

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



120th MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE
LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

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

**MEETING SUMMARY
FEBRUARY 21, 2001
APPROVED MARCH 28, 2001**

CALL TO ORDER

The Chair, Speaker Saxl called the Council meeting to order at 1:17 p.m. in the Legislative Council Chamber.

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, Acting 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 JANUARY 31, AND FEBRUARY 7, 2001
COUNCIL MEETINGS**

Motion: That the Summaries of January 31 and February 7, 2001 be accepted and placed on file. (Motion by Sen. Bennett, second by Rep. Colwell, 10-0 unanimous)

REPORTS FROM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND STAFF OFFICE DIRECTORS

- **Executive Director's Report**

James Clair deferred his report other than to say he had spoken with the Mayor of the City Augusta regarding the appointments for the Capitol Area Advisory Committee and he will draft something about getting the appointments made. OPLA staff informed him that the LD 169 work session was scheduled for February 28, 2001 at 1:00 p.m. Speaker Saxl asked Mr. Clair send a letter to the appointing officials from Augusta and the Kennebec County Delegation from Sen. Bennett and himself on behalf of the Council.

No Council action was required.

- **Renovations: Status Report**

Stan Fairservice told Council members the foundation was completed around the West side of the building. On February 22nd they will begin to remove the steel and the building will be placed back on the foundation. Speaker Saxl asked for an update from Mr. Fairservice on negotiations with the Executive regarding tearing down of the Education Building. He said the majority of the demolishing would be done on the weekend, and was scheduled for March 3rd and 4th. Speaker Saxl asked if the Senate had been briefed, and if they not, recommended that they do because it impacts their end of the building.

No Council action required.

- **Fiscal Update**

Grant Pennoyer reported on the fiscal note production saying, although it was early in the process, as of Friday, February 16, they had completed fiscal notes on 1/4 of the bills printed and also had completed 80% of the fiscal notes on those that had been heard. Their goal was to get a fiscal note memo to the Committee prior to their public hearing. The fiscal notes on the original bills are not technically required by joint rule, but it is helpful to get the information to the committees as early as possible in the process. In terms of amendments, they are required to respond to amendments by joint rules and have had 24 requests for fiscal review on amendments, have completed 2/3 of those. OFPR's goal is to respond within 5 working days, but we did have 2 requests that took longer.

Sen. Bennett asked if OFPR, when they provide fiscal notes to the Committee make sure that sponsors and cosponsors get copies of the fiscal notes too. Mr. Pennoyer responded not necessarily the sponsors, the fiscal note form is set up to send it to the primary sponsor, that is all the system generates. They do not have a means within the system to easily pull down the cosponsors and distribute to them.

Mr. Pennoyer provided a summary of January 2001 revenue reports for the General Fund and Highway Fund variances. The Commissioner of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services just released the revenue report. The major reason they were ahead for the month was a significant variance in the individual income tax. It was up \$27 million for the month. \$9 million of it was revenue that should have been credited in February, so the amount will reverse itself in February, but was still \$18 million of positive variance that could not be explained. Without the positive variance for individual income tax, there would be a substantial negative variance for the month, of approximately \$12.8 million. While the Highway Fund is doing well, there are a few lines in the General Fund that will need to be

revisited by the Revenue Forecasting Committee, which meets February 26, 2001 at 10:00 a.m. at the State Planning Office. Speaker Saxl asked if action would be taken at that meeting and Mr. Pennoyer replied if consensus can be reached, action will be taken.

Sen. Bennett noted that, in the footnotes, the summaries incorporated the change in revenue forecasting of November, 1999. Mr. Pennoyer said the sheets had been copied over, and the date had not been changed. Sen. Bennett asked if they incorporated the revenue reforecast of November, 2000, and Mr. Pennoyer responded they had been adjusted upward to reflect the upward reprojection that was approved technically in December of 2000. Sen. Bennett said the individual income tax and sales tax are quite stark variances considering the revenue that was reforecasted 2 months ago and asked Mr. Pennoyer if he had any comment. Mr. Pennoyer said they were concerned about the underlying assumption of the sales tax estimates at the last reprojection and decided to go with the underlying assumption of growth, with the most recent reforecast of the economic forecast by the Consensus Economic Forecasting Commission bears out that a reduced underlying growth assumption is appropriate for the line. Sen. Bennett asked if the Economic Forecasting Commission had personal income growing at 5 1/2%, did it drop to 5% for the upcoming year? Mr. Pennoyer said that was the personal income number, not individual income, there is a difference. The Economic Forecast looks at personal income. That is a factor determining individual income tax collection, but there is not a one-to-one relationship between the two. Personal income numbers for the State are one indicator of economic activity and then feed what would be included as income for the income tax. Sen. Bennett then asked about the expensive modeling that we had purchased over the last few years, does it for ordain the revenue forecast amount or is there something that will cause or give the Revenue Forecasting Commission latitude to look at the numbers? Mr. Pennoyer responded that the unexplained variance in the individual income taxes in the past month would need to be discussed. He does not believe the model will be able to capture that so it will be a focus of their discussions, what caused it. It may be that the Maine Revenue Services did not have good data at that point to explain it. They experienced that in the past when trying to forecast Capital Gains Revenue, individual income tax from capital gains. It may be related to people deferring income into tax year 2001.

No Council action required.

- **Migration Project Status**

Paul Mayotte informed the Council members that the issue surrounding the conversion of the WANG database for the statutes had been resolved and well into the development of an automated process to convert the statutes from WANG to client-server format. They were defining the bill drafting systems security levels and will be presenting it to the user community shortly. The development of the interface between the drafting system and the Legislative data repository is 50% complete.

Compaq will install the production version of the bill drafting application during the week of March 19th and will start technical and systems integration testing of the product. His office was working with International Roll Call on their efforts with the Legislative Management System for the Chambers.

Mr. Mayotte referred members to the Contract Amendment 1 document. The 119th Legislative Council directed the Executive Director, supported by his office, to negotiate with Compaq to come up with a cost project contract reduction of \$300,000, to lower the value of the contract from \$4.5 million to \$4.2 million. The Contract Amendment reduces the contract price in three ways. \$223,000 worth of reductions resulting from a decrease in actual scope; \$42,000 reduction based on a decrease in the number of software licenses that will be

provided to the Legislature; and price adjustment with no reduction in scope of \$35,000 reflecting damages to the Legislature from the delay in the implementation from Compaq. The above figures add up to the \$300,000 reduction. The document has been reviewed by the Attorney General's Office and their comments and suggested changes have been integrated into the document and had also been reviewed by Compaq. It is now before the Council for their consideration.

