

MICROFILM DIVIDER

OMB/RECORDS MANAGEMENT DIVISION
SFN 2053 (2/85) 5M



ROLL NUMBER

DESCRIPTION

1430

2007 HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS

HB 1430

2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. HB 1430

House Appropriations Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: January 22, 2007

Recorder Job Number: 1529

Committee Clerk Signature

Minutes:

Rep. Berg: I believe that HB 1430 is another critical change in essence. Again if we look around the states, it is really trying to define the difference between ongoing spending and one time spending. What are those revenues that are coming in year after year and what are the revenues that are coming in for this biennium? In 2003 our whole budget increased \$75 million. What this committee is looking at is an increase larger than that for K-12, higher education, and human services. Those three agencies, each of them you are looking at an increase that was higher than all of the state government spending in 2003. The concern that I have is taking one time money and on going money and adding it to growing budgets. Then hitting a point that we did in 1987 where the revenue in the state was actually 6% lower than the prior biennium. What this bill really attempts to do is make it simple like an individual, family, and business would. It takes the one time money and sets it aside, put the ongoing revenue into ongoing expenses. When you invest that one time money make sure you are investing in areas where you are going to get a bang for your buck. In this budget, there are many one time expenditures laid out. One time revenue would be the dollars left at the end of a biennium. What this bill would attempt to do is say that at the end of a biennium we are showing a surplus of \$211 million. When we built the budgets in the 2007-2009, you are taking the new revenue forecast, the higher income, the higher sales, and they are all forecasted into

that biennium. The \$210 million, the money at the end of the biennium, is literally the one time, non reoccurring budget. What this would do is say we will take that money that is a one time investment and put it into a fund that is called a strategic one time investment. You as legislators, during the session, will look at how that money is spent. You will ask if this is truly a one time investment, is it something that is going to improve a service and not be in a reoccurring cost. Is it something that is going to lower the cost of government? Is it something that a one time investment will increase revenue to the state, and increase people's incomes? When I think about this I think it will do two things. As an appropriator you will separate those one time expenditures and ask those questions. Also I think it could be one of the most inspiring those to have creativity and innovation from legislators. All of a sudden you will see as legislators to think of ways to improve government with one time investment dollars and take them out of this fund. We will use those to improve government. That is the essence of the bill. I would also like to hand out an amendment to the bill. The original intention was to set this up as we go through the session. As I thought about this, since we've talked about this, it will say as we move into the future to look at this. If there is money left over at the end of the biennium we will look at the budget stabilization fund and make sure it has an appropriated amount of money in it. Any additional money can go into this strategic one time investment fund. As we move through the session you will transfer money from this fund into those expenditures. The rest of your expenditures, which are ongoing, will be used or ongoing expenditures.

Rep. Kerzman: Would the executive branch or OMB be able to put any input into this or use that when you are looking at figuring out a recommendation? Or is it just for legislators to look at? Are you talking in the case that needs to be an allocation so the revenue is dropped? Could this fund be accessed?

Rep. Berg: The intention here would be for example putting \$187 million into this fund. We go through the legislative session and at the end we have spent all that money in one time expenditures. I don't envision this fund to have a lot of cash in it long term. There may be the decision this session that the governor has laid out money for one time spending. We go through it and see there is only \$150 million, we have some legislative ideas. There could be money left in there. I don't look at this as a fund that is going to hold money in the interim. Here is where our one time money goes. When we appropriate money we are making sure that it is coming out of this one time stabilization fund that it is going into investments. WE can be assured that are not reoccurring expenditures.

Rep. Kerzman: Can you use this per say as \$100 million for education, \$60 million for human services? Are you referring to one time projects like building a prison? Or investing in a structure like transmission line? How are you going to characterize one time investments?

Rep. Berg: I guess this is where we can bring some creativity into it. I would look at examples like a software program that we can put in place. When it's in place we don't need additional FTE's. We can lower the cost. We can get the whatever it is to the consumer quicker. A new prison might be a good example. If you look at the cost of our prison and all our operations, if we know we can put a one time investment on there we are actually going to have a better facility at a lower cost. That might be something to consider. We may want to pay off some bonds. We may want to do things that lower our states obligation in the future. If I summed it up three simple ways it would be a one time investment that is going to lower the cost of government, a one time investment that is going to improve the services to citizens, or a one time investment that is going to increase peoples income in the state, approve our economy, and ultimately generate more revenue for the business in the state. The simplest way I can describe it is like a savings account and a checking account. This will be our savings account.

