# 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)

### LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL June 27, 2001 AGENDA

### CALL TO ORDER

### ROLL CALL

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

# REPORTS FROM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND STAFF OFFICE DIRECTORS

- Executive Director's Report
- Renovations: Status Report
- Fiscal Update
- Migration Project Status

### REPORTS FROM COUNCIL COMMITTEES

- Personnel Committee
- Space Committee
- Technology and Migration Committee (Proposal for Direct Legislative Access)

### **OLD BUSINESS**

Item #1: Proposed Drafting Guidelines of Legislative Studies-120<sup>th</sup> Legislature

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

### **NEW BUSINESS**

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

### ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REMARKS

### **ADJOURNMENT**

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 **APRIL 25, 2001**

### CALL TO ORDER

The Chair, Speaker Saxl, called the Council meeting to order at 1:25 p.m. in the Legislative Council Chambers.

### 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

## SUMMARY OF THE MARCH 28, 2001 COUNCIL MEETING

Motion: That the Summary of the March 28, 2001 meeting be accepted and placed on file. (Motion by Rep. Bruno, second by Rep. Colwell, unanimous).

### **NEW BUSINESS**

### Item #2: 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.

# REPORTS FROM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND STAFF OFFICE DIRECTORS

### Executive Director's Report

James Clair had 3 items on the Executive Director's Report.

1. The North Wing Planning Process. The offices affected by the North Wing renovations had been involved in a review of both the furnishings design plan, and the architectural, structural, electrical, etc. review. The furnishings design is virtually completed with some minor changes. It is dove-tailing with the architectural changes that need to take place. The reason for bringing it to Legislative Council members' attention now was the design team and construction team this week want to send out to bid the services that are going to be required for the North Wing. Hopefully, responses will be back in early June. There will be an opportunity to assess the bid to the budget scenario, and should the bids come in higher than the budgeted resources, there will be an opportunity for the Legislative Council to weigh in on changes that need to be made. The ultimate goal, is to kick off the renovations for the North Wing by mid-June. That would allow us, with a certain degree of confidence, to say that the Second Regular Session would start on schedule in the first week in January. Stan Fairservice had a conversation with someone from Granger Northern that indicated if they started sometime in July, even early July, that would push it into January, and that was trying to be avoided if at all possible.

Rep. Bruno asked if renovations started in mid-June, could they start with the Legislature still in session? Mr. Clair thought that would be really difficult. He thought there would be an opportunity for some offices to move out, the Executive Director's Office could move out, but he would let the other offices speak for themselves. The construction process always takes longer than one plans, so if we are budgeting on a fairly strict basis to be done by late December, it has been spilling over, and we are trying to avoid that.

No Council action required.

2. Certain events in the Cross Office Building had been an issue in the past few weeks. The Clerk's Office schedules the reservations for the Hall of Flags and the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor Rotunda. We had an event where a group wanted a press conference, could not find room in this building, so asked about the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor Lobby in the CSOB. Mr. Clair asked that it be run by Chief Suitter to make sure that the building could accommodate the number of people, etc. The Press Conference went smoothly. Since then, there have been a number of requests to use that area for more press conferences. Deputy Commissioner Jacobs called Mr. Clair with concerns about using the space for them. He said it was designed to be an entryway, and meet and greet area, the kiosk, etc. and not designed for press conferences. Mr. Clair said the legislation that was enacted said the Legislature, the Legislative Council, was to

receive 33,000 gross square feet. The 33,000 feet is essentially all of the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor space and includes the Lobby. What the Administration is offering is to open up and even reserve for Press Conference Room 107, which is on the 1<sup>st</sup> Floor. Mr. Clair was seeking guidance as to whether the Legislative Council wanted to designate, which is in their purview, the use of the Lobby for press conferences and other events.

Rep. Norbert believed the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor in the CSOB was the Legislature's space and felt strongly that it was something that worked well and needed the Legislature to keep their domain over it. A message should be send that it is the Legislature's area. Sen. Treat agreed with Rep. Norbert. She also thought the space in the CSOB was better designed for people to get in and out of with disability and mobility issues for press conferences. It is legislative committees in that area and not executive branch offices, so if complaints are to be had, they should be from committees.

**Motion:** That Mr. Clair give an oral communication to the Administration to inform them that the Legislative Council believes the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor in the CSOB to be Legislative space and will use the area as the Legislature sees fit. (Motion by Rep. Bruno, second by Sen. Treat, unanimous 9-0).

3. Margaret Matheson and Mr. Clair came across old information on printing costs for the Laws of Maine. Information from 1990 talks about the costs for the Laws of Maine as single copies having no charge, but additional copies being charged at \$20 each, and believed that to still be the policy. He said they could determine that the cost to produce it is at least \$40 per copy. He was not looking for any immediate action, but given what was learned about the printing costs, wanted a review of items the Legislative Council had purview over in terms of what should be charged. He did a markup of the fee recommendations from the Clerk and the fees set by the previous Council. If there are items like that that have not kept up with the times, he would have a recommendation for the Legislative Council at a subsequent meeting.

Rep. Bruno asked if anything had gone up from the 119<sup>th</sup> and whether there was anything built in for automatic increases or should it come to the Legislative Council every session and have someone inform them of the new proposed rates for the Session. Mr. Clair deferred to the Clerk of the House. Clerk MacFarland said there were 2 separate fee schedules. One was legislative document service and the other was Legislative Council publications. It was built around not making money but covering the cost of postage and printing and believed the only session they may have lost money was a couple years ago when there were over 2,300 bill presented, but thought they may have actually made a little bit of money this year.

Sen. Bennett asked if there was a consensus of the Legislative Council that Mr. Clair report back to them at the next meeting regarding the printing costs.

No Council action required.

#### • Renovations: Status Report

Stan Fairservice gave an update on the West Wing. They were currently putting the finishes on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor, the Snack Bar, Interpreter Center and the main lobby. The stairs to the connector had been poured and you can walk across to the CSOB. Today the finishing touches on the roof of the Connector itself, the diorama area are being done. They will be pouring about 80% of it on Friday, April 27<sup>th</sup>, weather permitting and will be lowering the dioramas into the Connector on Monday, April 30<sup>th</sup>, building protective

walls for the dioramas. On May 4<sup>th</sup> should put the last piece of the concrete into the Connector. They have started drilling for the elevators and that installation has started. Also, sometime this week, they will be receiving from the Architect, the landscaping plan that will be used, and it will be issued it out for bidding immediately and hopefully bids will be received within 3 to 4 weeks.

Rep. Norbert asked Mr. Fairservice the date a citizen would be able to walk from the Cafeteria to the State House underground in the new Connector. Mr. Fairservice said there had been a problem with the granite. The granite was from Deer Isle and was delivered about a month or two late. It is now in the artist's hands and need to have the granite completed. If looking at a complete Connector he said mid-June.

No Council action required.

### Fiscal Update

Grant Pennoyer reported he had 3 items on the fiscal update.

1. A review of the progress on the fiscal note production. For printed bills they had completed fiscal notes on approximately 80% and bills scheduled for hearing approximately 82%. The real interest now, is how amendments are being turned around. Over the course of the session they had requests for 635 fiscal reviews, which also included some floor amendments and have completed work on 484 of them. During the week of April 17<sup>th</sup> they had concentrated on turning around amendments and have completed work on 186, and had been passed on to the Office of Policy and Legal Analysis and the Revisor's Office for final completion.

Sen. Small inquired as to the number of bills printed in relation to previous years. Speaker Saxl said they were about 11% ahead of the last Legislature presently. Sen. Small was concerned about the service to the public, were committees trying to hear to many bills in an afternoon. She had noticed a difference in the committee procedure this year and asked if other legislators had concerns. Speaker Saxl said, in his perspective, at least in the House, they had 13 of 17 chairs that are new, and in the Senate, at a minimum, 8 chairs are new. He thought it would be incumbent to have a training book for chairs and rank and file members that would be more extensive on the basics. Sen. Small said the committee she attended had to many bills scheduled. First they heard legislators and then the public. The public had to wait for a long period of time, and it was very confusing. Speaker Saxl suggested participating with the Rules Committee. The last Rules Committee suggested capping the number of bills a legislator could bring in and while there are fewer number of bills this year, than last session, this year is still 2<sup>nd</sup> most bills ever introduced. Some of the challenges are just volume.

Speaker Saxl referred back to Mr. Pennoyer to continue his fiscal update.

2. Mr. Pennoyer gave an update of the variances for the month of March revenue. The Commissioner of the Administration and Financial Services, would be releasing the March revenue reports soon. The General Fund, while ahead for the month of March \$1/2 million, the area of concern was the Corporate Income Tax, which was down by \$9.6 million in the month of March, which was a big month for Corporate Income Tax payments. Speaker Saxl asked what percentage it was down. Mr. Pennoyer said they were expecting \$25 million of budget for revenue, so is a sizable variance. Corporate profits were down, but believed the actual experience had been even worse than expected. Speaker Saxl asked if the Revenue Forecasting Committee had a

meeting scheduled and Mr. Pennoyer said no. There were not any plans to meet right away. They thought after the close of the year, they would meet and evaluate performance. Speaker Saxl asked if that size of a variance was reason to think that they might downgrade their projections. Mr. Pennoyer said some variances are expected to be up and down, and some may recover over the next few months. He had talked with the Maine Revenue Service, and the April revenue shows the Corporate Income Tax was ahead a little, but believed for the year, it would still be down given the rather unfavorable experience in March. Rep. Bruno noted that a lot of the corporations work on a calendar year so the quarterly report was not due until April, and asked if a rebound was expected in April. Mr. Pennoyer said corporations are required to file their final return for the prior calendar year of March 15, unlike individual income taxes. He said the next big month for corporate tax collections was June, and usually not quite as large a month as March. Instead of \$25 million, the budgeted amount expected was \$21.2 million. June is another large payment month that will need to be watched.

Mr. Pennoyer said the numbers do reflect the most recent revenue reprojection, and have reduced the estimates for general fund revenue for the fiscal year 2001 by \$11.4 million. The sales tax was the primary area where revenue estimates were reduced. Reduced the yearly estimate in FY 01 for sales tax by \$10.2 million and February sales were \$4.7 million under budgeted revenues for the month of March, which reflect February sales. That will be watched as well. The other area of concern was the estate tax. A large settlement in the last quarter would result in a recovery and bring it back into alignment with budgeted revenues. The highway fund was doing well, \$1.4 million ahead for the month and \$3.7 million ahead year to day.

3. Mr. Pennoyer reported the general fund cash balances went negative for the first time since 1996. That was of interest to the Appropriations Committee and had the Commissioner and his office do presentations for the Committee trying to explain this. He furnished the Legislative Council members information to look at the historical trends of the monthly averages for general fund cash balances. Note that the beginning of this fiscal year we had reached the peak, which coincides with the expectation they had based on the actions taken during the 119<sup>th</sup> Legislature where there was a balance of approximately \$300 million and by the end of the Fiscal Year 01 and the expectation was that balance would be reduced to almost zero. That was primarily from the spending that was authorized last year and various tax reductions that were authorized during the 2<sup>nd</sup> Regular Session of the 119<sup>th</sup> Legislature. This information was being provided as an update. Mr. Pennoyer informed members that the Commissioner of Administration and Financial Services would doing a presentation to the Appropriations Committee the afternoon of April 26, 2001 on their cash position, and said they may want to listen.

Rep. Bruno asked if Mr. Pennoyer could give an explanation on how the rainy day fund balances work into the cash balance pool. Mr. Pennoyer said as of now the balance in the Maine rainy day fund is \$143.7 million. Another major reserve within the general fund is the reserve for general fund operating capital. Combining those 2 reserves contribute to the General Fund cash balance. Right now they are contributing \$153.2 million to that cash balance. When they went to negative numbers in April, we were actually \$153.2 million worse off than those numbers actually indicated because the reserves are part of that cash position. They are using the reserve for general fund working capital and the Maine rainy day fund as working capital reserve. Keeping the general fund from having to borrow from either the cash

pool from other funds. He said as of that morning, they had an \$85.6 million positive general fund cash balance, which improved over the last few days. Without the 2 reserve funds they would be negative by \$60 million.

### Revisor's Report

Margaret Matheson reported that much of their work has shifted to committee amendments. Also, some work from Joint Orders requiring bills to come out of committee, working on 8 of those now. They had 3 pursuant to statute that are going to be major substantive rules and those will be emerging within the next day, and 2 after deadline bills were still in progress. From the Revisor's point of view, as far as production of committee amendments, there has been great progress within the last week and a half. More than 330 committee amendments have been completed. Approximately 100 were out Monday afternoon, April 23, as a result of the prior week and another 70 on April 24 and today. There are about 200 that are currently in the production loop where the 3 offices have conjoined and have been through the first loop of review, teching and proof reading.

Sen. Treat thanked Ms. Matheson for all the hard work they have done.

No Council Action required.

#### Migration Project Status

Paul Mayotte reported that Compaq had installed the bill drafting system application software on April 2<sup>nd</sup>. They had completed the technical testing on the software application on April 13<sup>th</sup>. There was one remaining item open as a result of a technical item, which relates to the statutes database and they were working on it. Actual user acceptance testing, with thanks to Ms. Matheson's organization, started on April 17<sup>th</sup> and the goal is to complete the user acceptance testing in mid-May. Compaq is making fixes to the software as the user is finding them and on a weekly basis the minor fixes are being corrected. Overall user acceptance testing is well underway and working well. International Roll Call has also had their personnel on site for the past 2 weeks working on the Legislative Management System and his staff has been supporting that effort on an intense basis since they have been here.

Speaker Saxl asked Mr. Mayotte if there was anything the Legislative Council should be worried about, any time period, was everything on schedule and on budget. Mr. Mayotte said he was a little worried about the integrating the statutes database with the application software. He said he would like to see them a week or two further into it than they are currently. They had 1 title they were using and he would like to see them having more than 1 title being used and followed by the application software. Working with Compaq he believed there would be many more titles in place within 2 weeks or so, but it does put it kind of late into the session.

No Council action required.

### REPORTS FROM COUNCIL COMMITTEES

### Technology and Migration Committee

Sen. Treat said they had a great meeting with full attendance and careful attention to detail. The overall picture was that they were not ready to ask the entire Council for a

policy decision on any of the items the Committee has been working on but they had been quite diligent about getting to where that would happen. There is a lot of complicated issues and additional information has had to be obtained before they could make a recommendation based on price, policy, etc. They had received updates from Mr. Mayotte on the status of the new bill drafting system implementation and are trying to understand better how the committee pieces and other parts will all fit together. That relates very directly to the Part II requests as it has been outlined.

An update on the State's Chief Information Officer was provided and the Legislative Council does not need to take action on that item.

The Committee talked about the Executive branch's budget and financial management system, which had been talked about before, whether it should be adopted. The Executive Director, OFPR Director and Information Services Director are meeting with the Budget Office to look into the status of it. She said it was not going well in terms of the Executive Branch's experience, and they already had concerns. The Committee will be getting a recommendation to the Legislative Council members.

The Committee also spent a lot of time talking about the proposal that have the Legislature establish its own direct internet access. As of now access is through the Bureau of Information Services and is based on a per computer charge of \$34.75 a month. Compared to how many computers the Legislature may have in the future (when legislators are connected), now there is a fairly limited number, Paul Mayotte and the staff gave figures that were quite comprehensive that essentially showed a savings in Fiscal Year 2002 of \$131,000. There are issues about it, such as access to data which is currently in the data repository which we have access to and there are issues related to BIS' concern about the Legislature pulling out, \$110,000 right now. We are a drop in the bucket right now for their total number of accounts. The Committee was leaning in a direction, but was not ready to recommend anything because they were still trying to get the cost. BIS said their estimates were not accurate that it was going to cost more. Because the Committee wanted to make a decision based on good information asked BIS how the cost was determined. They were trying to determine what additional cost had not been anticipated. What Mr. Mayotte had presented, was that investing in the technology could be done out of the savings so there would not be an additional cost that would be recouped later, it would be recouped within this budget cycle, which is significant. It also could be done with the present amount of staff. They will have more discussions with BIS, the proposal was made that the data issue could be resolved by having a certain number of dedicated computers that we do pay the monthly fee to BIS that would be connected to the data that we need to get. The material she was referring to was budgetary data, revenue forecasting data, etc., and there was a statute that mandated they get us the information. It may be something we update the language on so the format of the information is also required to be provided. They will be getting that information and may be able to come back to the full Legislative Council before another month goes by if there is another meeting before then. They have also been continuing to review the Part II Requests and get additional data to make specific recommendations at the next meeting.

