

MINUTES

MONTANA SENATE 55th LEGISLATURE - REGULAR SESSION

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH, WELFARE, & SAFETY

Call to Order: By CHAIRMAN STEVE BENEDICT, on February 17, 1997,
at 3:29 PM, in Room 410.

ROLL CALL

Members Present:

Sen. Steve Benedict, Chairman (R)
Sen. James H. "Jim" Burnett, Vice Chairman (R)
Sen. Larry L. Baer (R)
Sen. Chris Christiaens (D)
Sen. Bob DePratu (R)
Sen. Dorothy Eck (D)
Sen. Sharon Estrada (R)
Sen. Eve Franklin (D)
Sen. Fred Thomas (R)

Members Excused: None

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Susan Fox, Legislative Services Division
Karolyn Simpson, Committee Secretary

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

Committee Business Summary:

Hearing(s) & Date(s) Posted: SB 338, SB 331, 2/17/97
Executive Action: None

HEARING ON SB 338

Sponsor: SENATOR LORENTS GROSFIELD, SD 13, Big Timber

Proponents: Page Dringman, MT Ranch Vacation Assn.
Shelly Carkoccia, Sweet Grass Ranch
Barbara Van Cleve, MT Ranch Vacation Assn.
Tack Van Cleve, MT Ranch Vacation Assn.
Julie Childs, MT Ranch Vacation Assn.
Stewart Doggett, MT Innkeepers Assn.
Jean Johnson, MT Outfitters and Guides Assn.
Jack Rich, Seely Lake
Quinn Holzer, MT Stockgrowers Assn.
Sybil Branger, self

Opponents: Mary Belcher, Department of Health

Opening Statement by Sponsor:

SENATOR LORENTS GROSFIELD, SD 13, Big Timber, said SB 338 deals with some of the Department of Health regulations for certain kinds of businesses. There are guest ranches and outfitters and guides which are seasonal, short term facilities and have a problem conforming with regulations applying to large facilities. The purpose of this bill is to recognize the wide disparity in the types of establishments, particularly size, time of year in operation, and the ability of small establishments with a few employees and a limited operating season to conform with all the same standards for large year-round establishments. The intent of this bill is to provide a slightly different regulation structure for the small seasonal operations.

Proponents' Testimony:

Page Dringman, Montana Ranch Vacation Association, said they are group of mainly cattle ranches that operate year-round basis and have some tourism component. Some of these take in a few guests year-round and others are summer only as an added value to the regular ranch operation. The 1965 statute was introduced by the hotel and motel industry and the regulations were promulgated in the early 1980's. These regulations fail to mention outfitting and guides, guest ranches, dude ranches or anything of this kind. As a result, none of these facilities had any way of knowing they were supposed to acquire a public accommodations license to comply with the regulations. The requirements for the hotel and motel industry make compliance difficult for the small, seasonal, rural operation, especially for something like city sewer and water. When questioned about these regulations, the Department of Health sent her general guidelines for hotel and motels, tourist homes, retirement homes, and boarding houses, and indicated to her, they would be reasonable and could waive certain requirements for guest ranches and outfitters and guides. If these people are required to get a public accommodations license, first there should be notice given, then give them an opportunity to be involved in the process, help them figure out what regulations and rules are really necessary for those facilities and how to implement them. There has been no reported incidences of any problems of any guest ranch or bed and breakfast. The proponents of this bill will be testifying that, if we must comply with regulations, then let us be included in the rule-making process.

Shelly Carkoccia, Sweet Grass Ranch, said they have a working cattle ranch and take in guests, and have been doing this for more than 30 years. Diversification and added value are a necessity for the small family ranch operation, if the ranch is to stay in the family. The State of Montana encourages people in agriculture to get involved in tourism by taking guests or hunters, but now the State wants to impose excessive regulations on them before they even get started in tourism. The cost of compliance is high, especially for those who are just getting started in the industry. The State is trying to fix a problem that doesn't exist and there have been no known problems or

complaints in health and sanitation of these facilities. If a small family ranch must comply with State regulations, the atmosphere of being a part of a genuine ranch family, which is the attraction for guests, is lost. Compliance with public sewer and water regulations is not relevant to a ranch in a rural area. She doesn't see there is a problem and therefore doesn't see a need for the bureaucratic regulations, but if there is a need, the regulations need to be tailored to fit each family and/or operation.

