

MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the
LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY
at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library
<http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib>



Reproduced from scanned originals with text recognition applied
(searchable text may contain some errors and/or omissions)



REP. MICHAEL V. SAXL
CHAIR

SEN. RICHARD A. BENNETT
VICE-CHAIR

SEN. BEVERLY C. DAGGETT
SEN. MARY E. SMALL
SEN. PAUL T. DAVIS, SR.
SEN. SHARON ANGLIN TREAT
REP. PATRICK COLWELL
REP. JOSEPH BRUNO
REP. WILLIAM S. NORBERT
REP. WILLIAM J. SCHNEIDER

JAMES A. CLAIR
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

120th MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE
LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

MEETING SUMMARY
June 27, 2001
APPROVED JULY 31, 2001

CALL TO ORDER

The Chair, Speaker Michael V. Saxl, called the Legislative Council meeting to order at 1:22 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Senators: Sen. Bennett, Sen. Daggett, Sen. Small, Sen. Davis,
Sen. Treat

Representatives: Speaker Saxl, Rep. Colwell, Rep. Bruno, Rep. Norbert,
Rep. Schneider

Legislative Officers: Joy O'Brien, Secretary of the Senate
Pamela Cahill, Assistant Secretary of the Senate
Millicent MacFarland, Clerk of the House
David Shiah, Assistant Clerk of the House
James A. Clair, Executive Director, Legislative Council
Grant Pennoyer, Director, Office of Fiscal and Program Review
David Boulter, Director, Office of Policy and Legal Analysis
Margaret Matheson, Revisor of Statutes
Lynn Randall, State Law Librarian
Paul Mayotte, Director, Legislative Information Services

**SUMMARIES OF THE APRIL 25, MAY 7, AND MAY 10, 2001
COUNCIL MEETINGS**

That the Summaries of the April 25, May 7, and May 10, 2001 meetings be accepted and placed on file. (Motion by Sen. Bennett, second by Sen. Small, 9-0).

REPORTS FROM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND STAFF OFFICE DIRECTORS

- Executive Director's Report

Mr. Clair presented a summary of his written report. He said he had a number of items alerting the Council members to items that will come before them later in the Council meeting.

First, he wanted to highlight 3 key issues on the North Wing renovations before the meeting got to New Business. One was the scope of the work, second was how to finance whatever that scope of work was and third, at a minimum, they needed to give the construction crew some affirmative step to take and he had a recommendation.

Second, was an update on the Legislative budget. For some of the summaries done previously for the Part I exercise and the Part II exercise, there was an attachment that listed for FY 02 and FY 03 all the different accounts and it took them sequentially from the Part I development through the Part II, etc. This was provided for the Council members' information.

Third, under Item 2 of Old Business, members had a separate attachment that provided an update on the final legislative action on studies.

The 4th item was information he received from the firm of Weinrich + Burt, our architects. Mr. Burt apologized for not being there, but he had an interest in hiring a consultant to look the granite work in the front of the building because there had been chipping and cracking. Mr. Burt was seeking Council approval to proceed with a consulting service at an estimated cost of \$5,469. Mr. Clair was putting that before the Council for consideration.

Number 5 was regarding the Press Room on the 4th floor off the Rotunda. They requested that phone lines be installed. Mr. Clair suggested they come back with a recommendation on a way to put in phone lines and a way to finance them. The question was whether the Legislative budget should be paying for the lines or whether they should be directly subsidized by the members of the press who used them. Speaker Saxl asked if the members of the Press paid fees for the space they have in the CSOB and in the State House. Mr. Clair said they leased the space in the CSOB, but paid nothing to the Legislature for the space in the State House. Sen. Bennett questioned the purpose of the phone lines. Mr. Clair said the previous Legislative Council had established the old custodian office to be a press satellite area. There was enough space for members of the press to use a lap top and, perhaps, a cell phone; there was not a lot of working area. There is the capacity to activate phone lines but only one member of the press is presently paying for privately. No others had been activated. There had been interest for a phone line because press conferences require at a minimum an ISDN line and also had interest in fax transmissions.