From our savings account we will be very careful about what we are spending money on. We aren't going to have the money to continue to support it.

Rep. Wald: This is the kind of fund that could accommodate into a library at DSU?

Rep. Berg: Absolutely.

Rep. Kroeber: When you talked about \$210 million carryover, what did you include in that money? The general fund carries over?

Rep. Berg: If you look at our ending fund balance that is projected, it is projected at about \$211 million. There are maybe three different entities or more, what we are saying is that we projected so much revenue and so much expenditures during the 2005-2007 biennium. At the end of that, not counting the oil fund we brought in \$211 million more than we spent. That is what we are talking about. That \$211 million that was our revenue over our expenditures for the 2005-2007 biennium, I'm calling one time revenue. The 2007-2009 biennium, the higher projections are built into that forecast which is the revenue that we are receiving.

Rep. Kroeber: I'm just looking at the budget and he has \$187.7 million of one time general fund appropriations, and the \$1.16.7 million of property tax relief. How would this affect the property tax relief?

Rep. Berg: First of all we are just talking about revenue, those are the expenditures.

Rep. Kroeber: But we are talking about ending fund balance?

Rep. Berg: If we do this it will have no change in the numbers that have been brought for you or the budget. The only thing that I'm saying here and again at a very initial point would be to say that we are going to take the one time money and put in our savings account. The \$187 or anything else that is one time money, we are going to use money out of the savings account to fund that. We will make sure that those expenditures are one time expenditures and not ongoing expenditures.

Rep. Gulleason: I don't have a question but I am pretty confused about this. To me this just seems like the appropriation process. That is the collective group that is here that works their way through this every session. You sort your way through the one time revenues and those things that have come along as part of an anticipated collections. You look at any kind of displaced and maintenance repairs and look to how we can sort through that. I'm not sure what the need for this is. Isn't that called the appropriations committee?

Rep. Berg: I certainly disagree with that. I think that this is nothing at all but a tool for the appropriations committee. First of all we have never faced this situation before in budgeting that I'm aware of. That is the first thing. I think it's critical that we have a process that separated the one time revenue from the ongoing revenue. Then we try to line it up with a one time spending and the ongoing spending. I certainly look at this as much more of a tool not only for appropriations but for the public to see and for it to be more transparent on how we are investing those state dollars.

Rep. Svedjan: I think it's fair to say that in prior sessions we co mingled both one time and ongoing revenues to fund both ongoing and one time expenses. What this bill does is clearly distinguishes between one time revenue and ongoing revenue. It takes \$187 million, which is the same amount that is in the governor's budget for one time expenses. It takes that sum, sets it aside in a one time investment fund with the idea that the fund be used to fund priority one time expenditures. Rather than using ongoing revenues to fund one time expenditures, is that correct?

Rep. Berg: Absolutely.

Rep. Svedjan: The purpose here is really to give definition to using one time revenues for one time expenses. Would you talk just a little bit about the effect of funding one time expenses from ongoing revenues in terms of how it increases the bar?

Rep. Berg: That would be the other example. I think its better long term and more transparent. An example might be if you have an entity that has a \$40 million increase over last biennium. \$20 million is one time spending and \$20 million is ongoing spending. We come back into the next legislative session and they receive a \$30 million increase that is really \$10 million less than they received last session. If you co mingle the ongoing spending and the one time spending. I bring this up because we really haven't been in this situation before. In 2003 we didn't have an ending fund balance. In fact we had a \$50 million shortfall in December. I will use examples like MN, there was a situation where a lot of money was spent and they had a \$2 billion shortfall. They had thousands of state employees that were rift in reductions and budget. I view this as a tool not only for us now but in future sessions. If we have the type of surpluses that I hope this session sends the state out with, we will have a way of spending that when it's appropriate. We are insured that it is not something that is going to increase in costs.