Barbara Van Cleve, Lazy K Bar Ranch, Big Timber, requested the committee to compare the cost of land, taxes, machinery, fencing materials, and labor against the price they get for cattle. There is quite a difference and it's obvious how nearly impossible it is for small ranches to make a living. The State recognized this and has been urging small, family-owned ranches to share their lives by taking in guests to ride, hunt and fish. This would supplement the ranch income and bring money to the State of Montana. This bill could make it possible for small, family-owned ranches to stay in business. They have neither the time nor money to be subject to the same regulations for motels, hotels, and large resort ranches. These regulations aren't necessary for their type of operation.

Tack Van Cleve, President, Montana Ranch Vacation Association, said this association is composed of real operating ranches and farms that take in guests on a seasonal basis. (EXHIBIT 1 & 2)

Julie Childs, Lazy E L Ranch, Roscoe, said she is from a ranch that has been in the family for almost 100 years and have been taking guests for about six years. She agreed with previous testimony and said if there are too many regulations, they will be forced to quit taking guests and employing people as they do at present.

Stewart Doggett, Montana Innkeepers Association, said they want more information about SB 338, generally support the concept of SB 338 and do not think guest ranches should be exempt from public health regulations. Guest ranches are different from hotels and motels who invest millions of dollars to make their facilities safe for the public. They want to work with the guest ranch group on the bill and would like to help in rule-making process.

Jean Johnson, Montana Outfitters and Guides Association, said they support SB 338. They are an independent, diversified group and do not want another layer of regulation. To stay in business, it is difficult to just be an outfitter, but must add other types of services, such as a bed and breakfast and overnight accommodations at their facility. She said SB 338 will work for them the way it is, but has one amendment. (EXHIBIT 3) This amendment says, if an outfitter and guide is licensed under this bill and is licensed as a bed and breakfast under SB 118, there will be only one license.

Jack Rich, outfitter and guest ranch, Seely Lake, said Montana outfitters and guides are the most heavily regulated outfitting industry in the nation, and the last thing they want are more regulations. But they do see the need for some health standards that could bring them into the loop with guest ranches and other public facilities. Guests come to them because they want an outdoor adventure, referred to as the western mystique. If they have to comply with the same regulations as motels, hotels, and restaurants, much of the atmosphere or mystique would be lost. A negotiated process and recognizes the rustic nature of some of the facilities is the cornerstone of this legislation, and without it they would have a difficult time supporting it.

Quinn Holzer, Montana Stockgrowers Association, said they support SB 338. As more and more of their membership is diversifying to things like outfitting and bed and breakfasts to keep their small ranches, the Montana Stockgrowers Association supports this bill.

Sybil Branger, self, outfitter, said because of the restrictions in the outfitting business, they have converted to being a summer ranch business, taking in small family units. She is in favor of this bill.

Opponents' Testimony:

Mary Belcher, Staff Attorney, Department of Public Health and Human Services, said the Department has concerns about SB 338 and thinks minimum rules are required to maintain public health and safety. They want to work with the sponsor, **SENATOR GROSFIELD**, to amend the bill so all parties are satisfied. The way certain facilities have been defined provides disparate treatment between those facilities and other facilities that have a limited number of guests on a yearly or seasonal basis. There are hotels and motels that do not offer the experience of a guest ranch or outfitting guide, but don't necessarily serve more than 20 people per day, based on the definition of a seasonal establishment. There are facilities that will complain that guest ranches and outfitters are getting preferential treatment. She is also concerned the bill proposes a 2-year license for outfitting guides and guest ranches. Current statutes provide for 1 year license and she doesn't think there should be exceptions made. They are also concerned about over-regulation but if the Department is restricted, they couldn't protect public health.
(EXHIBIT 4)

Questions From Committee Members and Responses:

SENATOR SHARON ESTRADA said she is confused because some of the proponents didn't sound like proponents and asked why this bill is being presented.

SENATOR GROSFIELD said they are trying to set up another tier or way of regulating those people appearing as proponents. The law has been on the books for years but has not been enforced and these people didn't know about it. The Department is getting around to regulating them now. Outfitters and guides, and guest

ranches are different type of facilities from hotels and motels. These people aren't saying, don't regulate us at all, but eliminate us from the bill. They recognize there may be a public need to regulate some areas and page 3, lines 25-28, lists these areas that may be legitimate, such as safe drinking water, adequate water supply, adequate and sanitary sewage system, refuse, food safety, etc. Because their industry is composed of small, seasonal establishments, the regulations for hotels and motels do not fit them and they want to negotiate rule making for rules that would fit their industry.