Rep. Norbert said the Technology Committee had been working very hard. What was exciting was the direct internet project. He believed the Bureau of Information Services would need to come forward with hard data or more compelling reasons. The Committee is trying to lay the groundwork so they can save money, get quicker access, and exert Legislative independence on the matter. Sen. Treat clarified that the direct access would improve the usability of the system for legislators as well as the capability to broadcast over the internet, would ensure that capability into the future. Speaker Saxl said if the

Committee thought they could get better service going independently, that would be great. He congratulated them for pursuing it and asked that the Committee and Mr. Mayotte review the Part II Budget, and come back with some of their priorities. He said that would be helpful, they were not as optimistic they would be able to afford all the requests in the Part II Budget for technology.

No Council action required.

#### • Personnel Committee

Speaker Saxl said the Personnel Committee had several motions to present to the Legislative Council. If at any point during the discussion they wished to go into Executive Session, they will honor that to discuss the details of those.

Motion: On behalf of the OFPR Director Search Committee, that Grant Pennoyer be appointed as Director of the Office of Fiscal & Program Review for a 3-year term commencing on April 26, 2001, at grade 14 step 6, and as provided in Title 3, Section 162, Subsection 6 of the Maine Revised Statutes, that reappointment be based on performance and in accordance with policy and procedures established by the Legislative Council. (Motion by Speaker Saxl, second by Sen. Small, unanimous 9-0).

Speaker Saxl said, Mr. Pennoyer, on behalf of the Legislative Council, congratulations to you. It was a very competitive search. We had national candidates, people who had established these offices in other legislatures, others from private and public sector experience and had a great group of finalists, but Mr. Pennoyer was head and shoulders above and did a great job.

Motion: That Income Protection for two legislative employees be granted as reviewed and accepted by the Personnel Committee at our April 25, 2001 meeting. (Motion by Speaker Saxl, second by Rep. Bruno, unanimous).

Speaker Saxl informed the Legislative Council members that the Personnel Committee had completed its personnel review of Paul Mayotte's work at the Legislature and as a result of that review, have recommended that he receive his annual step increase which is for a job well done.

No Council action required.

Speaker Saxl said the Personnel Committee was committed to talking about deferred compensation for legislators and legislative employees and will do that at a subsequent Personnel Committee meeting but if any member of the Council had any special expertise, insight, or would like to be part of that discussion, he would be very interested in having their input.

No Council action required.

#### • Space Committee

Rep. Colwell reported that the Space Committee met and worked diligently on the issue of smoking areas on Legislative property. The Space Committee came up with the following recommendations: Since the West side of the Capital will be the main entrance to the building once construction was completed, all foot traffic, children, everyone would be entering through that area. The Space Committee determined there would be

no smoking on the West side of the Capital, between here the Cross State Office Building and on the East side of the Capital. The areas were smoking will be allowed will be on either end of the building. On the North side it is where the concrete slab with a picnic table on the lawn. The other area for smoking will be on the South entrance of the building inside the granite wall where the fence is. The Committee proposed building another concrete picnic table and walkway. That area would be a secured entrance there will not be public access through that entrance. The Space Committee also recommended that the Executive Director find outside ashtrays.

Sen. Treat asked if the idea of the new concrete slab and walkway had already been vetted with Capitol Planning Commission and the Historic Preservation Commission. Rep. Colwell said that Earle Shettleworth, Director, Maine Historic Preservation Commission, was in the room during the discussions. He said there was a table in the area now, on the other side of the fence, and he asked Mr. Clair to address that question. Speaker Saxl asked if they should ask the new Capitol Area Advisory Subcommittee, whether they want a slab there and Mr. Clair said both groups, the Capitol Area Advisory Committee and the State House and Capitol Park Commission, played a role in that space. The timing for doing something in that area was a ways away and there was time to bring it to both those groups. Speaker Saxl thought that would be a good idea.

Rep. Schneider said he objected to the plan because it did not provide any kind of a covered place for someone to smoke. The comments heard that someone could smoke in their car actually was not possible for someone who was parked in the parking garage. The plan did not allow for any place under cover for someone to have a smoke. Sen. Treat did not think it was their responsibility to provide a covered area for smokers.

Speaker Saxl asked Mr. Clair if a motion and vote was needed or could they refer the relevant parts to the Capital Area Advisory Commission. Mr. Clair said with the exception of the new concrete pad, and the walkway, the rest of the policy was ready to be implemented with a motion and vote.

**Motion:** That smoking be abolished anywhere West of the State House, leading up to the Cross Building; that two smoking spots be located Northwest and Southwest of the State House; that the Executive Director be tasked with finding better receptacles for cigarette butts in these two locations that can handle the elements; and that smoking be banned from the entire East side of the State House, continuing the current ban on the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor porch but now extending the ban to the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor porch as well. (Motion by Rep. Colwell, second by Sen. Davis, 8-2).

Mr. Clair will prepare a draft memo to the Capital Area Advisory Committee for a recommendation.

#### • Time and Attendance Subcommittee

None

#### **OLD BUSINESS**

### Item #1: Proposed Drafting Guidelines for Legislative Studies-120<sup>th</sup> Legislature

David Boulter gave a presentation to the Legislative Council for adoption pursuant to Joint Rule 353, which requires that at the start of each legislative biennium the Council adopt rules to guide the drafting of legislative studies and studies should be in

accordance with those guidelines as approved by the Council. He had a few major points. First the guidelines are consistent with the Joint Rules as adopted by the 120th Legislature. They serve two major purposes: to provide consistency in drafting legislation to assure that important elements of establishing study commissions are included to allow legislators to easily discern what is being proposed; and that all key elements for a successful study and study commission are included. The second reflects a legislative intent as expressed by the 119th and this Legislature to allow legislators to better maintain control over legislative studies and to shape the scope and direction of studies. In the past, it had been, even though they were legislative studies, largely controlled by external forces. These guidelines in the Joint Rules, expressly allow the control and shaping of that to be done by the Legislative branch. Key provisions of the guidelines themselves, looks very much like a working or staff document and is designed specifically so all major elements are included in each study proposal. There is standardized language for a consistency in drafting, and for easy review by legislators. There is model language, and explanatory comments to help people, particularly staff, to be guided in certain circumstances. The elements include the appropriate legislative instrument to be used in times when variations are appropriate, composition of the study commissions, appointment process, both in terms of members and chairs, compensation, reporting requirements, extensions, requirement to have some explanation as to what the study would involve in major duties. Each of those are included. You may have seen study legislation coming before members already with many of those elements. It does reflect the general policy of the Legislature that the Joint Order is the preferred legislative instrument to be used in most cases, that the Joint Order being within the purview of the Legislature solely and not subject to veto. It is also a very efficient way of convening a study, do not need to wait until 90 days following adjournment before studies could convene. For example, if a Resolve was passed as non-emergency, it would probably be late September perhaps October before a study began and the deadline for the submission of the report would be about 5 weeks later, so there would not be much opportunity in the ordinary course to do a thorough study. The Joint Order allows for a speedier beginning to those studies. He drew the Legislative Council members' attention to the compensation of members on a study commission. The Joint Rules require, and these guidelines are consistent with the Joint Rules, that specify that legislative members are entitled to receive the Legislative per diem and reimbursement of necessary expenses for their attendance at authorized meetings. Public members on the commission, who are not, otherwise compensated by their employers, are entitled to reimbursement of necessary expenses and a per diem equal to the legislative per diem. Although that is what the joint rules say, the actual practice has been in odds with that. In most cases, at the study table time, the Council, and ultimately the Legislature, had deemed that public members not otherwise compensated were entitled to reimbursement of expenses, but not entitled to a legislative per diem. He pointed that out because he wanted to be consistent with the Joint Rules, but if the Legislative Council wanted to vary, and if adopted, there would not be study language that was consistent with that which would include a per diem for all members. If the Legislative Council wished to vary from that, it could either do it by a floor amendment or if you wish to vary as a matter of policy, this might be the appropriate time to do that. With that exception Mr. Boulter did not see any conflicts from what he understood the intent this Council had with respect to the studies and the guidelines themselves.

Speaker Saxl speaking on institutional memory said it had been the tradition of the Council, when reviewing special study committees, to try to set identical parameters, whenever possible, for all the study committees. They are allowed to convene for 3 or 4 meetings and exclusively reimbursed legislators the per diem. That was the past practice. The reason being, was to maximize the limited budget for legislative studies

so they could allow each committee 1 or 2 studies and then choose 1 or 2 studies the Council themselves as a group believed was important for the next legislative session. Sen. Treat commented on the compensation issue. She believed it had been the general practice, that some committees, with outside members, who want to encourage participation, had recommended a small budget for compensation for members who had a financial need. She said there ought to be room in the policy that the Council adopts to make sure that is an option in cases where it was important to have citizen members that may not be able to take off from work or may need help with transportation costs. Speaker Saxl said they may want to make the language around that and believed it was permissive to reimburse those designated members when there was merit, but might not want to create the expectation of reimbursement for all public members. It was a question of policy for the Council. Sen. Treat suggested to include language to have it on a case-by-case basis, committees would know it is something they could request if they had a reason for it.

Speaker Saxl asked Mr. Boulter to draft an option for the Council's consideration. It was the Speaker's suggestion that instead of adopting this as a whole today, they take a week or so to review it and see if there were other concerns upon review. Sen. Treat did not have a problem with the specific recommendations of the proposal, but in practice, the joint order had not worked well for a couple of reason and until those items were fixed, she had concern about requiring studies to be done by joint order. She recognized that it does not make sense to have the Governor sign legislative study committees, so did not know how to correct it and believed there was a relationship between the computer issue and this. She had two joint orders in the past that were studies that were completely off the information systems, did not have her name on them or anyone else as sponsors. It was not showing up that she had sponsored it, so when the hearing was scheduled she was not notified. The problem was it was on a different computer system than the bills, and that is a problem. A political problem in the Senate was that joint orders are not clear. Some Senators had been voting against them because they did not realize they went to the Revisor's Office and were appropriate. They thought someone just stuck them in and they were being expected to vote on it. Until they could resolve those two problems to mandate that people had to do it that way was a concern to her

Rep. Bruno asked Mr. Boulter to refresh his memory, did every study come to the Legislative Council for approval.

Mr. Boulter said a joint standing committee could actual do a study. There were ways in the policy that allowed that to be expedited, but in general there was an opportunity for the Council to look at all the studies before they go forward. Occasionally, a study that was part of a bill or resolve that sits on the Appropriation's Table. Sometimes the Appropriation's Committee will act independently, but typically, in the last 4 years many studies had gone through joint orders on special studies and had come to the Council. What the Council basically did was rubber stamp the committee of jurisdiction's 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> proposals and occasionally, one recommended as a priority for the committee of jurisdiction.

Speaker Saxl asked that someone make a tabling motion so the Council could hold it for final approval until the next Council meeting. Moved by Rep. Bruno, second by Rep. Schneider, unanimous.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

Item #1: Review of 2002-2003 "Part II" Legislative Budget Requests

Mr. Clair told Legislative Council members they had seen the Budget Requests in a couple different forms over the past few months. It is the most recent update as of April 23<sup>rd</sup>, is broken up by office, data by line category and by fiscal year 02 and 03. The lion's share of the request, \$3.4 million is in Information Services related issues, some being from migration part 2, positions, software upgrades, etc. He asked that members read through the information. The Technology Committee had taken it on as a task to try and take another look at it before the Council meets again.

There were requests for new positions and some upgrades in the Senate. Mr. Clair said after the recent discussion on miscellaneous studies, although the Joint Rules call for a specific legislative account, there had never been one. The way studies had been funded in the past had either been the Appropriations Committee had set aside \$50,000 or \$100,000, or the Legislature could determine there was sufficient resources within the legislative budget for the next fiscal year such that \$50,000 or \$100,000 worth of studies could be "absorbed". The Joint Rules do say it should be a specific account, may have some flexibility in how you go about doing it, but if you looked at the budget and 100% of the costs had already been committed in the Part I Budget and what would be needed for studies, thought \$85,000 per year would fund approximately 15 studies. There was flexibility in that number but at least wanted it before you.

Lastly the Law Library had some issues and Mr. Clair wanted to make sure that the Legislative Council understood them. The temporary shelving for that unit was never budgeted as a move issue. It needs to be taken care of, he would like to talk to them in more detail, along with relocation expenses, including the rent, etc, for Capitol Street. Speaker Saxl asked if there were questions for Mr. Clair and asked the Council to take about a week, Mr. Clair would organize a Council meeting for next week, so they can make a recommendation of what the Legislative Council would like to ask the Appropriations Committee to include in their Part 2 Budget, if anything, and reconvene the entire Council to ask questions of Directors and the Chambers themselves, regarding their requests. Members directed Mr. Clair to contact their respect offices and try to set up a Council meeting next week exclusively about the Part 2 Budget.

No Council action required on this matter.

### ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REMARKS

None.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Sen. Bennett moved that the Council adjourn at 3:05 p.m. (Motion by Sen. Bennett, second by Sen. Treat, unanimous).

REP. MICHAEL V. SAXL CHAIR

SEN. RICHARD A. BENNETT VICE-CHAIR



# 120<sup>th</sup> 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 MAY 7, 2001

### CALL TO ORDER

The Chair, Speaker Michael V. Saxl, called the Council meeting to order at 12:42 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:

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

Speaker Saxl said the purpose of the Council Meeting was to review the "Part II" Budget for the Legislative Council.

Speaker Saxl asked that everyone join with him in a moment of silence in memory of Julie Read-Marsh, an Analyst in the Office of Policy and Legal Analysis, who passed away Saturday evening, May 5, in Belfast. Ms. Marsh was diagnosed with cancer shortly after giving birth to a son three months ago.

### REPORTS FROM COUNCIL COMMITTEES

None.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

None.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

### Item #1: Review of 2002-2003 "Part II" Legislative Budget Requests

Mr. Clair was asked by the Speaker to lead the Legislative Council through the budget discussion. Mr. Clair said back in the fall they initiated a process to develop, not only the Part I Budget proposals, but also any Part II proposals that offices might have for the Council's consideration. That list had been amended many times, the most recent of which, was last week. The Technology Committee met and reviewed approximately \$3.5 million in proposals. He referred Council members to the information in their packet, which represented \$4.3 million for the next biennium over a series of different requests, including two different looks from the Technology Committee. A "Priority A" list that sums to \$2.5 million and a "Priority B" list that sums to about \$400,000. Those amounts are about \$2.9 million of the \$4.3 million. The Technology Committee met last week, reviewed the "Priority A" list and of the members present, endorsed it. They did not endorse the "Priority B" list. The Committee believed those items could wait. What follows is about \$1.4 million of other requests from various offices. There are session positions, upgrades, and expenses related to the Law Library's move. The rent being paid for that move and some shelving needed in the new facility. That is how it rounds off to \$4.3 million in total.

Speaker Saxl asked if members wanted to move through the information item-by-item in an expedited fashion to see whether they wanted to move anything out. He said that they would assume that everything in the information is in, then if they want to move it out, that can be done, have a discussion, and take a vote. Speaker Saxl asked if that was the preferred way to go through the information or did Mr. Clair have any suggestions. Mr. Clair said that was fine, he wanted to let them know that Mr. Mayotte was distributing information from the Technology Committee that gave more detail on the "Priority A" items. Sen. Bennett agreed but wanted to make sure it required an affirmative vote to approve the supplemental budget requests. Rep. Bruno asked if the plan was to go line by line as to what the Technology Committee already had? Speaker Saxl answered they did not have to. Rep. Bruno was concerned they would hear the same thing over again and he understood that to be the purpose of the Subcommittee, for the subcommittee to make recommendations and thought a quick explanation of where they were going would be sufficient. Speaker Saxl asked Sen. Treat to take them through the Technology recommendations.

Sen. Treat said the Technology Committee met and the information before the Legislative Council is the unanimous position of the Committee. She referred members to information in their packet. The first 3 pages were the first priority items, the last page was a lower priority which the Committee was recommending not to fund. She said they could go through any item if someone had specific questions. There were 2 positions being requested, the rest deal with automating the committees, the

legislative bill status program, and the migration from the WANG. The Committee moved items around to postpone some items into a future year because they would not be able to do it all over the summer. For example, automating the Chambers, had been pushed to the 121<sup>st</sup> legislative session in terms of individual Senators being automated at their desks. It was the Committee's judgment that the items in "Priority A" are really needed and the items in "Priority B" could wait. One item discussed as possible being on the "Priority A" was Legislative staff remote access, the ability to dial in and do things on the State computer. The Committee determined it would be making a recommendation for the Legislature's own Internet connection. We would have better access without having it directly on the computer and you could go through a Webbase. Rep. Bruno convinced the Committee they did not need to fund that piece because they would have the functionality they wanted without spending extra money. With the changes both in the technology outside the State House and also the changes recommended in the "A" part, that would be happening even without the additional spending, so concluded to put that in the "B", for not funding at all or consider it later.