Rep. Glasheim: This is new legislation and I'm having trouble getting my hands around it. I'm unsure about one time revenues. Most of the revenues that make up a surplus are not one time revenues. You may be calling them that but they have increased sales taxes. Is that a one time revenue? Most of that money is not one time revenue although you're calling it that. Are the oil money's one time? They might be. They might be pretty solid where they didn't use to be. You are putting operating increases in there. I think this is strange because it's not accurate and there isn't truth in the labeling. You can manipulate the general fund balance. You just did it. You took an extra \$100 million out. It would have been a general fund balance. Now you are putting it into a new fund. You can manipulate it up or down as you wish. I don't get it. We have many of these funds floating around. Some you can do stuff with and some you can't. The third point is that it seems to me that the governor wanted a rather high savings account of \$4-5 million. Because we have some surpluses this session we have to make some

increases in operating appropriations but we want to have money to sustain the increases that we are going to give this year, two years from now. We don't want to spend only on investing in one time things. We want to have some moneys available for continuing increased operating expenditures.

Rep. Berg: I don't know if I can get to all three. Let's just assume for the minute that there is nothing sinister here. The ending fund balance in October was \$527 million. That is not our ending fund balance. Our balance was \$211 million. My point is the way we wanted it presented to the budget section and the way it is presented to the public is those other funds are added in. If this is changed some how it is not an intention to say there is really not \$527 million it is just allocated that way. Over the last two years that is how legislative council has presented where our cash and revenue is. It is not the intent to somehow argue and say our ending fund balance is a lot smaller than it is. If there is anything the committee needs to do to ensure that there is clarity in there that is not the intention. The other question you brought up which I think is part of the essence of this is maybe we don't know what is one time and on going but should we? I think we should. Maybe we don't know what expenditure are on going or one time but I think we should. I believe as Republicans and Democrats we are going to have differences. We can isolate what clearly is one time revenue and what is one time expenditures. I think what this will do is bring more focus to that so if there are questions we can wrestle with those and sort those out. I think we can have more stability long term as a state.

Rep. Bellew: This concerns your proposed amendment and has to do with the emergency clause on the bill. If your amendment passes with the emergency clause, does that mean that there will be a transfer of \$211 million into this fund?

Rep. Svedjen: My interpretation is that this bill would put \$187 million into a special fund. In future biennium, the effect of the amendment is that any ending fund balance that is projected for that biennium would go into this fund so you would end up with a 0 ending fund balance.

Rep. Wald: I think the amendments replace section 2 so what the amendment does is whatever the ending fund balance is it would go in here.

Rep. Berg: So that would be correct. What we are doing is setting up the savings account during this legislative session we are going to look at spending that money as well for one time investments. At the start of the next biennium there won't be \$211 million in there it will be whatever amount we have not appropriated for one time expenditures.

Rep. Kreidt: With the prison fund controversy right now, say there was nothing done. There was a \$41 million that would go into the fund. Would that then carry over into the next biennium? Is that how it would work?

Rep. Berg: I'm not predicting on what types of decisions would be made but that would be a very good example. Let's say that there is a one time expenditure that you guys have identified as a one time expenditures but you don't want to make that expenditure now. You could leave the money in the fund. As we go into the next session, clearly there are funds available for a one time expenditure.

Rep. Wald: Legislative Council prepared this orange document for us which is the supplement to the legislative reports of council. Starting on page A-5 the governor identified a shopping list of potential one time expenditures. The total is \$187 million. How much leeway do we have in not funding some of these if we feel to fund another need that is more important than what is in the governor's shopping list?

Rep. Berg: That is how I look at the legislative process. We have recommendations from the governor but at this point this is where we need to put it all together. I think at the end of the

day whatever we feel are the highest priorities of the state within the resource we have should be funded. The thing that is important for me is if we are calling those one time expenditures, I want to make sure that they are one time expenditures.

Rep. Wald: I think it is going to be obvious as we get through these bills that there are one time expenditures that are going to be come part of the base. I think those are the kinds of things we have to keep in mind as we move into one time revenue, one time expenditures, what falls where, and it becomes very confusing. I think we need some kind of a flow chart to show all these different categories that at one time were ongoing so we are absolutely sure that we all have an understanding.

Rep. Skarphol: If we do this as outlined in the bill and your amendment and we make appropriations out of this fund in the next biennium, would it be presumed that those appropriations could not be added to a baseline of an agency. Since they are one time expenditures would there be an automatic assumption that they would be needed to the baseline.