Speaker Saxl inquired if the Council had to act on the Contract Amendment at the meeting and Mr. Clair said yes, at some point during the meeting, because the Council was not scheduled to meet again until the end of March. If there were no objections, it would be appreciated if the Council would make a motion so they could get the sign offs and get it implemented and underway. Speaker Saxl asked how Council members wanted to proceed. Did members have time to review the Amendment, or would they want to meet next week? Sen. Treat responded that she felt it should be dealt with as quickly as possible, but would like to have it explained. She questioned the list of items that would not be done, and wanted to make sure she knew what they were. Speaker Saxl said time permitting, the Council would do it at the meeting, but wanted to make sure there was time to discuss the budget. If needed they could have a Council meeting next week.

Speaker Saxl asked if the contract would be fulfilled, would the system be fully tested and fully operational before the next Legislative session and Mr. Mayotte said that was the plan. He then asked if additional items would be needed for the full compliance and full migration, added resources that the Council would need to give in order to make it work. Mr. Mayotte said it would deliver the basic bill drafting system. One of the items being eliminated from the scope of work was the interface with the budgeting system in the Executive Branch. There is nothing to interface with as of now, so part of the \$223,000 is \$32,000 for work that is not needed at this point and to his knowledge, that was the only item that he would have to come back to the Council for in the future. Speaker Saxl asked with the additional appropriation of \$32,000, would the Legislature be at a fully operational system, would not have to make any other programmatic changes to migrate fully off the WANG and, if that decision is made in the Part 2 budget appropriation, have that portion ready for the Legislative session, no questions asked. Mr. Mayotte's reply was yes.

Sen. Treat wanted to clarify that members of the Technology Committee were apprised of a number of other things she thought the Legislative Council intended to be part of the Legislature's technology system which include all of the technical support for the Appropriation's Committee and for the functioning of the committees and management of amendments, etc. If you are just talking about bill drafting, the answer is yes, but the other answer is no, when it comes to other things that she thought would be anticipated as being part of technology going on in the Legislature. Sen. Treat said it was a lot of money. Rep. Colwell asked the amount. Mr. Mayotte said the first item on the list included \$300,000 in case they were unable to negotiate with Compaq, pending Council approval, the need for the \$300,000 no longer exists. He asked the Technology Committee for direction on how to proceed with a budget module for the Fiscal Office, how to proceed with new support items for Committees and will be asking them if they want to proceed on remote access for Representatives and staff. There was a list of potential new technology items, but to answer the Speaker's question directly, for bill drafting, other than the caveat that he had put on it, bill drafting was there.

Rep. Colwell thought because the Council was going to be taking up the budget shortly, it would be helpful to know what anticipated costs might be needed. If all of the above things were done, was there an estimate of cost. Sen. Treat said what they were given, its lists items

that the Committee had not discussed, \$2.5 million in FY 02 and \$744,925 in FY 03, understanding that you would subtract \$300,000 of the first number but even so, still talking about close to \$3 million.

Speaker Saxl asked for comments from the Secretary and Clerk regarding the Chambers' integration of the new system and migration off the WANG, if there were any changes they anticipated that had not been outlined that would add additional costs to the Part 2 budget request. Secretary O'Brien did not think any more money would be needed, but Mr. Mayotte would be more familiar with that part of it than she. Once the system was up and running, there might be some tweaking, but thought the biggest part would be in the Committees. Clerk MacFarland agreed with Secretary O'Brien. Speaker Saxl asked the Clerk to explain the Committee system. She said it would allow Committees to, for example, schedule their public hearings electronically, electronically report their Committee reports to the House and Senate, notify sponsors and cosponsors of public hearings on their bills, etc. Speaker Saxl asked Clerk MacFarland to get a cost and she said their best estimate right now was approximately \$150,000, but that is a guess. Speaker Saxl said that if they were talking about full migration, thought the Council should have the entire landscape in front of them. He asked Mr. Clair if there was anything the nonpartisan offices might need and Mr. Clair replied the figures that Sen. Treat had started to take the Council through reflects an older "Part 2" version, one that he believed they had seen previously, but will have some updates. It has a whole series of issues related to IS, migration phase 2, some staff needs, and committee status had been talked about. He said nothing stands out over and above what was either on this list or what was just talked about regarding the Committee management status with the Secretary and Clerk.

Clerk MacFarland talked about the time reporting systems that was still in WANG. Mr. Clair said that was one of the things in the Part 2 item. Mr. Mayotte said it was their intent that the number that Sen. Treat had in front of her, did have an allowance for the Committee support that the Clerk and Secretary were referring to. He did not see their numbers added to it, but adjusting the number that was in there. Speaker Saxl asked the partisan and nonpartisan representatives to come back to the Council with their ultimate needs and prioritize them for the Council so they could have an understanding, but to share it with the Technology Committee first. Sen. Treat said there was a Technology Committee and that was the point of the Committee, to run through it first and make recommendations to the full Council. She had concern about how the Council meeting was proceeding and thought it more appropriate if the Technology Committee had their meeting, had the material at the meeting and then the Committee make recommendations and give briefings to the Council. Speaker Saxl agreed. Sen. Bennett thought it would be useful if the Technology Committee could review the contract in detail and then either come back to the Council next week to advise them if it should be adopted, signed, amended or deferred. Sen. Treat said this was the first she had seen it and Mr. Clair said the process of getting a draft for the Attorney General to sign off on the wording, was completed this morning. Speaker Saxl asked if the Council was open to allowing the Technology Committee to review the contract and report back to the Council for a brief meeting next week so the Council could vote on the recommendation.

Motion: Allowing the Technology Committee to review the contract and report back to the Council for a brief meeting next week so the Council could vote on the recommendation. (Motion by Sen. Bennett, seconded by Rep. Schneider, unanimous).

Discussion: Sen. Daggett had concerns about the time constraints because some Council members would only be available Monday and Tuesday of next week. Speaker Saxl said they would try to meet by Tuesday. Because of the time constraints, Sen. Treat asked if the

Technology Committee could meet briefly that day. Speaker Saxl asked Mr. Clair to try to schedule a brief meeting of the Council subject to the extraordinary limitations of each of the members.

- Interim Studies: Status Report

David Boulter reported that the Studies of the 119th/2nd Regular Session had concluded with the exception of 4 studies that were authorized as 2 year studies. Those studies had been suspended as of now until adjournment of the session, and would reconvene in the summer. All other studies had concluded and the reports have either been issued or will be issued within the next day or so.

