*



Dillon, Montana

February 8, 1991

The Honorable Edward Grady  
House of Representatives  
Helena, MT 59620

Dear Mr. Grady:

The Beaverhead County Commissioners are in full support of House Bill 549. If we can be of any help in getting this bill passed, to not hesitate to call us.

Sincerely,



David I. Moss  
Chairman  
Beaverhead County Commissioners

:pk

EXHIBIT 11  
DATE 2-8-91  
HB 549

Amendments to House Bill No. 549  
First Reading Copy

For the Committee on Agriculture, Livestock, and Irrigation

Prepared by Connie Erickson  
February 21, 1991

1. Page 5, line 16.  
Strike: "shall"  
Insert: "may"

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
VISITOR'S REGISTER

1 of 2

Agriculture COMMITTEE BILL NO. 549  
DATE 2-8-91 SPONSOR(S) Rep Bradley  
PLEASE PRINT PLEASE PRINT PLEASE PRINT

NAME AND ADDRESS	REPRESENTING	SUPPORT	OPPOSE
Dave Piclett 610 Greenacres Butte	Butte Weed Board	X	
Neil R. Peterson Sheridan,	Headwaters R.C. & D Madison Co.	X	
DALE HANKINS Box 454 FORT BENTON	CHOUTEAU CO. WEED DIST.	X	
ANN RAUSER 102 RAUSER LN. TOSTON	BROADWATER Co. " "	X	
Pam Hackley 1343 Beaverhead Helena	Lewis & Clark Co Weed Board	X	
Joni Bangorner 1523 Hansen Helena	AERO	X	
Reeves Petroff Room 304 COURTHOUSE BOZEMAN	GALLATIN County weed DIST	X	
Celestine Lacey	Weed Mgt. Ser	X	
Brian McNitt	MEIC	X	
Joni Gordon	Montana Weed Control	X	
David Bunch	MT Weed Control Assoc.	X	
Lorraine Gillis	Int Farm Bureau	X	
Long Johnson	Cascade Co. Weed + Mosquito Mgmt.	X	
Charles Hahnke	Headwaters R.C. & D	X	

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED TESTIMONY WITH SECRETARY. WITNESS STATEMENT FORMS  
ARE AVAILABLE IF YOU CARE TO SUBMIT WRITTEN TESTIMONY.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
VISITOR'S REGISTER

2 of 2

AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE BILL NO. 549  
DATE 2-8-91 SPONSOR(S) REP GRADY

PLEASE PRINT

PLEASE PRINT

PLEASE PRINT

NAME AND ADDRESS	REPRESENTING	SUPPORT	OPPOSE
Janet Ellis	MT Audubon	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Bob Stephens	MT. Grain Growers Exp	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Gordon Morris	MA Co		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED TESTIMONY WITH SECRETARY. WITNESS STATEMENT FORMS  
ARE AVAILABLE IF YOU CARE TO SUBMIT WRITTEN TESTIMONY.