

MICROFILM DIVIDER

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



ROLL NUMBER

DESCRIPTION

2037

2007 SENATE JUDICIARY

SB 2037

2007 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. **SB 2037**

Senate **Judiciary Committee**

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: January 09, 2007

Recorder Job Number: 800

Committee Clerk Signature

Maria L Solberg

Minutes: Relating to criminal history records checks in relationship to other departments and sharing the information electronically.

Senator David Nething, Chairman called the Judiciary committee to order. All Senators were present. The hearing opened with the following testimony:

Testimony In Support of Bill:

Roxanne Woeste – L.C. Staff Neutral serving on the interim committee reviewed the bill.

(meter 0:30) Page 2, line 6 is the main part of bill.

Sen. Nelson referred to sec. 8 and a discussion of no longer (meter 2:31) doing any studies- discussion of this in regards to efficiency and securities. She also asked in regards to new computers the difference of hardware vs. software. (3:90)

Sen. Fiebiger questioned what page 5 sec. 8 and was there a specific project that generated this language (meter 7:16) Yes

Nancy Walz, Dir. Policy and Planning IT Dept. – (meter 9:23) Gave Testimony – Att #1a ND CJIS (Criminal Justice Information Sharing) hand out Att. #1b.

Sen. Nething, Chm. Asked what specific data is in the system (meter 14:00) and Ms. Walz discussed how access to the information is determined

Sen. Marcellais questioned FTE for the process and security officers checks (meter 15:30) have been and will continue to be under BCI.

Mark Molesworth, Project Manager, Policy & Planning Div. of IT Dept. (meter 16:33)

Reviewed Bill and gave his testimony – Att. #2a and ND Enterprise Project Management Standard Att. #2b

Sen. Nelson asked if there is a time limit for the protocol? (meter 20:41) the committee discussed how they monitor legislation and try to be “pro-active” once any legislation is passed they go to work, including Higher Ed projects.

Sen. Nething, Chm. Asked Mr. Molesworth if he was present last session? Yes. Discussion of what has changed since last session on this bill and what was not included to help this bill to pass (meter 24:20). The projects follow purchasing guidelines.

Randall Thursby, Interim CIO ND University System (meter 26:00) gave his testimony – Att. #3

Laura Glatt-Vice Chancellor Administrative Affairs University System (meter 29:30) discussed the support or lack of support in the University system. The committee was split. If we do not change this it would not be a deal breaker. We would like the awareness that project management is costly, for us and ITE. We don’t currently have the resources if the number of projects are expanded. At some point we will need a fiscal not if more is added.

Thomas Trenbeath, Attorney General’s office (meter 31:45) Gave testimony Att. #4a and an amendment Att. #4b

The committee discussed the definition of “exempt” vs. “confidential”. An additional bill that requires more criminal history checks is a B.C.I. Bill that will come up with the required FTE.

Testimony in Opposition of the Bill:

None

Testimony Neutral to the Bill:

None

Senator David Nething, Chairman closed the hearing.

Mike Molesworth stated that they do not have any issues with any of the amendments.

Sen. Nelson made the motion to Do Pass Randall Thursby's amendments and **Sen. Olafson** seconded the motion. All members were in favor and the motion passes

Sen Nelson made the motion to Do Pass Tom Trenbeath's amendment Att. #4b, **Sen.**

Olafson seconded the motion. All committee members were in favor and the motion passes.

Sen. Lyson made the motion to Do Pass SB 2037 as two times amended and **Sen.**

Marcellais seconded the motion. All members were in favor and the motion passes.

Carrier: **Sen. Nelson**

Senator David Nething, Chairman closed the hearing.

FISCAL NOTE

Requested by Legislative Council

04/04/2007

Amendment to: Engrossed
 SB 2037

1A. **State fiscal effect:** *Identify the state fiscal effect and the fiscal effect on agency appropriations compared to funding levels and appropriations anticipated under current law.*

	2005-2007 Biennium		2007-2009 Biennium		2009-2011 Biennium	
	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds
Revenues	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Expenditures	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Appropriations	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

1B. **County, city, and school district fiscal effect:** *Identify the fiscal effect on the appropriate political subdivision.*

2005-2007 Biennium			2007-2009 Biennium			2009-2011 Biennium		
Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

2A. **Bill and fiscal impact summary:** *Provide a brief summary of the measure, including description of the provisions having fiscal impact (limited to 300 characters).*

This bill is clean-up language for ITD and will not have any fiscal impact.

