

# MICROFILM DIVIDER

OMB/RECORDS MANAGEMENT DIVISION

SFN 2053 (2/85) 5M



ROLL NUMBER

DESCRIPTION

24409

2007 SENATE INDUSTRY, BUSINESS AND LABOR

SB 2409

## 2007 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. **SB 2409**

Senate Industry, Business and Labor Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: **January 31, 2007**

Recorder Job Number: **2412**

Committee Clerk Signature



*Referring to cell phone complaints:*

**S Aaron Krauter – Senator District 31 - In Favor**

**TESTIMONY # 1** Went over testimony

Pg 3, goes over amendments to adopt rules. Went over bill breakdown. In ND have good service, some have poor service. This is a "Bill of Rights" for cell phone consumers.

**S Hacker:** Isn't there already a lot taking place in the cell phone companies?

**S Krauter:** some is provided, but not by ALL companies. Having Public Service Commission would make sure it is done on all companies. As a business with less complaints, it would be good public information.

**S Klein:** With Federal issues, can we go beyond Federal standards?

**S Krauter:** there are many issues. Some states have a Bill of rights. FCC starting to understand that states do have rights.

**S Wanzek:** The problem is in the sign up, you are locked in for 1-2 years, it should be easier for them to cancel to put more power into the consumer hands.

**S Krauter:** Section F allows for a 15 day change after the first bill.

**S Wanzek:** The policy is to be locked in for 2 years. Maybe you don't see the problem in the 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> bill, if you cancel early, you will pay damages. What if you were to limit how long they could write the contracts.

**S Krauter:** If you want to amend the bill to change ND to have one year, that's your decision. I don't think you want to do that.

**S Wanzek:** If the program doesn't work, or not what was presented, there would be some ability.

**S Heitkamp:** What kind of reaction do you get when a constituent gets a map with a colored area that says "this is our area." Then they get dropped calls or there is no service and it is on a map. Do you get calls for that?

**S Krauter:** Yes. Those are frustration calls, the people are upset, or if I had an emergency call, I'd be out of luck.

**S Heitkamp:** I'm for promoting economic development, what do you get when someone comes into the state and the cell phone doesn't work in the state? They are told about the technology we have in the state, but can't get service.

**S Krauter:** They say, "You've told me about all your technology, and yet I can't use my cell phone." That's a negative.

**S Klein:** So you're forcing them they must set up towers?

**S Krauter:** That's not part of the bill. The bill once the consumers understand the information, and see the maps that there is no service there, they will lose business....

**S Klein:** Well, the story about someone coming into your community....

If he came from New York and couldn't get service, he wasn't buying the plan, just using his phone because he uses it in NY.

**S Heitkamp:** Intent of my question was that if more information gets out as to what areas have coverage and what areas don't, is there the potential then for these cell phone companies to make sure that ALL areas colored on the map , NOW, do have coverage?

**S Krauter:** Yes, that's the bottom line. If the consumers get that information and they don't buy any phones, or they buy a phone and there's a problem, they contact the PSC, and it sets up a process where the information gets out and pretty soon as the annual report comes out you can see this information and hope that providers would say, "Company A is missing the boat on this one and we can capitalize on it."

**S Behm:** I understand the problem more in your area than others. The towers are not there, I've been there, more of a problem in your area.

**S Potter:** I'm fond of the "lemon law," the fact when I see the bill, I think it's a good feature.

Question on the complaint procedures: when you say the burden-of-proof is always going to be on the wireless provider, is that preponderance of proof or reasonable doubt levels of proof? Can you give me other examples, do utility companies have burden-of-proof when people complain?

**S Krauter:** The burden-of-proof is on the provider. If I complain with the PSC, and they accept that complaint, then it's up to the provider to respond.

**S Potter:** Statement, on the number of complaints of each provider, to the public, it seems just, I understand the purpose, but it seems a little bit unfair to the dominant carriers, they're naturally going to have more complaints because they have more customers and will show up that they've had more complaints and it's difficult to see if they were valid complains, angry complaints. Seems troubling.