Sen. Treat asked if a decision had to be made regarding phone lines at the meeting. Mr. Clair said he had been discussing it with the Maine Association of Broadcasters, but there is not a group that serves both the print media and the tv media, so it had been difficult to get all groups together at the same time. Also, how the costs would be divided had also been an issue. This matter was deferred until a later time.

Mr. Clair announced his resignation as Executive Director effective September 15, 2001, saying it was not something that he did lightly or in any other capacity than what he believed to be in the best interest of his family and his professional future. It had been nothing short of an honor for him to work at the State House for 18 sessions, he had enjoyed it immensely but, nonetheless, it was a decision that had been painful but one that he had come to. He wanted to announce his resignation publicly and also to thank everyone for their support because everyone had been great to work with.

Speaker Saxl thanked Mr. Clair for his service to the Legislature, not just in his capacity as Executive Director, but for the last 18 years he had made a tremendous contribution to the people in the State of Maine and was very sorry to see him go. The Speaker wished they could convince him otherwise, but knew that the job came with a lot of sacrifices and wished him the very best in his future endeavors. He knew that it had not been an easy decision for him to make and thanked you for all your service.

- Renovations: Status Report

The topic of the granite consultant was raised again. Mr. Burt feels very strongly about it but, given our financial situation, Mr. Clair dragged his feet a little bit on it, quite frankly. Mr. Fairservice and Mr. Clair met with Rick Burt a couple of weeks ago and he was very interested in this. It had been pointed out to him where there are some of these problems. Mr. Clair believed it would be helpful to hear Mr. Fairservice's perspective.

Mr. Fairservice said they did meet with Rick Burt to discuss the chipping and cracking of the granite. They are at the front entrance of the building, some were before the construction, but some came during the process of the construction project and are fairly substantial. He asked Mr. Hilfrank and he also felt that a granite consultant would be beneficial to all, so Mr. Fairservice would also recommend it.

Sen. Treat asked if it was the existing or new granite, and Mr. Fairservice said it was the existing granite on the curve of the building. It would be the front doors of the future entrance. Rep. Norbert referring to the memo from Mr. Burt questioned why the Legislature would pay. Mr. Fairservice believed it was turned back to the architect because of the decision-making. He did not feel comfortable in pursuing it with a contractor, and felt he needed a consultant to give him recommendations. Some had been done earlier on the retaining wall and the type of process they used turned to yellow. That would not be something to use for the front entrance. Rep. Bruno asked if any type of contingency had been built in for cracking or chipping. Mr. Fairservice said some had been built in, but a lot of it had already been used, plus money not built in to do the Hall of Flags floor, which had bid about \$95,000. They tried to do that work with the Hall of Flags floor, inside the contract using the contingency instead of asking for any additional monies, and so had used quite a bit of it.

Sen. Bennett questioned if the Council was going to be approving all of the expenditures at that level and if there was a reason it was coming before them. Mr. Clair felt he was statutorily obligated to bring an expenditure of this sort on the building before the Council and also the entering of a contract for services. He needed to get the Council's approval and the nature of some of the work on the renovations was such that he was not anxious to bring someone on board unless he had a limited contractual obligation, so \$5,000 did not become \$15,000. Sen. Bennett asked if this was something the architect normally would contract for, and if so, why wasn't he doing so in this case. Mr. Clair said he believed the architect was prepared to tell the Council that they would pay his 10.8% commission on top of the contract amount if they went through him as an

addendum to his present contract. Sen. Bennett did not want to see things of this nature coming before them in the future. Sen. Treat agreed, but believed it would be best to have a contract and would like to see members move towards actually approving it and if others members were of the same mind, she would move to approve it.