Speaker Saxl asked Mr. Boulter how joint studies got established and if he would talk about the Study Committee on Studies and their report of 2 or 3 years ago. Mr. Boulter said after extensive and broad participation on the Study Committee back then, the Council adopted changes that are reflect in the Joint Rules that encourage the use of joint study orders which historically, was the principle vehicle for legislative studies. There is now a renewed emphasis to create studies not by resolve, which require pieces of legislation and signature by the governor and elapsing of 90 days after the close of the session to begin, but use joint study orders which is in the domain of the Legislature itself, with the rational being they are in fact legislative studies and they ought to be controlled, both in terms of timing and scope, by the Legislature as much as possible. That is suggested as the principle vehicle now to both the study report and the rules, and is consistent with the joint rules, treated as if it were a piece of legislation and LD, referred to a joint standing committee for its review, but a policy committee for its recommendation, back to the full Legislature as to whether the study should proceed.

Sen. Treat wanted members to be aware that there had been a number of the joint orders that still had not been signed and wanted to make sure that study requests did not inadvertently get killed. Speaker Saxl said it was the tradition of the Legislature to refer studies to committee, to have the committee of jurisdiction make the determination and priorities. There is a special study table, established last year. The Council has a budget by which they allot money for studies. Studies had traditionally been standardized, 4 meetings allowed, every Legislative participant received per diem and that the standard allotment was approximately \$3,500. In the past each committee got 2 studies in the off session, and reserved 2 or 3 additional studies that the Council felt were priorities above and beyond the recommendations of those committees. He recommended dialogue by the Council, but also thought it was up to the committees of jurisdiction to make the determination on their priorities, unless the chamber wants to kill bills on reference.

Mr. Clair wanted to clarify that the Joint Rules speak to establishing an account from the studies, and technically that had not happened yet. When the studies were funded, either there was an express appropriation or it was absorbed in the Legislative account. He talked with Mr. Boulter, and Rose Breton going through the budget the past fall and early winter and with the Part I Budget having already been submitted, establishing a "study" line will have it be a Part II item. Sen. Bennett said he did not believe the intent of the Senate was to kill bills on reference, he believed there had been confusion in the Senate about where they were coming from. For example, the House Chair of the Utilities Committee submitted something that dealt with utility matters and none of the Senate members of that Committee were apprised of it, certainly not the Chair and he believed, there needed to be more dialogue. The effects of making the change to the process of joint orders is now that they are not doing them by bill or resolve form, doing them by joint order and joint orders can be put in at any time by a member, there is no cloture, and he believes they are treated differently in the Legislature than a bill.

Mr. Boulter said they had tried to draft them in a consistent fashion, so when looking at them, they looked similar. There are guidelines that they go by that had been adopted by past Legislative Councils, and given the nature of the change here, it made sense to bring the drafting guidelines before this Council for ratification. He said they did not anticipate a lot of changes, but it gave the Council an opportunity to look at whether there are certain provisions on a standardized basis that they would like his office to draft in a different matter.

Speaker Saxl suggested that as members wanted to bring forward studies, they try to adhere to the guidelines.

No Council action required.

NEW BUSINESS

Item #1: Legislature's FY 2002-2003 "Part I" Budget Request

Speaker Saxl said the Ad Hoc Part I Budget Subcommittee appointed for the purpose of today's Council meeting met and had several unanimous recommendations and several divided recommendations. He asked if Rep. Colwell could report to the Council and Rep. Bruno had information for the Council as well.

Rep. Colwell said the Subcommittee met twice. They had unanimous agreement on some items and were divided on a few. Looking at the cost drivers in the budget, it was clear that, of the \$7.6 million biennial increase, roughly \$5.2 were driven by the Collective Bargaining, Compensation Study, Retirement cost, and Health Insurance costs. There was consensus that the Subcommittee was not interested in laying people off, or addressing those major cost drivers, so looked at other areas of the budget. They had come to unanimous agreement on shortening the 2nd Regular Session 1 week, a savings of approximately \$100,000, as estimated by the Executive Director, reducing the Capital Park Commission by \$50,000 per year, for total savings of \$100,000. They agreed unanimously to ask the Executive Director to work with the Directors of the nonpartisan offices as to what type of efficiencies and management recommendations they could come back to the Executive Director, to streamline their operations. Mr. Clair has a list of the areas the Subcommittee wanted the Office Directors to look at. The Subcommittee also reached unanimous agreement on Sen. Small's suggestion to poll the staff and the Legislature to inquire if people would voluntarily withdraw from the health insurance plan if there were some type of monetary reward for them. They also looked at cutting the Legislative Apportionment Budget, which is approximately \$500,000, and to cut it \$100,000. Rep. Colwell said 3 members recommended that cut, but he had opposed it because they did not know what it was costing other states. The Executive Director was to provide that information. He said the Subcommittee had unanimous agreement on approximately \$200,000 of cuts.

Rep. Bruno requested additional information after looking back over the history of the Legislature. It had carried a balance of over \$1 million a year, the past 11 years, except for 1 year. It started at \$2.5 million and went up to \$3.5 million in 1991, 1998 was \$2 million, 1999 was \$1.8 million and at the end of last fiscal year was \$1.8 million. Looking at the above numbers, it is reasonable that the Council, as a compromise position, without cutting to deep, can look at some easy cuts to get to \$500,000 a year over the next 2 years for a total of budget cuts of approximately \$1 million based on the balance forward. Rep. Bruno also said to cut the budget \$500,000 a year, would only be a 2 1/2% cut in the budget per year. The items he came up with

are the ones already talked about. Earle Shettleworth gave up \$100,000. The Maine Education Research Institute had carried forward, \$75,000. Last year was the first year they actually spent the total \$150,000. He thought \$25,000 could be taken from them a year, for a total reduction of \$50,000. He also thought interim committee meetings could be reduced by \$125,000 a year for a total of \$250,000. A reduction in the length of session, a week off next year, the short session and two weeks off the 1st Regular Session of the 121st would save almost \$250,000. Reducing out-of-state travel by \$15,000 a year would give another \$30,000. Longevity payments total approximately \$67,000. The Legislative account carried approximately \$800,000 to \$900,000 every year so could take \$150,000 per year out of that. The items listed above total \$1,047,000, take \$100,000 from reapportionment, gives you \$1,147,000.

Sen. Small brought up a comment that had previously been made that the President Pro Tem's Office cost more than the President's Office. She asked if those figures are correct and asked the Executive Director's Office to update them.

Mr. Clair responded that Rose Breton would be updating that information and would furnish that information. Sen. Small said what she was getting at, are those figures incorrect? Are there variations? Mr. Clair asked Ms. Breton if she had done an update? She said she had not updated this - but certainly could do that. Mr. Clair said that it could be updated to take a look at where everyone is, the earlier version being his best look on January 12, now admittedly a month old. He did not believe it would change appreciably, but it could.

