

MINUTES

MONTANA SENATE
55th LEGISLATURE - REGULAR SESSION

COMMITTEE ON BUSINESS & INDUSTRY

Call to Order: By CHAIRMAN JOHN HERTEL, on January 29, 1997, at
9:00 A.M., in ROOM 410.

ROLL CALL

Members Present:

Sen. John R. Hertel, Chairman (R)
Sen. Steve Benedict, Vice Chairman (R)
Sen. Debbie Bowman Shea (D)
Sen. William S. Crismore (R)
Sen. C.A. Casey Emerson (R)
Sen. Bea McCarthy (D)

Members Excused: None

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Bart Campbell, Legislative Services Division
Mary Gay Wells, Committee Secretary

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

Committee Business Summary:

Hearing(s) & Date(s) Posted: SB 169; SB 181; HB 16; 1/20/97
Executive Action: SB 113; SB 118; HB 16
SB 111 & SB 112 TABLED

HEARING ON SB 181

{Tape: 1; Side: A; Approx. Time Count: 9:03 AM; Comments: N/A.}

Sponsor: SENATOR DONALD HARGROVE, SD 16, BOZEMAN

Proponents: Mike Garrity, Attorney, Bozeman, West Yellowstone
Tavern Owners
Harry W. Klock, President, MT Tavern Assoc.
Bill Howell, West Yellowstone Conference Hotel
Clyde Seeley, Three Bear Lodge
Chuck Bostrom, Superintendent of School District
69, West Yellowstone, MT
Timothy Daley, citizen
Glenn Lumis, Mayor, West Yellowstone

David Owen, MT Chamber of Commerce
Mike Schulz, MT Innkeepers Assoc.
Jack Strozzi, West Yellowstone
Keith Colbo, MT Tourism Coalition
Veretta Steele, West Yellowstone

Opponents: Pat Donovan, Whitefish, MT Capital Partners, Inc.

Opening Statement by Sponsor:

SENATOR DONALD HARGROVE, SD 16, BOZEMAN. The sponsor told the committee the history and title of the bill was self-explanatory. In the 1970's when the Big Sky was being developed by Chet Huntley and the Chrysler Corporation, there was a need to have liquor and all-beverage licenses in that rural area, which did not have the populations for quotas. In Montana Code 16-4-202, current law states the intent and purpose of the resort licensing to encourage the growth of quality recreational resort facilities in undeveloped areas of the state. The law requested a current actual evaluation of resort and recreational facilities including land improvements thereon of not less than \$500,000, at least half of which valuation must be for a structure within the resort area. He stated current house valuations are above the \$250,000 on an average. The law also said the beverage license not be subject to the quota limitations set forth in 16-4-201. Further, the Department of Revenue had within its authority to develop some rules, which said the resort area, as determined by the Department, included establishments whose business and operations were designed to attract and accommodate visitors to a recreational development, whose primary purpose was not the sale of alcoholic beverages. Clearly, he said, they were thinking of ski resorts, pool halls and bowling alleys. A resort area means a site in Montana consisting of 15 or more contiguous acres where recreational development is located. Another definition said the resort area must have restaurant accommodations with seating capacity with tables for at least 100 persons. An applicant seeking an all-beverage license for an establishment serving only alcoholic beverages must have seating capacity for 30. The law, based on history and definition, he said, clearly had the intent of being in undeveloped areas. There were compelling reasons for the body to look at the whole basis of quotas and liquor licensing with gambling. As a bare minimum, it was the intent of licenses in undeveloped areas to be within city limits. There were some in the state, he stated, with some applications pending, which would not be affected by this bill. A resort area, for these purposes, may not include land or improvements lying within the corporate boundaries of an incorporated city or town. He said it was a way around the quota system.

Proponents' Testimony: Mike Garrity, attorney, Bozeman, West Yellowstone Tavern Owners. (EXHIBIT 1)

Harry W. Klock, President, Montana Tavern Association. (EXHIBIT 2)

Bill Howell, West Yellowstone Conference Hotel. (EXHIBIT 3)

Clyde G. Seeley, Three Bear Lodge. (EXHIBIT 4)

Chuck Bostrom, Superintendent of School District 69, West Yellowstone, Montana. He spoke for the school children in his district, saying more sites would be available for alcohol access, hence, alcohol abuses. Assessed valuation of property skyrocketed in Deadwood, S.D., increasing local school revenues; however, special education went from 20 to 40. Local people had been forced to 2-3 families per house. There were more negative aspects to the student if the bill were not passed.