Sen. Bennett asked if everything under "A" had been determined by the Subcommittee as absolutely necessary to do now? Sen. Treat said some had been pushed out to the 2<sup>nd</sup> year of the biennium, but it was an integrated program and all the members had agreed to what was listed. He thought it was a lot of money, that phase one of the migration had not yet been finished yet, and he believed they needed to look closer before putting \$1.6 million in for phase 2 and he could not support the additional funding request.

Speaker Saxl asked Rep. Bruno if he was part of Subcommittee, Rep. Bruno replying that he was. He supported the request because thought it was the intent of the Legislature to become automated, and it could not get there unless some of the requested items were funded. If the Legislature did not want to be automated, that was okay, it had functioned for over 100 years without being automated, and could continue, but if it wanted to move into the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, the request was needed. There were places to cut in the "A" recommendation, and funding could also come from other sources. Look at the entire Legislative budget, make cuts, and arrive somewhere close to that number. He believed that in order to move forward, they had to at least fund Fiscal Year 02 to keep moving in the right direction. If it were the goal to get a laptop for every legislator, it would cost \$900,000. Every Legislative Council, for the past 3 or 4 years had been saying the Legislature needed to automate, and this would be the direction they need to go.

Speaker Saxl then asked about broadcasting on the Internet, why it was put in B priority items, do you have any plans to do broadcasting and how does that impact the Chamber?

Sen. Bennett asked the status of moving the Legislature off from the Bureau of Information Services system on to its own. At a previous Legislative Council meeting, that was talked about as a way of saving money because the Bureau was charging \$35 - \$36 a month to get a service that had not functioned for the last 4 or 5 days, and believed it is outrageous to be paying that amount of money. Sen. Treat said the Legislature needed to migrate off the Wang, they don't sell parts for it anymore, they were missing deadlines for advertising. At their last meeting, recommendations about getting off from BIS, was the direction they were going, but BIS wanted the opportunity to return with additional information showing it would be to our financial disadvantage to make that change. The Committee did not see that, asked them to get information to us before this meeting, and she asked if that had been provided. Mr. Clair said he and Mr. Mayotte met with Commissioner Waldron and the Director of

Information Services, last Friday and did have their estimate. He felt it important to point out that he disagreed with part of their analysis, and believed Mr. Mayotte did as well. He maintained they could do it at the same costs they told the Technology Committee. They wanted to identify the staff resources that would be applied towards it, considered it an incremental exercise, and approached it differently than they did. The Administration was not going to fight the issue of breaking away from the Wide Area Network, but professionally thought we were making a mistake in doing that because we would not have the same level of service, and it would be more expensive than we were estimating. We believed we had options that preserved the kind of Wide Area Network connections that we needed, especially for fiscal purposes. Sen. Treat explained where the Committee was going, unless they got new and persuasive information from BIS that indicated our numbers were wrong, we would be recommending to the entire Council that they go ahead with the earlier proposal to have a direct access and believed members of the Committee agreed. They needed to look at the information and make sure it did not change their minds, but they were pretty clear on making that recommendation and was in the "Part A" recommendations given to the Legislative Council today. Speaker Saxl asked what the timeline was of the Council's decision on leaving BIS, and Mr. Clair said it could be at any time. The Speaker said the Part II Budget decisions were not contingent upon confirming that day they would be leaving BIS and Mr. Clair agreed. Speaker Saxl said although he agreed and appreciated the work of the Subcommittee, they could defer the final decision. He asked if there was further discussion about the Part II, Part A priority recommendations of the Technology Committee. Sen. Treat wanted to clarify the Committee agreed it was a "B" priority. Speaker Saxl recognized that and was the reason he asked Clerk MacFarland whether it was a priority of the Chambers and she agreed the Legislature needed to automate before that was done.

**Motion:** To accept the targeted "A" increases for the Part II Budget for Technology. (Motion by Sen. Treat, seconded by Rep. Bruno, 8-2 in favor).

Sen. Bennett had concerns about items in the request. Speaker Saxl had concerns as well, and also had concern about some that were not included. He asked Mr. Clair to coordinate with the Senate and House to schedule another meeting for later in the week to finish the Part II recommendations.

# Item #2: Authorization for the Executive Director to enter in an agreement with Cost Management, Inc., licensed construction economists, for estimating services in connection with the State House/North Wing renovations.

Speaker Saxl asked Mr. Clair to explain to the Council, his and the Speaker's recommendation. Mr. Clair said they were in a very critical phase in the renovations project overall, and they had been undergoing a process with the design team and the construction team of reviewing where they were to date with the South and West Wing projects. As the North Wing project is kicked off, hopefully in late June, the most important thing to him was where they stood financially. With the guideline as expressed by Stan Fairservice, the construction team and the design team, it would be approximately \$5.50 million. Mr. Clair estimated the resources right now were below that amount. Cobbled together with the way the reserved fund would be used we could get to an amount that approached the \$5.50 million, but it spoke about the problems keeping on schedule and if there needed to be some rethinking of the North Wing project - not that it would look dramatically different, but if they needed to find ways to make sure the project stayed on scope - it was brought to his attention that the Bureau of General Services had used a firm called Cost Management, Inc. They refer to themselves as construction economists, were used on the Psychiatric

Treatment facility to make sure, as the bids came in, there was a way to have a second opinion, to take a look at the architectural design work, the systems work, etc. in order to see where you could cut back and have plans like that make sense, look at the schedule to make sure the 2<sup>nd</sup> Regular Session process would go smoothly, etc. This person was recommended to Mr. Clair and he asked him to put together a response to a request for services which he had done. He also asked him to estimate the maximum cost for an intensive effort to have him go over the construction documents page-by-page and then meet with both the design team and construction team to poke holes in the documents before us and this firm was willing to do that.

Speaker Saxl asked if there were questions.

**Motion:** The Legislative Council authorize the Executive Director to enter an agreement with Cost Management, Inc. (Motion by Sen. Bennett, second by Rep. Schneider, unanimous).

### ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REMARKS

None.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The Council meeting was adjourned at 1:07 p.m. (Motion by Sen. Bennett, second by Rep. Colwell, unanimous).

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 MAY 10, 2001

### CALL TO ORDER

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

### ROLL CALL

Senators:

Sen. Daggett, Sen. Treat

Absent: Sen. Davis, Sen. Small, Sen. Bennett

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

Speaker Saxl took up New Business because Commissioner Waldron was at the meeting and wished to discuss with the Legislative Council members their interest in proceeding with leaving the State's Wide Area Network.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

### Item #1: Proceeding with Legislative Internet Access

Speaker Saxl asked Mr. Clair to present Item #1. Mr. Clair said the Technology Committee had reviewed the information prepared from the meeting of Paul Mayotte, Commissioner Waldron, staff from the Bureau of Information Services and himself to discuss 3 options for how the Legislature accessed the Wide Area Network and internet services. One option was to continue as presently done, but with a reduced rate. Commissioner Waldron said there might be an opportunity for a lower monthly access charge. Second the Technology Committee discussed with Commissioner Waldron and Mr. Hinkley the possibility of having a modified version of breaking away completely. Third, the Legislature would still have limited access to the Wide Area Network for some key items, the fiscal and administrative tools, (examples: the data warehouse, MFASIS, etc.) There were pros and cons for each of the approaches. Options #2 and #3 made financial sense because the costs to the Legislature would be reduced. Mr. Clair said Commissioner Waldron would present a prospective that the aggregate cost for information services system-wide are relatively fixed, and they would need to spread their costs among the remaining users.

Speaker Saxl invited Commissioner Waldron to address the Legislative Council. Commissioner Waldron introduced Dick Hinkley, the Director of Bureau of Information Services. She said they had an excellent working relationship between shops and appreciated the work and cooperation received from Mr. Mayotte. Whatever the Council chose to do, they would support and help however they could to make it work the best it possibly could. If the decision was made to have your own network, she said, from their perspective, believed it would cost the Legislature more and as it moved more into remote access, would cost even more, when Legislators had laptops, it would be an incremental amount for the enterprise as a whole. What was being purposed, as a separate network was an additional amount, did not see it as a cost savings. They also argued the functionality would change for the Legislature because they believed the present service was comparable, they could make any accommodations on the network that the Legislature needs. There were disadvantages, and problems that would have to be worked on collectively in terms of access and transmission of information, which the Commissioner did not have the answers to yet. An example given was how the Legislature would get the budget system information if on its own network. It could be done; it would be a matter of getting the systems in place so the information could be transmitted. Information was given on what the Legislature gets for the rate paid on the Wide Area Network. It is not just an ISP service, it connects to the MFASIS, budget, data warehouse systems, the State's intranet services, and the email global system. The Bureau of Information Services is a 7 day, 24-hour operation, has security and firewall management, remote access, network monitoring and management on an ongoing basis, technical consulting and services associated with the network. The network is priced distance insensitive, and set up to recover costs, it was set up with an internal service fund. Should the Legislature decide to have its own separate network, BIS had two options in terms of facilitating that. The Commissioner turned it over to Mr. Hinkley for his technical expertise.

Mr. Hinkley had discussed in general 2 options with Mr. Mayotte and Mr. Scott Clark. Option 1 would create two separate networks and interconnect them by using the internet itself. The cons with Option 1, are the connectivity and performance are not enjoyed. The second option, which he believed they were leaning toward, would be to interconnect the two networks. They still would be foreign networks, but would more directly connect them and each would enjoy their respective security, firewalls, etc. The particulars would have to be worked out, there is not a business or technology plan that he was aware of with that scoped out, all of the elements that would be involved, but these above are basically the two options being considered.

Commissioner Waldron said there were not any savings on their side, their costs were. They had to run the network regardless, and the number of devices on the network. The rates are priced so the larger number of devices, the lower the rate. There were not any savings to BIS, there was nothing they needed to change. There will be cost to them and the Legislature, if the Legislature separates. Commissioner Waldron then asked Mr. Hinkley to explain the functional differences.

Mr. Hinkley explained what was included in the packet as being a part of the Wide Area Network, the email directory access, which means separate email directories would be maintained and would not be able to use the address list that is currently used, and vise-versa. Second, the remote access piece is built into the rate, so if an agency dials into the State servers, it is part of the rate already paid for, that would be an added cost that the Legislature would have to pick up to have that service added. Commissioner Waldron said the first run through actually shows a higher savings in the first 2 years and then shows a cost that essentially nets out the 2 years if the Legislature had its own network. That savings was reduced because it was not included was the cost for the InforME connection the Legislature would also have to maintain. One of the points of difference between the numbers are the cost of labor, which to BIS was not an unusually big argument, but do see the cost of staff operations and believe the cost of the labor should be included in the total cost, it was in their total cost and in order to have an exact comparison, had included it as a cost item for the Legislature and used numbers that Mr. Mayotte had benchmarked in terms of some cost items. Looking at a reduced rate, as Mr. Clair indicated, they do have some Executive branch functions that she believed could be removed from the rate. In particular, the CIO, the reorganization had just been completed, and if the cost of that was removed as an Executive Branch cost, they could provide the Legislature with a reduced rate she believed would be acceptable to the Federal Government, because they had to have equity in the rates that all funds are charged. Commissioner Waldron believed legally there was a differentiation that would show, if using a reduced rate of \$30.25 a month as opposed to the \$34.75 a month, it changed the cost. She said BIS wanted to help the Legislature and if the Legislature wanted its own network, be happy to help achieve that. They wanted to support the Legislative Council's decision.

Rep. Colwell received complaints about the number of hours the system was down, and asked why that was and what was being done to address it. Commissioner Waldron said the availability percentage of the network was greater than 98%. The numbers change on a building-by-building, agency by agency basis, depending upon what was happening within the building or facility. BIS did not have those statistics, it would have to be on a case-by-case basis to figure out what the problem may have been.

Speaker Saxl asked the time line for making a decision regarding migrating off the State's system and Mr. Clair said there technically was no deadline, the Legislature paid a monthly rate, but would like to have a certain amount of lead time for implementation. He had mentioned to Commissioner Waldron that they believed there

was a savings that is irrefutable. The rest becomes an internal issue about when the Legislature wants the service up and running. Assuming that was what is wanted, they would need a certain amount of lead time to get everything up and running. Mr. Clair and Mr. Mayotte had not talked about what amount of time would be needed. For the purposes of the meeting today, Speaker Saxl said while many members may be ready to make a change dealing with the network for the Legislature, there was no urgency.

Rep. Norbert asked if the server was down in this building, the numbers might not reflect the percentage building by building? Mr. Hinkley said they deliver a service up to a building or agency and what happens within that building may affect what you see. Rep. Norbert also commented that the Technology Committee was excited about establishing independent access for the speed. Commissioner Waldron asked Mr. Hinkley to address the speed issue because it was a function of what one was securing for service. He said it depended on your work, and if you sized your pipeline too small there would be a decrease in response time. They sized the aggregate band by all users of WAN and graduate it according to use.

Rep. Bruno was interested in the reduction of cost the Bureau of Administrative and Financial Services was offering of \$4.00 a month. Would that amount be applied statewide or was it only for the Legislature, and if so, why? Commissioner Waldron said it was just for the Legislature because they were backing out costs associated with designating the Chief Information Officer, as representative of the Executive Branch. The Appropriations Committee saw that it was very important that the State have a Chief Information Officer. To that end, they were very clear in the language that that person represented the Executive, not the State as a whole. They could not cross branches of government, so the cost was pulled out of the rate and she felt it a legitimate cost that could be distinguished as a cost of the Executive and not a cost to the Legislature. She could not make that same differentiation for other agencies. The question had been raised that if the Legislature had its own network, everyone else would want their own, and the Appropriations Committee was concerned they got the economies of a single, unified internal technology system. The more people that go off, the higher the cost for everyone. It was asked if the savings would be approximately \$35,000 for the first year, and \$66,000 the 2nd. Mr. Clair said in the 3 options, option 1 was a reduction of about \$12,600 a year over what is presently built into the budget due to the \$4.00 per month rate reduction. Option 2 are the numbers Rep. Colwell just cited, \$35,000 the first year, \$67,000 the second. Option 3 we are building in specifically the former network access needs from the Executive Branch for data warehouse, budget system, etc. For the purpose of the budget Rep Colwell asked what the Legislature was looking at under option 2, \$66,000? They believed for the biennium, assuming this happened soon, there would be about \$110,000 savings to what the Legislature had already budgeted.

Sen. Treat believed the recommendation of the staff would be to go with option 3. When discussed at the Technology Committee, they were looking at a separate network, but maintaining some connection with the State system so there was access to the data, and believed Option 3 to be consistent with the direction the Technology Committee was going. They had spent a lot of time and she would be willing to make a motion, if appropriate. She believed Option 3 had less of an initial savings, but maintained the connection with BIS. The Bureau would like to have some connection to the Legislature and it also serves our purposes for being able to continue to get the data for the budget in the MFASIS system, but also gives the flexibility to have our own network.

Rep. Colwell said although it is important that the Legislative Council move quickly, Speaker Saxl, who left the meeting, had requested that a vote not be taken on the above issue at today's meeting. He thanked the Commissioner and Mr. Hinkley for their presentation.

No Council action taken.

### REPORTS FROM COUNCIL COMMITTEES

None.

#### **OLD BUSINESS**

### Item #1: Review of 2002-2003 "Part II" Legislative Budget Requests

Mr. Clair was recognized, who referred to the handout before the members. He said that at the May 7, 2001 the Legislative Council had voted 8-2 to accept the Technology "Priority A" list costing \$2.5 million in the 2002-2003 biennium. Mr. Clair also believed a decision was made to drop the "B" items because they had not been supported by the Technology Committee. These included the Legislative Information Services' request for 3 reception positions for 2 kiosks, 1 in the State House, and 1 on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the CSOB. Rep. Norbert asked Mr. Clair to clarify the position request, the projection of when the position would take effect and if the requested amount was \$127,000. Mr. Clair said the issue was to make sure there was sufficient coverage at the kiosks with vacation time, etc., the positions would take effect July 1<sup>st</sup>, and the amount requested was \$127,000. Sen. Treat asked if it would be the same people who staffed the citizen access area for information, and believed that area to be more important than the kiosks. Mr. Clair said how the public access center was to be used was still undecided and a pending issue before the Space Committee, but the requested positions were just for the kiosks. Sen. Treat did not believe someone needed to be at the kiosks all summer and fall when the Legislature was not in session. There are not be a lot of hearings in the CSOB during in the interim, and the positions being requested are year round. If the decision was to have positions, she believed they should be session only, 3 full time positions was excessive. Capitol Security had been sitting at the kiosk, if that was part of their job, the need would be only for someone fill in part of the time. Rep. Colwell had envisioned the positions as year round because of the interest in developing the Capitol for tourism. It was Mr. Clair's understanding, to the extent it was explained, that the kiosks would be co-staffed by someone from the Legislature, perhaps the Legislative Information Office, and someone from Capital Security, each kiosk was designed for 2 people to be there. When Rose Breton and he reviewed the budget they could not find where the Legislative Information Office, especially during the session, had the people to be at the kiosks. Sen. Treat believed it would be helpful before moving forward, to get figures for a session only position, and what the cost would be for a different configuration of the positions. Mr. Clair wanted to provide the Legislative Council options, including a way to use existing resources throughout Legislative offices that could staff the kiosks at down times, and believed there was a way to do that. The Council asked him to prepare that information. Rep. Colwell said the use of volunteers, internships, etc. for positions had also been mentioned.