**S Hacker:** In the complaint process, if I have a dropped call, could that be a valid complaint?

**S Krauter:** If you had a consistent, monthly, monthly series of dropped calls, that would be a valid complaint, but no, only if consistent.

**S Hacker:** What about when the cell phone carrier switches to another tower?

**S Krauter:** If you have a legitimate complaint, it is your right to bring it to the PSC.

**Representative Pam Gullickson – In Support**

This bill is timely as a legislative body. Cell phones are now a primary phone and you need to make decisions on what works best for them. This would help everybody, it would be most helpful and reliable for consumers. Designate PSC with authority. They had a series of meetings for versions of problems that have been brought up today. People have concerns on purchasing something and haven't had reliable, consistent daily use. They purchase a plan and then have sticker shock when the bill comes. Customers hear they can get all kinds of capabilities for \$39.99, and then get the bill and it's \$80. By then you are bound by a contract.

[explains 27:22m – 39:95m]

**S Behm:** I had this experience on the first cell phone I had. I used roaming and had shock when I got the bill.

**P Gullickson:** [Example 29:07]

**S Wanzek:** Promises are made, pitch is good, but the product doesn't do what it said it would do. I made the decision as a consumer. You need to sign a contract for 1-2 years. Couldn't it be understood as a consumer as a breach-of-contract if I want to cancel the contract without financial penalty, wouldn't that be more effective?.

**P Gullickson:** I don't disagree. We need to manage concerns.

**S Potter:** If it was a break-of-contract, don't you worry about other additional issues come up?

**FAVOR**

**Linda Johnson – AARP - In Favor**

**TESTIMONY # 2** [read testimony]

[Wanted to change time allowed for examining plan from 15 to 20 days for elderly]

**Mike Muscha – Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers & Trainmen ND - In Favor**

**TESTIMONY # 3** [read testimony]

Would like a complaint procedure.

**William Bennett for Commissioner Wefald – Public Service Commission - In Favor**

**TESTIMONY # 4** [read testimony] These were personal comments, not of her fellow commissioners. Covered sections on concerns on the bill.

**S Hacker:** You spoke on concerns – any resolutions?

**W Bennett:** No proposed amendments. Purpose is to point out some already covered.

**S Potter:** Federal government pre-empted the PSC on “entrance” and how this relates to the “lemon law.”

**W Bennett:** Entrance relates to the company coming into the state, not the consumer.

**OPPOSITION**

**Tom Kelsch – Alltel’s Corporate Lawyer - Kelsch Law Firm - In Opposition**

**TESTIMONY # 5** [passed out many examples, copies, testimony. States the bill is unnecessary. Covered 4 testimonies. Tried to prove there are not that many complaints and don’t need the legislation. Alltel’s practice that consumers have a chance to respond within the first billing. They draw up a “draft bill” and explain what will happen if they go over their minutes or text messaging. Feel it is unnecessary as there is a lack on the number of complaints. There are complaints in the rural areas because of the towers. Towers will cover a 20 mile radius and cost \$500,000 for one tower. PSC already has an on-line complaint section called “zap the gap.” This bill cannot force them to put up towers governed by Federal

and FCC for towers. Must get approved before they turn on the towers. We understand the need and also the financial need. National companies having different service than the nation need to raise their costs. Suggested example [53:50m] on phones. There will be no more free phones if this goes through. They get a free phone if they sign up and then in 30 days, if you add 15 days making it 45 days and they get the phone back, it is worthless. [ex 55:09] If you buy a car from a car dealer, you can't take back the car. With a phone, you'd have to pay back the portion you paid in and part of the bill. Went over other points on the bill. Situation went before the courts before and they won and will challenge the bill if it goes through. They don't need to take two years. You can have pay as you go, and buy minutes, or go to another company. It doesn't need legislation. The House has a bill for tax breaks. We don't need road barriers to increase the costs.]

**S Klein:** We've heard from folks when selling the plan, the representatives are not telling the truth, making the customer unhappy. Shouldn't this custom be addressed, or is it about selling merchandise?

