

MICROFILM DIVIDER

OMB/RECORDS MANAGEMENT DIVISION

SFN 2053 (2/85) 5M



ROLL NUMBER

DESCRIPTION

2323

2007 SENATE AGRICULTURE

SB 2323

2007 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. 2323

Senate Agriculture Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: January 25, 2007

Recorder Job Number: 1893

Committee Clerk Signature



Minutes:

Sen. Flakoll opened the hearing on SB 2323, a bill relating to pesticide registration fees and to provide an appropriation. All members (7) were present.

Sen. Wanzek from district 29 testified in favor of the bill.

Sen. Wanzek- It is my understanding that the EPA has had a number of lawsuits that challenge them on their endangered species act. They are looking on doing additional work on their endangered species act, and the concern is that they will come down to state levels and will eventually create some regulations that could have a negative impact on our states economy and agriculture. We can let EPA have total control and take total responsibility or we as a state can take total control over it by following the federal rules and EPA and administer our own program. What this bill is attempting to do is to provide some funding so we can come to a hybrid situation or maybe in the middle where we allow the EPA the responsibility of the program but where we can provide some state input. I think it is very valuable that we have ND input into the administration of the endangered species act. This would take money from the general funds and put it into the EARP fund.

Jim Gray, pesticide registration coordinator with the ND Department of Senate Agriculture testified in favor of the bill. See attached testimony.

Sen. Klein- would the appropriation have to be a ongoing thing or just for the biennium?

Jim Gray- the money would be used for a variety of things. It is going to be a fluid ongoing process, EPA is going to constantly doing risk assessments, whenever they signal a red flag they will look at updating bulletins and adding restrictions above and beyond what they had in the past. So the department would need to continuously look different things, so this is intended to be a long ongoing process, permanent positions. We would need to add 2 people to the department of Ag one would have background and technical knowledge of GIS the other would have knowledge of chemistry, environmental fate, toxicology and use the data to perform risk assessments. We would also take part of the money and use it to monitor different areas that could be contaminated by pesticides.

Sen. Klein- so if we didn't pass this bill it wouldn't cost us anything but we would be under the heavy hand of the federal government?

Jim Gray- that is correct.

Sen. Taylor- have other states taken this third option?

Jim Gray- yes.

Merlin Leithold, south central director for the ND weed Control Association and lobbyist, testified in favor of the bill. See attached testimony.

Sen. Klein- so the money that is going into the general fund will cover the cost of this concern?

Merlin Leithold- yes.

Woody Barth, ND farmers union and lobbyist 286, testified in favor of the bill.

Woody Barth- We have been watching this endangered species act. We support the bill.

Gary Knutson, from the ND Senate Agriculture Association and lobbyist 371, testified in favor of the bill.

Gary Knutson- The majority of our 400 members are either dealers, distributors, or advisors in the crop pesticide industry. We think this initiative has a really sound basis. The pesticide industry pays these fees so they should be used for something towards our industry. I think it makes sense for us to have a seat at the table.

Brian Rau, farmer and commercial applicator, testified in favor of the bill. See attached testimony.

Myron Beeterly, Sheridan county wheat board, testified in favor of the bill. Brought in a aerial photo for the committee to look at as an example.

Testimony was submitted by **Ivan Williams**, representing Ag retailers, Ag manufacturers and other Ag professionals across ND in favor of the bill. See attached testimony.

Testimony was submitted by **Dan Wogsland**, executive director for the ND Grain Growers Association in favor of the bill. See attached testimony.

Brian Kramer, from the NDFB and lobbyist 40, was present and in favor of the bill.

Ken Junkert, program industries for ND planned industries of agriculture, testified in favor of the bill.

Ken Junkert- As you may be aware in the governors budget and in SB 2009 the EARP fund is also addressed there. We have developed a chart that shows the expenditures from the beginning of EARP all the way through the recommendations through the governors budget. (showed committee a chart)

Sen. Taylor- does the fund run into a deficit? Does it have a small carry over or right now is it right down to the wire?