Speaker Saxl asked if the engineers would actually do the work and Mr. Fairservice believed they would give them a set of direction and specification and then they would have to find a list of contractors that would be able to do the work. Mr. Fairservice believed they would garnish a lot of information and technical expertise from it that could be used in a lot of other places around the building that would need to be done in the future with doing this one contract.

Rep. Bruno questioned Mr. Fairservice about the procedure. You are bringing a consultant in to tell you there are cracks in the granite and who should be hired, but you will not know what that cost will be to fix it. Mr. Fairservice said yes.

Rep. Colwell asked if it was damage that resulted from the construction and Mr. Fairservice said anything damaged during the construction, the contractor would do. There are existing places where big chunks of concrete are gone. Rep. Colwell asked if that was why the specialist was needed, to make the distinction of where the liability lies and Mr. Fairservice said yes. Any repairs for those that were cracked or broken during the construction process, we will take care; this was for the other granite issues.

Motion: Move that the Legislative Council approve the contract with the specialists to review the granite. (Motion by Sen. Treat, second by Rep. Colwell, 8-2).

Speaker Saxl asked for further renovation updates. Mr. Fairservice said at present they had turned over the portion of the building on the 1st floor to the head of the stairs to the connector tunnel. The Snack Bar had moved in and was working on a limited basis at the present time. Also the "Interpretive Center", was able to be occupied. The other side of the Connector, they were doing the finishing touches, the drywall, plaster, the stone was being etched by the artists, and we hopeful would see the stone in mid-July. Also hoping the connector will be open by mid-August, along with the front entrance. They received the drawings for the front entrance and sent them out to bid. Bids had been received and they had issued a contract. That person had started to procure the stones.

Speaker Saxl asked if there were other updates or any questions for Mr. Fairservice.

Mr. Clair wanted to mention, with the awkwardness of the West Wing opening and the North Wing closing, they were presently using the Interpretive Center space for the custodial bins because there was no other place in the building right now. This was only a temporary use, but might be necessary for a short time after the West Wing entry way opened. Speaker Saxl asked if he could make a recommendation that the Space Committee would be the appropriate venue, but thought it would be good if the Legislature convened a subcommittee to work on the "Interpretive Center" to develop a program for it. He knew that Rep. McKee had been working on it, and thought incorporating some of the University of Maine in Augusta and some of Rep. McKee's suggestions in a bipartisan, bicameral effort to try to come up with a program to be ready once it was done being used by the custodial staff, there would a welcoming center and a program that they had a chance to review and approve.

Motion: That the Space Committee with an addition of four people, one from each caucus in the Legislature, to make recommendations over the programming that would occur in the Interpretive Center, the one individual to be from each of the caucuses to be appointed by the leaders of each of those individual caucuses. (Motion by Speaker Saxl, second by Sen. Treat, 10-0).

Speaker Saxl asked Mr. Clair to speak to those leaders within the next week. Rep. Linda McKee is his choice for the House Democrats.

- Fiscal Update

Mr. Pennoyer drew members to information in their packet. First he gave an update of the May revenues. The Commissioner of Administrative and Financial Services has released May revenues that day. The May general fund revenues were down \$3.2 million for the month, primarily as a result of corporate income tax and sales tax being under budget. However, to date, they remain \$30.1 million over budget and looking ahead to June, looks like sales tax had recovered in June and will be on or slightly ahead of budget, corporate tax will still be down, and individual tax will be right about on budget. There is one other adjustment that needed to be made in the budgeted revenue that provided the basis for the variance report did not include 2 legislative changes to FY 01 revenue. One was enacted in the emergency FY 01 budget and the current services budget also included additional revenue not reflected in the budgeted numbers. The \$30.1 million variance at the end of May was actually \$29 million. Absent any significant change in the other minor lines, it looks like there may be excess in revenue of approximate \$25 million. As part of the Part II budget there were yearend commitments totaling \$17.9 million. As of now, absent any major changes, those will all be able to be funded to yearend balances.