**S Potter:** [told of a personal situation] How many complaints have there been for Alltel?

**T Kelsch:** I don't have that number.

**S Potter:** Maybe should send to PSC. [S. Potter wants a list.]

**T Kelsch:** I like and need cell service. It makes sense. I'll have a cell phone and I'll participate. If I get a "free" phone, I'll do it.

**S Hacker:** You presented us with an article on complaints. In Sept. there was a surge, why was there a rise in one day? Where is this from?

**T Kelsch:** The info was off the FCC website

**S Heitkamp:** Did you see the map when you went into the store?

**T Kelsch:** No



**S Heitkamp:** When you go down the road with the service, when you're unhappy, where do you go?

**T Kelsch:** The issues won't be settled with bill. If a customer loses service even on interstate, they will get 1 minute in credit.

**S Heitkamp:** What if you see the map coverage in the store, and you don't get it?

**T Kelsch:** Take it out and try it.

**S Heitkamp:** That's the point of the bill. If you put together a system for complaints, someone has to respond, I have no problems when it comes to complaints.

**Kent Blickensderfer- Quest Rep - In Opposition**

**TESTIMONY # 6** [went over testimony]

Covered early termination agreements. Companies produce cheap handsets, early termination is part of the rate structure. Quest does things to mandate the bill.

**S Wanzek:** If the consumer is lead to believe certain things, is there a resolve to back out of the plan? Early termination?

**Kent B:** I paid \$400 for my phone because I decided to not go long term.

**S Klein:** I would think that 7<sup>th</sup> graders, kids with large cell phone usage could have more complaints.

**S Wanzek:** Do you think you could see what the future holds?

**Kent B:** Technology is going super fast.

**S Potter:** This is a way to separate ND cell phone complaints.

**Todd Kranda – Verizon - In Opposition**

**TESTIMONY #7** Market-driven interest. The market will pick winners and losers. This is a highly competitive industry. [went over testimony] We are already complying with regulations,

what if ND did this and we have plans to go nationwide, how will that affect the company operating in ND.

**S Klein:** 41 states say they don't have to regulate you, are there any states to adopt something as we're looking at today?.

**T Kranda:** I don't have it today, I could find out.

**S Klein:** We'd be one of 9 who have restrictions

**S Heitkamp:** The number portability, that's federal law, right?

**T Kranda:** I'm not sure, I thought ND adopted something similar, but yes, it's a Fed law.

**S Heitkamp:** You really have no choice on that.

**T Kranda:** I think portability is available across the nation.

**S Heitkamp:** I struggle with that when we switched, if we could keep our number, so were happy when the Feds switched and I could keep my number.

**S Hacker:** What happens when you signed up with voluntary compliance. What happens if you don't comply?

**T Kranda:** You have an agreement, it gets enforced through Attorney General.

**NEUTRAL**

**Tony Clark – Public Service Commissioner – Neutral**

[There to answer questions.]

**S Potter:** Have you seen Sen. Wefald's testimony?

**T Clark:** Yes

**S Potter:** What comments do you have?

**T Clark:** I think the idea of having a local place to turn is a sound one, especially with consistent with Federal laws. Don't want to have restrictions like a patch-work quilt of state regulations that one state is telling cell phone companies they have to have 10.5 point type on

invoices, etc. If they had standardized law, we as a national association have been trying to work on.

**S Wanzek:** This is quite a competitive market.

**T Clark:** Telecommunications is an industry that is in transition nationwide.

**S Heitkamp:** The point I would make is it's a competitive field, but if there is a complaint, where does the customer go?

**T Clark:** It depends on the complaint. It's about the marketing practices. The most jurisdiction that you're going to find in consumer protection and fraud are enforced by the Attorney General, it's no different than misrepresenting a hammer that you buy at the hardware store or anything else. Suggest Public Service commission instead of Attorney General office.