Timothy Daley, represented himself. He supported the bill, which clarified the statutory provisions relating to the establishment of designated resort areas within which, all-beverage licenses may be issued. He called attention to paragraph 1 of Section 16-4-2-2, which encourages the growth of quality recreational facilities in undeveloped areas of the state. The Dept. of Revenue had taken the position since 16-4-202 did not define undeveloped areas of the state, and had no prohibition to the resort being located within the boundaries of an incorporated city or town. He said the logic was faulty in that unoccupied was not necessarily undeveloped. An attempt was underway for a resort to be located complete within the corporate limits. No limits would be imposed on how many liquor licenses of this type would be allowed because the resort area would not be subject to the quota system, which in itself, might be endangered. He encouraged support of the bill and the quota system.

Glenn Lumis, Mayor of West Yellowstone, spoke for himself. He said the town had been asked to annex additional land into the city limits which included zoning, covenant, plan procedures and other safeguards, ensuring beneficial development. Suddenly a cloud of all-beverage licenses available to a resort community in an undeveloped area came to them and upset their prior plans if granted. He felt that impacts on schools, police departments, sewer and water systems were unreasonable. Advance planning would become unrealistic.

David Owen, Montana Chamber of Commerce, asked the committee to reverse the question in deliberation: Would you pass a bill that would construct the opportunity that has been discovered? or Would you approve a bill which would allow resorts to be defined within city limits? He stated if the Committee would not do such a thing as an intentional act, SB 181 would give an opportunity to not allow it as an unintentional act and they would support that.

Mike Schulz, Montana Innkeepers Association, said they supported SB 181 in theory; however, there needed to be a clarification of

the meaning, "resort area." He urged the Committee to take a broader view than SB 181 suggested -- resort area designations should be reserved for a true resort development, not just an attraction. Montana Innkeepers Association urged the adoption of stringent requirements which clearly defined a resort area as a minimum of 100 acres for recreation under the ownership of one person or entity. **Mr. Schulz** also said the current minimum actual valuation for the facilities, land and improvements should be raised from a minimum of \$500,000 to \$5 to 10 million, adding resort areas should be of the magnitude to generate economic bases in and of themselves, and not be merely added attractions. He urged support for SB 181.

Jack Strozzi, West Yellowstone, expressed support for SB 181 for all the reasons already stated. (EXHIBIT 5)

Keith Colbo, Montana Tourism Coalition, said they stood in support of SB 181.

Veretta Steele, West Yellowstone, said she was a native Montanan and had invested her life's savings into her restaurant and bar business, so she felt strongly about the passing of SB 181. She said she did not like the idea of an out-of-state person(s) coming into her town to make a large development and put her out of business because of the acceleration of property values. She asked if Montana was the Last Best Place for outside developers, and would that make it necessary for native Montanans to leave the state. She used the example of Big Sky being overdeveloped, explaining a person who had moved to Montana was complaining because development took place due to the establishment of a resort liquor license. **Ms. Steele** urged DO PASS for SB 181.

The following Proponents left written testimony:

Mike Klostrich, representing himself (EXHIBIT 6)
Dixie Klostrich, representing herself (EXHIBIT 7)
Marcia Gray, Totem Restaurant & Lounge, West Yellowstone, (EXHIBIT 8)
Rene Brisbin, West Yellowstone, (EXHIBIT 9)
John Costello, West Yellowstone, (EXHIBIT 10)
Howard McCray, Two Top Motel, West Yellowstone (EXHIBIT 11)
Randy Roberson, West Yellowstone, (EXHIBIT 12)
Gayle Mansfield, West Yellowstone, (EXHIBIT 13)
Tim Whitman, representing himself (EXHIBIT 14)
Jerry Johnson, representing himself (EXHIBIT 15)
Maarten W. Schaap, West Yellowstone (EXHIBIT 16)
Pierre Martineau, West Yellowstone (EXHIBIT 17)
Joe Eagle, West Yellowstone (EXHIBIT 18)
Grey Bryan, Whitefish (EXHIBIT 19)

{Tape: 1; Side: A; Approx. Time Count: 9:43 a.m.; Comments: N/A.}

Opponents' Testimony:

Pat Donovan, Whitefish, Montana Capital Partners, Inc., said his company was formed to bring investment capital to Montana for quality developments and he was working as a local partner in the Iron Horse Golf Course Resort development in Whitefish. He said the property was between Whitefish and Big Mountain Ski Resort, i.e. partially in the city limits and partially outside. He said in 1991 local landowners formed a partnership to seek entitlement to develop the Resort and he anticipated the finished product to be among the finest quality developments in the Northwest. He said one of the key elements in the development was the acquiring of a resort liquor license under existing legislation. **Mr. Donovan** said the company had spent over \$4 million to date for design approval, road construction, golf course clearing and drainage control structures. He estimated the cost of infrastructure and golf course without any home construction to be about \$40 million, and cost of residential construction to be over \$150 million. He informed the Committee approval for this project had been granted by both the city of Whitefish and Flathead County with a number of conditions which were in direct conflict with SB 181, listing one being the condition of mandating that the project be annexed to the city of Whitefish upon completion of each phase of infrastructure. He explained it was in direct conflict with SB 181, Provision 2 (b). He outlined three direct benefits of the Resort being a part of Whitefish: (1) The appraised value of the property would be in excess of \$150 million which would result in an increase of the tax base for Whitefish of over \$500,000, with an additional \$1.4 million for schools; (2) The 1995 legislature enabled Whitefish to pass a 2% city resort tax and his Resort would pay this tax if it was located within the city limits; (3) By being within the city limits, the Resort had the opportunity to connect to the city sewer facilities which was crucial to maintaining the low impact, environmental friendly proposal they presented to the City Council. **Mr. Donovan** said the Resort was anticipated to have a golf club house with dining, pool with snack bar, small executive conference facility which would cater meals and perhaps two snack shacks on the golf course -- a potential of five liquor licenses, which could come with a price tag of \$2 million, if the licenses were available. **Mr. Donovan** summarized by saying the Resort was well down the road to construction, had committed to the city of Whitefish in reliance on existing legislation and had fully disclosed their plans to Whitefish which had been approved by the city. He said the passing of SB 181 could deal a serious economic blow to their project and he suggested if the Committee wanted to pass SB 181, it should be amended to contain language which would protect projects to bring exactly the kind of resort investment envisioned when the legislation was first acted in 1975.

{Tape: 1; Side: B; Approx. Time Count: 9:45 a.m.; Comments: N/A.}

Questions From Committee Members and Responses:

SEN. STEVE BENEDICT asked **Pat Donovan** if his group had applied for any liquor licenses and was told they had not because they had not yet arrived at the stages of development asked for in the applications. **Mr. Donovan** said the attorneys would be deciding what was appropriate and his company was going in for financing and did not want any complications. **SEN. BENEDICT** suggested it would be prudent to have an application in when lining up the financing because the savings clause in SB 181 would mitigate any problems because it was in progress. **Mr. Donovan** said their attorney advised it was okay if the application was complete in every way and was accepted. He said they were advised if the application was denied, reapplication could be very difficult; their concern was SB 181 placed a tremendous burden on them and a change in language could solve the same problem make it legal for them to have a resort liquor license. **SEN. BENEDICT** referred to New Section 2, Page 3, and asked if the savings clause would protect the developer represented by Pat Donovan if he even filed an application. **Gary Blewett, Administrator of Liquor Division, Department of Revenue**, said he believed it would, but supposed it would be arguable at what point the proceeding was in progress, explaining if the application was not completed, it would be returned as incomplete which would make it as though nothing had begun. **SEN. BENEDICT** commented "proceeding begun" did not sound as though the application had to be complete. **Mr. Blewett** still affirmed it was open to legal interpretation.

SEN. BEA MCCARTHY asked **Mike Schulz** if he had discussed his amendments with the sponsor, was told he had and they agreed it would be better to define what a resort was; however, they still felt a resort should not be within the city limits, though the Innkeepers Association thought it was more important to determine what a resort was than to decide whether it was inside the city limits.

SEN. MCCARTHY asked when the resort in Polson was given the license. **Pat Garrity** said the resort area was determined on February 7, 1992, and the license was issued May 29, (tape garbled)

SEN. CASEY EMERSON said it seemed to him if SB 181 passed, the land outside the city could be developed as a resort and then it would be taken into the city. **SEN. DON HARGROVE** said they could do that now, and added the question was fraught with loopholes. He suggested an interim study would be appropriate.