Rep. Bruno asked Mr. Pennoyer about his statement, the sales tax line had recovered. Did he mean year to date or just month to month. He said in June it was on budget, or slightly ahead for June. Some may be a timing issue, the late winter might have slowed some sales, hopefully this is a trend that will continue, it will be right on budget. There was a concern earlier if that were a continuing trend, it might result in a downward projection for that line, but would have to watch. If the trend holds up the downward projection may not happen.

Mr. Pennoyer said the second item was an update of the general fund cash position. The 12 month moving average on the graph decreasing over FY 01 and reflects the spending of the \$300 million plus surplus that was available at the beginning of FY 01. He expected the 12 month moving average to continue down slightly and then level off. The Administration thought they would need an additional tax anticipation note, or TAN, which would need additional authorization and the Legislature did approve that at \$100 million for FY 02. They thought it would be needed in late July or early August. Mr. Pennoyer said he would continue to keep the Council apprised of the cash position.

Mr. Pennoyer noted that normally some kind of update on the fiscal note production and other session end updates. However, they were not available at the time. He wanted to make sure the information was correct before he provided an update. It would be done shortly and also he would provide a comparison of how they had done this session as compared to past sessions. Also, as soon as the yearend closes and that information was available, an update would be provided as to the actual variance and revenues that will fund the year end commitments, as well as lapsed balances.

- Migration Project Status

Mr. Mayotte said the Migration Project was an on going effort, had been in the completion of user testing which was behind schedule for two reasons. There was not enough time allocated to do the testing and they ran into the end of session schedule and then the Revisor office move. At this point they estimate that it is 2/3 complete on the user testing. They estimate there are 4 weeks of remaining work to do and look at it as being 6 weeks of elapsed time. The Revisor's Office was moving and Compaq was on a corporate wide shutdown during the 4th of July week. The soonest testing could be resumed would be the week following the 4th. They estimated 6 weeks of elapsed time to complete it, which would have user testing completed in the middle of August. To date Compaq had made several hundred changes and stated that Compaq had been very responsive in correcting problems as soon as they had been found. Mr. Mayotte had been very pleased with Compaq's reaction to issues and problems. Because of the delay in completion of user testing there were several impacts. Compaq needed to keep staff on this project longer than anticipated and where possible, were trying to find other work for these people, but was not always possible. They had been working with Compaq to develop what they viewed as some equitable options to keep supporting the user testing function through completion to help Compaq get through a period of down time, and that was the goal he was putting before the Council. They were proposing and requesting Council approval to proceed on two different fronts. One request was to re-phase the deferred payments of \$150,000. He would like to accelerate payment to them into the user testing period and was proposing that as Compaq completed different segments of user testing, payment would be released to them. This would be a no cost impact to the Legislature as it would accelerate payments that were already budgeted. There was the risk that it reduced the Legislature's leverage. To date Compaq, with one small instance, had been very honorable and worked very hard to meet the Legislature's requirements. If the Legislature were to accelerate the \$150,000 it would take away some leverage, but it would still have \$50,000 in payments being withheld until the completion of the warranty period.

The Speaker asked Mr. Clair if he had been part of the renegotiations and he said he had. He then asked him if he had concern about paying the accelerated payments. Mr. Clair said his concern was more about the user testing and the fact that there was not a better integration of Compaq's time here and the way the session was proceeding, but that was a fact of life. We want to make sure that the user testing is thorough so the 2nd Regular Session product works wells. Mr. Clair recommended item one before the Council.

Motion: That permission be given to revise the Migration Project mile stone schedule to change the timing of the warranty payments. (Motion by Sen. Treat, second by Sen. Bennett, unanimous).