**CLOSE**

## 2007 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. **SB 2409 C**


Senate Industry, Business and Labor Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: **February 7, 2007**

Recorder Job Number: **3032**

Committee Clerk Signature



*Cell Phone "Bill of Rights" – part 3:*

**S Heitkamp:** presented his amendments. The Amendments address 2 situations: the 8<sup>th</sup> Circuit ruling and the philosophical question, if we have a problem in ND, we need to ask, "Who does the problem lie with?" In my opinion it only lies with those individuals who have been taken out of the universal service fund. You're getting money from the Feds to get this done and provide coverage over a blanket area. To me if you're a private company and you're NOT getting money from the Feds and Universal Service fund, then, you know your service and I'm not helping to subsidize, I really don't have much to bitch about.

**S Klein:** It takes Quest out of the equation.

**S Heitkamp:** In the instance of Quest, it's pretty narrow in scope.

**S Klein:** This doesn't affect any other phones.

**S Heitkamp:** This doesn't address how Alltel and others do business.>

**S Klein:** The neutral testimony of Commissioner Wefald, wasn't very neutral, so I asked a lot of questions on that. I wanted to see what that really meant. There is either a pre-emption by the Feds, or that they are already on the compliance or complaint side of handling those issues. I think we're already covering complaints through consumer fraud division.

**S Heitkamp:** Before we get into the argument if the bill should pass, I'll move **THIS** amendment – 0102.

**S Potter Second the Motion**

**S Wanzek:** This would make the bill better, I understand the reasoning behind why we're doing this, I don't know if it's going to change the view, but would support the amendment.

**S Klein:** Why would I want to cut those guys out if they don't participate in the service? The issue concerns with the consumer, we should treat everybody fairly so that the PSC takes a call and hear: "Are you Verizon, or Alltel, or Quest? Oh, you're Quest, then we can't help you." How do we address that?

**S Heitkamp:** Answer is that you're building a network, you're building everything out there, but if you're not sitting at the Federal spot getting money, I don't really have as much as a complaint there.

**RECESS**

**Rest of committee members arrived.**

**S Heitkamp:** With the amendment 0102 address 2 things, there is another amendment that needs to go on after this which is a clerical amendment for clarity from S Krauter in his testimony. Two provisions in this: 1. Deals with the 8<sup>th</sup> circuit ruling, that's what the first part of this amendment does on page 3. Page 3, you'd also need to include the exclude "F"

**S Klein:** So that would be lines 16-23.

**S Heitkamp:** Right.

**S Potter:** So that's the right of refusal after you receive the bill? You want to take that out.

**S Heitkamp:** Right Isn't that what the 8<sup>th</sup> circuit ruled?

**S Klein** asked Kent Blickensderfer to take the stand.

**Kent Blickensderfer** goes to podium.

**Kent B:** As in my testimony, the 8<sup>th</sup> circuit and the Feds have clearly pre-empted any type of rate regulation with respect to wireless service. Anything that requires, page 3, # 5, that's pretty much EXACTLY what was struck down in the Minnesota statute. If you look at "F" you are dangerously close to regulating rates when you examine "terms and conditions" trial periods.

**S Klein:** As you look through this, "dangerously close," section upon section as I visited with the commissioner upstairs, our concern are the pre-emption issues with the Feds.

**Kent B:** Yes

**S Klein:** At the end of the day, we have one little section that the Feds would pre-empt us on. How would we even want to move this forward?

**Kent B:** I stand by my testimony that I gave the other day about us being in opposition in this bill. I believe that conversation went something to the effect of: "you take out all the stuff that's likely to be pre-empted by the Feds." You take out the provisions that the Public Service Commission felt would be so onerous it would be too difficult to implement with respect to some of the bills standards and requirements, I think we were left with page 5. Discussion with page 5 was that that could all be done today without adding further language.

**S Heitkamp:** My point is we could all determine if we're going to vote against this bill or not. My belief is that these amendments make it better. **I move these amendments.**

**S Klein:** We already have a second, still in discussion.

**S Hacker:** FUSF Federal Universal Service Fund, is that large?

**Kent B:** I don't have the exact figures, it's a lot of money. Quest doesn't receive these funds. If this bill goes forward, that we're clear on, if the amendments if they passed, we don't get any except to the extent that we provide lifeline and linkup for wire line customers and we get some reimbursement there.