Sen. Treat asked for clarification on Rep. Bruno's proposal regarding longevity payments. She did not know what they were and asked if it could be explained. Speaker Saxl said there are employees who had reached the cap on their range and step. After a period of 15 and 20 years, an employee receives one last increase as a reward for serving many, many years. It also extends to legislative and executive staff. Rep. Bruno said longevity was not done in the private sector, if someone worked for a long time they were simply compensated. He believed the NCSL study had been done to look at compensation. It is separate from a longevity payment, but quite a few people received a good raise when the study was done, because they were brought up to the level where everyone else was. The question is, do you need to give people longevity bonuses to stay, or does it become an added part of their compensation. Speaker Saxl said his position was you give that person longevity. If someone was willing to work an extraordinary number of years, he believed the person should be compensated. Sen. Treat said now that she knew what longevity was she was uncomfortable cutting it. The amount of the cut, \$67,000, was not a lot of money when looking at total picture, to retain experienced staff, particularly with term limits.

Sen. Bennett said one of the issues was not talking about cutting money, but talking about affecting the budget. Rep. Bruno's proposal would actually still result in an increase of 18% or so, in the Legislative budget, which was a staggering increase. He did not believe the Council had come to a collective conclusion about how much money to "cut", or how much money it would increase to. Was there to be an increase of 12%, 15%, 18%, 22%. Started with a proposal of 22% and now talking about cutting that increase back. He did not know if \$67,000 was a lot of money, because the Council had not agreed on the amount of money they were seeking to trim from the \$7 million plus increase. Sen. Bennett did not feel it was fair to ask Directors where they could save money without providing targets. They would not voluntarily come up with ideas they had not already come up with. You may get an answer that is useful if you said \$150,000 had to be cut from your office's budget, where would you do that explaining to the Council the ramifications and impact. He did not know how the issue

could be tackled without picking a target figure and then attempting to reach it. If each had their own view of what the figure was, it would be disaster. He was aware that a lot of the increases are foreordained by the way they had decided to organize themselves. Compensation of the staff, what kinds of benefits to provide, with health insurance in particular. The House and Senate had reorganized itself and had added costs because of new positions. He would not be opposed to looking at some of those issues, but would the Senate and House cut their budget without some sense of equanimity of equivalency by the other body.

Speaker Saxl thanked Mr. Clair for drafting a good budget and a balanced budget. It was the first time in modern history that the Legislature was fully funded. It had taken 10 years for the Legislature to fund itself to their statutory requirement for legislative session. By law, the Legislature had until a certain date, to meet as a Legislature and it had taken a long time to get back to it. It had taken a long time to make sure they look at educational opportunities, rather it be through travel or other opportunities of training, at the same time faced term limits and devolution so had less functional legislative experience, but at the same time, had more responsibilities. The Legislature had completed an NCSL study and had unanimously voted to accept it, which showed the Council was providing compensation for an inordinate amount of over time worked by both partisan and nonpartisan staffs. They had recommended those changes and higher level of threshold before getting comp time as an offset and also looked at comparable jobs in this State and fair wages. Speaker Saxl also said the Legislature was undergoing the first major reconstruction of the institution, in the last century. To do things that they had an obligation to do under law, meet the requirements for the Americans With Disabilities Act, the needs of modern technology for themselves and their constituents, and are doing things that had to be done in order to be a modern, functioning institution. He applauded Rep. Bruno's efforts to be constructive, and he was trying to find reasonable cuts. He felt the Council had a responsibility to make sure that this Legislature was a co-equal branch of government. Once fully funded, which they were according to Mr. Clair, if they were going to begin to cut funds which keep this institution whole, without holes in the wall and ceilings, if money was going to be cut from research programs, limit the oversight capability of the Legislature, cut back the statutory length the Legislature, cut back on the travel budget, stop giving longevity payments to long term employees, take \$150,000 out of the Personnel account or take money out of the reapportionment without looking at what other states our size had done, then we should insist on the same percentage cuts from every other branch of government. He did not think they should unilaterally disarm as a co-equal branch of government, and did not believe he could get to \$1.147 million that way, but thought it possible that some cuts could be made. He would only vote for those cuts if the Council agreed to send with the areas of cuts to the Appropriations Committee asking them to look for similar levels of cuts from the Executive and Judicial Branches. Speaker Saxl knew the Council went through this every 2 years, but was proud they had a fully funded Legislature and wanted to make sure they remain co-equal.

Sen. Treat asked if the Council could go through the unanimous suggestions from the Subcommittee on the Budget and the additional proposals that had come before the Council, discuss them briefly and then vote.

Rep. Colwell said there was a 3-1 recommendation on cutting the legislative apportionment study, he being the one who opposed it because he wanted information on it. Speaker Saxl wanted to take the matters up in order.

Speaker Saxl said the apportionment recommendation was to cut \$100,000, it was a 3-1 vote and asked if Mr. Clair had done background checking on it. Mr. Clair stated there

was a "list serve" through NCSL called the NALFO, National Association of Legislative Fiscal Officers, we had utilized that service, and listed the "apportionment budget" responses he had received to date: Idaho had about \$480,000, Budget put together in 99 to support the effort \$400,000 plus \$80,000 is available through a contingency fund; Arkansas had \$250,000 to \$300,000, the AG's office also receives \$500,000 for litigation expenses. Speaker Saxl asked if litigation expenses were included in our budget. Mr. Clair said no. New Jersey, this decade \$1 million is being set aside for the work of the Commission; Vermont - \$45,000; South Dakota - \$90,000 for redistricting expenses, includes funds for an estimated 3 day special session and the Legislature can tap into a contingency fund of about \$50,000. Sen. Bennett asked if he knew what was spent on redistricting 8 years ago? Mr. Clair said that came up in the budget Subcommittee deliberations and they could come up to about \$200,000 for over 3 fiscal years, FY 91, 92 and 93. Sen. Bennett asked what it would be in present dollars and Mr. Clair said their rough math it would be about \$400,000. Sen. Bennett then asked if \$500,000 was being requested for this budget over 2 years and Mr. Clair said it was for 1 year. Sen. Bennett thought it extreme and also thought the technology was less expensive and easier to use now than it was back then. He had not participated in the Redistricting Commission but felt they should come in with the proof they needed the additional dollars rather than just allocate a large sum of money and then see if capacity was built in.

Motion: Speaker Saxl said he would move to cut it \$100,000, second by Rep. Colwell.

Discussion: Rep. Bruno asked if the Council was going line by line. Speaker Saxl replied they would go by his suggestions and then if there was an additional suggestion outside of that list, let the Council know, unless he had a concern. He said members would have differences, it was appropriate to go through the process if members disagreed. The Legislative Council had asked the Appropriations Committee for an extension, and tomorrow was the deadline. They could deliver a minority report from the Council if they so choose, but they needed to finish the process. They would have a Part 2 recommendation for additional spending.