SENATOR ESTRADA asked if the Department wants to regulate those who don't have licenses, and for them to keep operating, the proponents have come to a consensus and said this is the way we want to do it.

SENATOR GROSFIELD said yes.

CHAIRMAN STEVE BENEDICT asked if the proponents are reluctant proponents to SB 338 and asked them if they realize the reluctance they have shown before the committee may create some doubts whether this bill should be passed, and if this bill is not passed, they will come under the public accommodations law and probably be out of business.

Page Dringman said they are reluctant proponents because some of them question why they should be regulated because, if there isn't a problem, why fix it? So, some of them are very reluctant to be regulated because there have been no historical problems but most do recognize there may be valid health concerns and would rather have some say in determining those regulations.

SENATOR CHRISTIAENS referred to page 3, lines 7 and 9, seasonal establishments serving 40 people or less at one time, and thinks that would be a hotel/motel type of operation, but 24 people or less would probably be a small establishment. He said those people testifying probably are in the 24 or less category, then asked about the rationale of the two numbers on the bill.

Page Dringman said the numbers came from varying size of the operations. Many hotels and motels take many more people and some guest ranches that take in 70 to 100 people. The intent was, not to leave a lot of people out, but to leave out those that are clearly so big they should have to comply with the hotel and motel regulations. The regulations should be based on size of the operation.

SENATOR CHRISTIAENS asked if there could be exemptions for those small ranches who take in only a few people, because most of them are not set up to be taking care of large numbers of people at one time. If they are using their bunk house or lake cabin, and that is what most of these people are doing, and to bring them under these regulations is not appropriate. He asked, since this

law has been on the books for a long time, what has the Department been doing.

Mary Belcher said there has not been uniform enforcement of licensing requirements for guest ranches and outfitters and guide facilities. There is 100% compliance in some counties where they license all of the guest ranches and outfitting guides, but in other counties the licensing requirement has not been enforced. Now, the Department is making efforts to notify those facilities they feel should be licensed under the statute.

SENATOR CHRISTIAENS said this seems to be the same thing that is going on with the bed and breakfast issues, that one county does it one way and every other county does it another way. It would make better sense for the Department to become standardized and get its act together before trying to regulate others.

Mary Belcher said there should be uniform applicability of the statutes and the Department is making efforts to insure laws are applied uniformly.

SENATOR EVE FRANKLIN asked **Page Dringman** about the letter her grandmother had received and wondered how the Department found her, and if other guest ranches in that area are regulated.

Page Dringman said it was in Sweet Grass County. She had talked with guest ranches in Park and Stillwater Counties, and other places, and none of them had any knowledge of this law. She agrees, enforcement has been very sporadic and possibly has been focused on Gallatin or areas of the Flathead.

SENATOR FRANKLIN said she had worked as a kitchen worker at a large guest ranch and they did have regulations.

SENATOR LARRY BAER asked **Page Dringman** why they want to do this, and if they are here to subject themselves to the regulatory bureaucracy because of fear, that if they don't, things could be even worse.

Page Dringman said yes that is probably the case because it is better for these people to be involved in crafting rules that are tailored to fit their facilities and what they do, rather than allow the Health Department to impose regulations on them, then they would have to go to court to fight.

SENATOR BAER asked why not ask for exemptions, for the type of organizations these people represent, from the regulatory authority that is not intended to cover such small operations.

Page Dringman said they thought about asking for exemptions, and there is a wide variety of guest ranches, some of whom only take four people at one time and others take 25 people during three months of the year. In talking with the Department of Health, they were reluctant to consider any exemptions, the premise

being, they are taking in the public and there are public health concerns that need to be addressed. The people she represents decided, because they do take in the public, then let's have regulations that make sense.

{Tape: 1; Side: B; Approx. Time Count: 4:15 PM}

SENATOR BAER asked **Page Dringman** if she feared this Legislature would be reluctant to exempt these groups from this regulation, if she were to ask for it.