**S Heitkamp:** It is money from the federal government. There is a clear separation between those who are getting federal dollars to get this done. Why kick someone who isn't getting private funds.

**S Klein:** How many customers do you serve and how many wireless customers are out in ND?

**Kent B:** I wouldn't feel comfortable sharing Quest's wireless subscriber base, publicly on the record, that is proprietary information. Wireless subscribers, it's a very small number. We tipped over the 300,000 mark a year ago. The wireless companies are bigger than the largest wire line company now, by far.

**S Heitkamp:** I have one land line, but 4 cell phones.

**S Wanzek:** I can't recall from the testimony as far as complaints that did come in, were they pretty much directly towards those that were using universal funds, or were some directed at.

**Kent B:** I would think that people with the most customers have the most complaints, I did not see the latest reports.

**S Wanzek:** We have the rights to change our views. I'm struggling with when the complaints are filed. Are there those who do not receive universal funds that could potentially have the same complaint. Does the consumer make the distinction?

**Roll on Amendments 70756.0102. – 3 – 3 – 1 FAILS ON A TIE**

**S Potter:** In S Krauter's testimony, he proposed some amendments: 0101. I think they were for removing civil penalty.

**Move the AMENDMENT 70756.0101 by S Heitkamp**

**Second by S Potter**

**S Klein:** Page 4, subsection 4, remove procedures... "A" ? [reads from amendment]

**Roll on Amendment 0101 – 6 – 0 – 1 PASSES**

**S Klein:** What we've done is page 3 discussion, which removes section 5, after line 10 and "F"

*Feb.*

**S Heitkamp:** It goes beyond that. Once you get to page 5 after line 10, that part of the amendment down, goes away. Everything on top, stays.

0102 – in reference, we still need to do that needs to put the bill in the right form.

**S Klein:** Asked S Heitkamp to fix the amendments and get them ready to bring Monday, to have a better understanding. I want to make sure the amendments are understood.

**S Heitkamp:** Monday

**CLOSE**



## 2007 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. **SB 2409 B**

Senate Industry, Business and Labor Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: **February 7, 2007**

Recorder Job Number: **3058**

Committee Clerk Signature



*Wireless Bill of rights*”:

**S Potter:** I believe all things have been heard, I've heard from both sides saying “just do the right thing.” It must be all over and all the arguments must be over.

**S Klein:** I don't think that's going to be the issue, I think S Andrist is going to need some time, I think S Heitkamp, can you bring those for Monday?

**S Heitkamp:** You don't want to do them now Mr. Chairman? Why don't I hand them out now so I don't have to carry them around. [hands out amendment]

What they did was took out any group that did not use the federal universal service fund.

FUSF What we're debating here is if coverage should be provided and if you have a private business that isn't using the Federal funds to build this, I felt they should be excluded. Those were defeated. The other part of the amendment, non-controversial, which deal with the 8<sup>th</sup> circuit ruling when it comes to regulating bills, I'm not speaking for the other side of opinion, I'm hoping not to send the bill up unless we clean it up, even if comes out with a DO NOT PASS recommendation. I offer the amendments.

**S Klein:** S Andrist, you'll have an opportunity to see how they fit in. On Monday we will have a few bills and we will do some committee work on Monday to get this bill out.

CLOSE

## 2007 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. **SB 2409 D**

Senate Industry, Business and Labor Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: **February 12, 2007**

Recorder Job Number: **3401 7:56m**

Committee Clerk Signature



*Wireless Phone "bill of rights":*

*S Heitkamp passed out the Amendments to the bill.*

**Motion to move the Amendments by S Heitkamp**

**2<sup>nd</sup> by S Potter**

**S Heitkamp:** What the amendments do is deal with the 8<sup>th</sup> circuit issue, they don't go into what we debated the other day on the universal service fund. This removes lines 16-26, Amendment number 70756.0104

**Roll for DO PASS AMENDMENTS 70756.0104 – 6-0-1 Passed**

**S Klein:** We've had a lot of discussion on that, everyone's got their minds made up, as this could play out. After visiting with the Public Service Commission, have a lot of problems with the entire bill, so I'm not going to support it whichever way it comes to you.