Mr. Mayotte's second item was to start designing, building and implementing the fiscal note system for the Office of Fiscal and Program Review. It would be an add on to the bill drafting system and would be integrated with the bill drafting system. Currently there was \$364,000 budgeted; originally the Part II budget included additional money for the effort, however, the Executive Branch was facing delays in developing their budgeting system and at this time, he did not know what or how they were going to present for the Legislature to integrate with. The integration piece with the budgeting system was on hold until the Executive Branch decided on what they were going to do. In the meantime, Mr. Pennoyer's Office did need a tool to replace the Wang tool currently used to develop fiscal notes. What was being proposed to the Council at this time, was a release of a change order to Compaq, not for the full \$364,000 but for just under \$75,000, which would allow Compaq to start the design effort. It would require

several stages, the first being for Compaq to come in and meet with Mr. Pennoyer and his people, review their requirements, and then based on those user requirements, come forward with a design and a cost estimate for what the office needs. At this point, he would come back to the Council with a recommendation on how best to proceed. They did not recommend releasing all \$364,000 at this time.

Motion: Move that the Council authorize a change order not to exceed \$75,000 to get started on the fiscal note design. (Motion by Sen. Treat, second by Sen. Daggett, unanimous).

Mr. Mayotte said now being out of session, and being at a critical stage in the project, he thought they should be issuing a bi-weekly Migration status report, at least to the Technology Committee, and if approved by Sen. Treat, copies to the rest of the Council members. Speaker Saxl said the Council would leave it to his discretion.

Sen. Treat asked if Mr. Mayotte was going to discuss the Internet access. It was her understanding that formal approval had not been given by the Council to proceed with its own Internet access.

Motion: That the Maine State Legislature proceed with establishing a direct connection with the Internet. (Motion by Sen. Treat, second by Rep. Bruno, unanimous).

REPORTS FROM COUNCIL COMMITTEES

- Personnel Committee

Speaker Saxl reported that the Personnel Committee had met earlier that day. Lynn Randall's anniversary date was soon and they would be conducting a review of her service, and would be meeting regarding that prior to the next Council meeting.

The second item discussed briefly in executive session was the upcoming vacancy of the Executive Director's position and they would be preparing a recommendation at the next meeting of the Council on how to proceed.

The third item was collective bargaining. It had been the tradition of the Legislature to adopt the same collective bargaining agreements that had been bargained for Executive Branch staff. The Legislature had usually honored the union agreement for Legislative employees. Discussion then centered around the funding of the legislative branch collective bargaining agreement. There was a sense of agreement to extend the increase to legislative branch employees, but there was concern among all parties about appropriately funding it.

Sen. Bennett said there was absolutely no issue about the fact that it had been the long standing policy of the Council to approve the same collective bargaining increases that Executive Branch employees received and he certainly would continue that. In doing so, he did want to underscore the issue that he felt that when they returned in January they were going to have a significant problem with the legislative budget and the additional information received (concerning agencies having to absorb the costs through their vacancies) extended to the Legislature. Sen. Bennett said the most important resource the Legislature has is the people, the nonpartisan and partisan staff.

Rep. Bruno felt it was not the employees' fault for any budget problems, they were entitled to their raises, but the problem was the way it was budgeted. There was a \$5 million short fall statewide and the unions approved the agreements. There would be a short fall and he did not think it was very good budgeting, did have a concern of where the money would come from, but it should not be laid on the employees who ratified a contract in good faith to deny them a raise.

Speaker Saxl agreed that it should have been fully funded as it had been in the past. He was operating under the assumption that it had been and said they will work together to make sure that it is fully and appropriately funded, but that legislative employees deserved to be treated with equity as the Executive employees are treated.

Motion: Moved to exercise the Council's authority in granting Legislative employees and, with reluctance, the Constitutional Officers and the State Auditor as well, the increase approved for the Executive Branch employees thus far. (Motion by Sen. Bennett, second by Rep. Bruno, unanimous).

Motion: That income protection for a Legislative employee be granted as reviewed and accepted by the Personnel Committee at its June 27, 2001 meeting. (Motion by Sen. Bennett, second by Sen. Davis, unanimous).