Page Dringman said she didn't know what this Legislature would do, but would be agreeable to working with **SENATOR GROSFIELD** to exempt them.

SENATOR ESTRADA asked if the two bills, heard in the Public Health Committee, one that regulates swimming pools and the other regulates food establishments, would apply to guest ranches.

CHAIRMAN BENEDICT said those were for public accommodations but this bill is creating another class for health regulations.

SENATOR ESTRADA said we can't put both on here and both are for public accommodations.

CHAIRMAN BENEDICT said they are asking for different public accommodations laws.

Mary Belcher said the swimming pool bill would apply to any swimming pool except those owned by the state or any political subdivision of the state, but if an outfitter or guest ranch had a swimming pool, that would be regulated. There are separate safety concerns with those kinds of entities as opposed to public accommodations.

SENATOR ESTRADA asked if the restaurant inspection bill would apply to guest ranches.

Mary Belcher said it would apply to any facility that met the definition of a food establishments, but in this case, they hope to adopt rules to fit the needs of the bed and breakfasts because they may need lesser regulations for food service, and think that may also apply to certain types of guest ranches or seasonal facilities.

SENATOR ESTRADA asked **Page Dringman** if she understands if SB 338 is passed, you are not just getting these rules and regulations, but you're getting a bunch of rules and regulations that apply.

CHAIRMAN BENEDICT said that is not the way he interprets it. If they fall into a category with commercial application for restaurants then that law would apply. This bill gives them a little flexibility to operate without getting into public health laws that affect restaurants.

Page Dringman said that is her understanding, also. She had talked with **Kathleen Martin** about the food service establishment bill because there might be something that should be addressed in this bill or should oppose. **Kathleen Martin** said if they serve only food to just over-night guests, the facility doesn't fit the definition of food service establishment and those regulations would not apply.

SENATOR CHRISTIAENS asked **Susan Fox** to do some research on this issue. It is alright to serve meals to overnight guests, but if they do a chuck wagon dinner where other people are invited to attend, that would fall under the broader scope. If they have guests who pay a meal, then they will fall under the broader definition and will need commercial kitchens. This is the same thing they had in mind for bed and breakfasts and that is the reason he opposed that bill.

CHAIRMAN BENEDICT said the committee won't take executive action for a few days, and by that time, some of the people attending this hearing can get together and see that those concerns are addressed.

Closing by Sponsor:

SENATOR LORENTS GROSFIELD said if the bill is killed, the guest ranches would come under all of the motel/hotel accommodation rules, but if the bill is passed, they would be involved in negotiated rule-making with the Department, and would be somewhat limited from the hotel/motel rules. This negotiated rule-making would be limited to those four items on page 3 and is not wide-open rule making covering all aspects of their businesses.

HEARING ON SB 331

Sponsor: **SENATOR FRED THOMAS, SD 31, Stevensville**

Proponents: **Wayne Dunn, Benefits Health Care**
Jim Oliver, Kalispell Regional Hospital
Keith Colbo, Deaconess Hospital, Billings
Dave Etchart, St. Peters Hospital
Dick Brown, MT Hospital Assn.
Bob Olson, MT Hospital Assn.
Nancy Butler, State Fund

Opponents: **George Wood, MT Self Insurers Assn.**
Don Allen, Coalition for Workmans Comp Improvement

Opening Statement by Sponsor:

SENATOR FRED THOMAS, SD 31, Stevensville, said SB 331 revises the Workers Compensation payments to hospitals. Workers Compensation first started regulating payments made to the doctors, chiropractors, paramedical services in 1985, and a schedule of fees was developed which set payments equal to 90% of the usual and customary fee for professionals. Then, in 1987, the statute was amended to set rates for hospital payments and froze those

rates for two years. Then, in 1989, the payment freeze was extended for another two years to provide temporary relief from insurance payers from raising health insurance costs. In 1991, the payments to hospitals were allowed to go up as wages went up. The statute was amended in 1993, at the request of the payers, to create a DRG payment system for in-patient hospital care. This was part of managed care for Workers Comp case loads, which has not been taken advantage of, to this point. The Department of Labor has not created a DRG payment system, at this point. At present, hospitals are being paid 66% of their expenses for injured workers. The temporary relief, sought in 1987, has grown to an annual subsidy of \$12 million to the insurers. Hospitals want a fair and reasonable payment system to reimburse for care provided. This bill limits growth of the subsidy provided to payers or insurers (top page 3). Beginning in July 1, 1997, each hospital will be paid at the rate 69% of normal charges. This change does not affect everyone, but does provide some relief to some hospitals who are receiving the lowest payments. (EXHIBIT 5) This payment relief will last for just one year. Page 3, line 5, one year later, if hospitals control their charges, the rate will increase based on the state's average weekly wage, but if hospitals do not control their charges, the payment rate will fall to below the 69%. Payments would be based on a fee schedule and each hospital would be paid the same for each specific service.