SEN. MCCARTHY said Whitefish declared itself a resort area in order to be able to use the sales tax within the community area and wondered why that did not carry over to the liquor license. **SEN. HARGROVE** said it was not the intent of the original law -- it was just for one purpose.

SEN. BENEDICT asked if language could be added to the savings clause, after " or proceedings that were begun before" which would be to the effect "an application for a liquor license, even if the application was returned as incomplete if the applicant reapplies". He explained it would designate something started in the process, even though returned, would be included. **Pat Donovan** said tweaking like that was what they wanted; it was discussed earlier but they wondered if it would be possible for others to tweak with it also. **SEN. BENEDICT** commented **Pat Donovan** was not so much an opponent of SB 181 as a proponent of "let us in first." **Mr. Donovan** said he was an opponent of something which would put them out of compliance with the law.

SEN. JOHN HERTEL asked **SEN. DON HARGROVE** if had visited with Mike Schulz regarding his amendments and was told there were so many possibilities, suggestions and questions that SB 181 should continue to be a simple, easily defined bill with no amendments other than to give an immediate effective date.

Closing by Sponsor:

SEN. HARGROVE said everything had been discussed and he felt the Committee clearly understood the intent of SB 181 and it was appropriate for consideration; however, our capitalistic system almost required people who were after dollars to try to circumvent the law. He asked a DO PASS for SB 181.

{Tape: 1; Side: B; Approx. Time Count: 10:14 a.m.; Comments: N/A}

HEARING ON HB 16

Sponsor: REP. ROBERT "BOB" PAVLOVICH, HD 37, Butte

Informational Testimony: Janet Jessup, Administrator, Gambling Control Division

Opening Statement by Sponsor:

REP. ROBERT "BOB" PAVLOVICH, HD 37, Butte, said HB 16 required licensure of a person selling sports tab games, which were used in place of a 100-square board and were really found only in the Butte and Anaconda area. He said in 1991, they were made legal and the manufacturers and license fee was \$50 and \$100, which was fine at the time. He said the original manufacturer quit and they could not find a replacement because the fee was \$1,500 and there was a tax collection. **REP. PAVLOVICH** said the \$1,500 manufacturers' fee had been eliminated so now the only requirement was to be a distributor in Montana and pay a \$100 fee for a distributors' fee. He said if HB 16 passed, they would contact Universal who would begin manufacturing again, but they would have to buy in large quantities. **REP. PAVLOVICH** said the only place they could be sold was in a place which had an all-beverage liquor license, and it was not an expansion of gambling.

Proponents' Testimony: None.

Opponents' Testimony: None.

Informational Testimony:

Janet Jessup, Administrator of Gambling Control Division, said she was here to answer questions.

Questions From Committee Members and Responses:

SEN. STEVE BENEDICT asked how the Gambling Control Division would regulate the tavern owners to ensure the paying of the tax. Janet Jessup said that currently the manufacturers had the responsibility of collecting the tax and paying it to them, and under HB 16, the distributor would have that responsibility.

SEN. BEA MCCARTHY asked if the tax was collected at the time of manufacture or use. Ms. Jessup said she was not sure and deferred to REP. PAVLOVICH who said it was at the time of sale to the tavern.

SEN. WILLIAM CRISMORE asked the limits of the winnings and REP. PAVLOVICH said it was \$5, explaining the tabs were sold for \$1, \$2.50 or \$5. He said over the Super Bowl weekend the \$5 tabs paid \$112.50 on a quarter, the \$2.00 tabs paid \$45 on the quarter and the \$2.50 tabs paid \$225.

Closing by Sponsor:

REP. ROBERT "BOB" PAVLOVICH said he would ask either SEN. DEBBIE SHEA or SEN. J. D. LYNCH to carry HB 16.

{Tape: 1; Side: B; Approx. Time Count: 10:24 a.m.; Comments: N/A}

HEARING ON SB 169

Sponsor: SEN. DARYL TOEWS, SD 48, Lustre

Proponents: None.