The next request was for a full-time position during the 1<sup>st</sup> Regular Session by the Office of Fiscal and Program Review. The Office of Policy and Legal Analysis had requested the same type of position, and a similar position for the Revisor's Office, except the Revisor's request was for both the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Sessions. Sen. Treat requested information on overtime hours, how much staff comp time had accumulated in the 3 difference offices.

Rep. Colwell asked Mr. Clair to clarify what had been done in the Part I Budget for the Senate. He said the amendments in LD 300 would be a reduction in the fully funded level starting in FY 03 to the 120<sup>th</sup> Senate, the 3 positions that were created as part of the power sharing agreement. The funding goes away at the end of the 120<sup>th</sup> Legislature. Rep. Colwell asked if the amount was approximately \$125,000 and if the Council had voted and agreed on that. Mr. Clair said yes it had been and endorsed in the Appropriation Committee. It was asked why it was back to the Legislative Council and Mr. Clair said the whole budget process started in October, the above was a request that came in at that time. He didn't think that the 120<sup>th</sup> Senate had focused on this "old" request yet. Rep. Colwell confirmed they were additional positions, so is not the same thing as what was now funded in the Part 1 additional information was needed on the increased Senate staff request.

Miscellaneous studies were the next item. Mr. Clair explained that the Joint Rules called for a special account to be established for studies, and Council members may recall there was an account called miscellaneous studies but it was not for the purpose for which the Joint Rules called. For whatever number of studies the Council will authorize later, they had never identified an amount of money for what Study Commissions or Select Committees might do. The way the studies had happened in the past, either the Legislative budget was able absorb what the study cost was, or the Appropriations Committee would reserve a sum, \$50,000 or \$75,000 from the whole Appropriations' Table process, and leadership would divide that among the studies. The Joint Rules say there should be a specifically designated account for studies and this would do that. It would fund 17 studies each year at an average cost of \$5,000 per year, the average cost for an interim study. Rep. Colwell said the distinction is it would be a line item in the legislative budget, which is the requirement not being met currently. The amount budgeted presently for studies are for ongoing studies, not for the interim studies.

Mr. Clair continued to the Law and Legislative Reference Library request. The Image Newspaper Clippings would be a way to access and enter the clippings they now do by hand, electronically. The second item is new shelving for the Hallowell Annex. He could not find in the budget the money for the Law Library or shelving. If the money was to come out of the Library's budget, it was not there. If it was to come from the renovations budget, it was not in that either this. Requested monies to pay for the lease of the facility at 161 Capital Street and the shelving. Rep. Norbert asked for an explanation on the move of the Library, and Mr. Clair said a moving contract had been bid that will move the Law Library out on June 22, 23 and 24, 2001 to 161 Capital Street. The nature of the Library in the renovations is everything will be gutted, new windows, electrical system, data supply, phone lines, and shoring work. The space needs to be vacated for 6 months, and then moved back into in December. Rep. Norbert asked how consumers are being informed. Lynn Randall said they had already put signs up in the Library, plan to use their Website and as soon the plans are definite, they will begin notifying publications.

Rep. Bruno asked the status with the Appropriations Committee regarding moving the Law Library to the Maine State Library. Mr. Clair said he knew they organized a 3 person subcommittee, but did not believe they had met yet.

If any members of the Legislative Council were interested in a tour of the space at the Hallowell Annex or the rental space at 161 Capitol Street, Mr. Clair would have the van available for them to do that.

Mr. Clair said he had just received word from the Secretary of the Senate, Joy O'Brien, that the Senate Part 2 requests could be deleted.

No Council action taken.

### ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REMARKS

None.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The Council meeting was adjourned at 2:27 p.m. on the motion of Rep. Norbert, second by Sen. Daggett



# Executive Director's Report June 27, 2001

- 1. North Wing Renovations
  - Details to be discussed under "Space Committee" and "New Business"
  - Key questions: Scope
    - : Financing
    - : Letter of intent to proceed
- 2. 2002-2003 Legislative Budget Update
  - See attached
- 3. Interim Studies Update
  - Details to be discussed under "Old Business"
- 4. Granite Consultant
  - · see attached
- 5. Other Pending Issues
  - 4th floor "press room" phones (how many lines? Who pays? ISDN?)
  - Cost Center Budgeting

exdir budget 02-03budget Net Approp xls														
6/25.01														7-33-4
														***************************************
			20	02 2002	TECTO	T APPLY TO	DIDO	TEAR (AC	ATATIC	AUGUSTA OF		TT \		
			20	UZ-ZUUS	TFG12	LAIIVE	$^{\prime}$ BUDG	ET - (AS	ADJUS	) I LU, I	U DA I	<b>L</b> )		
			1				T	T				T		
	·····	4		FY 02						4	FY 03 -	<b></b>		****
	Original	Governor's	120th L/C	PL 2001,		Part 2-LD 855		Original	Governor's	120th L/C	PL 2001,	i -	Part 2-LD 855	
ACCOUNT	Part I Request	Part I	Adjustments	c. 358 Adj.	Subtotal	(As Engrossed)	Total	Part I Request	Part I	Adjustments	c. 358 Adj.	Subtotal	(As engrossed)	Total
(col. I)	(col. 2)	(col. 3)	(col. 4)	(col. 5)	(col. 6)	(col. 7)	(col. 8)	(col. 9)	(col. 10)	(col. 11)	(col. 12)	(cot 13)	(col 14)	(col 15)
Legislative Account														
Postitions - LEG Count	137.500	-1.500			136.000		146,500	137.500	-1.500			136,000	10,500	146.50
Positions - FTE Count	40.358	6.123			46,481	-7.027	39.454	40.358	6.123			46,481	-7.027	39.45
Personal Services	14,396,528	(71,918)	(20,950)		14,303,660	224,435	14,528,095	15,741,965	(75,237)	(150,341)		15,516,387	290,897	15,807,28-
All Other	4,738,789		(119,050)		4,619,739	220,142	4,839,881	5,275,664		(28,600)		5,247,064	(63,800)	5,183,26-
Capital	40,000				40,000		40,000	41,000				41,000		41,000
Total Legislative Account	19,175,317	(71,918)	(140,000)	0	18,963,399	444,577	19,407,976	21,058,629	(75,237)	(178,941)	0	20,804,451	227,097	21,031,54
														· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Comm on Interstate Cooperation	160.560		I	_ [		1					_			
All Other	168,760	1	1	0	168,760	1	168,760	177,198	1	1	0	177,198	1	177,198
Comm on Uniform State Laws														
All Other	26,280	1	'	o '	26,280	1 1	26,280	27,200	'	'	0	27,200	1	27,200
	. 1	1						-		1				<b>,-</b>
State House & Capitol Park Comm												~		
All Other	139,350	'	(50,000)	•	89,350	'	89,350	142,834	•	(50,000)	0	92,834	'	92,83
	1	1	, , ,	1	,	1		1	1	, , ,		1		•
State House Renovations														
All Other	o '		,		0	,	٥١	0	,	'		. 0		(
Misc Studies-Legislative														
Personal Services	2,200			1,320	3,520	8,360	11,880	0				0		
All Other	7,000			2,600	9,600	92,300	101,900	0				0		
Total Misc Studies	9,200	0	0	3,920	13,120	100,660	113,780	0	0 .	0	0	. 0		(
Apportionment Commission						ļ		21,000				21,000		31.00
Personal Services	0				0	<del></del>	0	24,000		(100.000)		24,000		24,000
All Other	0				0	<b></b>	0	414,500		(000,001)		314,500		314,500
Capital	0	1			0		0	61,500		(100.633)		61,500		61,500
Total Apportionment Commission	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	500,000	0	(100,000)	0	400,000	0	400,000

exdir/budget/02-03budget/Net Approp xls	I						1	T			····			
6/25/01														
			200	02 2002	TECTO	ar A months 7115	DIDO	man (A O	ADTIC	מו אונטונטוט		T3\		
			200	02-2003	LEGIS.	LATIVE	RODG	EI - (AS	ADJUS	IED, I	O DAT	E)		
	İ T							T						
				FY 02				<del> </del>		<del></del>	= FY 03 -			
	Original	Governor's	120th L/C	PL 2001,		Part 2-LD 855		Original	Governor's	120th L/C	PL 2001,		Part 2-LD 855	
ACCOUNT	Part I Request	Part I	Adjustments	c. 358 Adj.	Subtotal	(As Engrossed)	Total	Part I Request	Part I	Adjustments	c. 358 Adj.	Subtotal	(As engrossed)	Total
(col. 1)	(col. 2)	(col 3)	(col. 4)	(col. 5)	(col. 6)	(col. 7)	(col. 8)	(col. 9)	(col. 10)	(col. [1)	(col. 12)	(col. 13)	(col. 14)	(col. 15)
Education Research Institute		I												
All Other	150,000			0	150,000		300,000	150,000	0	0	0	150,000	,	150,000
LEG. ACCTS SUMMARY:														
Postitions - LEG Count	137.500	-1.500			136.000	10.500	146.500	137.500	-1.500			136,000	10.500	146.500
Positions - FTE Count	40.358	6.123			46.481	-7.027	39.454	40.358	6.123			46.481	-7.027	39.45
PERSONAL SERVICES	14,398,728	(71,918)	(20,950)	1,320	14,307,180	232,795	14,539,975	15,765,965	(75,237)	(150,341)		15,540,387	290,897	15,831,284
ALL OTHER	5,230,179		(169,050)	2,600	5,063,729	312,442	5,376,171	6,187,396		(178,600)		6,008,796	(63,800)	5,944,996
CAPITAL	40,000				40,000		40,000	102,500				102,500		102,500
TOTAL SUMMARY	19,668,907	(71,918)	(190,000)	3,920	19,410,909	545,237	19,956,146	22,055,861	(75,237)	(328,941)	0	21,651,683	227,097	21,878,780
Reserve Fund for State House Pres	ervation and Mainter	.,												
All Other	0	850,000			850,000		850,000	0	850,000			850,000	0	850,000
Total Reserve Fund for SH Pres.	0	850,000	0	0	850,000	0	850,000	0	850,000	0	0	850,000	0	850,000
			1											
			j											
Law & Legislative Reference Libra														
Postitions - LEG Count	14.500				14.500		14,500	14.500				14.500		14.500
Personal Services	992,872				992,872		992,872	1,021,716				1,021,716		1,021,716
All Other	347,120				347,120		347,120	351,920				351,920		351,920
Capital	0				0		0	0				0		0
Total Library	1,339,992	0	0	0	1,339,992	0	1,339,992	1,373,636	0	0	0	1,373,636	0	1,373,636
i	T													

17 -24

# Fiscal Briefing for the Legislative Council

June 27, 2001

Prepared by the Office of Fiscal & Program Review

- 1. May Revenue Variances
- 2. General Fund Cash Balances
- 3. Fiscal Note Production/Other Session-end Updates
- 4. Question-and-Answer

# **Revenue Update**

General Fund Revenue	· Variance Summary								
For the Month	of May 2001								
(Note: Includes effects of March 2001 Downward	Revenue Reprojection of \$11.4 Millio	n in FY01)							
	In Millio	ns							
	Fiscal Year-to-								
Revenue Source	May 2001	May 2001							
Sales and Use Tax	(\$1.9)	(\$12.7)							
Individual Income Tax	(\$0.1)	\$46.9							
Corporate Income Tax	(\$5.3)	(\$13.5)							
Cigarette and Tobacco Tax	\$1.5	\$1.0							
Public Utilities Tax	(\$0.1)	(\$0.0)							
Insurance Companies Tax	\$1.4	\$5.1							
Inheritance and Estate Tax	(\$0.6)	(\$1.0)							
Property Tax - Unorganized Territories	\$0.0	\$0.8							
Income from Investments	(\$0.6)	(\$0.2)							
Transfer to Municipal Revenue Sharing	\$0.4	(\$1.1)							
Transfer from Liquor	\$0.2	\$2.3							
Transfer from Lottery	(\$0.3)	(\$1.9)							
Other Revenues	\$2.3	\$4.4							
Total General Fund - Variances	(\$3,2)	\$30.1							

Highway Fund Revenu For the Month	_								
	In Millions								
	Fi	scal Year-to-Date							
Revenue Source	May 2001	May 2001							
Fuel Taxes	\$0.0	\$3.3							
Motor Vehicle Registration and Fees	\$2.3	\$3.3							
Inspection Fees	(\$0.1)	(\$0.1)							
Other Revenues	\$0.0	(\$0.1)							
Total Highway Fund - Variances	\$2.2	\$6.5							

Prepared by the Office of Fiscal and Program Review
Based on Preliminary Data; Subject to Change

STATE OF MAINE . Undedicated Revenues - General Fund For the Eleventh Month Ended May 31, 2001

		Month				Year to Dat			
	Actual	Budget	Variance Over/(under)	Percent Over/(under)	Actual	Budget	Variance Over/(under)	Percent Over/(under)	Total Budgeted Fiscal Year Ending 6-30-2001
Sales and Use Tax	61,175,993	63,041,715	(1,865,722)	(3.0%)	667,278,117	680,016,726	(12,738,609)	(1.9%)	823,000,000
Individual Income Tax	90,959,718	91,039,007	(79,289)	(0.1%)	1,026,444,400	979,630,651	46,813,749	4.8%	1,121,964,159
Corporate Income Tax	4,485,229	9,763,308	(5,278,079)	(54.14)	78,847,634	92,301,254	(13,453,620)	(14.6%)	113,548,431
Cigarette and Tobacco Tax	8,426,480	6,943,310	1,483,170	21.44	70,614,262	69,638,306	975,956	1.4%	77,466,005
Public Utilities Tax	29,268,918	29,400,000	(131,082)	(0.4%)	29,772,945	29,800,000	(27,055)	(0.1%)	29,800,000
Insurance Companies Tax	7,633,972	6,231,603	1,402,369	22.5%	32,866,608	27,721,813	5,144,795	18.6%	39,993,634
Estate Tax	1,684,618	2,284,077	(599,459)	(26.2%)	23,421,492	24,374,042	(952,550)	(3.9%)	31,041,869
Property Tax - Unorg Territory	-	-	•	· · · · · ·	8,399,884	7,622,802	777,082	10.2%	9,213,301
Income from Investments	693,535	1,300,455	(606,920)	(46.7%)	14,254,711	14,498,204	(243,493)	(1.7%)	17,000,000
Transfer to Municipal Revenue Sharing	(7,987,668)	(8,356,046)	368,378	(4.4%)	(90,401,078)	(89,349,381)	(1,051,697)	1.2%	(104,984,142)
Transfer from Liquor Commission	1,756,850	1,544,287	212,563	13.8%	21,999,174	19,687,934	2,311,240	11.7%	21,477,758
Transfer from Lottery Commission	2,677,605	3,020,670	(343,065)	(11.4%)	32,899,661	34,835,572	(1,935,911)	(5.6%)	37,975,384
Other Revenues	12,886,636	10,629,754	2,256,882	21.2%	124,514,340	119,688,295	4,826,045	4.0%	133,467,400
Total General Fund Revenues	213,661,884	216,842,140	(3,180,256)	(1.5%)	2,040,912,150	2,010,466,218	30,445,932	1.5%	2,350,963,799

NOTES: (1) Included in the above is \$7,987,668 for the month and \$90,401,078 year to date, that was set aside for Revenue Sharing with cities and towns.

<sup>(2)</sup> In addition to the amounts above, \$1,152,347 was transferred from the Maine Rainy Day Fund to Municipal Revenue Sharing in accordance with PL 1999 Chapter 528, October 1999.

<sup>(3)</sup> Figures reflect estimates through the Second Regular Session of the 119th Legislature.

<sup>(4)</sup> This report has been prepared from preliminary month end figures and is subject to change.