Rep. Berg: I think if it was funded from the strategic one time investment fun in 2007-2009 and you saw that item showing up on an ongoing expenditure, I would think it would be pretty clear that unless there is some change that happened, it would not be a one time investment. So my assumption would be yes it shouldn't be part of the base

Rep. Monson: If I understand this right, if we were to pass this the \$187 million would go into the one time expenditure fund. It would not preclude us from spending \$190 million for instance for a one time expenditures this time around. It would stop us from spending some of that \$187 million for ongoing expenses is that correct?

Rep. Berg: Yes.

Rep. Svedjen: With the proposed amendment, does that put any money in the one time strategic investment fund.

Rep. Berg: My understanding is it puts all of the ending fund balance into this fund rather than the \$187.

Rep. Svedjen: Ok I just wanted clarification. Is that true? So if that is done during this legislative session we can appropriate funds out of that fund for one time expenditures.

Rep. Berg: Correct, that is the exact intention. We would go through the process of spending money for one time expenditures out of this fund.

Rep. Svedjen: Before we go into session we have a number that is projected be to what we normally call the ending fund balance. That amount would be moved into this fund so we would virtually have a 0 ending fund balance. The funds would be in the one time strategic investment fund.

Rep. Berg: Correct.

Rep. Glassheim: Would one time water projects qualify? Would one time centers of excellence qualify? Would everything we used to have in the bonding bill, would it all qualify. They are all one time expenditures that are used to cover the general fund. Would water bills qualify?

Rep. Berg: That is the exact debate I would like appropriations to have. If there is a one time investment you know it is a one time investment. You know those monies are not committed to in the future. The other thing I would like to reiterate is that we have done this the last several sessions. In 2003 we had special funds that were funding general fund expenditures in 2005. One of the things that we did in the house is we put that money through the general fund so it was clear that it was an ongoing expenditure and it was a bar that would have to be met in the future. This in essence is no different than that but to try and identify where these fund are

coming from and when they are spent that we have the questions that we are wrestling with, asked or resolved.

Rep. Svedjen: We have an amendment before us, what are your wishes?

Rep. Klein: I move the amendment.

Rep. Kreidt: I second that.

Rep. Svedjen: Is there any discussion?

Rep. Glassheim: Could you explain what it does, I'm not clear.

Rep. Svedjen: The amendment would allow for the full \$211 million that is projected to be moved into this strategic investment fund. During the course of this legislative session this legislator can appropriate funds from this fund to fund one time investments. That is the point you were getting at earlier. In future bienniums with this amendment, it would normally appear as a sum of money constituting an ending fund balance. Whatever that number is will be moved into this fund. Consequently it will show a 0 ending fund balance. In that legislative session again appropriations can be made from this fund for one time expenditures. It is important that one time expenditures be defined.

Rep. Ekstrom: My question goes to the whole balance. From a public perception I think everyone can understand that there is money remaining at the bottom line. What would our intent be in terms of publication to the general voting public? What is the ending fund balance? If we tell them it is zero it will not make a happy populus. What is the intent in terms of what kind of number would we be putting out in front of us?

Rep. Svedjen: The way I would see this is first of all we are distinguishing between one time revenues and on going revenues. In this case what could be communicated toward the public is that you have x many millions of dollars available for one time expenditures. In addition to

that there is a direction also on what our ongoing revenues are going to be. It becomes more a two piece communication that clarifies one time versus ongoing.

Rep. Monson: As I understand it, this would be the very last transfer that would be made at the end of the biennium to this fund. What I'm getting at is sometimes we do have legislation that says if there is money left at the end of a biennium for reorganization bonuses and such; it gets paid out for those purposes. All of those kinds of appropriations that we make would be made and then whatever is left over on the very last bit of business on June 30 gets transferred into this fund.

Rep. Svedjen: That would be my assumption.

Rep. Hawken: We are saying now that we need an emergency clause to transfer this in here now. That is not the end of the biennium. If that is what we really want to do, that shouldn't happen until June. It shouldn't happen now. I really hope that we will not act on this right now. I think we really need to look at this. Are we just changing the whole legislative process? In a way I think we are. This concerns me a lot. I would like a lot more information and I hope that we can have that time to talk. It may be the best thing since sliced bread. Right now I think we need more information and discussion.