Opponents: A. Farrell Rose, Board of Real Estate Appraisers
Susanne Zanto, Montana Society for Clinical
Laboratory Science
Gloria Hermanson, Montana Psychological Association
Teresa Dougherty, Montana Dental Hygienists
Association
R. Perry Eshridge, Montana Department of Commerce
Jim Smith, Pharmaceutical Association

Opening Statement by Sponsor:

SEN. DARYL TOEWS, SD 48, Lustre, said SB 169 limited the number of yearly continuing ed hours and said an amendment had been

submitted to **Mr. Bart Campbell**. (EXHIBIT 19A). **SEN. TOEWS** said the bill should have said "medical professional" instead of "medical practitioner." He explained industry needed minimum regulations and continuing ed; however, as industries mature it became convenient to use regulatory agencies as a vehicle to expand their professional standards. **SEN. TOEWS** suggested increasing the number of continuing ed hours for seemingly no reason was a type of tax. He informed the Committee SB 169 limited the continuing ed hours to eight and it affected less than six agencies, but would probably be a baseline from which future agencies could work. He said he felt the real issue was the role of government -- was it regulatory or professional development, explaining the profession should hold up the standard.

Proponents' Testimony: None.

Opponents' Testimony:

A. Farrell Rose, Board of Real Estate Appraisers, read his written testimony. (EXHIBIT 20)

Susan Zanto, Montana Society for Clinical Laboratory Science, read her written testimony. (EXHIBIT 21)

Gloria Hermanson, Montana Psychological Association, said they opposed SB 169 for the same reasons stated by **Susan Zanto**. She said their current requirement was 20 hours, which was necessary to maintain the standards needed by the industry.

Teresa Dougherty, Montana Dental Hygienists Association, read her written testimony. (EXHIBIT 22)

R. Perry Eshridge, Department of Commerce, said he represented the following six boards: (1) Board of Clinical Laboratory Science Practitioners; (2) Board of Psychologists; (3) Board of Architects; (4) Board of Dentistry; (5) Board of Pharmacy; (6) Board of Nursing. All opposed SB 169 because they preferred to have the flexibility to determine the standard of continuing ed. **Mr. Eshridge** explained (EXHIBIT 23), saying it came from the Department of Commerce. He felt if there was a problem with the hours required for continuing ed, it would be better to address the issue through individual boards. He also distributed copies of a letter from **Donald Nordstrom, Board of Dentistry**. (EXHIBIT 24)

Jim Smith, Montana State Pharmaceutical Association, said the pharmacists felt they needed the current CEU requirement of 15 hours so was pleased **SEN. TOEWS** had amendments which would exempt them.

Questions From Committee Members and Responses:

SEN. CASEY EMERSON asked if it would be helpful if SB 169 addressed individual professions. SEN. TOEWS said the amendment in its original intent would exempt everyone except architects and appraisers. SEN. EMERSON commented continuing ed could be used to keep up with new information but was also used to cut down on the competition. SEN. TOEWS said he agreed.

SEN. JOHN HERTEL asked how many people in the Department were responsible for providing the required continuing ed for the different agencies. R. Perry Eshridge said it was not people from his Department but outside vendors who offered the courses and petitioned the Board for approval of the CEU.

{Tape: 2; Side: A; Approx. Time Count: 10:45 a.m.; Comments: Lost a minute or two when changing tapes.}

SEN. HERTEL asked how many FTE's were required to monitor the CEU and Mr. Eshridge said he did not know but might be able to get the answer.

SEN. CASEY EMERSON asked how many boards needed continuing education and R. Perry Eshridge estimated about 16 or 17. SEN. EMERSON commented there were more boards than that and Mr. Eshridge said there were currently 34 boards and 4 licensing programs.

SEN. HERTEL asked how many hours of education was necessary to become a licensed real estate appraiser. M. Farrell Rose said the number came from the Qualification Board of the Appraisal Foundation who presented the courses for training. SEN. HERTEL asked for explanation why 15 CEUs were required for a licensed appraiser -- was the industry changing that much. Mr. Rose said it was; the Appraisal Foundation was constantly changing the way appraisals were being done. He said there was also a Qualifications Standards course which dealt with the standards related to the industry. Mr. Rose said the number of CEUs was 15 every three years.

SEN. BEA MCCARTHY asked if prior to becoming a real estate appraiser, was it necessary to pass the test as real estate sales person. Mr. Rose said it was not; they were two totally different fields.

SEN. EMERSON commented federal regulations had caused changes and Mr. Rose agreed.