Proponents' Testimony:

Wayne Dunn, Chief Financial Officer, Benefits Health Care, Great Falls, said they support SB 331. Workers Comp is changing the same way as health care is changing and managed care is becoming more common. Hospitals are acting more business-like and, like other businesses, they don't sell a product for less than their cost. Presently, the Workers Compensation payment rates are at or below the hospital's costs of providing care. This bill is a temporary fix, putting a floor on payment levels to hospitals. Physicians are questioning whether they want to participate in providing care for workers under Workers Compensation because they consider the reimbursement levels too low. At Benefits Health Care, they are paid about 69% of their charges, and with the recent price decreases they implemented, they would have nothing to gain from the passage of this bill, at least in the short run. Their real concern is for the way the whole service of Workers Comp is going to be delivered if the present trend continues. The key to decreasing Workers Comp is not in the discounting of the health care service, because one-third of the cost is medical and two-thirds is lost wages and indemnity kinds of things. The solution to cost control is medical because the objective is to get that person back to work. There needs to be management of the medical care to get people back to work quicker. That is a partnership concept with the provider communities working with Workers Comp and the Department to maximize savings through partnership. (EXHIBIT 6)

Jim Oliver, Administrator, Kalispell Regional Hospital, said last year they took care of 175 in-patients and there were 3,258 out-patient visits, with some of these people coming back several times. The charges were \$3,101,000.00 and the hospital received \$1,747,000.00, which was \$1,353,000.00 less than their actual costs for services provided. An example of the charges for two recent lumbar fusion surgeries were \$35,024.00 and the hospital's reimbursement was \$19,500.00, and for the other, \$26,262.90 with they received \$15,000.00. reimbursement. This bill sets the payment floor at 69% but even with that amount, hospitals will not break even.

Keith Colbo, Deaconess Hospital, Billings, made a statement in support of SB 331. (EXHIBIT 7)

Dave Etchart, Chief Financial Officer, St. Peters Hospital, said they have re-directed their emphasis to serve out-patients. In 1992, 38% of their business was out-patient services, and in 1997, 53% business is from out-patient services. Consequently, the number of Workers Comp patients increased. St. Peters Hospital would have something to gain by the passage of this bill because their reimbursement rate is 55-56%, which well below 69%. Over the years, St. Peters Hospital has subsidized other programs such as hemodialysis, psychiatric programs, heart caths, and ambulance services. Other hospitals in the state, Bozeman for example who has none of those services, is being paid at the rate of 82%. The 55% payment level to St. Peters does not even equal their cost, and, as a business, this is something they must look at. Like Medicare and Medicaid, everyone needs to pay their fair share of the bills.

Dick Brown, Senior Vice President, Montana Hospital Association, and Administrator for Workers Compensation Trust, testified in support of SB 331. (EXHIBIT 8)

Bob Olson, Montana Hospital Association, said the report from Prospective Payment Advisory Council lists nation-wide hospital private payer payments for 1994. (EXHIBIT 9) It is the estimate of cost that private paying patients must pay to make up for the discounts that Medicare, Medicaid, and insurers like Workmans Comp are allowed under the law. The number for Montana is 142%, which means that someone who pays for their own care or an employer who pays for health insurance, is paying 142% for the actual cost of their care. SB 331 is the latest effort in Workers Comp to bring below charge payers forward and, hopefully, control hospital costs, with the benefit to employers and people who pay for their own health care. There has been an attempt to develop a rational method to pay hospitals, but has not been done. What has been done is, payers can discount the charges, but it really doesn't get at utilization, but instead increases utilization. As a hospital provides services, and they know they are going to be reimbursed a fraction of their cost, there is an incentive to do more. Referring to exhibit 5, he said there is disparate treatment hospitals receive from Workers Comp insurers. Every

hospital receives a different percentage of their charges and there is no consistent method to make sure hospitals are treated approximately the same for the treatment of injured workers. The desire is to provide relief to those hospitals who have fared the worst. He is asking for time to work with the payers on a fee schedule for services, and because most of the dollars are in out-patient care, they believe it is best to work on those charges first and everyone would be paid about the same amount for the same service in any hospital, in any area in Montana.