Rep. Svedjen: Just to respond to the emergency clause part of it, that is on there so the funds could be moved into that fund for this legislative session.

Jim Smith: The emergency clause is on the bill originally so that the \$187 million would go into that before June 30. With the change in section 2, you wouldn't need the Emergency clause to accomplish that so it could come out and it does come out in the amendment. No it does not but it could be part of it.

Rep. Wald: Could Jim address line 11 in increments it says requested by OMB.

Jim Smith: The original bill would have transferred the \$187 million that is in the governor's budget, identified as one time money. The language that says increments as suggested would have put that in there in case there were items that needed to be funded quicker on an emergency basis. If that money was needed they could have transferred it in earlier. It was going to get some flexibility in terms of when that would have went in. All of that would have been transferred by the end of the biennium on June 30, 2007.

Rep. Wald: It doesn't mean that the money will be deposited as the revenue comes in?

Jim Smith: That is true. Part of it is that some of this money we are talking about in terms of projected ending balance hasn't been collected yet. So it needs to be timed and there needs to be flexibility.

Rep. Glasshiem: But the amendment takes that away. The amendment seems to me means that you can't have the money until the next biennium because you don't know what the ending fund balance is until June 30. There is no ending fund balance. You can't transfer anything under the amendment. I think if I brought this in, you would tell me to go home and do some more homework. Someone else brought it in and maybe we have to move on it.

Rep. Svedjen: My understanding of the amendment is that the amendment would move the \$211 million into the fund. It would allow for appropriations to be made from the fund during this legislative session. During the course of this next biennium whatever amount is determined to be and what we typically call the ending fund balance would be moved into this fund on the very last day of the biennium. In the next legislative session you would have that sum of money to appropriate for one time purposes.

Rep. Klein: To kind of clarify that I would further amend to remove section 3, the emergency clause.

Rep. Kempenich: I second that.

Rep. Svedjan: Is there any discussion? We have a motion to amend on the table. This is a motion to further amend.

Rep. Skarphol: I don't know about the rest of the committee but I'm having trouble satisfying the meaning of some of the terms, the meaning of the amendment. I think we ought to wait and give ourselves the opportunity to digest this a little bit. For one thing on line 6 it says an unanticipated one time reserve. It would seem to me that as a legislator all we would need to do is overestimate what our anticipated revenues were going to be and there would be no unanticipated one time reserves. I think if we are going to do this we need to make an attempt to at least do it properly. I think that maybe it was done a little too hastily. I appreciate what the majority leader is trying to do but I think we need to wait with this.

Rep. Klein: I'm getting the sense that we are moving this too quickly

Rep. Svedjan: Would you want to withdraw motions?

Rep. Klein: I will withdraw.

Rep. Svedjan: Both motions are withdrawn.

Rep. Carlisle: With or without this amendment, what is your observation on this bill?

Pam Sharp: I guess I'm not sure about the amounts and such. I don't know how we would determine what the increments would be based on the criteria and such. My other concern would be that we tried to get the ending balance accurately projected. I guess we could be off either way. It could leave a huge pot of money for one time investments, or it could leave absolutely nothing. I'm just not sure how that plays out.

Rep. Wald: If we had a motion to delay this to a time after the February projections, I think that would give this committee a better comfort level. Is that something that would be appropriate?

Pam Sharp: I think that would be a good idea because we will have a new projected ending balance for the current biennium at that time.

Rep. Wald: I want to move to delay this bill to a time certain which would be identified as the February revenue projection.

Rep. Svedjan: Is there a second?

Rep. Kempenich: I second that.

Rep. Svedjan: Is there discussion?

Rep. Bellew: When is that revenue projection supposed to take place?

Rep. Svedjan: The 5th or 6th of February.

Rep. Skarphol: Can we request from Pam Sharp that we get some kind of documentation as to what OMB used in determining the criteria for what was perceived to be a one time expenditures.

Rep. Svedjan: My understanding of a motion is that I understand the reason for delaying it.

That will clarify the number only. It won't address any to he other issues. We have a motion to delay dealing with this bill until a time certain, after we received a new revenue projections in February. That is what we are discussing right now. I just made the statement that it will clarify the number. It won't address any other questions that we had about the bill.