SEN. MCCARTHY asked how many appraisers were in Montana. Mr. Rose said 447 licensees.

SEN. EMERSON asked if there were different areas within the appraisal field. A. Farrell Rose said there were, and each area required different training.

SEN. HERTEL asked if the Montana Board of Real Estate Appraisers determined how much extra education an appraiser should get. **Mr. Rose** said the Appraisal Foundation had come out with their standard of 14 hours a year, or 45 hours over a three-year period; however, the Montana Appraisal Board made it an additional hour because a 15-hour standards course was required, and many of the courses were 30-hour courses.

SEN. STEVE BENEDICT asked clarification for his understanding the Montana Board adopted national standards, without which a person could not be recognized nationally as a certified appraiser. **Mr. Rose** said that was true.

Closing by Sponsor:

SEN. DARYL TOEWS said there were 24 departments which required continuing education, and the Appraiser's Association was a good example of how requirements for continuing education could grow. He said even if a person were a licensed appraiser, he or she would not have enough credentials to do all types of appraisals in Montana. He said they have adopted the higher national standard so they could go wherever they wanted to go, even cross state lines. **SEN. TOEWS** said the underlying question still was, "Is it the duty of Montana government to regulate industry, or is it the duty of the profession?" He maintained it was not the duty of the state of Montana.

{Tape: 2; Side: A; Approx. Time Count: 10:57 a.m.; Comments: N/A}

EXECUTIVE ACTION ON SB 111

Motion: **SEN. STEVE BENEDICT** MOVED DO PASS ON SB 111, WITH THE PROVISIO HE WOULD BE OFFERING TO TABLE SB 111 IN A LATER MOTION.

Discussion: **SEN. WILLIAM CRISMORE** asked for the latest information on SB 111. **SEN. BENEDICT** said they were trying to prevent the movement forward of many bills addressing basically the same issues, i.e. combine as many of the bills as possible into one bill. He said the Kennedy-Kassebaum Compliance Bill contained essentially the provisions in SB 111 and SB 112; therefore, he was asking the Committee's concurrence in tabling both bills.

Frank Cote said he had not been in contact with the sponsor of either bill. **SEN. BENEDICT** reminded the Committee both sponsors had been at the hearings when it was mentioned the bills came under the Kennedy-Kassebaum bill.

MOTION/VOTE: **SEN. STEVE BENEDICT** MOVED TO TABLE SB 111. Motion CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 6-0, WITH A ROLL CALL VOTE.

EXECUTIVE ACTION ON SB 112

Motion: **SEN. STEVE BENEDICT** MOVED DO PASS ON SB 112.

Motion/Vote: SEN. STEVE BENEDICT MOVED TO TABLE SB 112. Motion CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 6-0.

EXECUTIVE ACTION ON SB 113

Motion: SEN. BEA MCCARTHY MOVED DO PASS ON SB 113.

Amendments: SEN. BEA MCCARTHY MOVED DO PASS ON AMENDMENTS (EXHIBIT 25)

Discussion: SEN. MCCARTHY explained the amendments were offered by the Farmers Insurance Group.

SEN. BENEDICT said he also had visited with most of the insurers involved and all concurred on the amendments.

Vote: Motion DO PASS ON AMENDMENTS sb 011301.abc CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 6-0.

Motion/Vote: SEN. BEA MCCARTHY MOVED DO PASS ON SB 113 AS AMENDED. Motion CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 6-0.

EXECUTIVE ACTION ON SB 118

Motion: SEN. WILLIAM CRISMORE MOVED DO PASS ON SB 118.

Amendments: SEN. WILLIAM CRISMORE MOVED DO PASS ON AMENDMENTS (EXHIBIT 26)

Discussion: SEN. WILLIAM CRISMORE said all amendments except #5 & #11 were in the original.

Motion: Motion DO PASS ON AMENDMENTS CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 6-0.

Motion/Vote: SEN. WILLIAM CRISMORE MOVED DO PASS FOR SB 118 AS AMENDED. Motion CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 6-0.

EXECUTIVE ACTION ON HB 16

Motion/Vote: SEN. BEA MCCARTHY MOVED DO CONCUR FOR HB 16. Motion CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 6-0.

ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment: 11:15 A.M.



SEN: JOHN R. HERTEL, Chairman



MARY GAY WELLS, Secretary

JH/MGW