Ken Junkert- it is pretty close to the wire. And as far as the department is concerned the \$50 that would be moved from the general fund to the EARP fund, I believe the legislator has taken a very proactive stance and has funded many important programs from the EARP fund and

make flexibility for the legislator to look at some of those dollars and use those for appropriate programming.

Sen. Flakoll closed the hearing.

Sen. Taylor motioned for a do pass and to be rerefered to appropriations and was seconded by **Sen. Behm**. Vote was 7 yeas, 0 nays, 0 absent. **Sen. Wanzek** was designated to carry the bill to the floor.

2007 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. 2323


Senate Agriculture Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: January 25, 2007

Recorder Job Number: 1894

Committee Clerk Signature



Minutes:

Sen. Flakoll opened discussion on SB 2323.

Sen. Klein- my only question was that \$170,000. I think this is a great idea and we need to move it forward.

Sen. Flakoll- and the motion was to rerefer to apps?

Sen. Taylor- yes.

Sen. Wanzek- if it enhances the odds of the bill passing I would certainly wouldn't oppose that we amend it to do that, I don't know if we should let the appropriations committee do that or if we should do that here.

Sen. Klein- I often rely on the appropriations to do that but it up to us if we think that's important that we get it in a good shape to allow for easier passage over there. I think in this case its \$ 170,000 its really not like it is billions.

Sen. Taylor- the principal of these funds being dedicated and not necessarily going to general fund and you could take down to taking \$38 of it to cover this appropriation and have \$12 go back to the general fund, odds are that there have been a lot of good programs funded out of EARP that pertain to the goals and maybe by the end of the session one of the programs that

is targeted for general fund might go to EARP to take up that \$175,000. The money is going to come from somewhere. I think it will work itself out.

Sen. Heckaman- if the \$50 is going into the EARP fund and we are only asking for \$325,000 out of there that the rest of that money should be able to be used for some good program. I think it is fine the way it's written.

Sen. Wanzek- I think I can support leaving it this way, but if we get to a point where there is a concern that the money is going to sit in there and not be used in the appropriate way or we need to do something we will work with the appropriations committee, I do believe there will be some other opportunities and good programs where we cant get general fund dollars that this might be something to look at. I am ready to vote on it.

Sen. Klein- the discussion has been the last few days is that we currently are over a billion dollars over the governors budget in spending proposals and bills, so I have concern as it's gong through the process and people are starting to look at that.

Sen. Flakoll closed the discussion.

Sen. Taylor motioned for a do pass and to be rerefered to appropriations and was seconded by **Sen. Behm**. **Sen. Wanzek** was designated to carry the bill to the floor. Vote was 7 yeas, 0 nays, 0 absent.

FISCAL NOTE
 Requested by Legislative Council
 03/28/2007

Amendment to: SB 2323

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	\$505,000	\$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).*

The bill eliminates the sunset on \$50 of the current \$350 per product pesticide registration fee.

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.*

Based on an estimate of 10,100 pesticide registrations for the 2007-09 biennium, the bill will increase revenues to the Environment and Rangeland Protection by \$505,000.

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.*

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.*

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.*

Name:	Jeff Weispfenning	Agency:	Agriculture
Phone Number:	328-4758	Date Prepared:	03/28/2007

FISCAL NOTE
Requested by Legislative Council
03/13/2007

Amendment to: SB 2323

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	(\$505,000)	\$1,010,000	\$0	\$0
Expenditures	\$0	\$0		\$50,000	\$0	\$0
Appropriations	\$0	\$0		\$50,000	\$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).*

The bill transfers all pesticide registration fees into the EARP Fund and eliminates the sunset on \$50 of the current \$350 per product fee. Currently, \$50 of the \$350 registration fee goes into the general fund. The bill also provides an appropriation to develop an endangered species program.

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.*

Based on an estimate of 10,100 pesticide registrations for the 07-09 biennium and the impact of the proposed registration law change, the general fund impact will be (\$505,000) and the EARP Fund impact will be \$1,010,000 in additional revenue.

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.*

The statutory changes will provide an additional \$100 per pesticide registered for the EARP Fund. The impact to the general fund will be (\$505,000). The EARP Fund will increase by \$1,010,000.