The amendments added in engrossed SB 2037 (70015.0500) will not have any fiscal impact.

The amendments added in engrossed SB 2037 (70015.0502) will not have any fiscal impact.

B. **Fiscal impact sections:** *Identify and provide a brief description of the sections of the measure which have fiscal impact. Include any assumptions and comments relevant to the analysis.*

3. **State fiscal effect detail:** *For information shown under state fiscal effect in 1A, please:*

A. **Revenues:** *Explain the revenue amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each revenue type and fund affected and any amounts included in the executive budget.*

N/A

B. **Expenditures:** *Explain the expenditure amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each agency, line item, and fund affected and the number of FTE positions affected.*

N/A

C. **Appropriations:** *Explain the appropriation amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each agency and fund affected. Explain the relationship between the amounts shown for expenditures and appropriations. Indicate whether the appropriation is also included in the executive budget or relates to a continuing appropriation.*

N/A

Name:	Mike J. Ressler	Agency:	ITD
Phone Number:	328-1001	Date Prepared:	04/04/2007

FISCAL NOTE

Requested by Legislative Council

01/19/2007

Amendment to: SB 2037

1A. State fiscal effect: *Identify the state fiscal effect and the fiscal effect on agency appropriations compared to funding levels and appropriations anticipated under current law.*

	2005-2007 Biennium		2007-2009 Biennium		2009-2011 Biennium	
	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds
Revenues	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Expenditures	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Appropriations	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

1B. County, city, and school district fiscal effect: *Identify the fiscal effect on the appropriate political subdivision.*

2005-2007 Biennium			2007-2009 Biennium			2009-2011 Biennium		
Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

2A. Bill and fiscal impact summary: *Provide a brief summary of the measure, including description of the provisions having fiscal impact (limited to 300 characters).*

This bill is clean-up language for ITD and will not have any fiscal impact.

The amendments added in engrossed SB 2037 (70015.0500) will not have any fiscal impact.

B. Fiscal impact sections: *Identify and provide a brief description of the sections of the measure which have fiscal impact. Include any assumptions and comments relevant to the analysis.*

3. State fiscal effect detail: *For information shown under state fiscal effect in 1A, please:*

A. Revenues: *Explain the revenue amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each revenue type and fund affected and any amounts included in the executive budget.*

N/A

B. Expenditures: *Explain the expenditure amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each agency, line item, and fund affected and the number of FTE positions affected.*

N/A

C. Appropriations: *Explain the appropriation amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each agency and fund affected. Explain the relationship between the amounts shown for expenditures and appropriations. Indicate whether the appropriation is also included in the executive budget or relates to a continuing appropriation.*

N/A

Name:	Mike J. Ressler	Agency:	Information Technology Department
Phone Number:	328-1001	Date Prepared:	01/20/2007

FISCAL NOTE
 Requested by Legislative Council
 12/26/2006

Bill/Resolution No.: SB 2037

1A. **State fiscal effect:** *Identify the state fiscal effect and the fiscal effect on agency appropriations compared to funding levels and appropriations anticipated under current law.*

	2005-2007 Biennium		2007-2009 Biennium		2009-2011 Biennium	
	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds
Revenues	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Expenditures	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Appropriations	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

1B. **County, city, and school district fiscal effect:** *Identify the fiscal effect on the appropriate political subdivision.*

2005-2007 Biennium			2007-2009 Biennium			2009-2011 Biennium		
Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts

2A. **Bill and fiscal impact summary:** *Provide a brief summary of the measure, including description of the provisions having fiscal impact (limited to 300 characters).*

This bill is clean-up language for ITD and will not have any fiscal impact.

B. **Fiscal impact sections:** *Identify and provide a brief description of the sections of the measure which have fiscal impact. Include any assumptions and comments relevant to the analysis.*

No fiscal impact.