Sen. Bennett said one thing discussed was to divide the budget into areas of jurisdiction, House, Senate, Council, so there could be clear lines of accountability and understanding and asked if the Subcommittee had looked at that at all? Rep. Colwell asked if he meant changing the entire format of how they budget for these offices? Sen. Bennett had heard various people from different parties make that suggestion, for example, instead of having a travel budget for out-of-state travel, have a Senate budget, a House Budget, a non-partisan budget or Council budget so there are clear lines of authority and accountability, you are not only looking at printing costs but are looking at House printing, Senate printing, other printing, had the Subcommittee looked at that? Rep. Colwell said that it brought up and believed there was a certain amount of that was already being done. The Clerk and the Secretary of the Senate break it down, but the Subcommittee did not recommend redoing a new format. He agreed with Sen. Bennett regarding the 22% increase, it was inescapable if you looked at where the increases are. Collective bargaining an 18.4% increase, compensation study a 13.2% increase, position changes 13%, health insurance 23%, and retirement costs 13.2%. That was where the cost increases were in the budget. Looking at a \$3 million dollar unanticipated cost in the WANG migration in the upcoming year, if cut down too much, what would be accomplished.

Speaker Saxl said there were philosophical differences but the Council needed to go through the appropriate cuts, try to move in as many as they could agree on. If they could not, if any member wanted to go to the Appropriations Committee on February

22 and talk further cuts, that was perfectly fine. Sen. Bennett believed his comments were not philosophical, but were completely about management of the institution, the Legislative Council is a managing board. The Republicans on the Council, since philosophical may be construed as a word really meaning partisan or ideological, believed in not making this a partisan issue, or a philosophical issue at all. He was interested in making sure the Council recognized they were entering into very difficult economic times as a State, and the Legislature ought to lead. They had chosen to invest in the staff, which he believed was good, but at the same time, investing in staff, they might want to take a harder look at some of the other items, some staff related, some not, that are contributing to costs, to see if they could be trimmed back.

Speaker Saxl told members of the Council they needed to go through a budget process for the Appropriations meeting the following day. They were going to make recommendations to cut, hopefully it could be done in a nonpartisan manner and hopefully it could be unanimous. What he would ask would be to defer comments on how money would be apportioned, and make decisions on making cuts. Sen. Bennett said he would be happy to do that, but the real opportunity was on the management side, that was what a budget was for, and that was what he was interested in.

Rep. Bruno said the recommendations that the Council was voting on, represent his look at the budget, his recommendations, and did not feel it was fair to only take his suggestions up at this time. Everyone had their own recommendations and if the Council went one by one on everyone that would be different. Speaker Saxl said that was what the Council was going to do. The Council was going to take the unanimous recommendations for the Subcommittee, define them, and then vote on them.

Sen. Treat believed there was a motion on the floor, concerning apportionment, the Council never voted on, which was not a unanimous recommendation of the Subcommittee.

Motion: Apportionment recommendation is to cut \$100,000 out of the budget. (Motion by Speaker Saxl, second by Rep. Colwell, 9-1, Sen. Bennett abstained).

Discussion: Sen. Bennett abstained from the vote because if the Council was going to vote on the above item, he supported \$100,000 but would like to see more of a reduction if one in present dollars cost \$400,000. Speaker Saxl said he could make his minority report, but he would not support a deeper cut than \$100,000.

Motion: Reduce the length of the Second Regular Session by one week for a savings of \$100,000. (Motion by Sen. Treat, second by Sen. Small, failed 5-5).

Discussion: Rep. Bruno said it was a 2-year budget, if the Legislative Council was going to reduce the session they do it not only in the short session but also the next long session of the 121st. He did not believe it fair to take 1-year worth of cuts, when there was a second year of a budget, and would not support one week. Sen. Treat asked for clarification on Rep. Bruno's proposal. She had made the above motion because she did not think it appropriate to make a decision now as to what would be going on in two years. Speaker Saxl said there would be a new governor in 2 years, would be delivering their first budget document, and during the changes of an administration, budget documents came out later. He also did not feel comfortable managing and making a decision for the next Legislature and could not support cutting the 121st.

Motion: To cut one week off the Second Regular Session and two weeks off the First Regular Session. (Motion by Rep. Schneider, failed 5-5).

Motion: To cut one week off of the Second Regular Session and one week off the First Regular Session, a total of two weeks, rather than three or one. (Motion by Sen. Bennett, failed 5-5).

Motion: Reduce funding for the State House and Capitol Park Commission in FY 2002 by \$50,000 and FY 2003 by \$50,000. (Motion by Sen. Treat, second by Rep. Colwell, unanimous 10-0).

Motion: To cut interim study committees by \$150,000 total, \$75,000 per session.

Discussion: Speaker Saxl asked what the total allocation for interim studies was and Rep. Colwell said \$330,000 over the biennium. The Speaker said there was no motion on the floor because there were 2 different suggestions. He said under the good work of Sen. Bennett, former Speaker Rowe and himself had met to reform the way business was done at the Legislature. One of the concerns was they felt they did a very good job of ascertaining their oversight of the Executive and thought it would be helpful to allow committees to meet off session. Last summer was the first time it was tried and Committees met at the cost of \$60,000. Many of the members did not have a full understanding of the opportunities they had, and believed that under devolution and term limits it was critical to assert legislative oversight, and believed \$50,000 was different than \$130,000, and there may be accommodations in between. Sen. Treat asked the amount allocated currently and was told \$331,500.

Motion: That the Legislative Council cut \$100,000 out of the account over the two year period, \$40,000 in 2002 and \$60,000 in 2003. (Motion by Sen. Treat)

Discussion: Sen. Treat thought they had an obligation to tighten up the budget. Given the tough times, may have reduced revenues in the future, but thought it was important to have the Committee role, especially with term limits. However, she felt each Committee cut a couple of meetings and still have a sufficient amount of meeting time. Rep. Bruno asked for the amount spent last session and was told \$58,000 with every committee meeting as they wanted. Even with the cuts of \$250,000, there was \$75,000 per year, plenty of room to play with. Speaker Saxl said the cost of 1 committee to meet 1 day was \$1,625.00. If 17 committees met, the cost would be \$27,625.00. He wanted to find a balance, it was a new policy for Committees, were trying to reform the way business is done.

Sen. Treat thought it may be an inaccurate representation of what was likely to happen in the future because it was a new policy, the first year was during an election year, she believed there was going to be more use of the oversight function this summer and fall.

Motion: That the Legislative Council cut \$100,000 out of the account over the two year period, \$40,000 in 2002 and \$60,000 in 2003. (Motion by Sen. Treat, second by Rep. Colwell, failed 5-5).

Discussion: Sen. Small asked who called the meeting? Speaker Saxl said the Chairs of the Committee and the leads agree on a meeting, a request is made to the Presiding Officers, and the Presiding Officers approve the request. Committees are pre-approved basically for 1 meeting a month. Sen. Small agreed that some money should be budgeted but believed some will take advantage and meet when they do not need to if a larger amount is put in the budget.