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.*

The bill provides an appropriation of \$50,000 for two positions and operating for the endangered species program.

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.*

The bill provides the agriculture commissioner an appropriation of \$50,000 to fund the endangered species program. The appropriation was not included in the executive budget.

Name:	Jeff K. Weispfenning	Agency:	Agriculture
Phone Number:	328-4758	Date Prepared:	03/14/2007

FISCAL NOTE
 Requested by Legislative Council
 01/17/2007

Bill/Resolution No.: SB 2323

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	(\$505,000)	\$505,000	\$0	\$0
Expenditures	\$0	\$0		\$325,000	\$0	\$0
Appropriations	\$0	\$0		\$325,000	\$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).*

The bill transfers all pesticide registration fees into the EARP Fund. Currently, \$50 of the \$350 per product registration fee goes into the general fund. The bill also provides an appropriation to the agriculture commissioner to develop an endangered species program.

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.*

Based on an estimate of 10,100 pesticide registrations for the 07-09 biennium and the impact of the proposed registration law change, the general fund impact will be \$505,000.

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.*

The registration law change moves \$50 of the registration fee into the EARP Fund. The impact to the general fund will be \$505,000. The EARP Fund will increase by \$505,000.

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.*

The bill provides an appropriation of \$325,000 for two positions and operating for the endangered species program.

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.*

The bill provides the agriculture commissioner an appropriation of \$325,000 to fund the endangered species program. The appropriation was not included in the executive budget.

Name:	Jeff Weispfenning	Agency:	Agriculture
Phone Number:	328-4758	Date Prepared:	01/22/2007

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

SB 2323: Agriculture Committee (Sen. Flakoll, Chairman) recommends DO PASS and BE REREFERRED to the Appropriations Committee (7 YEAS, 0 NAYS, 0 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). SB 2323 was rereferred to the Appropriations Committee.

2007 SENATE APPROPRIATIONS

SB 2323

2007 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. 2323


Senate Appropriations Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: 02/01/07

Recorder Job Number: 2507

Committee Clerk Signature



Minutes:

Chairman Holmberg opened the hearing on

Senator Terry Wanzek, District 29, Jamestown, introduced SB 2323 dealing with pesticide registration fees and pesticide regulations when it comes to implementation of the endangered species protection program. He indicated the EPA published a final notice on implementation of the endangered species program. This bill enables counties and states to take on a role in developing what happens in the state. He then talked about the fiscal note.

Jim Gray, Pesticide Registration Coordinator with ND Dept of Ag, presented a written testimony (1) and discussed how the funding would be used. He indicated if the bill is to pass, the Dept of Ag would add two staff members, would set up a monitor system of gather data, the department would play a part in the process, provide information to the federal agency and have a seat at the table as bulletins are being developed in ND.

Senator Bowman asked if really takes two people and will it be full time for ever. The response was the program at the federal level is on-going. This is a long-standing need.

Senator Christman asked if these bills were watched closely, what else is out there.

Senator Wardner asked what the funds had been used for before. The response was the monies went to a variety of different projects.

Senator Tallackson with the ERP monies do you have to go after people to collect funds or do they just pay it. The response was it has been a smooth process.

Senator Krauter asked that an analysis of the ERP fund be provided.

Several questions were raised regarding the pesticides, notice of implementation.

Merle Meyer, South Area Director for ND Wheat Control Association, Lobbyist, NDWCA, Wheat Officer for Grant County, presented written testimony, testifying in support of SB 2323 indicating they abdicated local control stressing the importance of keeping decisions within the county or state level, not federal level.

Brian Rau, farmer, aerial applicator, representing the ND Ag Aviation Association, testified in support of SB 2323.

Dan Wogsland, Executive Director, ND Grain Growers Association, testified in support of SB 2323 indicating ND has to have credibility with the EPA. It will take dollars to have that credibility.

Kelly Dormacker, representing ND Farmers Union, testified in support of SB 2323.

Myron Dietterly, Sheridan County, representing the Sheridan County Wheat Board, testified in support of SB 2323 identifying their concern of the surface water.

Gary Knudson, ND Agricultural Association, testified in support of SB 2323.