OFPR
G:\OFPR\HWYFUND\REVENUE\MONTHEND.XLS
6/01


(Data Source: Bureau of Accounts & Control)

### HIGHWAY FUND

UNDEDICATED REVENUE MONTH ENDING May 31, 2001

		CUI	RRENT MONT	<u>H</u>			Y	EAR TO DATE			
										% REC'D	
	ACTUAL		BUDGET		MORE/LESS	ACTUAL		BUDGET	MORE/LESS	TO DATE	TOTAL BUDGETED
Fuel Taxes	\$ 12,733,245	\$	12,721,957	\$	11,288	\$ 148,532,052	\$	145,206,362	\$ 3,325,690	83.6%	\$ 177,634,606
Motor Vehicle Registration and Fees	7,416,212		5,161,253		2,254,959	67,438,513		64,160,254	3,278,259	93.2%	72,356,030
Inspection Fees	151,412		219,251		(67,839)	2,120,987		2,187,473	(66,486)	87.6%	2,421,945
Other Revenue	 987,844		956,178		31,666	 10,450,788		10,524,426	 (73,638)	91.3%	11,443,386
TOTAL	\$ 21,288,713	\$	19,058,639	\$	2,230,074	\$ 228,542,340	\$	222,078,515	\$ 6,463,825	86.6%	\$ 263,855,967
Variance MORE/ <less></less>					11.7%				2.9%		

 ${\it Prepared by the Office of Fiscal and Program Review}$ 



### TAX ANTICIPATION NOTES (1) FY 1990-91 to FY 1997-98

Fiscal Year	Amount Authorized	Amount Issued	Reference
1997-98	\$100,000,000 <sup>(2)</sup>	\$0	PL 1997, c. 24, §F-1
1996-97	\$190,000,000	\$150,000,000	PL 1995, c. 665, §P-1
1995-96	\$182,000,000	\$182,000,000	PL 1995, c. 368, §V-1
1994-95	\$175,000,000	\$175,000,000	PL 1993, c. 707, §P-2
1993-94	\$170,000,000	\$170,000,000	PL 1993, c. 382, §1
1992-93	\$170,000,000	\$170,000,000	PL 1991, c. 780, §BB-1
1991-92	\$150,000,000	\$150,000,000	PL 1991, c. 589, §1
1990-91	\$125,000,000	\$115,000,000	PL 1991, c. 5, §1

Notes:

<sup>(1) 5</sup> MRSA, §150 authorizes up to \$30,000,000 of Tax Anticipation Notes, special increases are detailed in this schedule.

<sup>(2)</sup> Authorization subsequently repealed by PL 1997, c. 643, §E-5.

General Fur	d - Fiscal Year	2000-01	1 - Beginning D	aily Ca	sh Balances																		
	July-00		August-00	S	eptember-00		October-00	٨	lovember-00		ecember-00		January-01	F	ebruary-01		March-01		April-01		May-01		June-01
Da W		1472.21				Week				Weel		Week		Week		Week		Week		Week		Week	
Day of Weel Mo. Day		Week Day	Beg. Balance	Week Day	Beg. Balance	Day	Beg. Balance	Week Day		Day		Day		200	Beg. Balance	Day	Beg. Balance						
1 S	Deg. Data 100	T.	250,695,744	elija in er Euri	190,079,062		Deg. Dalarice	w	106,647,257	F	111,513,870	м	Holiday	Th	141,482,380	Th	73,120,629	Su	ocg. ca.aco	T	129,070,474	F	116,216,942
2 Su		w	259,094,084		100,070,002	М	195.926.685	Th	100,040,050	s	111,010,070	7	122,604,208	F	151,508,862	F	80,632,231	М	25,930,181	w	123,459,001	s	,,,,,,,,,,,
3 M	295,782,946		252,119,024			Ŧ	195,655,146	F	109,443,123	Su		w	103,556,748	s		s		Т	(265,778)	Th	147,658,335	Su	
4 T	Holiday	F	262,570,419		Holiday	w	172,049,616	s		М	110.967.084	Th	72,035,357	Su		Su		W	(5,129,951)		157,883,880	M	117,370,808
5 W	288,006,832	s		Т	158,407,798	Th	170,493,841	Su		Т	114,426,490	F	105,482,770	М	157,989,758	М	80,418,783	Th	(5,095,607)	s		Т	115,550,569
6 Th	280,444,001	Su		W	153,825,964	F	164,645,667	М	109,201,503	W	100,123,754	s		Т	150,082,469	Т	Snow Day	F	1,390,695	Su		W	101,230,163
7 F	260,852,327	М	258,082,605	Th	118,866,331	S		т	112,253,416	Th	95,107,064	Su		W	121,601,137	W	71,661,392	s		М	147,930,096	Th	87,922,380
8 S		T	233,169,023	F	128,136,834	Su		W	123,086,142	F	99,380,655	М	112,968,338	Th	121,660,557	Th	57,173,229	Su		Т	167,853,230	F	80,362,443
9 Su		W	239,796,162	s		M	Holiday	Th	103,823,498	S		Т	119,109,967	F	128,868,961	F	51,569,417	М	(3,914,288)	W	144,205,503	S	
10 M	286,475,120	Th	225,302,241	Su		Т	159,017,400	F	Holiday	Su		W	122,622,455	s		\$		Т	(5,467,802)	Th	138,960,346	Su	
11 T	293,989,030	F	231,225,592	M	131,467,091	W	163,432,299	s		M	91,298,221	Th	123,703,625	Su		Su		W	(1,263,644)	F	152,093,524	M	89,413,056
12 W	298,408,421	s		Т	128,090,421	Th	152,784,419	Su		Т	104,276,172	F	126,773,860	М	130,696,485	M	51,849,662	Th	(10,585,466)	s		Τ	88,721,587
13 Th	301,038,997	Su		W	127,209,823	F	128,885,868	M	107,731,503	W	92,508,243	S		T	135,841,063	T	61,099,762	F	(13,443,454)	Su		W	83,267,861
14 F	301,794,042	М	230,529,334	Th	126,859,714	s		Т	106,883,295	Th	95,273,680	Su		Ŵ	122,296,814	W	48,160,326	s		M	150,747,059	Th	78,113,855
15 S		T	243,706,514	F	128,480,032	Su		W	104,314,946	F	100,054,945	М	Holiday	Th	113,407,922	Th	41,563,254	Su		Т	158,154,427	F	33,173,934
16 Su		W	231,883,292	s		M	130,918,126	Th	112,207,724	S		T	122,347,661	F	115,688,386	F	38,749,006	М	Holiday	W	142,789,483	S	
17 M	271,184,067	Th	225,977,784	Su		· T	131,252,599	F	120,003,044	Su		W	133,954,686	S		S		Т	(11,239,965)	Th	160,618,125	Su	
18 T	274,554,273	F	222,203,856	M	140,582,191	: W	127,417,979	s		М	103,040,404	Th	124,955,805	Su		Su		W	(14,805,167)	F	173,751,584	М	36,194,365
19 W	256,597,083	S		T	149,750,696	Th	124,696,485	Su		T	101,484,733	F	146,131,432	M	Holiday	М	46,712,315	Th	(3,228,104)	s		Т	51,026,695
20 Th	195,596,052	Su		W	149,994,765	F	135,783,363	M	135,038,747	W	115,232,057	s		Т	127,595,487	T	69,099,407	F	20,601,226	Su		W	37,927,614
21 F	196,004,071	М	242,120,501	Th	149,003,163	S		Т	144,259,804	Th	111,863,437	Su		W	138,659,405	W	59,954,128	S		М	184,423,370	Th	27,074,836
22 S		Т	250,763,505	F	118,832,941	Su		W	103,653,967	F	93,853,280	М	154,164,343	Th	116,026,316	Th	68,795,861	Su		Т	192,889,568	F	51,049,825
23 Su		W	205,447,267	S		М	113,818,974	Th	Holiday	S		Т	171,189,194	F	146,349,964	F	94,836,438	М	(21,332,159)		191,030,446	S	
24 M	221,349,603		167,245,776			T	91,223,410	F	Holiday	Su		W	179,375,424	S		S		Τ	25,999,325	Th	169,281,773	Su	
25 T	232,314,939		184,644,162		175,225,750	W	88,186,656	S		M	Holiday	Th	172,935,949	Su		Su		w	85,628,703	F	128,356,789	M	79,231,683
26 W	225,976,963			T	180,104,597	Th	91,351,145	Su		Т	97,441,927	F	151,654,082	M	92,362,951	M	51,416,531	Th	96,168,620	s		T	94,818,586
27 Th	216,830,148			W	198,383,953	F	101,576,249	M	105,125,050	W	114,515,489	s		Т	95,813,630	T	51,339,894	F	113,880,439	Su		W	88,037,665
28 F	244,546,079		188,037,713		185,656,396	s		Т	113,033,899	Th	114,480,643	Su		W	98,018,047	w	43,256,847	S		M	Holiday	Th	
29 S		T	193,798,940		193,304,607	Su		W	110,792,221	F	115,462,707	M	165,943,851			Th	40,722,898	Su		T	129,118,991	F	
30 Su		W	186,513,887	S		M	104,800,944	Th	115,610,330	s		T	165,096,212			F	35,910,956	М	124,156,301	W	130,264,845	s	
31 M	238,015,789	Th	181,047,162			Τ	122,972,657			Su		W	155,025,773			S				Th	128,942,299		
Avorago	258,988,039		004 607 501		151 612 100		100 510 540		112,797,343		104 115 040		125 701 000		100 000 070		58,002,046		10 800 805		152,249,234		76.668.677
Average	250,500,039		224,607,591		151,613,106		136,518,549		112,797,343		104,115,243		135,791,988		126,628,979		35,002,046		19,899,205		132,243,234		/ / 0,000,0 /

Source: MFASIS Updated: 6/27/01

FY Ave.

129,823,333

# MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL MIGRATION PROJECT June 27, 2001

- Completion of user testing is behind schedule.
- User testing has been on hold pending completion of the Legislative Session and the Revisor's Office move.
- User testing is 2/3s complete with an estimated 4 additional weeks of effort to complete. (6 weeks elapse time)
- To date, Compaq has made several hundred fixes.
- The Legislature is working with Compaq to equitably minimize the impact of the delay in completing user testing:
  - Proposed revision to change the timing of \$150,000 in payments in support of extending the user testing period. (no cost impact)
  - Proposed Fiscal Notes system design task for \$75,000 from the \$364,000 available for the fiscal system.

# Request Legislative Council approval for the following:

- 1. Revise the Migration Project Milestone Schedule to change the timing of the warranty period payments to the user test period.
- 2. Issue a change order, not to exceed \$75,000, for the design of the fiscal note system, using the funds originally budgeted for this purpose.



# Maine State Legislature OFFICE OF POLICY AND LEGAL ANALYSIS

13 State House Station, Augusta, Maine 04333-0013 Telephone: (207) 287-1670 Fax: (207) 287-1275

#### Memorandum

To:

The Honorable Michael V. Saxl, Chair

The Honorable Richard A. Bennett, Vice-Chair

120<sup>th</sup> Legislative Council

From: David E. Boulter, Director

Date: March 26, 2001

Re:

Proposed Drafting Guidelines for Legislative Studies-120th Legislature

Please find attached proposed drafting guidelines for legislative studies that I present to the Legislative Council for its review and adoption, pursuant to Joint Rule 353. Under Joint Rule 353, The Legislative Council must adopt guidelines for the drafting of study orders and legislation at the beginning of each legislative biennium. Study orders and legislation must be consistent with the adopted guidelines.

The proposed guidelines closely track relevant provisions of the Joint Rules of the 120th Legislature and the guidelines that were adopted by the 119th Legislative Council. Some provisions have been revised somewhat or expanded to be provide greater clarity, but the guidelines do not propose any major change in policy with respect to studies. The guidelines also include guidance to staff when preparing joint standing committee requests to the Legislative Council for committee studies and a sample order creating a study committee.

If you have any questions, I would be happy to answer them at the Council meeting.

Cc:

Senate President Michael H. Michaud

Jim Clair, Executive Director

G:\ARCHIVES\STUDIES\study guideline memo to council.doc (3/26/01 8:24 AM)

MAR 2 6 2001

# Legislative Studies: Drafting Guidelines

# DRAFT

Adopted by the 120<sup>th</sup> Legislative Council Pursuant to Joint Rule 353(8)

March 28, 2001

Prepared by the Office of Policy and Legal Analysis Maine Legislature

# **Guidelines** for Legislative Studies

Introduction. Each session the Maine Legislature considers numerous bills that would enact new law or amend or repeal existing laws. While the vast majority of legislation is considered and finally acted upon by the Legislature in the session in which it is introduced, some legislation warrants further study before a final decision is made. When additional time or information is needed to fully evaluate issues, the Legislature may establish a special commission or committee to study the matter by gathering information, evaluating options and making recommendations to the Legislature for its consideration. Conducting legislative studies is an important way that legislators may better inform themselves about complex issues affecting public policy. Conducting legislative studies also is an important way for the Legislature to seek information from interested persons and members of the general public and to help educate the public on matters affecting state policy.

Consistent with the historic legislative purpose of conducting studies to develop information to assist legislators in making policy decisions, Joint Rule 353 and these guidelines enhance the ability of the Legislature to efficiently establish and independently direct the scope and course of legislative studies in ways that best meet its needs.

<u>Authority.</u> Section 8 of Joint Rule 353 that was adopted by the 120<sup>th</sup> Legislature on December 6, 2000 directs the Legislative Council to adopt guidelines for drafting legislation that establish studies.

Scope. These guidelines apply to legislative studies. Legislative studies are studies established by action of the Legislature that are conducted by a joint standing or select committee of the Legislature, a subcommittee of a joint standing committee or by a special legislative study commission or committee and which reports its findings, conclusions and recommendations to the Legislature or some component of the Legislature. It is the Legislative Council's policy that membership on a legislative study committee or commission consists wholly or primarily of legislators, and non-partisan staff of the Legislature provide staffing assistance to the study commission or committee.

Legislative studies are distinguished from non-legislative studies which include studies that direct an executive department or agency, the Executive or the Judiciary to study the matter and make a report. Study committees or commissions established by Executive Order of the Governor are also non-legislative studies even if they invite appointment of legislators or make a report to the Legislature.

In addition to legislative studies, these guidelines should be applied to the drafting of legislation for non-legislative studies as well, using standardized elements and language as appropriate.

<u>Purpose and use of the guidelines.</u> These guidelines implement provisions of Joint Rule 353 as they relate to the preparation of study orders and legislation. These guidelines also incorporate many of the recommendations of the Special Committee on Legislative Rules contained in its final report issued in November 1998 and the Special Commission to Review the Study

Commission Process contained in its final report issued on January 16, 1998. The guidelines identify the major elements that should be included in each proposed joint order, resolve or law that establishes a study committee, offer suggested language for each element and comment on or generally explain the purpose for the language.

These guidelines provide assistance to non-partisan staff who prepare orders, resolves or bills proposing legislative studies. The guidelines will insure inclusion of standardized language for core elements of study orders and legislation, promote efficient drafting and encourage drafting consistency among committees and drafters.

The Legislative Council recognizes that from time to time committees or sponsors of study orders and legislation will need flexibility to address unique aspects of proposed studies not encompassed within the suggested language in these guidelines. The guidelines are sufficiently flexible to accommodate those unique circumstances.

These guidelines will also assist in preparing joint standing committees' requests for approval from the Legislative Council for studies proposed to be conducted by joint standing committees or their subcommittees.

Key provisions of the guidelines. These guidelines incorporate the following principles.

- 1. Joint orders (study orders), resolves or law may be used to establish legislative studies. It is the Legislative Council's general policy that study orders be the legislative instrument for all legislative studies except when studies will: (a) be conducted by a blue ribbon commission or other group created by the Legislature that needs to include substantial membership by non-legislators; or (b) extend beyond the current legislative biennium.
- 2. Proposed study orders will be referred to joint standing committees for consideration and reported out in the same manner as legislation. Committees also may initiate and report out study orders on their own initiative consistent with Joint Rule 353, section 1.
- 3. Ordinarily, the presiding officers appoint the members of a study committee, including its chair or co-chairs. In most cases, chairs should be legislators. Also, in most cases, the presiding officers are not directed to make their appointments jointly.
- 4. Ordinarily, the size of a study committee is between 3 and 13 members and should consist entirely or mostly of legislators. In accordance with the Joint Rules, joint select committees usually consist of 10 members or less.
- 5. Legislative members, and non-legislative members (if any) who are not otherwise compensated for their time serving on the study committee, are entitled to receive a per diem and reimbursement of necessary expenses, as authorized by their respective presiding officers.
- 6. Study committees are required to complete their work before the start of a legislative session or to curtail their work during the session if it spans two or more sessions.

- 7. The Legislative Council may grant limited extensions to the report date for a study committee. However, studies established by joint order may not be extended beyond the current legislative biennium.
- 8. All study orders or legislation proposing legislative studies must be placed on a special study table in the Senate or in the House and reviewed by the Legislative Council for coordination with legislative priorities and allocation of staffing and budgetary resources to support the study request.
- 9. Studies will ordinarily be funded from a study line in the legislative budget.
- 10. Ordinarily, non-partisan employees of the Legislature provide staffing services for legislative studies. Staff and other professional services to the committee or commission are under the direction of the director of the office that provides the primary staffing.