- Space Committee

Rep. Colwell reported that the Space Committee met on June 26 and referred Council members to information in their packet. The Executive Director had informed the Committee that the North Wing renovations project, after additional accounts had been factored in, would end up with approximately a \$750,000 deficit from the original estimate for the work. The original estimate was about \$6 million. Mr. Clair had put together a scenario of potential cost savings. The alternate cost savings measures that were recommended to help fill in the \$750,000 hole. The Space Committee reviewed them very carefully and it was their consensus that, although they agreed with most of them, there were some they felt they could not agree to. Alternate # 1, the structural repairs of the Law Library floor was an issue with Weinrich + Burt. They said the Library floor as it currently existed would not bare the load of all the books. The floor either needs to be repaired or remove about 28% of the books in the Library. They were getting a second opinion from another structural engineer regarding the structure itself. The Committee was not interested in removing books, so unless the second structural engineer gave a different opinion, the amount between \$87,000 and \$71,000 would have to be moved back into the account.

Alternates #2, #3, #4, #6, and #8, the Space Committee accepted those cuts; Alternate #5 was rejected. The Council had made it clear on a previous vote that the wheelchair lift to the Library Mezzanine was to stay in, \$39,000 was left in. Alternate #7 was split. The Committee accepted half the cut but the fan coil unit for the Clerk's Office, Room 300, was put back in, approximately \$2,500. Rep. Colwell said they had requested more information on Alternate #9 and Mr. Clair was checking on whether money had been budgeted in the BGS budget specifically for the State House, and if so if that money could pay for this work. Rep. Colwell said they coupled #10 with #12 and Earle Shettleworth felt the State House and Capitol Planning Commission's budget had approximately \$90,000 of additional money and felt it very important aesthetically to do Alternate #10 and 12 and he was optimistic that they would be able to come up with about \$29,000 to

fund the two items for the Legislature. Alternate #11 involved a conference room and a fixed wall so they could put floor and ceiling shelving, and that was moved back in the budget.

Sen. Daggett asked if the Committee had discussion regarding an issue of deleting some of the dimming switches, except for Engrossing or Proofing. Rep. Colwell said that was correct. Mr. Clair said Bruce Hilfrank, Stan Fairservice, Rose Breton and himself had discussed that and specifically the list that Sen. Daggett mentioned previously. He believed it might be instructive if Mr. Hilfrank and Mr. Fairservice went over the items, including Alternate #12, that Rep. Colwell referred to, as it had been tied to both some time savings and dollar savings. He drew members' attention to information in their packet regarding financing the North Wing, and what needed to be done at the Council meeting to make sure that Granger Northern's crews, with Mr. Fairservice's oversight, got to work as soon as possible. Mr. Fairservice said when they reviewed the proposed savings from E.S. Boulos, on item #1, not putting the card access intrusion detection in conduit he would not recommend. Speaking as the owners' representative, it should be in conduit, it was a security type system and did not want it tampered with or accidentally cut. Item 2, the sound systems on j-hooks, he would consider accepting that cost proposal. Item 3, the fire alarm cabling definite believed that should stay in conduit and should not be accepted for the Legislature's protection. Item 4, the dimming ballast, there were a lot in the building now, and are not being used very often except in the Proofreaders area. The C-5 and C-6 fixtures on item #5 were basically an architectural selection. Lynn Randall spoke on item #6, switching at the stacks, and felt a real need for them. The Space Committee asked that they look at Item 7, the Tel/Data outlets. He would like to work with Mr. Mayotte, get the stations as they are set up now with the furnishings plan and the electrical plans. In the plans there was a considerable amount of telephone and data on every wall in an office space and he believed some could be eliminated and would not eliminate the effectiveness. One thing that had come out with item #12, which also tied directly to this one, is he was concerned about the conduits above the ceilings for telephone and data, but Mr. Mayotte said he saw in the future they would be going to a wireless system anyway. Bearing that in mind, the cost savings on Item #7 probably should be looked at carefully. That cost still included the conduit being placed in the wall so they could further gain from that and requested that he work closely with Mr. Mayotte and Mr. Clair on this item. Also, if the Legislature was definitely going wireless in the near future, it could save a considerable amount of money and time.