Senator Bowman, requested a breakdown of the ERP fund, the new pesticides coming into the state and how many are dropped each year.

Chairman Holmberg closed the hearing on SB 2323.

2007 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. 2323

Senate Appropriations Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: 02-12-07

Recorder Job Number: 3416

Committee Clerk Signature



Minutes:

Chairman Holmberg opened the hearing on SB 2323 on February 12, 2007 regarding pesticide registration fees and regulations.

Senator Bowman explained the bill and the funding regarding this bill.

Senator Christmann had questions regarding the funding.

There was no further discussion.

Senator Bowman moved a **DO PASS**, **Senator Grindberg** seconded. A roll call vote was taken resulting in 13 yeas, 0 nays and 1 absent. The motion carried. **Senator Wanzek** will carry the bill.

The hearing on SB 2323 closed.

Date:
Roll Call Vote #:

2007 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES
BILL/RESOLUTION NO. 2323.

Senate Appropriations Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Legislative Council Amendment Number _____

Action Taken

do pass

Motion Made By

Bowman

Seconded By

Grindberg

Senators	Yes	No	Senators	Yes	No
Senator Ray Holmberg, Chrm	✓		Senator Aaron Krauter	✓	
Senator Bill Bowman, V Chrm	✓		Senator Elroy N. Lindaas	✓	
Senator Tony Grindberg, V Chrm	✓		Senator Tim Mathern	✓	
Senator Randel Christmann	✓		Senator Larry J. Robinson	✓	
Senator Tom Fischer			Senator Tom Seymour	✓	
Senator Ralph L. Kilzer	✓		Senator Harvey Tallackson	✓	
Senator Karen K. Krebsbach	✓				
Senator Rich Wardner	✓				

Total (Yes) 13 No 0

Absent 1

Floor Assignment Wanzik Ag Committee

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

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE (410)
February 13, 2007 7:53 a.m.

Module No: SR-30-2981
Carrier: Wanzek
Insert LC: . Title: .

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

SB 2323: Appropriations Committee (Sen. Holmberg, Chairman) recommends DO PASS
(13 YEAS, 0 NAYS, 1 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). SB 2323 was placed on the
Eleventh order on the calendar.

2007 HOUSE AGRICULTURE

SB 2323

2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

-Bill/Resolution No. SB 2323


House Agriculture Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: 3-1-07

Recorder Job Number: 4167 & 4171

Committee Clerk Signature



Minutes:

Chairman Johnson opened the hearing on SB 2323.

Merlin Leithold, South Central Director and Lobbyist for the ND Weed Control

Association: (testimony attached)

Rep Mueller: Your testimony talked about part of Option 3 being here on pages 2-3. Are you suggesting then that the FTE's that we are talking about would be at the table for the environmental protection people to mitigate to control a bit what rules will come down?

Leithold: Yes, everything that the EPA would be doing, but doing it on a local level and then giving that information to the EPA. We need to keep it local - in this case local control would be our state.

Rep Mueller: What's been the track record on that kind of thing with the EPA?

Leithold: It's like dealing with any federal issue. There will be times without cooperation, but we're hoping that it will work. From everything we have heard and read they are looking to the states for input. If we don't give them input, they'll do it themselves.

Rep Belter: Has your organization been working with all the congressional delegation to see if they can get some of these issues resolved?

Leithold: No, basically this ruling came from a lawsuit in Washington state. But we haven't directly talked to our congressional delegation.

Eric Aasmundstad, President of the ND Farm Bureau: We support this bill. We have worked with the EPA and the EPA does not want to do this. They are being forced to do it by the courts. EPA is begging for input from the states.

Testimony was passed out from **Dan Wogsland, ND Grain Growers**, and from **Eric Bartsch, Northern Pulse Growers Association**. Neither could be present for the hearing.

Jim Gray, Pesticide Registration Coordinator, ND Dept of Agriculture: (testimony attached)

Rep Onstad: If a bulletin is sent out, how is that notification process done? Is it just stapled to a bulletin board at the FSA office or an actual notification to producers in that defined area or what?