## LEGISLATIVE STUDIES

## **DRAFTING GUIDELINES**

### Element of Study Order or Legislation

## Sample Language

### **Comments**

- 1. Selection of Legislative Vehicle
- ♦ Five types of document may be used

### A. Joint Study Order

(This is the principal method of legislative study and is adaptable for most legislative studies. Particularly appropriate for a limited term study of a specific issue by a committee consisting wholly or mostly of legislators that reports back to the Legislature within the legislative biennium. A joint order study may include a minority of non-legislators as members who participate at the request of the Legislature.)

"Ordered, the (Senate or House) concurring, that the Joint Select Committee on Substance Abuse is established as follows."

or "...that the Joint Standing Committee on Fisheries and Wildlife (or a subcommittee) is directed to study the issue of the recodification of the state hunting and fishing laws as follows."

or...that the Legislative Study Committee on the Integration of Social Security and Maine State Retirement System Benefits is established as follows."

- Must pass in each chamber only once (unless amended on the floor)
- · Governor's approval not needed
- Effective immediately, unless otherwise specified
- Appropriation/fiscal note not needed at time of passage
- Chair and all or most members are legislators
- Public and agency members may be invited but not compelled to serve
- Orders are printed in the Calendar and ordinarily are referred to committee.
- Introduction of legislation into another biennium requires legislative sponsor
- May authorize introduction of legislation directly by study group or by legislative committee without legislative sponsor; however, legislation is either "presented" or "reported" by a legislator
- Cannot authorize a committee in the next biennium to report out legislation
- Authority terminates with the end of the biennium; Legislative Council cannot extend

### Element of Study Order or Legislation

## Sample Language

### Comments

### B. Resolve

(Appropriate for limited-term studies for which the participation of a large proportion of nonlegislators is necessary, when outside members may need to be compelled to participate or when the issue to be studied demands the creation of a task force or blue ribbon commission of high profile members. Also appropriate for nonlegislative studies to be conducted by agencies with a report back to the Legislature.)

"Resolve, to Establish the Commission to Study Rate Setting and the Financing of Long-term Care Facilities"

NOTE: Unless otherwise noted in these guidelines, the term "study group" means, study committee, study commission, task force, work group, blue ribbon commission or study group.

- Governor's approval or veto override needed
- Unless passed as an emergency, takes effect 90 days after adjournment
- May compel participation, assistance or other action by non-legislators
- May authorize introduction of legislation directly by study group or by legislative committee without legislative sponsor; however, legislation is either "presented" or "reported" by a legislator
- Appropriation/Fiscal Note required

### C. Public Law

(Appropriate for ongoing, periodic studies established in statute [e.g., judicial compensation], for studies that are an integral part of a bill creating a new program [e.g., learning results, electric utility deregulation] and when the issue to be studied demands the creation of a task force or blue ribbon commission of high profile members [e.g. workers' comp reform].)

Commission"

- "An Act to Establish the State Compensation
- Governor's approval or veto override needed
- Unless passed as an emergency, takes effect 90 days after adjournment
- May compel participation, assistance or other action by non-legislators
- May authorize introduction of legislation directly by study group or by legislative committee without legislative sponsor; however, legislation is either "presented" or "reported" by a legislator
- Appropriation/Fiscal Note required

# D. Letter request to Legislative Council

(Appropriate for use by joint standing committees or their subcommittees only. Use for limited duration studies.)

See Appendix I for the procedure to request approval from the Legislative Council for study.

### Element of Study Order or Legislation Sample Language Comments E. Special Committees established Note: Joint standing committees may also study See sample order. pursuant to the presiding officer(s) order an issue during interim committee authorized by Joint Rule 315. (Appropriate for use by the presiding officers to establish special committees to meet the study needs of the House and Senate, individually or jointly. Neither the Presiding Officers nor Legislative Council may establish Joint Select or Joint Standing Committees; That authority is reserved to the full Legislature.) 2. Establishment of Study Group A. Order or Resolve Not necessary when the study is to be assigned to "The (study group), referred to in this (order/resolve) as the (committee/commission/ an existing joint standing committee or a subcommittee of a joint standing committee. (See task force/blue ribbon commission/etc.) is established." Appendix 1) "The (study group) established in Title 5, B. Public Law section\_\_\_\_, subsection\_\_\_\_, (boards and commission law) and referred to in this section as the "(committee/commission/ task force/blue ribbon commission/etc.)", consists of (#) members appointed as follows:..." 3. Appointment of Study Group Members Specify total number of members, usually "The (study group) consists of (#) members Conduct of studies by joint standing committees appointed as follows." ranging from 3-13 members or their subcommittees or by joint select committees consisting entirely of legislators is the method preferred by the Legislative Council

 Describe the method of appointment or selection of members

A. Joint study order

"The President of the Senate shall appoint (#) members and the Speaker of the House of

Unless specific circumstances warrant, the Presiding Officers should be the appointing

See Joint Rule 353 (2).

**Commer*	The Contract of the Contract o	$\rangle$
Element of Study Order or Legislation	Sample Language	Comments
	Representatives shall appoint (#) members to the (study group)."	authority for all members, but should not make appointments jointly.
B. Resolve or bill	"The (President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Governor or other appointing authority) shall appoint (#) members to the (study group)."	
<ul> <li>Specify qualifications or affiliations of members</li> </ul>	(Describe broad qualifications or other eligibility criteria, if any, e.g. membership on a joint standing committee, professional affiliation, or residency.)	Avoid appointment procedures that include narrow restriction to very specific membership slots or appointment by outside organizations
• Establish deadline for appointments	"All appointments must be made no later than 30 days following the (effective date of this resolve or Act/passage of this order)."	
<ul> <li>Establish terms and provide for filling vacancies</li> </ul>	"All members must be appointed for (# of years or to coincide with the legislative biennium). A vacancy must be filled (specify manner)."	Ordinarily applies only to on-going study group established in statute
<ul> <li>Specify notification of appointments to administering authority</li> </ul>	"The (appointing authorities) shall notify the (Executive Director of the Legislative Council or other administering authority) upon making their appointments."	
4. Selection of Chair		
<ul> <li>Designate the selection process or appointing authority</li> </ul>	"The first named Senate member is the Senate chair and the first named House of Representatives member is the House chair."  (Alternatives to preferred approach:) "The (Governor, the President of the Senate, Speaker of the House of Representatives or other	Unless there is some compelling reason to do otherwise, appointment of study chair or cochairs is by the presiding officers and is made at the same time the member appointments are made. If the study group consists of 5 or fewer members, one chair should be appointed by the presiding officer of the body in which the study

authority) shall appoint the chair of the (study

group)."

order or legislation originates; otherwise the Senate President should appoint the Senate Chair

Element of Study Order or Legislation	Sample Language	Comments
		and the Speaker the House Chair. See Joint Rule 353 (3). Avoid joint appointment of a chair.
	or  "At its first meeting, the (study group) shall select a chair from among its members. Notice of selection of the chair must be given to the Executive Director of the Legislative Council."	Use this method of chair appointment only for blue ribbon commissions or similar groups where there is a compelling reason for the group members to select the chair.
5. Convening of Study Group		
• Specify who is to call first meeting	"When appointment of all members of the (study group) is completed, the (chair of the study group or chair of the Legislative Council) shall call and convene the (study group) for the first meeting"	Ordinarily, the chair will do this. However, if the chair is to be selected by the members of the study group, the chair of the Legislative Council shall call and preside at the first meeting.
◆ Establish deadline for first meeting	"which must be no later than (date)."	All study groups should, ordinarily, be convened by August 1 in the first session and by June 1 in the second session. However, studies should not be convened prior to legislative adjournment in order to avoid scheduling conflicts for legislators and staff.
6. Study Subject & Tasks		
• State subject of study	"The (study group) shall study (subject of study)"	Unlike other legislation, study orders, resolves and legislation should include greater narrative description as to the purpose and scope of the matter to be studied. The purposes and charge of the study group should be specific enough for members to readily understand the nature and scope of the study and expected work products.
• Specify issues to be studied	"The (study group) shall examine the following issues: (list issues)"	Listing specific issues to be studied provides a clear legislative charge to the study group. It also will facilitate planning and preparation by

Page 8

## Element of Study Order or Legislation

## Sample Language

#### Comments

 Specify tasks to be performed when studying the issue "In examining these issues, the (study group) may:

- .- Hold (#) public hearings in (places);
- .- Hold informational sessions for discussions with (list of experts by generic identification); or representatives of programs undertaken in (list states or other jurisdictions) on (topics); etc."
- Conduct, a (telephone survey or other interview) of (people or groups) on (information sought);
- Identify and summarize the legislative actions or governmental programs undertaken in (list states or other jurisdictions) on (topics); etc."

"The (study group) shall (invite the participation of or offer the opportunity for) (entity) to submit comments on proposed recommendations of the study group." the chairs and staff before the first meeting.

Listing specific tasks to be performed will facilitate planning and preparation by the chairs and staff before the first meeting. Only those tasks that are essential to the charge of the study group should be mentioned.

Use with study orders when outside participation is necessary to direct the study group to invite the participation of entities that may assist the study group in its work.

Ordinarily, non-partisan staff will be assigned as primary staff to a study group only if the study is a legislative study.

## 7. Staffing

 Utilize non-partisan staff for legislative studies; (for non-legislative studies, executive agency or other personnel should be directed to staff the study group) "Upon approval of the Legislative Council the (non-partisan office or offices) shall provide necessary staffing services to the (study group)."

or

- Direct another state agency to provide primary staff
- specify who is to provide assistance in drafting study legislation

"The (state agency) shall provide staff assistance to the (study group)."

"The (state agency) shall prepare any legislation recommended by the (study group)."

Non-partisan staff resources ordinarily should not be committed to non-legislative studies. If it is necessary, they should be committed only during times when the Legislature is not in session.

### Element of Study Order or Legislation

## Sample Language

#### Comments

or (For non-legislative studies)

"If the (study group) requires assistance with the preparation of any recommended legislation, it may request, and upon approval from the Legislative Council, receive such assistance from (non-partisan staff office or offices) staff."

- Specify who is to provide clerical assistance
- "The (non-partisan staff office) or (state agency) shall provide clerical support to the (study group)."
- Permit the employment of consultants or other staff assistance

"The (study group), with the approval of the Legislative Council, may contract with a (consultant or expert) to provide staffing or other professional services."

Ordinarily, staffing will not be contracted, but will be provided by nonpartisan legislative staff for study activities. (designate as primary staff or cross-reference the pertinent study issues, tasks and products).

# 8. Compensation of Members

 Specify which members are eligible to receive per diem "Legislative members are entitled to receive the legislative per diem and reimbursement for travel and other necessary expenses for their attendance at authorized meetings of the study group. Public members not otherwise compensated by their employers or other entities whom they represent are entitled to receive reimbursement of necessary expenses and a per diem equal to the legislative per diem for their attendance at authorized meetings of (a study committee)."

This is consistent with Joint Rule 353 (5).

## 9. Report & Study Group Termination

 Specify work products to be prepared by the study group "The (study group) shall submit a report that includes its findings and recommendations, including suggested legislation, to the (specify which) Session of the (specify which) Legislature no later than (date). The (study group) is authorized to introduce legislation related to its report to the (specify session) Session of the (specify legislature) Legislature at the time of submission of its report." Alternative: "The (study group) is not authorized to introduce legislation."

or

"The (study group) shall submit a report that includes its findings and recommendations, including suggested legislation, to the Joint Standing Committee on (joint standing committee) and the Legislative Council by (date). The (study group) is not authorized to introduce legislation." "Following receipt and review of the report, the (joint standing committee) may report out a bill to the (specify which) Session of the (specify which) Legislature."

or

"The (study group) shall submit a report that includes its findings and recommendations, including suggested legislation, to the Joint Standing Committee on (joint standing committee) and the Legislative Council by (date). The (study group) is authorized to introduce legislation related to its report to the (session) Session of the (specify) Legislature at

Reports and legislation are to be submitted by the first Wednesday in November preceding a 1st Regular Session or the first Wednesday in December preceding a 2nd Regular Session. These dates are to assure that the report will be prepared and submitted for review by Legislators before the start of the legislative session and to allow for timely preparation of any accompanying legislation. Due to the their committee responsibilities, legislative analysts do not ordinarily staff study commissions during legislative sessions. See Joint Rule 353 (6) and (7).

Ordinarily, the reports should be submitted to the "Legislature." The language should be specific as to whether the study group has authority to introduce legislation or whether it is prohibited from doing so. The deadline for submission of legislation should be concurrent with submission of the study report.

If, however, the scope of the study is so narrow as to affect only a joint standing committee, then the report may be submitted to the joint standing committee having jurisdiction over the relevant policy area. The language should be specific as to whether the study group has authority to introduce legislation or whether it is prohibited from doing so. Furthermore, the language should be specific as to whether the joint standing committee has authority to report out a bill.

Authority to introduce legislation should not be

Element	of	Study	$\mathbf{C}$	)rder	or	Legislation
TICITICITE	•	Diuu	_	, uci	$\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{I}}$	Degisiation

## Sample Language

### Comments

the time of submission of its report"

granted to both the study group and the joint standing committee. In addition, it should not be granted to joint standing committees jointly.

◆ Specify date for submission of work products to the Legislature and to whom the report or other work product is to be submitted

(If the work product is not a report). "The (study group) shall submit (a questionnaire or survey summary, an informational booklet, legislation only, etc.) no later than (date))."

♦ Study Group Termination

"Upon submission of its required report(s), the study group terminates."

Extension of reporting deadline

"If the (study group) requires a limited extension of time to conclude its study and make its report, it may apply to the Legislative Council, which may grant the extension." A report date should not be extended into a legislative session. A study group created by a joint study order cannot extend beyond the biennium because the authority granted by the Legislature for the joint study order lapses with the convening of the new legislature.

# **Element of Study Order or Legislation**

### Sample Language

#### Comments

# 10. Funding & Management of Study Expenses

 Seek appropriation lines and figures from OFPR

This is included only if a study is not by joint study order.

 Specify the authority to administer the study group budget "The chair(s) of the (study group), with assistance from the (study group) staff shall administer the study budget. Within 10 days after its first meeting the (study group) shall present a work plan and proposed budget to the Legislative Council for approval. The (study group) may not incur expenses that would result in the study group exceeding its approved budget."

Although the projected number of meetings will be a factor in determining the study budget, avoid specifying in the study instrument the specific number of meetings authorized. Allow the study group flexibility to operate within its budget.

"Upon request from the (study group), the Executive Director of the Legislative Council or the Executive Director's designee shall promptly provide the (study group) chair and staff with a status report on the study budget, expenditures incurred and paid and available funds."

 Indicate alternative ways the study group may be funded and whether it is precluded from using General Fund dollars "The chair(s) of the study group may seek and accept outside funding. Prompt notice of solicitation and acceptance of funds must be sent to the Legislative Council. All funds accepted must be forwarded to the Executive Director along with an accounting that includes amount, date received, from whom, purpose and limitation on use of the funds. The (Executive Director of the Legislative Council or other administering authority) administers any funds received. Expenses that have an effect on the General Fund may not be incurred by the (study group)."

The general policy is to not allow solicitation or use of funds other than those appropriated or allocated by the Legislature. However, in the event that use of outside funding is appropriate and necessary, this language should be used.

# Legislative Council-Authorized Studies

## Requests for Studies

The joint standing committees of the Legislature may request authorization from the Legislative Council to conduct studies during the interim. These studies offer committees the opportunity to carry out research and evaluation on legislative matters of a scope and depth that is not possible during the sessions given legislator time constraints and availability of staff resources.

### Limitations

Within the Legislature's budgetary and staff resources, the Council's general policy is to authorize interim studies to be conducted by a subcommittee of the joint standing committee. If appropriate, studies may be conducted by the full committee or by committee staff.

## Staffing assistance to Committees

Studies conducted by joint standing committees or their subcommittees are staffed by members of the nonpartisan staff. The appropriate Office Director, in consultation with the Executive Director makes specific staffing assignments. Frequently, more than 1 committee analyst is assigned in order to draw on the expertise of various staff members and to provide adequate staffing levels during a study.

# Procedures to Request Studies

Study requests must be made in writing to the Legislative Council and must follow applicable portions of the Drafting Guidelines for Legislative Studies approved by the Council, including those relating to study charge, convening of study groups, administration and reports.

## Study requests must include the following (as applicable):

- Topic, policy area or nature of the problem to be studied
- Description of the tasks to be completed
- The proposed chair or chairs
- Number and identification of the members who will serve on the study
- Proposed study budget and workplan
- Number of and anticipated location of any public meeting(s) to be held
- Anticipated convening and completion dates of the study

# Decisions by the Legislative Council

Ordinarily, the Council will decide requests for committee studies when it considers other requests for studies when reviewing the Study Table, pursuant to Joint Rule 353(8). The Council will convey its decision regarding committee study requests in writing to the chairs of the joint standing committee and committee staff in a timely manner.