Sen. Bennett had tried to find the budgeted studies amount and looked at the two items as being related. The extent that members meet outside of regular sessions is important, also agreed with the oversight function and thought in some cases, it was appropriate for those committees to engage in other kinds of studies. If money had been budgeted for studies, he could not find it. Speaker Saxl said it would come from the Part 2 appropriations.

Speaker Saxl asked if there were any other proposals from the Subcommittee that had not been voted on and Rep. Colwell replied that travel was divided. The current budget was \$185,000 per year for travel and believed the Subcommittee was divided. Speaker Saxl said he would be open to some type of cut, but would not recommend it until the Executive and Judicial cut their travel budget by the same proportion, and would include that in a letter to the Appropriations Committee. A reasonable cut in travel would be appropriate during fiscally difficult times but not unless they exercise the same cuts to other branches of government. Rep. Bruno thought the Legislative Council should manage the Legislative budget. Speaker Saxl believed it was the first time the Legislature was fully funded and should not unilaterally disarm. Rep. Bruno asked what the Speaker meant by that, when there was \$1.8 million being carried forward every year, why hadn't the Legislature taken advantage of whatever fully funded meant. Speaker Saxl said the Legislature had not tried to spend their account down every year, but if you looked at what had been carried forward, the Legislative account figure as being the major portion of that, and they did not have a choice unless they cut positions, the positions had to be funded at a certain level, so unless the Legislature eliminated positions, there was not a lot of money to carry forward. The money that had been carried forward were the areas they had just agreed to cut, the Capital Park, etc. Rep. Bruno said the legislative budget was not due to having to cut positions, you had the amount to carry forward because somehow there was extra money built in, whether it was through attrition of vacant positions or whatever, money was being carried forward, but not due to an increase in positions, but an increase probably in attrition, bringing people at lower grades of pay or unfilled positions, that was where the money carried forward. Speaker Saxl agreed, but could not cut those positions because they reflect the number of positions, and asked Mr. Clair to explain how positions are budgeted in the Legislative account.

Mr. Clair said, like all agencies, we assumed every position would be funded with a minor adjustment made by the Governor at 99.2% for "attrition". There would be a certain amount of attrition savings, but otherwise every position would be filled 52 weeks a year. Speaker Saxl asked if that was a standard budget practice and Mr. Clair said yes. Rep. Bruno asked Mr. Clair if he would explain how the Legislature carried forward \$800,000. He said the budget practice was different from the actual experience due to the turnover that would actually occur. Rep. Bruno asked if attrition or hiring people at lower salaries generated savings and Mr. Clair said yes, for both of those reasons. Rep. Bruno said the last thing he wanted to do was to cut positions or people's salaries and benefits, but this did not touch that. What was being carried forward was more money than what was actually needed for these positions. Speaker Saxl said the Legislature was identical to the Executive's behavior, the way the Governor budgets for his position. The Legislature was not deviating at all, they were carrying money that was dedicated to positions, were not taking money from the personnel line, for personal services in the legislative account and spending it on furniture, they use it and carrying it forward if it is not expended due to attrition or for lower salaries. As long as the Legislature followed standard budget practices in concurrence with the Executive, there were not ways that you can cut that, but you cannot spend that money additionally and that was up to the Council.

Sen. Bennett referred back to travel, which he believed started the recent exchange, the budget of the State of Maine is now in the hands of the Legislature. The Legislative Council was in the position as managers for the Legislative account, advising the Appropriations Committee, but also had a unique role, in that they were the leaders of the Legislature, and leaders of the legislative branch, which was currently looking at the budget. If the Legislative Council wanted to take the lead on travel for its own budget, he thought it was also appropriate, since the rest of the budget for the State of Maine was within their purview, to suggest to the Appropriations Committee they reflect similar reductions to the other two branches of government. He thought the Council could affect the same sort of change that way without sending a letter to the Judiciary or the Executive branch asking if it is okay to cut their budget, it is up to the Appropriations Committee and the Legislature to make that determination. We are managing this branch and in order to maintain and put the investment in the people of the Legislative branch that they need to look hard at the other issues.

Sen. Daggett did not support cutting the travel budget and also had concerns about some of the other cuts, saying it was difficult to compare the Legislative branch to the other branches. She also believed because the budget had not been completely spent down, spoke to the fact that there had been continued efficiencies and was concerned about cutting money before the fact. She was agreeable with the reapportionment cut but was reluctant to cut travel.

Rep. Schneider was interested in an answer regarding the earlier statement that it was the first time the Legislative Budget had been fully funded. Speaker Saxl asked that the travel part be dealt with and then he would ask Mr. Clair, the Secretary and Clerk to respond.

Motion: To cut the travel budget by \$15,000 each year. (Motion by Rep. Bruno, second by Rep. Schneider, failed 5-5).

Speaker Saxl referred back to Rep. Schneider's question regarding the budget being fully funded. He said up until 1996 or 1998 the Legislature had budgeted fully for the legislative session until statutory adjournment. In addition they had budgeted an amount for an emergency or special session; had a measure of flexibility in the personal services line for an emergency; had fully funded the Capital Park, the state operating reserve fund, the travel budget to a similar level of what is being proposed today. Every year since the cutbacks, the Legislative Council and the Legislature as a whole, had worked to add a week back to the short session and a week back to the long session, and was the first budget since that time that had been accomplished. The Legislature had begun to again achieve the reserves that were there under the original Legislative budget.

Motion: To reduce or eliminate 3 positions in the Senate related to the 120th organization by \$119,000. (Motion by Speaker Saxl, second by Rep. Norbert).

Sen. Bennett asked if there were any positions in the House that were deemed temporary as well that might have been accommodated in the full budget. Speaker Saxl said the one position in the House which was not in the full budget, was not anticipated in the House was the position of Clerk Emeritus. It had not been funded in the subsequent budget. Sen. Bennett said it had been brought to his attention by Sen. Small, when the issue was raised about the various numbers, that the numbers had not been changed, updated or made more accurate since the January 15 accounting. He thought it made sense because they could not decide what was going to happen to the

next Legislature, which had to be budgeted for. The reduction was fine by him, but wanted to make sure they had not made errors in the Senate numbers that would reflect what the Speaker suggested. Senator Treat asked if there was money for the transition of staff from the previous session into the next and Speaker Saxl said it was included, it just did not anticipate the need of an additional pro tempore's office. Sen. Bennett still questioned, the accuracy of the figures for the Senate, whether the Speaker's motion reflected those numbers. Mr. Clair had a two-part answer. First, to Sen. Small's question about the accuracy count by office: First there were updated data, Rose Breton had started that work and would get the information to them. They were specifically tasked with trying to figure out what the three incremental positions would be after the dust settled and he thought the \$119,000 number was that updated figure. Second, as to which office cost more, the Senate President or the Pro Tempore, what was done on January 12th was to take the budgeted positions and as positions had actually been filled at certain steps within the allowable ranges, we think the costs are now lower. We will be doing the update for every one of those positions, and do think the \$119,000 reflects the updated data along with the transition period. Sen. Bennett asked if Mr. Clair was accommodating the fact that the people associated with the President's Office are actually going to be employed in the President Pro Tempore's Office and that the dates of transfer of those are not coincidental with the fiscal years. Mr. Clair said that was correct. Sen. Bennett said he supported the Speaker's motion.