Nancy Butler, State Fund, said they insure about 25,000 employers in the state. They are a cautious supporter of SB 331. The intent of this bill is to look at hospitals who are using usual and customary rates which are being discounted below 69%. They will be raised one time to 69%. In the future, if a hospital raises their rates more than the average weekly wage, they have the potential of dropping below 69% but will never go up more than the State's average weekly wage. Their concerns are when the employers come in, the cost of this one-time raise will be approximately \$949,000.00 on State Fund employers alone, and will be built into future rates, which is a 1.4% impact on overall rates.

{Tape: 2; Side: A; Approx. Time Count: 5:08 PM}

Opponents' Testimony:

George Wood, Executive Secretary, Montana Self Insurers

Association, said the association opposes SB 331. Hospital costs will increase as a result of this bill. The figures stated that medical costs are one-third of their total costs is not true. The amount is about 50% and are about 50-50 between comp and medical. Comp is limited by the amount of the weekly wage. Montana Self-Insurers Association is not an insurance company but are the employers in Montana, with a payroll over \$1 billion, have about 77,000 employees. Their cost of Workers Compensation is about \$25 million per year. Referring to page 3, line 1, provides insurers costs will be the greater of 69% of hospitals' usual and customary costs. Discount rates doesn't apply to costs because they don't know what they are, but they are applied to the usual and customary rates. He said, after listening to the proponents, he is puzzled at to who pays the usual and customary rates, Medicare, Medicaid doesn't, and we have heard the possibility that managed care won't. He doesn't know what the rate is, except the rate from which discounts are applied. The discount would affect 20 of the 47 hospitals listed, that is, about 20 are below the 69% and the remaining are above. Each hospital has its own rate structure and will increase based on it, with the usual and customary rates varying between hospitals. The larger hospitals are the ones who will benefit the most from passage of this bill because they do most of the work in treatment of traumatic injuries requiring in-patient care. In this bill, 69% is the floor, and anyone below 69% stays at that rate, and anyone above 69% would have theirs increased by the amount of the increase in the average weekly wage. The present floor in the law says, the

rates paid to hospitals, for Workers Compensation, cannot be less than that paid for Medicaid. For self-insurers, cost is brought into play by a hospital bill, not by a rate structure.

Don Allen, representing Coalition for Workmans Comp System Improvement, said in 1993 some employers were unhappy trying to compete with businesses in other states because it was not a level playing field. One of the goals was to have the private sector come back in and have a State Fund run an efficient Work Comp system. He said they have made progress but the impact of this legislation will be \$949,000.00 to the State Fund, which is only 1/4% but, where does it stop. The State Fund is a barometer of what's going on in the rest of the state, as far as Work Comp coverage goes.

Questions From Committee Members and Responses:

SENATOR SHARON ESTRADA said she wanted to assure everyone that she is going to take her work home, and visit with the lobbyists about this bill.

SENATOR DOROTHY ECK said when executive action on this bill, it would be helpful to have a simple rundown of what it is.

Closing by Sponsor:

SENATOR FRED THOMAS said a lot of people would be surprised there is a law freezing the amount paid to hospitals for services of Workers Compensation. He is wondering if this is adding to the problem created by the federal government with Medicare and Medicaid. The answer is yes, and we are just a small piece of the problem. If hospital costs are not paid there is a cost shift to the working, insurance-paying public. When Work Comp was in trouble, reimbursements were frozen, then extended, then the wage adjustment was put into law to try to control costs in Workers Compensation. But, things are better now because of difference in the administration of the State Fund, State laws, and the right thing to do now is to scale back those controls and Workers Comp should pay their own way. This bill calls for a fee schedule to be developed for services, applicable to all hospitals in Montana, rather than rates based customary and usual fees.

ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment: 5:27 PM



SEN. STEVE BENEDICT, Chairman



KAROLYN SIMPSON, Secretary

SB/ks