Gray: It is not published on hard copy. It is on line on the home page. They will have a month and year designation. They intend it to be a fluid process and will be constantly updated.

Rep Onstad: How will the individual ag producers know if they are in violation?

Gray: A major part of this will be public outreach. The Dept of Ag will play an active role in letting people know about bulletins and when they are updating.

Kent Albers, Farmer and Rancher from Center, ND, and Chair of the ND Ag Coalition:
(testimony attached)

Rep Mueller: The case for the FTE's has been made fairly well. There are certainly lots of other issues that they are involved with. Would these folks have impact or could they have impact on other issues, EPA kinds of issues, other than **endangeMred** species?

Albers: My understanding is that this is specific to this issue and whether it can be expanded, I don't know.

Jim Gray: To answer Rep Mueller's question - yes, but two of EPA's highest priorities are endangered species and water issues. They are assessing how well North Dakotans are protecting surface and ground water. We would certainly use the results from the surface water monitoring to cover both programs. We would choose sites that would cover both drinking water issues and endangered species. We could use that pesticide information for a variety of programs.

Myron Dieterle, Sheridan County Weed Board: (testimony attached)

No Opposition

Chairman Johnson closed the hearing.

Chairman Johnson asked for a vote on SB 2323.

Rep Boe made a Do Pass Motion

Rep Brandenburg seconded the motion

(Yes) 13 (Nos) 0 (Absent) 0

Carrier: Rep Uglem

2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. SB 2323


House Agriculture Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: 3-9-07

Recorder Job Number: 4824

Committee Clerk Signature



Minutes:

Chairman Johnson brought the committee to order to vote on SB2323

Rep Belter Moved the Amendment

Rep Brandenburg Seconded the Motion

A voice vote was taken

Rep Belter moved a Do Pass as Amended on SB2323

Rep Brandenburg seconded the motion

(Yes) 8 (No) 0 (Absent) 5

Date: 3/1/07
Roll Call Vote #: 1

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

House Agriculture

Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Legislative Council Amendment Number 2323

Action Taken Do Pass

Motion Made By Rep Boe Seconded By Rep Brandenburg

Representatives	Yes	No	Representatives	Yes	No
Chairman Dennis Johnson	✓		Tracy Boe	✓	
Vice Chair Joyce Kingsbury	✓		Rodney Froelich	✓	
Wesley Belter	✓		Phillip Mueller	✓	
Mike Brandenburg	✓		Kenton Onstad	✓	
Craig Headland	✓		Benjamin Vig	✓	
Brenda Heller	✓				
John D Wall	✓				
Gerry Uglem	✓				

Total (Yes) 13 No 0

Absent 0

Floor Assignment Rep Uglem

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

Date: 3/9/07
Roll Call Vote #: 1

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

House Agriculture

Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Legislative Council Amendment Number SB 2323

Action Taken Moved the Amend

Motion Made By Belter Seconded By Brandenburg

Representatives	Yes	No	Representatives	Yes	No
Chairman Dennis Johnson			Tracy Boe		
Vice Chair Joyce Kingsbury			Rodney Froelich		
Wesley Belter			Phillip Mueller		
Mike Brandenburg			Kenton Onstad		
Craig Headland			Benjamin Vig		
Brenda Heller					
John D Wall					
Gerry Uglem					

Total (Yes) X No

Absent

Floor Assignment Uglem

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

Date: 3/9/07
Roll Call Vote #: 2

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

House Agriculture

Committee _____

Check here for Conference Committee

Legislative Council Amendment Number 2323

Action Taken Do Pass as Amend referred to Approp

Motion Made By Belter Seconded By Brandenburg

Representatives	Yes	No	Representatives	Yes	No
Chairman Dennis Johnson	✓		Tracy Boe		
Vice Chair Joyce Kingsbury			Rodney Froelich		
Wesley Belter	✓		Phillip Mueller	✓	
Mike Brandenburg	✓		Kenton Onstad	✓	
Craig Headland			Benjamin Vig	✓	
Brenda Heller					
John D Wall	✓				
Gerry Uglem	✓				

Total (Yes) 8 No 0

Absent 4.5

Floor Assignment Rep Uglem

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