Sen. Daggett asked that the motion be repeated. She then asked that an amended version be read.

Motion: To eliminate funding for three Senate positions but leave the position counts effective December, 2002, two in the President Pro Tempore's Office, which would be the Chief of Staff and the Legislative Aide and one in the Senate Secretary's Office which would be the Senior Technology and Systems Support Coordinator but replace that to make sure there is fully funded back to the last fiscal year, the Calendar Clerk position Range 8 in the Secretary's Office so that we go forward with the previous status quo.

Speaker Saxl wanted members to know that he had expressly read the motion to the Senate President before the Council meeting so he was aware of the motion.

Sen. Daggett preferred the language to be that those positions be defunded as opposed to eliminated. Mr. Clair believed Sen. Daggett's point was that they would reflect a deappropriation of \$119,000 but not minus 3 positions. She said there were transitional issues involved for the individuals. Speaker Saxl asked Mr. Clair if they had the authority to blue line transitional issues and he said they had up until now. There had been a certain number of unfunded, authorized, but unestablished positions where they had not gone through the whole Bureau of Human Resources process to establish positions, known as the floating positions. The way the 120th had been organized, had used those in both the Senate and House accordingly. As of now, the number of those vacant slots was minimal. Sen. Treat thought the Pro Tempore and the President had certain people in positions and the President would then be the Pro Tempore and visa versa, the same people would be in positions. There was concern that during any transition into the next Legislature those people not be thrown out there be a vacant position they could be moved into over the transition. An example in her office, they could not hire a secretary they were allowed to have for a month because there wasn't a vacant position for that person even though they were allocated the position. It was not to continue to have three additional people, it was to make sure they did not end up with one or two people, during the interim period over Christmas, out on the street. She believed that was the issue. Sen. Bennett said positions were created by the

Chamber, in an order at the beginning of session. The next Legislature would have the ability to create or eliminate positions and did not understand the issues. He said there are more positions here, were not talking about creating new positions, talking about reducing the number of positions, he did not understand the dynamic being the same. Sen. Treat thought there was agreement to cut the \$119,000 it was the wording of the motion. They had received different information than the Speaker did and wanted to clarify it before the vote.

Speaker Saxl moved the previously tabled matter of the President Pro Tempore's Office and the 2 positions there and the 1 position in the Secretary's Office. Second by Rep. Colwell, unanimous. He said that Sen. Daggett had revised information and wanted to make a friendly amendment to the motion.

Sen. Daggett wanted to amend the motion to defund the positions and take the money, but leave the positions. This was not part of the motion, but leave the positions for transitional reasons. Speaker Saxl asked if there was a period at which defund becomes eliminated, so the transition could occur. Sen. Daggett said presumably the next Council at that point would be doing the budget as well and could eliminate them at the time. Speaker Saxl said he was trying to make sure there was a full transition period. Sen. Daggett hoped a transition period would take place in that time. He said it would eliminate the position count in the Legislature, and she said where they were not funded at all they certainly could be eliminated at another time. Speaker Saxl asked if she would be open to defund the \$119,000 and then eliminate the positions as of March 1 of that year.

Sen. Bennett said he was mystified by the entire conversation of defunding positions. If the Legislature keeps the positions, the presiding officer, who ever it may be, of the next Senate, would be able to fill those positions, and would be able to fill them on their authority if there was money appropriated for that purpose. The presiding officer had the authority to take money out of another account and move it to fund those positions if they were left intact. Sen. Treat did not know what a reasonable transition period was. It would be a bipartisan impact on the staff of both parties and offices there should be some period of time where the position counts are still available so new people can be on and old people can phase out or transition to the different positions. The intent was not to create new positions; it was to be fair to the people in the positions. Sen. Bennett said they were talking about positions that would be decided on election day, and people in the positions understand the reality of their job, were talking about a window of time between election day and the date they take office, about 1 month, and thought it efficient transitional time. He did not understand the need for additional time. Rep. Colwell did not think it would be a bad thing if all the offices had transitional time, but what the Council was talking about was the Senate Pro Tempore and the Secretary's Offices having the transitional time. It was not a budget issue, it was a personnel issue. If a transition time was needed it should come before the Personnel Committee and they should present it to the Legislative Council. Mr. Clair said the only transition policy unannounced was there had always been the "floating" positions. There had always been an ability to fill positions, because the presiding officers or the chambers took actions and the paperwork then would be sent to the Executive Director's Office, and they would then have to fill new positions using those "floaters". The ability to do that 2 years from now when positions were eliminated, would be severely limited, and we would be sending letters back saying we did not have the head count to do that. Clerk MacFarland said they had a couple of part-time, session only positions that they had used in the past for that type of personnel activity.

Motion: Cut \$119,000, defer transition to Personnel Committee. (Motion by Speaker Saxl, second by Sen. Treat, unanimous 9-0).

Motion: That the Legislative Council reduce the budget by \$1 million dollars; take what we had agreed on unanimously, and allow management, including the Executive Director and all the Department Managers, to come up with the difference in savings. (Motion by Rep. Bruno, second by Sen. Small, failed 4-6).

Discussion: Sen. Bennett said clearly the Council members were not agreeing on trimming back at the rate of increase in the budget. They had agreed on a few items but had not agreed on a lot of things. Some members of the Council wanted to make additional deappropriations from the proposal, and thought it best to take what they had agreed to, forward it to the Appropriations Committee with a letter saying they had agreed on these, there had been disagreement over other potential deappropriations and members of the Council, may in fact, approach the Appropriations Committee individually or collectively, to suggest other areas. The Legislative budget would be voted on as part of the big budget they will be considering and thought it would be part of that dynamic. They might as well move on, but keep open the option for any of the Council members to go to the Appropriations Committee with ideas to introduce, particularly the ones already talked about as part of their on going debate. Speaker Saxl thought that was fine if members wanted to do that. He knew it is tough, they had a goal of cutting \$1 million, from his perspective he had put forward \$519,000 of cuts that he did not want to cut. Rep. Bruno understood the differences in philosophy on budgeting, but thought the Legislative Council needed to set an example to the rest of the Legislature as leaders, they were in tough budget times, and if they could not make simple cuts, they would never approach the large budget and do what was right in the long run. That was his concern.