Rep. Kempenich: Can we figure out how to tie this. We could sit down here and guess at numbers all day long. If you had some type of tie to revenues, projections, and stuff like that. If the economy comes in with a revenue that we are going to have \$200 million in the bank and by the end of next biennium, we have spent that. Would that be the number that we used to put into this? It isn't collected yet.

Rep. Berg: Whatever that forecast is, only one part of it would have an effect on this. That would be the change of the 2005-2007 forecast. Right now that ending fund balance is projected at \$211 million. When you look at forecasting I think of forecasting that is closest is always the most accurate. In my opinion, that one time revenue could change. I think last

biennium it changed \$9 million. It could go from \$211 to \$220 million. As it relates to one time revenue and what we are talking about here, I would see the revenue forecast having very little effect on that particular amount.

Rep. Svedjen: Any further discussion on the motion to delay acting on this bill until we get the new revenue projections in early February.

Rep. Carlisle: If we do that we will hold this to further discussion on all amendments, emergency clause, and budge projections?

Rep. Svedjen: That would be my understanding. There have been a number of things requested for clarification on terminology and so forth. All of that would become part of a discussion. This motion would delay final consideration until after we receive the updates.

Rep. Glasheim: Just a suggestion that if we do pass this that the chair refer it to some subcommittee. I think it needs serious work on the language and so forth.

Rep. Svedjen: Is there any more discussion? If not we will take a voice vote. All in favor say 'aye' all opposed say 'no'. The motion carries and we will close the hearing on HB 1430.

2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. HB 1430

House Appropriations Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: February 9, 2007

Recorder Job Number: 3310

Committee Clerk Signature

Minutes:

Rep. Svedjen: While we are waiting I would like to go to HB 1430. We heard this in full committee a long time ago. It was considerable concern about this bill. The attempt was to try separating the one time revenue and spending from ongoing revenue.

Rep. Hawken: I move a do not pass.

Rep. Ekstrom: I second that.

Rep. Svedjen: It was intended to establish the strategic one time investment fund out of which one time expenditures would have come. There was considerable concern so we now have this motion before us. Is there any further discussion? We will take a roll call vote on a do not pass on HB 1430. The motion passes 17-6-1. Is there a volunteer to carry this?

Rep. Hawken: I will.

(A)

1/22/07

HB 1430

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE BILL NO. 1430

Page 1, line 1, replace "a transfer" with "certain general fund revenues to be deposited in the strategic one-time investment fund"

Page 1, replace lines 9 through 11 with:

"SECTION 2. Certain general fund revenues to be deposited in the strategic one-time investment fund. Any amount in the state general fund at the end of any biennium, after cancellation of unexpended appropriations under section 54-44.1-11 and after any transfers to the budget stabilization fund under chapter 54-27.2, must be transferred by the state treasurer to the strategic one-time investment fund."

Renumber accordingly

Date: 2/9/07
 Roll Call Vote #: 1

2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES
BILL/RESOLUTION NO. 1430

House Appropriations Full Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Legislative Council Amendment Number _____

Action Taken DNP

Motion Made By Huber Seconded By Ekstrom

Representatives	Yes	No	Representatives	Yes	No
Chairman Svedjan	✓				
Vice Chairman Kempenich		✓			
Representative Wald	✓		Representative Aarsvold	✓	
Representative Monson	✓		Representative Gulleson	✓	
Representative Hawken	✓				
Representative Klein	✓				
Representative Martinson	✓				
Representative Carlson		✓	Representative Glassheim	✓	
Representative Carlisle	✓		Representative Kroeber	✓	
Representative Skarphol	✓		Representative Williams	✓	
Representative Thoreson	✓				
Representative Pollert		✓	Representative Ekstrom	✓	
Representative Bellew		✓	Representative Kerzman	✓	
Representative Kreidt		✓	Representative Metcalf	✓	
Representative Nelson	✓				
Representative Wieland		✓			

Total (Yes) 17 No 6

Absent 1

Floor Assignment Huber

If the vote is on an amendment, briefly indicate intent:

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE (410)
February 10, 2007 6:56 p.m.

Module No: HR-28-2797
Carrier: Hawken
Insert LC: . Title: .

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

HB 1430: Appropriations Committee (Rep. Svedjan, Chairman) recommends DO NOT PASS (17 YEAS, 6 NAYS, 1 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). HB 1430 was placed on the Eleventh order on the calendar.