**S Hacker:** Are we speaking of the amendments or the bill?

**S Klein:** the bill

**S Hacker:** I live on the border and I'm nervous about the effects that companies might stop selling their phones in ND if this passes. Because of the structure of the cancellation policy that we would be enacting, this would be a penalty.

**Motion for a DO NOT PASS AS AMMENDED S Wanzek**

**2<sup>nd</sup> – S Andrist**

**S Klein:** We're not going to be increasing the amount of towers, this would generally go to some billing that would be required, that billing statements would look the same, I feel the providing consumer protection, this will hurt consumers as we move forward with the deal we currently have with the phones, don't think it's quite right. We're not dealing with a monopoly here.

**S Heitkamp:** I disagree with that.

**S Andrist:** I experience some of the frustration in cell phones, everybody does, but it is a vibrant, changing competitive marketplace out there. I see so much merging ahead or so many of these things, perhaps to the point where primary delivery in much of ND's going to be in the hands of telephone cooperatives, who knows. I don't see trying to run these companies.

**Roll vote for DO NOT PASS AS AMMENDED: Passed 4-2-1 (nays Heitkamp, Potter)**

**Carrier: Klein**

**FISCAL NOTE**  
 Requested by Legislative Council  
 01/23/2007

Bill/Resolution No.: SB 2409

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).*

Provides for rules regarding wireless service and billing, complaint procedures and complaint reporting. We estimate no 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.*

n/a

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

<b>Name:</b>	Illona Jeffcoat-Sacco	<b>Agency:</b>	PSC
<b>Phone Number:</b>	328-2407	<b>Date Prepared:</b>	01/28/2007

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SENATE BILL NO. 2409

Page 3, line 24, remove "The wireless telephone service provider to establish procedures for the notification"

Page 3, remove lines 25 and 26

Page 3, line 27, remove "6." and after "The" insert "rules at least must require the"

Page 4, line 3, replace "7." with "6." and after "The" insert "rules at least must require the"

Page 5, after line 10, insert:

"49-21.2-04. Application. This chapter or a rule adopted to implement this chapter does not apply to a wireless telephone service provider unless the provider receives federal universal service funds."

Re-number accordingly

Heitkamp/Potter

~~DO NOT~~

FAILS



PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SENATE BILL NO. 2409

Page 1, line 7, after "law" insert "or rule"

Page 1, line 9, replace "The" with "Unless inconsistent with federal law or rule, the"

Page 3, line 24, replace "to" with "shall"

Page 3, line 27, replace "to" with "shall"

Page 4, line 11, remove "- Civil penalty"

Page 4, line 12, remove "1." and after "procedures" insert "pursuant to chapter 28-32"

Page 4, line 17, remove "The procedures must include, at a"

Page 4, remove lines 18 through 20

Page 4, line 21, replace "b. That the" with "The"

Page 4, line 23, replace "; and" with an underscored period

Page 4, remove lines 24 through 31

Renumber accordingly

Date: 2-7-07

Roll Call Vote: 2

**2007 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES**

BILL/RESOLUTION NO. 2409

Senate INDUSTRY BUSINESS & LABOR Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Legislative Council Amendment Number 0101 A:

Action Taken pass ammendment - clerical

Motion Made By Potter Seconded By Heitkamp

Senators	Yes	No	Senators	Yes	No
Chairman Klein, Jerry	✓		Senator Behm, Art	✓	
Senator Hacker, Nick, VC	✓		Senator Heitkamp, Joel	✓	
Senator Andrist, John			Senator Potter, Tracy	✓	
Senator Wanzek, Terry	✓				

Total Yes 6 No 0

Absent 1

Floor Assignment \_\_\_\_\_

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