Speaker Saxl said they had the opportunity to make cuts, they had made cuts at the meeting, but thought there was very little room due to the personal services line and the enormity of it in the budget and that the last Council had agreed to accept increases in pay due to NCSL, and the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Sen. Bennett said he would be voting against the motion but was planning to take ideas directly to the Appropriations Committee for more specific kinds of cuts.

Sen. Bennett said he had commented earlier to authorize the Speaker and himself, in their capacity as Chair and Vice-Chair of the Council, to send a letter to the Appropriations Committee outlining the reductions in the proposed budget the Council had agreed to and with the language suggested earlier about other proposals raised, some voted on, but could not reach a majority conclusion, that members of the Council may take those issues directly to the Appropriations Committee for their consideration.

Speaker Saxl asked if on the 5-5 votes, some voted to cut and there was another interest in making a higher cut, would those all be included in the vote totals, or would they be included in the lower amount, how would they be included. Sen. Bennett was not suggesting including them at all, but certainly could be if that was the Council's wishes. Sen. Treat said other committees had done that, this was what the committee had agreed to unanimously and here are 2 recommendations that each received 5 votes. Sen. Bennett would consider that friendly but also did not want to foreclose the possibility of members of the Council taking to the Appropriations Committee further ideas, because believed some ideas presented by Rep. Bruno were done in the spirit of compromise and some felt there could be even further cuts.

It has been moved, Speaker Saxl seconded on the letter being sent to the Appropriations Committee reporting on the Council's actions, 10-0 unanimous.

Item #3: After Deadline Requests

After deadline requests were considered by the Legislative Council. The Council's action on these requests are included on the attached list.

Discussion: Speaker Saxl talked about the procedure for after deadline requests. He proposed that any after deadline request that sit on the table for 3 weeks, be pulled off the table by the Council and they will vote on it unless a Legislator specifically advocates their position. Sen. Bennett thought it would be helpful if the sponsors wanted to do a letter to Council members. Sen. Treat did not know in the past it had been a prerequisite that you show up in order to have your bill acted on, if that was the policy, people need to know it. Speaker Saxl asked if the members were comfortable with that for a policy change, to give sponsors notice and also give one of the Council members the information as opposed to attending the meeting.

REPORTS FROM COUNCIL COMMITTEES

- **Technology and Migration Committee**

Sen. Treat said there was a subcommittee meeting immediately following the Council meeting.

- **Personnel Committee**

Motion: That income protection for a legislative employee be granted as reviewed and accepted by the Personnel Committee at its February 21, 2001 meeting. (Motion by Speaker Saxl, second by Sen. Bennett, unanimous 10-0).

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REMARKS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

Sen. Bennett moved that the Council meeting be adjourned at 4:10 p.m., second by Sen. Davis, unanimous.

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL
ACTION ON REQUESTS TO INTRODUCE LEGISLATION
February 21, 2001**

		Action
SPONSOR:	Rep. Baker, Christina L.	WITHDRAWN
LR 2434	An Act to Improve Legislative Efficiency through Technology	
SPONSOR:	Rep. Baker, Christina L.	WITHDRAWN
LR 2449	An Act to Encourage Private Funding to Endow the Arts in Public Schools	
SPONSOR:	Sen. Bromley, Lynn	WITHDRAWN
LR 2455	An Act Regarding Responsibility for Payment of Taxes Upon the Sale of Property	
SPONSOR:	Rep. Bruno, Joseph	ACCEPTED
LR 2459	An Act to Amend the Portland Water District's Territorial Description to Include the Town of Raymond	
SPONSOR:	Sen. Cathcart, Mary R.	FAILED
LR 2447	An Act to Adopt the Uniform Athlete Agents Act	
SPONSOR:	Rep. Cressey, Jr., Philip	FAILED
LR 2437	Resolve, to Credit Certified Teacher 3 Points Towards Retirement for Taking Time to be Fingerprinted	
SPONSOR:	Sen. Douglass, Neria R.	ACCEPTED
LR 2344	An Act Regarding Dismissal of Municipal Employees for Cause	
SPONSOR:	Rep. Green, Bonnie	WITHDRAWN
LR 2389	An Act to Promote Fair and Expeditious Resolution of Cases Before the Maine Human Rights Commission	

SPONSOR: Rep. Volenik, Paul

ACCEPTED

LR 2456 An Act to Amend the Charter of the Vinalhaven Water District

JOINT RESOLUTIONS

SPONSOR: Sen. Douglass, Neria R.

WITHDRAWN

LR 2342 JOINT RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED
STATES TO RECOGNIZE THE YEARS 2000 TO 2010 AS THE
BONE AND JOINT DECADE

SPONSOR: Rep. McKenney, Terrence P.

WITHDRAWN

LR 2450 JOINT RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED
STATES, THE SECRETARY OF EDUCATION AND THE CONGRESS OF THE
UNITED STATE TO FUND SPECIAL EDUCATION

TABLED BY THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

SPONSOR:	Rep. Bryant, Bruce S.	TABLED 02/02/01
LR 2415	An Act to Ensure Public Participation in the Waiver Process for Certificate of Need Review	
SPONSOR:	Rep. Gooley, Walter R.	TABLED 01/31/01
LR 2392	An Act to Decrease the BETR Reimbursement by the Amount Received under a TIF Agreement	
SPONSOR:	Sen. Kilkelly, Marge L.	TABLED 02/21/01
LR 2460	An Act to Create the Maine Cattle Health Assurance Program	
SPONSOR:	Rep. Matthews, Zachary E.	TABLED 01/31/01
LR 2361	An Act to Create a Tax Amnesty Day	
SPONSOR:	Rep. Savage, William R.	TABLED 02/21/01
LR 2452	An Act to Prohibit an Insurance Company from Using a Person's Credit History in Determining Whether to Write a Policy or in Setting the Premium Rate	
SPONSOR:	Rep. Snowe-Mello, Lois A.	TABLED 02/21/01
LR 2433	An Act to Give Veterans Day Back to Veterans	
SPONSOR:	Rep. Thomas, Jonathan	TABLED 02/21/01
LR 2457	An Act to Amend the Unemployment Insurance Compensation Rates	
SPONSOR:	Rep. Tuttle, Jr., John L.	TABLED 01/31/01
LR 2383	Resolve, Directing the State Auditor to Simplify the Reporting Form for Candidates	
SPONSOR:	Rep. Tuttle, Jr., John L.	TABLED 02-21/01
LR 2435	An Act to Name the Maine Turnpike the POW-MIA Memorial Turnpike	