3. **State fiscal effect detail:** *For information shown under state fiscal effect in 1A, please:*

A. **Revenues:** *Explain the revenue amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each revenue type and fund affected and any amounts included in the executive budget.*

N/A

B. **Expenditures:** *Explain the expenditure amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each agency, line item, and fund affected and the number of FTE positions affected.*

N/A

C. **Appropriations:** *Explain the appropriation amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each agency and fund affected. Explain the relationship between the amounts shown for expenditures and appropriations. Indicate whether the appropriation is also included in the executive budget or relates to a continuing appropriation.*

N/A

Name:	Mike J. Ressler	Agency:	Information Technology Department
Phone Number:	328-1001	Date Prepared:	12/27/2006

Date: 1-9-07

Roll Call Vote # 3

2007 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES

BILL/RESOLUTION NO. 2037

Senate _____ Judiciary _____ Committee _____

Check here for Conference Committee

Legislative Council Amendment Number _____

Action Taken Do Pass as 2 times Amended

Motion Made By Sen. Lyson Seconded By Sen. Marcellais

Senators	Yes	No	Senators	Yes	No
Sen. Nething	✓		Sen. Fiebiger	✓	
Sen. Lyson	✓		Sen. Marcellais	✓	
Sen. Olafson	✓		Sen. Nelson	✓	

Total Yes 6 No 0

Absent _____

Floor Assignment Sen Nelson

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

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

SB 2037: Judiciary Committee (Sen. Nething, Chairman) recommends AMENDMENTS AS FOLLOWS and when so amended, recommends **DO PASS** (6 YEAS, 0 NAYS, 0 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). SB 2037 was placed on the Sixth order on the calendar.

Page 2, line 12, overstrike "A" and insert immediately thereafter "For the purposes of this subsection, a"

Page 2, line 15, after "~~the~~" insert:

"a."

Page 2, line 23, overstrike "a." and insert immediately thereafter "(1)"

Page 2, line 25, overstrike "b." and insert immediately thereafter "(2)"

Page 2, line 26, overstrike "c." and insert immediately thereafter "(3)"

Page 2, after line 29, insert:

"b. For the purposes of this subsection, a major project is a project with a cost of two hundred fifty thousand dollars or more in one biennium or a total cost of five hundred thousand dollars or more."

Page 8, line 11, after "**powers**" insert "- Exempt records"

Page 8, line 14, after the first period insert "The information technology department, at the direction of the board, shall maintain a criminal justice data information sharing system to facilitate the exchange of criminal justice information among judicial, law enforcement, and emergency personnel. Only a criminal justice agency, as defined in section 12-60-16.1, and any other person designated by the board may access the system. The system only may be accessed for the purposes set forth by the board. Any law enforcement record in the possession of the department is an exempt record." and after "staff" insert "and other necessary"

Page 8, line 15, after "policy" insert "and adopt rules" and after "the" insert "access to and the"

Page 8, line 18, remove "Only entities within the"

Page 8, remove line 19

Page 8, line 20, remove "justice information sharing system."

Renumber accordingly

2007 HOUSE INDUSTRY, BUSINESS AND LABOR

SB 2037

2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. SB 2037


House Industry, Business and Labor Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: February 21, 2007

Recorder Job Number: 3517

Committee Clerk Signature



Minutes:

Chair Keiser opened the hearing on SB 2037.

Roxanne Woeste, Legislative Council: Overview of SB 2037.

Rep. Keiser: What areas are we extending the powers of the IT committee, or the IT

Department?

Roxanne: That's section 2 of this bill. I don't believe we're expanding the powers, and duties of that committee; we're refining some the information that will come to that committee in regards to the large projects. On page 3, subsection 12 there's some new language there where we're allowing that committee to receive some more information about projects that aren't at the level of a major IT project, which is defined as \$250,000 or more. So, we're allowing that committee to receive some information about projects that are under that level, but I don't believe we're expanding the duties to the IT Committee.

Rep. Keiser: Currently, if it exceeds \$250,000 it's required that they receive it. Now, if its \$80,000 is it required.

Roxanne: I don't believe so. Under subsection 12, we say that the IT Committee can receive, and review information from the IT Department, and the effected agency about this IT project, if the cost is between \$100,000 and \$250,000, as determined by the IT Department.

Rep. Keiser: They do more than review, don't they?