Motion: That the Legislative Council move to accept the recommendations of the Space Committee in finding the cost savings and, for the ones not actually resolved, including the Tel/data outlets, direct the Executive Director to keep exploring options to find additional savings with the contracts. (Motion by Rep. Colwell, second by Rep. Schneider)

Discussion: Speaker Saxl asked about the additional funding and whether the East Wing steps were going to be considered an add on. Mr. Clair said yes, the way the draft GMP price had come in twice now was at about a \$5.3 million number or so. Everything that was to be added back, as Rep. Colwell took you through, was exactly that, an add back. What he understood Rep. Colwell's point to be was that some of the items he lead the Council through, would in fact be added now as part of the Guaranteed Maximum Price, that would come back before us. Additional items, the East Wing stairs for example, would be an alternate amount should the money be found somehow.

(Above Motion by Rep. Colwell, second by Rep. Schneider, voted on - unanimous).

Mr. Clair said given that they really were not in the position yet to have a Guaranteed Maximum Price before the Council for signature, it would assist both Bruce Hilfrank and Stan Fairservice to have a letter of intent as suggested. The dollar amounts were not quite ready to be finalized, but a letter of intent that the North Wing should proceed in a scope identified as the June 11th version, plus those "add-backs" that would take you to a number of approximately \$5.5 million. Speaker Saxl asked if that required Council action and Mr. Clair said if the motion was to endorse the work and to now have a guaranteed maximum price come before them, if that was all inclusive, then he was not sure they did need one now. Mr. Clair would prepare a letter of intent from the Chair and Vice-Chair to send to Granger Northern. Speaker Saxl asked if there was objection to that and hearing none, said perhaps by their next meeting Mr. Clair would be in the position of telling them where they stood financially.

- Technology and Migration Committee

No report.

OLD BUSINESS

Item #1: Proposed Drafting Guidelines of Legislative Studies-120th Legislature

David Boulter said members had proposed drafting guidelines for legislative studies. He did point out since the legislative session had ended there was no urgency with respect to taking action. The guidelines were back before the Council for two reasons. First, there was a requirement in the joint rules that the Council adopt guidelines to set the direction of drafting of studies. Second, the session had ended, there had been a number of changes with respect to studies and he felt it was an opportunity for the members to look at them and make any changes or suggestions before they were adopted. He said it would be helpful before they started drafting proposed legislation and participation of the 2nd Regular Session that they had guidelines before them.

Sen. Treat wanted to know if the Council was going to act on the guidelines. She would not agree if the Council wanted to bring them back for another meeting.

No Council action taken.

Item #2: Update on the 120th Legislature Study Requests

Mr. Clair said there was a lump sum appropriation of \$68,000 in the Part 2. There were some other items that were moved into the Budget. The rough math was about \$104,000. He drew members' attention to the Education Funding Reform Committee's request that was moved into the Part 2 of \$22,000. The aggregate cost of the studies was approximately \$104,000. Speaker Saxl asked if further action was needed on the failed studies and Mr. Clair said no, they failed. The update was for the Council members information and probably by the next meeting there would be staffing recommendations, etc. from OPLA and OFPR.

Sen. Treat asked Mr. Boulter to prepare a spreadsheet that showed more specific information about those that passed relating to the Legislative appointments.

NEW BUSINESS

Item #1: Proposed Scope and Budget for North Wing Renovations

This item was discussed and acted upon during the "Space Committee" presentation.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REMARKS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

The Council meeting was adjourned at 2:31 p.m. (Motion by Sen. Davis, second by Sen. Treat, unanimous).