# **SAMPLE**

# LEGISLATIVE INSTRUMENT

# FOR AUTHORIZING STUDIES

# SAMPLE JOINT ORDER (STUDY ORDER) CREATING A STUDY

## STATE OF MAINE

# IN THE YEAR OF OUR LORD TWO THOUSAND ONE

In	House	
----	-------	--

### H. P. 1951

# Joint Study Order to Establish the Committee to Study Access to Private and Public Lands in Maine

WHEREAS, this joint study order establishes the Committee to Study Access to Private and Public Lands in Maine; and

WHEREAS, the charge of this committee is vital to the interests of Maine citizens and camp and business owners in this State; and

WHEREAS, the spring and summer months begin the seasons of peak use of the Maine woods for Maine citizens and tourists and, therefore, are the optimal time for the committee to study access issues; now, therefore, be it

**ORDERED,** the Senate concurring, that the Committee to Study Access to Private and Public Lands in Maine is established as follows.

- 1. Committee established. The Committee to Study Access to Private and Public Lands in Maine, referred to in this order as the "committee," is established.
- 2. Committee membership. The committee consists of 6 members appointed as follows. The President of the Senate shall appoint 2 Senators; the Speaker of the House shall appoint 3 members of the House; and the Commissioner of Conservation is invited to participate as an ex officio member. When making the appointments, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House shall appoint at least one member of a party that does not hold the majority of seats in that body and shall give preference to members who serve the Joint Standing Committee on Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry.
- 3. Committee chair. The first named Senator is the Senate chair of the committee and the first named member of the House is the House chair of the committee
- 4. Appointments; convening of committee. All appointments must be made no later than 30 days following the effective date of this order. The appointing authorities shall notify the Executive Director of the

Page 16

Legislative Council once all appointments have been made. When the appointment of all members has been completed, the chairs of the committee shall call and convene the first meeting of the committee, which must be no later than August 1, 2001.

- 5. Duties. The committee shall hold its meetings at various locations in the State, to be determined by the chairs. Geographic locations of meetings must be chosen to accommodate maximum participation by landowners and people using lands that are the subject of this study. The committee shall gather information and request necessary data from public and private entities in order to:
  - A. Estimate the number of acres of land owned or controlled by landowners or landowner associations to which access is controlled by checkpoints, gates or other means and estimate the number of people accessing those lands, categorize the various uses of those lands and assess environmental damage and costs to landowners associated with public access to those lands;
  - B. Determine the number of acres of land managed by the Bureau of Parks and Lands within the Department of Conservation or the Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife that are commonly accessed via roads on which checkpoints are located and fees are charged.
  - C. Review existing fee structures for accessing lands beyond checkpoints operated by landowners or landowner associations and compare these fees and systems of public access to access and fee systems in other states; and
  - D. Assess the need for legislation to ensure reasonable access to the public resources of this state.
- 6. Staff assistance. Upon approval of the Legislative Council, the Office of Policy and Legal Analysis shall provide necessary staffing services to the committee. The Legislative Information Office shall provide clerical services to the committee.
- 7. Compensation. Members of the committee are entitled to receive the legislative per diem and reimbursement for travel and other necessary expenses related to their attendance at authorized meetings of the committee. Public members not otherwise compensated by their employers or other entities whom they represent are entitled to receive reimbursement of necessary expenses for their attendance at authorized meetings of the committee.
- 8. Report. The committee shall submit its report that includes its findings and recommendations, including suggested legislation, to the Second Regular Session of the 120<sup>th</sup> Legislature no later than December 5, 2001. The committee is authorized to introduce legislation related to its report to the Second Regular Session of the 120<sup>th</sup> Legislature at the time of submission of its report.
- 9. Extension. If the committee requires a limited extension of time to complete its study and make its report, it may apply to the Legislative Council, which may grant an extension. Upon submission of its required report, the committee terminates.
- 10. Budget. The chairs of the committee, with assistance from the committee staff, shall administer the committee's budget. Within 10 days after its first meeting, the committee shall present a work plan and proposed budget to the Legislative Council for approval. The committee may not incur expenses that would

result in the committee's exceeding its approved budget. Upon request from the committee, the Executive Director of the Legislative Council shall promptly provide the committee chairs and staff with a status report on the committee's budget, expenditures incurred and paid and available funds.

G:\ARCHIVES\STUDIES\Legislative Studies Drafting Guidelines 03-28-01.doc (3/26/01 8:27 AM)

# Legislative Council and Other Action through end of 1st Regular Session

							" OF			······································	Estim	ated Costs	General Fun	d & Other	Special Re	venue
JSO/LD	COMMISSION/STUDY	BRIEF PURPOSE OF STUDY	CMTE.	STATUS	CMTE. PRIOR- ITIES "	MEMBER- SHIP	# OF MTGS. BUD- GETED	REPORT DATE	STAFF- ING	COMPENSATION	PS	AO	FY 02 EST. COST	PS	AO	FY 03 ES
PPROVI	ED STUDIES															
	Round Table to Study Economic and Labor Issues Relating to the Forest Products Industry (no action required; already funded)	Continue work of round table previously authorized	ACF	2nd year of author, study	N/A	15 (4 Legislators)	6	12/5/01	OPLA	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses						
L.D. 1810	Committee to Study Access to Private and Public Lands in Maine (requires amendment and new Joint Study Order; revise JSO to conform to LC motion of 6/12)	Determine the status of public access to flowed lakes in the state	ACF	Н.Р. 1387	1	5 (5 Legislators)	4	12/5/01	OPLA	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses; Others: Expenses Only	1,100	4,900	6,000			
L.D. 1823	Commission to Study Issues Concerning Changes to the Traditional Uses of Maine Forest and Lands (LC motion would kill L.D. 1823 in favor of creating new Joint Study Order)	Study the economic and societal impact of terminating camp lot lease arrangements and public enjoyment in State lands	ACF	H.P. 1391		7 (5 Legislators)	4	11/1/01	OPLA	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses; Others: Expenses Only	1,100	1,800	2,900			
L.D. 455	Commission to Study Reimbursement Rates for Maine's Bottle Redemption Businesses and Other Issues Related to the Handling and Collection of Returnable Containers (LC motion would kill L.D. 455 in favor of creating new Joint Study Order)	Examine reimbursement rates for Maine's bottle redemption centers and other issues related to the handling and collection of returnable containers	BEC	H.P. 1389	1	13 (3 Legislators)	4	12/5/01	OPLA-	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses Others: Expenses Only	660	3,400	4,060			
L.D. 1632	Telecommunications Advisory Panel (requires amendment to conform to LC motion of 6/12)	Identify geographic areas where telecommunications capability is deployed at a lower rate; study telecommunication facility investments	BEC	Passed	3	17 (no Legislators)	4	12/5/01								
RES.1999, c. 126 <sup>2/</sup>	Commission to Study Domestic Violence (no action required; already funded)	Continue work of commission previously authorized	CRJ	2nd year of author study	. N/A	13 (5 Legislators)	6	12/14/01	OPLA	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses Others: Expenses Only		The second secon				
L.D. 1099	Commission to Study the Needs of Persons with Mental Illness Who Are Incarcerated (requires amendment and new Joint Study Order)	Study the availability and appropriateness of mental health services for persons incarcerated in corrections facilities	CRJ	H.P. 1383	1	13 Legislators	6	12/5/01	OPLA	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses	4,290	7,700	11,990			

# Legislative Council and Other Action through end of 1st Regular Session

								# OF				Estima	ated Costs	: General Fun	d & Other S	Special Re	venue
# J	SO/LD	COMMISSION/STUDY	BRIEF PURPOSE OF STUDY	СМТЕ.	STATUS	CMTE, PRIOR- ITIES 1/	MEMBER- SHIP	MTGS. BUD- GETED	REPORT DATE	STAFF- ING	COMPENSATION	PS	AO	FY 02 EST. COST	PS	AO	FY 03 EST COST
8	Cmte. equest	Education Committee Study to Review Transition to a New School Funding Formula Based on the Essential Programs & Services Model (no action required)	Committee to conduct a study of the school funding formula and review education finance policy issues related to transitioning to a new formula based on the so-called "Essential Programs and Services" model	-EDÚ	06/05 Req. to Council	1	13 Legislators	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	12/31/01	OPLA/ OFPR	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses	6,160	6,400	12,560			
9 L.	D, 1797	Blue Ribbon Commission on Postsecondary Educational Achievement (requires amendment to conform to study guidelines)	Creates a Blue Ribbon Commission on Postsecondary Educational Attainment	EDU	Approp. Table- OTP-A		15 (4 Legislators)	5	12/5/01	OPLA	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses; Others: Expenses Only	1,100	3,300				
10 L.	D. 1024	Extend the Youth in Need of Services Oversight Committee (on-going) (no amendments required)	Continues oversight committee until 06/30/02.	HHS	Approp. Table- OTP-A	1	23 (5 Legislators)	3	12/1/01	DHS	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses; DHS to absorb costs for non-leg, members and other expenses	825	750	1,575			
11 <b>L</b>	D. 853	Commission to Study Assisted Living (requires amendment to conform to study guidelines and to increase funding)	Study assisted living, existing housing and program options for elderly and disabled persons, and develop an assisted living plan	ннѕ	Approp. Table- OTP-A	2	21 (8 Legislators)	4	12/5/01	OPLA	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses; Others: Expenses Only	1,760	4,400	6,160			
12 L.	D, 1021	Maine Millennium Commission on Hunger and Food Security (requires amendment to conform to study guidelines)	Extends report date for commission authorized in Resolve 1997, c. 117	ннѕ	Approp. Table- OTP-A		15 (4 Legislators)	6	12/5/01	DHS/ SPO	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses	1,320	1,200	2,520	Triple	Federal Control	
13 I	.D. 28	Extend the Commission to Study Equity in the Distribution of Gas Tax Revenues Attributable to Snowmobiles, All-terrain Vehicles and Watercraft (requires amendment to conform to study guidelines)		IFW	Approp. Table- OTP-A	1	15 (10 Legislators)	2	12/5/01	OPLA/ OFPR	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses (from available unexp. bal. est. to be approx. \$2,957						
14 L.	D. 1732	Commission to Study the Needs and. Opportunities Associated with the Production of Salmonid Sport Fish in Maine (requires amendment to conform to study guidelines)	Study needs associated with production of salmon and issues relating to fish hatcheries	IFW	Approp. Table- OTP-A	2	15 (5 Legislators)	FY 02=4; FY 03=4	12/1/01	LEG. CNCL.	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses; Others: Expenses Only (Allocation of OSR funds)	1,320	3,600	4,920	1,320	3,600	) 4,920

# Legislative Council and Other Action through end of 1st Regular Session

								# OF				Estima	ated Costs	: General Fur	d & Other	Special Rev	/enue
#	JSO/LD	COMMISSION/STUDY	BRIEF PURPOSE OF STUDY	смте.	STATUS	CMTE. PRIOR- ITIES "	MEMBER- SHIP	MTGS. BUD- GETED	REPORT DATE	STAFF- ING	COMPENSATION	PS	AO	FY 02 EST. COST	PS	AO	FY 03 EST. COST
15	HP 613	Recodification of Title 12, ch. 701-721 (no action required)	OPLA and ROS to prepare proposed recodification of the inland fisheries and wildlife laws	IFW		3	N/A Staff		01/15/02	ROS/ OPLA	N/A - Costs absorbed						
16 L	.D., 1793	Commission to Review the Child Protective System (L/C motion would kill L.D. 1793 in favor of creating new Joint Study Order)	Study child protective system	JUD	H.P. 1385	1	11 (5 Legislators)	5	12/5/01	OPLA	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses; Others: Expenses Only	1,375	5,300	6,675			
17 I	.D. 1466	Commission to Study the Benefits and Costs for Increasing Access to Family and Medical Leave for Maine Families (L/C motion would kill L.D. 1466 in favor of creating new Joint Study Order; revise JSO to conform to study guidelines and LC motion of 6/12)		LAB	H.P. 1386	1	15 (2 Legislators)	4	12/5/01	OPLA	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses; Others: Expenses only if outside funds are received	440	1,200	) 1,640			
	.D, 300 L 2001, c 358)	Part I Budget (Commission to Develop a Plan to Implement the Closure of State Liquor Stores (no action required; already funded)	Develop a plan for statewide liquor distribution system, including strategies to rely on agency stores	LVĀ	Enacted	N/A	9 (4 Legislators)	6	01/31/02	OPLA	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses Others: Expenses Only (Funding included in Budget Bill)						
19	S.P. 627	Joint Study Committee to Study the Maine Clean Election Act (L/C motion would kill S.P. 627 in favor of LVA interim study via letter)	Establishes committee to study the Clean Election Act and develop recommendations to update or improve the laws	LVA	LVA Interim Study	1	13 Legislators		12/3/01	OPLA	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses (Costs absorbed/conduct study as part of interim committee meetings)						
		Commission to Recognize Vietnam Veterans in the Hall of Flags (no action required; already funded)	Extends the reporting date of the study conducted last interim from 11/01/00 to 12/01/01 (staffing issue only)	LVA	Enacted	3	5 (no Legislators)	N/A	12/1/01	OPLA	N/A						

# Legislative Council and Other Action through end of 1st Regular Session

					- <u></u>			# OF				Estima	ated Costs:	General Fun	d & Other	Special Rev	venue
#	JSO/LD	COMMISSION/STUDY	BRIEF PURPOSE OF STUDY	CMTE.		CMTE. PRIOR- ITIES 1/	MEMBER- SHIP	MTGS. BUD- GETED	REPORT DATE	STAFF- ING	COMPENSATION	PS	AO	FY 02 EST. COST	PS	AO	FY 03 EST. COST
2	L.D. 1489	Task Force to Make Recommendations Regarding Loss of Commercial Fishing Waterfront Access and Other Economic Development Issues Affecting Commercial Fishing (L/C motion would kill L.D. 1489 in favor of creating new Joint Study Order)	Review current policies regarding fishing industry, including commercial fishing waterfront access and economic development issues affecting commercial fishing	MAR	H.P. 1384	1	10 (4 Legislators)	5	12/5/01	OPLA/ DMR	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses; Others: Expenses Only	1,100	2,800	3,900			
22	2 H.P, 1140	Joint Study Committee to Study the State of the Lobster Fishery in Maine (L/C motion would kill H.P. 1140 in favor of MAR interim study via letter)	Study the state of lobster fishing in Maine, including forecasts for decline in lobster abundance and potential impacts	MAR	MAR Interim Study	2	13 Legislators		11/1/01	OPLA	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses (Costs absorbed/conduct study as part of interim committee meetings)						
23	PL 1999, c, 773 <sup>2</sup>	Task Force to Study Market Power Issues Related to the Solid Waste Hauling and disposal Industry (no action required; already funded)	Continue work of task force previously authorized	NAT	2nd year of author. study	N/A	5 (5 Legislators)	4	12/5/01	OPLA	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses						
24	RES. 1999, c. 134 <sup>2</sup>	Commission to Study the Establishment of an Environmental Leadership Program (no action required; already funded)	Continue work of commission previously authorized	NAT	2nd year of author, study	N/A	8 (8 Legislators)	4	12/1/01	OPLA	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses						
25	5 L.D. 1454	Commission to Study the Establishment of the Department of Environmental Protection as the Lead Response Agency in All Emergency Releases and Spills of Toxic or Hazardous Materials (requires amendment to conform to LC motion of 6/12)		NAT	Enacted	5	18 (5 Legislators)	5	12/5/01	OPLA	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses; Others: Expenses only (Allocation of OSR funds)	1,375	4,300	5,675			
20	RES.2001, c. 17	OFPR to Study Tax Expenditure Review Process (no action required; already funded)	OFPR & MRS to jointly study tax exp. review process (36 MRSA c. 9)	TAX	Enacted	N/A	N/A Staff Study			OFPR	N/A - Costs absorbed	1,373	4,500	2,0/3			