Roxanne: They don't approve or adopt a plan, but they receive detailed information for a new plan.

Rep. Kasper: If they receive and review, what if they don't like it, or they think it shouldn't go forward, but all they're doing is receiving reviewings? What are their powers in the case of they don't like what they receive and review?

Roxanne: They do have the ability, if they receive some information about an IT project, and see difficulties; they do have statute authority to make a request to OMB the expenditures for a project. It would be up to OMB to decide if that should be pre-approved.

Rep. Amerman: On page 8, on line 23 would you expand a little bit on what some of these criminal justice agencies might be, and who might be someone, or any other person

designated by the board that would have access to this information?

Roxanne: This was the language that was added by the Senate.

Nancy Walz, ITD: Support SB 2037. See written testimony #1.

Rep. Keiser: How long does it take, and who pays for the background checks?

Nancy: We pay for the background checks.

Rep. Keiser: Could you describe that process for us, and what's involved?

Nancy: What's involved in that process is we identify if there's a project that would be over \$250,000. At that point, the agency begins their planning process. They submit a business case that says here's why we need the project, approximately what it would cost, what the proposed schedule would be, and what would be covered in the project. Once that the planning is a little further along, there's a charter submitted that says here is exactly what we're going to do, and how much it's going to cost. Then they continue the planning process, and create a detailed plan with schedules for each task, and exactly how much the cost is going to

be. Throughout the life of the project, each quarter they provide a report to ITD, and we summarize those reports for all the projects, and that report then goes to the IT committee, so they get a birds eye view of all of the projects that are happening, and where they are at. At the end of a project, the agency submits a full implementation report that states what they planned to do, and how successful it was.

Rep Keiser: Doesn't IT have to help design that project, and then approve it as it's going through each of these phases?

Nancy: To a certain degree, the responsibility for the project is with the agency, as far as managing the project. As far as the actual technology, they make contact with ITD to do some of the work, or they may contract with a vendor. They do have to meet the standards that are in place for technology, which are created through a different process, and follow other technology guidelines.

Rep. Keiser: Don't they have to contract with IT first, and then if you choose not to do it, then they have the option to go out?

Nancy: It depends on the services that they're requiring. So, they have to host with ITD according to our Century Code, they have to actually probably run the operation through ITD, but the actual development, the programming, the design, and those types of things can either be contracted, or provided from ITD, but that's up to the agencies.

Rep. Kasper: Would you describe in the last 2 years the most difficult project submitted to ITD with problems, as far as moving forward, or stopping.

Nancy: In my testimony, we track all the projects, and during the past fiscal year state agencies completed 11 large IT projects under the oversight of ITD, and the IT committee. 7 of the 11 projects were completed under budget, resulting in a savings of \$1.4 million. The 4 projects that are acceding their original budget, the total overage was \$300,000. So, the total

budgetary savings was \$1.1 million for the state, and 9 of the 11 projects completed within the acceptable 20%. So, overall we think the process as being very successful.

Rep. Kasper: I'm not looking for general, I'm looking for you to pick one of those projects, and tell us what happened, what was the project all about, and how it was resolved?

Nancy: Connect ND would be one example, because it was a very large project, and because it involved so many agencies and higher education. Just the coordination of it is probably our biggest challenge of a project of that size.

Rep. Kasper: What was Connect ND?

Nancy: Connect ND was the implementation of the ERP system financial, human resources, and student information systems for state government under education.

Rep. Kasper: On page 2, line 12 I see that the legislative branch was added as a branch of oversight. Why was that added?

Nancy: The IT committee felt like because the judicial branch, and executive branch was included, they felt like they should include themselves in that process. Legislative Council has been following this process.

Rep. Keiser: Will that bring the IT people and the legislative section under ITD?

Nancy: No. In terms of other kinds of services that ITD offers, it doesn't change that.

Rep. Zaiser: Can you describe what you do? What is your objective in the process?

Nancy: Our role in IT is working as staff for the IT committee to have the view from the CIO's office of all state governments, and to make sure IT is managed properly in terms of this oversight.

Rep. Keiser: How long have we had an ITD Department?

Mike Ressler, ITD: 1969.

Rep. Keiser: What is the current budget projection requested for this coming biennium?

Mike: The budget we're asking for in the 07/09 biennium is going to be about \$124 million.

The majority of that money, \$113 million is money that's really budgeted in the agencies, and it's passed through as a special fund concept. \$11 million is general funded to IT for projects like the CGIS, and then the K/12 network.

Rep. Keiser: So, really we've probably got \$60 million general fund dollars into ITD?

Mike: Our last study shows that it's about 1/3, 1/3, 1/3. So, 1/3 of \$111 million is general funds, 1/3 is special funds, and then 1/3 is federal funds.

Rep. Keiser: How does the department get out from under ITD?

Mike: Today, there are really 3 services in technology. There is network conductivity, so agencies that want to connect their system to the network, by law they have to buy it from ITD. The 2nd service is hosting, which is the most recent legislation passed that said if an agency is going to have an application that's run on a computer, you have to come through ITD. In both cases, the CIO, and the director of OMB have the ability to grant a waiver. The 3rd service is really software development which is probably the largest cost to state government, in that agencies have the option to go wherever they want to go for that, however ITD has over 100 developers on staff.

Rep. Keiser: There are no agencies on the first two that are exempt?

Mike: With regards to the network, there are no agencies that are exempt. From a hosting standpoint, I believe the Attorney General's office has a waiver that's in law, as well as retirement investment in ND, however they use our systems, and then there are waivers that we've granted on individual instances.

Rep. Kasper: Some officials at ND State University have expressed their frustration with the IT system with simple reports. What was going on there?

Mike: Higher Education, with Connect ND is that people soft application that was purchased for all of state government, including higher education. They added the three pieces to it, the financial piece, the human resource piece, and then the student administration piece. A good part of what was floating around in the mail was the higher educations on student administration piece that had to do with grants and contracts, and the people soft product which covers many facets of technology was very weak in that area. So, Higher Ed has spent a lot of time, money, and energy trying to get that built up. I think they've made huge improvements, however, I think there is still a lot of ground that they have to cover.

Laura Glatt, ND University System: Supports SB 2037. See written testimony #2.

Hearing closed.

2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. SB 2037


House Industry, Business and Labor Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: February 26, 2007

Recorder Job Number: 3900

Committee Clerk Signature



Minutes:

Chair Keiser opened the hearing on SB 2037. We have some amendments for SB 2037.

This seems like a very powerful amendment, as I read it.

Rep. Kasper: Looking at my notes it says subject to legislature is the oversight. I really don't like that.

Rep. Keiser: With the combining of the three branches of government, it's bringing the legislative under the executive.

Rep. Kasper: I don't like it. I wonder if we shouldn't have an amendment that would eliminate the legislative branch from this bill.

Rep. Keiser: On page 2, line 12 where it says legislative, if we could delete that.

Rep. Kasper: Page 3, line 7, page 5 line 2 and 7, I would move that.

Rep. Keiser: Rep. Kasper moves that we strike all references to bringing the legislature under the control of IT.

Rep. Ruby: Second.

Voice vote was taken, amendment adopted.

Hearing closed.

2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. SB 2037


House Industry, Business and Labor Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: March 7, 2007

Recorder Job Number: 4533

Committee Clerk Signature



Minutes:

Chair Keiser opened the hearing on SB 2037. This was the IT bill.

Rep. Kasper: This bill subjects the legislative branch to the review, and oversight of the Information Technology Department in some areas. We're looking at taking the word legislative out of certain areas of the bill, and if you turn to page 2, line 12 that was one area where you would remove legislative. We don't want the executive branch to be able to interfere with what the legislative branch wishes to do, so this has to do with separation of powers. Over on page 3 we would remove legislative on line 7. On page 4 there's legislative mentioned on line 22, 23, and 24, and I think that's OK, because that does not give away any of our power, it just gives us assistance. On the top of page 5, we would want to take out legislative there on line 2 and line 7. On line 15, it's OK. On page 6, there is a question, this is current law on line 19, and it has to do with information technology plans, and line 19 agencies of the judicial, or legislative branches shall file an information technology plans with the department. So, if we're filing it with the department, does that mean they're going to interfere, or is it just a filing. We're not giving up any power there, and that would be OK. The same way with line 27, that would be OK. So, I would move to amend.

Rep. Vigesaa: Second.

Rep. Keiser: The argument I think is a legitimate one and that's separation of powers, although as you read this bill, judiciary is being added as one of the branches, so they will have oversight.

Rep. Gruchalla: Would that be up to us to take judiciary out of there. Whose responsibility is that?

Rep. Keiser: The legislature. Right now the new language put the judiciary in some places in terms of responsibility.

Rep. Thorpe: Does this amendment address the concerns of the ND University System? I had written down to prepare amendments. Have we heard anything more on that?

Rep. Keiser: I think she proposed an amendment. I guess the question is we're proposing this amendment to take the legislature out of the balance that separates the powers. This committee wanted to remain just the legislature. Does this committee also want to take the courts out to?

Rep. Nottestad: Has anybody from the judiciary made any comments?

Rep. Keiser: The only answer I can give you is in the testimony we heard, there was a statement made that the judiciary would not oppose this, but they're not thrilled with it.

Rep. Ruby: On page 2, line 12 it talks about the judicial branch agency, and they're already in there, so it seems to me that one of the reasons they put it in the bill there is just to clean it up, since they're already there. I don't know if it's a major issue, or the other provisions if we put them in are so restricted they'd rather be included.

Rep. Keiser: They did not come forward, and request to be taken out.

Rep. Johnson: I'm trying to understand, the whole intent here is just to add IT Department on complete oversight of any IT project that is going on in the state government.

Rep. Keiser: That is the plan.

Rep. Thorpe: I went through the bill, and it looked to be that what the bill was doing was giving the legislative oversight committee more power in reviewing the IT, which if all of the members of the house feel comfortable doing that, that would be fine. If they get overzealous, in 2 years we can change it.

Rep. Keiser: I know that many committee members have said repeatedly that they get lots of complaints from injured workers. For every injured worker complaint I get, I get 5 complaints about IT from departments.

Rep. Vigesaa: Noticing on the fiscal note that ITD is proposing this as cleanup language, I believe where they've added the judicial branch they are doing it to make it consistent to where it was in current law. Clearly, they have added the legislative branch in there, so I think we should just delete as the amendment states, and just take care of the legislative branch, and leave the judiciary branch in there.

Roll call vote was taken, amendment adopted.

Rep. Vigesaa: I move a do pass, as amended.

Rep. Clark: Second.

Roll call vote was taken. 9 Yeas, 4 Nays, 1 Absent, Carrier: Rep. Thorpe

Hearing closed.

Date: 3-7-07
Roll Call Vote #: 1

2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES
BILL/RESOLUTION NO. SB 2037

House Industry Business & Labor Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Legislative Council Amendment Number _____

Action Taken Remark Signature

Motion Made By Rep. Kasper Seconded By Rep. Vigesaa

Representatives	Yes	No	Representatives	Yes	No
Chairman Keiser	X		Rep. Amerman	X	
Vice Chairman Johnson	X		Rep. Boe	X	
Rep. Clark	X		Rep. Gruchalla	X	
Rep. Dietrich	X		Rep. Thorpe	X	
Rep. Dosch	X		Rep. Zaiser	X	
Rep. Kasper	X				
Rep. Nottestad	X				
Rep. Ruby	X				
Rep. Vigesaa	X				

Total Yes 14 No 0

Absent 0

Floor Assignment Rep Thorpe

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

Date: 3-7-07
 Roll Call Vote #: 2

2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES
 BILL/RESOLUTION NO. SB 2037

House Industry Business & Labor Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Legislative Council Amendment Number _____

Action Taken DO PASS, AS Amended

Motion Made By Rep. Vigesaa Seconded By Rep. Clark

Representatives	Yes	No	Representatives	Yes	No
Chairman Keiser	X		Rep. Amerman	X	
Vice Chairman Johnson	X		Rep. Boe		X
Rep. Clark	X		Rep. Gruchalla	X	
Rep. Dietrich	X		Rep. Thorpe	X	
Rep. Dosch		X	Rep. Zaiser		X
Rep. Kasper					
Rep. Nottestad	X				
Rep. Ruby		X			
Rep. Vigesaa	X				

Total Yes 9 No 4

Absent 1

Floor Assignment Rep. Thorpe

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