g:\budget\2002-2003\studies\studies120th1STreg.xls

# 120th LEGISLATURE / FIRST REGULAR SESSION INTERIM STUDIES

# Legislative Council and Other Action through end of 1st Regular Session

Notes: see last page

							# OF				Estim	ated Costs	: General Fun	d & Other	Special Re	venue 
# JSO/LD	COMMISSION/STUDY	BRIEF PURPOSE OF STUDY	CMTE.	STATUS	CMTE. PRIOR- ITIES 1/	MEMBER- SHIP	MTGS. BUD- GETED	REPORT DATE	STAFF- ING	COMPENSATION	PS	AO	FY 02 EST. COST	PS	AO	FY 03 EST. COST
27 H.P. 1327	Committee to Study the Authorization of Specialty License Plates (L/C motion would kill H.P. 1327 and L.D. 881 in favor of TRA interim study via letter)		TRA	TRA Interim Study	1	13 Legislators		12/5/01	OPLA	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses (Costs absorbed/conduct study as part of interim committee meetings)						
27 L.D. 881	Joint Standing Committee on Transportation to Study Passenger and Freight Rail Opportunitie in Maine (L/C motion would kill L.D. 881 and H.P. 1327 in favor of TRA interim study via letter)	s Study East West Rail corridor to examine the benefits, feasibility and viability of an	TRA	TRA Interim Study	2	13 Legislators		12/31/01	OPLA	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses (Costs absorbed/conduct study as part of interim committee meetings)					Land Control of the C	
28 S.P. 566	Subcommittee of the Joint Standing Committee on Utilities and Energy to Undertake a Study of the Electric Industry (L/C motion would kill S.P. 566 in favor of UTE interim study via letter)	f Study the development in the Maine electric energy market since deregulation	UTE	UTE Interim Study	ì	10 legislators	8	01/01/02	OPLA	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses						
	SUB TOTAL: ADDITIONAL STUDY COS BIENNIAL SUBTOTAL	TS - MOVED IN THROUGH 06/12/01									\$23,925	- \$51,050	) \$74,97 <u>5</u>	\$1,320	\$3,600	\$4,920 \$79,893
SUBSEQU	JENT APPROVAL (No Action	Taken by Legislative Counc	il; on (	Governo	r's des	k and subs	equent]	y signed	l into la	aw)	57.4					
L.D. 297 29 (RES. 2001 c. 49)	Advisory Committee to the Department of Administrative and Financial Services Regarding Workers' Compensation System	Advisory committee to DAFS study of workers' compensation	LAB	Enacted		10 (4 Legislators)	6	12/15/01	DAFS	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses (Allocation of OSR funds)	1,320	1,200	2,520			
SUBSEOL	JENT APPROVAL (Failed Leg	islative Council approval: Pa	assed o	or Enact	ted by	Legislature										
	Committee to Study Growth Management	Establishes a committee to study issues related to sprawl and growth management in Maine		Passed	4	13 legislators	3	12/5/01	OPLA	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses	1,485	2,150	3,635			(a) (b) (b) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c
	Economic Development Incentive Commission	Maintains repeal of the commission on August 1, 2002.	TAX	Enacted		11 (4 Legislators)	3	Biannual	OFPR	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses						
Prep	ared by the Office of the Exec. Director					Page 5									6/27	104

Page 5

6/27/01

# Legislative Council and Other Action through end of 1st Regular Session

							# OF				Estin	nated Cost	s: General Fun	d & Other S	Special Rev	venue
# JS	O/LD	COMMISSION/STUDY	BRIEF PURPOSE OF STUDY	CMTE.	CMTE. PRIOR- STATUS ITIES 1/	MEMBER- SHIP	MTGS. BUD- GETED	REPORT DATE	STAFF- ING	COMPENSATION	PS	AO	FY 02 EST. COST	PS	AO	FY 03 EST. COST
SUBS	<u>EQUE</u>	ENT APPROVAL (Legislative	Council Referred to Approp	riatio	ns Committee;	AFA mov	ed into	Part II (	L.D. 85	55)						
32 L.I	. 1779 (	Legislative Youth Advisory Council (ongoing) (Leg. Council directed sponsor to develop an amendment to lower the costs) Eff. 7/01/02	advice to the Legislature on matters	EDU	Inc. in Part II (L.D. 855)	26 (3 Legislators)	8 per year	Annual by 2/01	MUSKI	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses; Others: Expenses Only	I.			11,660	36,200	47,860
SUBS	EQUE	ENT APPROVAL (Tabled by	Legislative Council; Moved i	nto Pa	art II (L.D. 855	) by Appro	priatio	ns Com	mittee)		Statistic Strategy Strategy	novelakon niggi (1821-1822)	mo 🎚 Ji sozumo mozno oskoji strebado	, sistema takastakka di bisansi revosa sakasta		a esterántico o con el relativa
33 L.	), 970 I	Education Funding Reform Committee	Committee established to make recommendations regarding education funding reform in the state	TAX	Inc. in Part II (L.D. 855)	14 (14 Legislators	) 10	12/31/01	LEG, CNCL.	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses Other Comm. Costs	7,700	14,300	22,000			
SUBS	EQUE	ENT APPROVAL (No Action	Taken by Legislative Counci	l; Mov	ved into Part II	(L.D. 855)	) by Ap	propria	tions C	ommittee)				20042		
34 L.I (P <i>A</i>	). 1277 RTA)	Health Care System and Health Security Board	Board established to conduct a feasibility study and develop proposals to implement the Maine Single-Payor Health Care Plan	BAN	Inc. in Part II (L.D. 855)	19 (4 Legislators)	6	03/01/02	OPLA/O FPR	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses	660	10,00	10,660			
TABI	ED B	Y LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL	ı													1
1 L.I		Commission to Develop and Finance Health  Care Coverage for All Maine People	Establishes the Commission to Develop and finance Health Care Coverage for All Maine People	BAN	Indef. PP 1	19 (4 Legislators)	FY 02=11; FY 03=9	11/1/02	OPLA/ DHS	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses; Others: Expenses Only	1,540	11,07	75 12,615	1,980	8,775	10,755
<u>FAIL</u>	<u>ED</u>															
ì L.I	. 1761 I	Committee to Study and Make Recommendations to Enhance the Governance of the Allagash Wilderness Waterway	Study history and establishment of Allagash Waterway, federal requirements, access and states management	ACF	Approp. 2 Table 2	15 (7 Legislators)	5	12/5/01	OPLA/ INFO OFFICE	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses; Others: Expenses Only	1,925	6,90	8,825			

# Legislative Council and Other Action through end of 1st Regular Session

						,		# OF				Estima	ated Costs	: General Fun	d & Other S	pecial Re	enue
#	JSO/LD	COMMISSION/STUDY	BRIEF PURPOSE OF STUDY	CMTE.	STATUS	CMTE. PRIOR- ITIES 1/	MEMBER- SHIP	MTGS. BUD- GETED	REPORT DATE	STAFF- ING	COMPENSATION	PS	AO	FY 02 EST. COST	PS	AO	FY 03 EST. COST
2	H.P. 1293	Joint Study Committee to Examine Issues Related to Motor Vehicle Glass Claims	Examine issues related to motor vehicle glass claims	BAN	Indef. PP	2	5 legislators	4	11/15/01	OPLA	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses	1,100	1,800	2,900			
3	S.P. 423	Joint Study Committee to Study the Need for Additional Civil Legal Resources	Study need, if any, for additional civil legal resources	JUD	Study Table	3	6 legislators	6	11/1/01	OPLA	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses	1,980	2,600	4,580			
4	L.D. 1720	Commission to Study the Administrative Structure for Providing Services to the Blind and Visually Impaired	Commission to study the administrative structure for providing services to the blind and visually impaired	LAB	Approp. Table	2	12 (5 Legislators)	4	12/1/01	OPLA	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses; Others: Expenses Only	1,100	2,600	3,700			
5	L.D. 1404	Stakeholders Group to Modernize Maine's Clean Air Policy	Establishes a stakeholders study group to study and recommend changes to Maine's Clean Air Laws	NAT	Approp. Table	3	Number Not Specified (4 Legislators)	4	11/15/01	DEP	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses	880	800				
6	L.D. 1748	Commission to Study Economically and Socially Just Policies for Foreign Investments by the State	Study economically and socially just policies for foreign investment; evaluate impacts of proposed standards	SLG	Approp. Table	1	10 (4 Legislators)	FY 02=3; FY 03=4	12/1/01	OPLA	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses; Others: Expenses Only	660	5,150	5,810	880	2,250	3,130
7	L.D. 1507	Commission to Study Ways to Improve Transportation for Senior Citizens	Study public and private transportation programs for senior citizens and prioritize needs	TRA	Approp. Table	3	11 (4 Legislators)	4	12/5/01	OPLA	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses; Others: Expenses Only	880	3,000			,	
NO	) ACTIO	ON TAKEN															
		Joint Study Committee to Examine Issues Relating to the North American Free Trade Agreement	Examine issues relating to the North American Free Trade Agreement	ACF	Study Table	3	13 legislators	6	None required	OPLA	Legislators; Per Diem & Expenses	4,290	4,075	8,365		15 miles	
2	L.D. 1277 (PART B)	Health Security Board (ongoing) eff. Jan. 1, 2003	Establishes ongoing Health Security Board to adopt rules to implement the single-payor health care plan	BAN	Approp. Table	Parket and	25 (4 Legislators)	4	Jan. 1st each year	Other	Estimate is for the payment of Legislators Expenses only in FY 03; ongoing costs thereafter \$1,240					400	400
3	L.D. 1778	Commission to Study Ways to Eliminate Cigarette Litter in Maine	To eliminate cigarette litter in Maine	BEC	Indef. PP	2	15 (5 Legislators)	4	12/1/01	OPLA	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses; Others: Expenses Only					400	400

# Legislative Council and Other Action through end of 1st Regular Session

								# OF				Estim	ated Costs	: General Fur	d & Other S	occial Rev	/enue
#	JSO/LD	COMMISSION/STUDY	BRIEF PURPOSE OF STUDY	CMTE,	STATUS	CMTE, PRIOR- ITIES <sup>1/</sup>	MEMBER- SHIP	MTGS. BUD- GETED	REPORT DATE	STAFF- ING	COMPENSATION	PS	AO	FY 02 EST. COST	PS	AO	FY 03 EST
4	E.D. 1731	Subcommittee of the Business and Economic Development Committee re; LD 1731	Subcommittee to work with stakeholders regarding the registration of building contractors	BEC	Req. to Presiding Officers	4	3-5 Legislators	4	None required	OPLA	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses						
5	L.D. 986	Ontions for Maine Businesses	Commission to investigate options for employee ownership of businesses in the state	BEC	Approp, Table	5	13 (4 Legislators)	4	11/15/01	OPLA	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses Others: Expenses Only	1,760	2,600				
6	L.D. 870	Sentencing of a Person Convicted of a Crime	Review laws relating to penalties imposed for crimes against children, including sentencing practices and patterns	CRJ	Approp. Table	2	11 (5 Legislators)	4	11/15/01	OPLA	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses Others: Expenses Only	1,100	2,200	3,300			
7	L.D. 1462	Criminal Code Revision Commission	Review all provisions of Maine Criminal code, Juvenile code and Maine Bail code and draft legislation that repeals/amends archaic laws	CRJ	Approp. Table	3	9 (5 Legislators)	FY 02=5; FY 03=5	11/15/02	OPLA	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses; Others: Expenses Only	825	1,925	5 2,750	1,375	2,375	3,750
8	L.D. 754	Commission to Study the reastority of a 42	Creates a commission to study the feasibility of establishing a 4-year vocational education program in the state	EDU	Approp. Table	2	6 (6 Legislators)	4.	12/6/01	OPLA/ OFPR	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses	1,320	2,000				
9 ]	C.D. 1487	film in the state of the film of the second state of the second st	Study special education laws and strategies to improve education plan	EDU	Approp. Table	3	15 (4 Legislators)	6	01/15/02	OPLA	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses; Others: Expenses Only	1,320	6,700				
10 1	L. <b>D. 1264</b>	Funding of the Education Passarch lactitute	Task Force to examine issues concerning the governance and funding of the Education Research Institute	<b>EDU</b>	Approp. Table	4	7 (3 Legislators)	- 4	01/15/02	OPLA	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses	660	1,400	2,060			
11	L.D. 766	Legislative Oversight Committee To Advise the Commissioner of Education on the Child Development Services Reorganization Plan	Majority Report establishes a legislative oversight subcommittee	EDU	Indef. PP		6 legislators	5	Nov-01	LEG, CNCL.	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses	3,850	4,300			= T	
12 ]	L. <b>D. 1475</b>	Commission to Respond to the Crisis in Access to Oral Health Services for Residents of the State	Establishes the Commission to Investigate - developing difficulties of access to oral health	HHS	Approp. Table	3	13 (2 Legislators)	FY 02=6; FY 03=10	11/1/02	ÓPLA	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses	440	77		550	1,175	1,725

# Legislative Council and Other Action through end of 1st Regular Session

								# OF				Estimated Costs: General Fund & Other Special Revenue					
#	JSO/LD	COMMISSION/STUDY	BRIEF PURPOSE OF STUDY	СМТЕ.	STATUS	CMTE. PRIOR- ITIES "	MEMBER- SHIP	MTGS. BUD- GETED	REPORT DATE	STAFF- ING	COMPENSATION	PS	AO	FY 02 EST. COST	PS	AO	FY 03 EST. COST
13	L.D. 872	Commission to Study Privacy Laws	Establishes the commission to study practices and laws relating to privacy of personal information	JUD	Approp. Table	2	7 (7 Legislators)	4	11/2/01	LEG. CNCL.	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses	1,540	2,200	3,740			
14	L.D. 1517	Commission to Review Landlord-tenant Laws	Study state's landlord-tenant laws and develop recommendations to improve laws	LVA	Approp. Table	2	12 (6 Legislators)	4	12/1/01	OPLA	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses; Others: Expenses Only	1,320	5,200	6,520			
15	L.D. 285	Commission to Clarify the Laws Governing Lobbyist Disclosure Requirements	Establishes commission to study issues related to clarifying the laws governing lobbyist disclosure requirements	LVA	Approp. Table	4	8 (5 Legislators)	4	12/1/01	OPLA	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses Others: Expenses Only	1,100	2,400	3,500			
16	S.P. 340	Joint Standing Committee on Legal and Veterans Affairs to Review 1st Election Cycle under the Maine Clean Elections Act	Review 1st election cycle under the Maine clean Elections Act	LVA		5	13 Legislators	6	04/15/02	OPLA	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses	1,980	2,600	4,580			
17	H.P. 878	Task Force to Study the Costs and Design of a Household Hazardous Waste Disposal Program		∍ <b>NAT</b>	Study Table	1	13 legislators	4	11/15/01	LEG, CNCL	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses						
18	L.D. 1775	Commission to Develop a Comprehensive Plan to Reduce Toxic Emissions and Expand Plastics Recycling	Undertake an analysis of plastics generation and study feasibility of expanding bottle deposit laws to include certain plastic containers	NAT	Approp. Table	2	15 (4 Legislators)	FY 02 - 5; FY 03 6	· 12/1/02	OPLA/ OFPR	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses	2,860	3,400	6,260 2,275	1,320	1,875	3,195
19	L.D. 562	Subcommittee of the State and Local Government Committee re: LD 562	Subcommittee to work with interested parties on a number of issues related to creation of capital improvement districts	SLG	05/03 Req. to Presiding Officers	2	4 (4 Legislators)	3	None required	OPLA	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses						
20	H.O. 21	Committee to Study the Feasibility of Laptops for House Members	Study the feasibility of laptops for members of the House	1			5 legislators	6	01/04/02		Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses	1,650	725 2,300	1,385			

# Legislative Council and Other Action through end of 1st Regular Session

Notes: see last page

[							"OF		<u></u>		Estin	Estimated Costs: General Fund & Other Special R				enue .
					CMTE. PRIOR-		# OF MTGS.									
#	JSO/LD	COMMISSION/STUDY	BRIEF PURPOSE OF STUDY	CMTE.	STATUS ITIES 1/	MEMBER- SHIP	BUD- GETED	REPORT DATE	STAFF- ING	- COMPENSATION	PS	AO	FY 02 EST. COST	PS	AO	FY 03 EST. COST
CARRYOVERS - NO ACTION REQUIRED - INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES																
1	L.D. 472	Fatherhood Issues Study Commission	Study issues associated with being a father in the state	AFA	Carry Over Req.	11 (5 Legislators)	5		OPLA	All Members: Per Diem & Expenses						
2	L.D. 1749	Commission to Review Internet Policy		BEC	Carry Over Req.	11 (6 Legislators)	3		OPLA	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses						
3	L.D. 1330	Commission to Examine the Maine Correctional Institute		CRJ	Carry Over Req.	11 (4 Legislators)	6		OPLA	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses; Others: Expenses Only						
4	L.D. 1346	Commission to Study the Health Care Workforce Shortage		ннѕ	Carry Over Req.	. 17 (6 Legislators)	FY 02=7; FY 03=6		DHS	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses; Others: Expenses Only						
5	L.D. 1678	Legislative Compensation Commission		SLG	Carry Over Req.	5 (No Legislators)	4 per year		LEG. CNCL.	All Members: Per Diem & Expenses						
6	L.D. 1570	Task Force to Study Clean Production Tax Exemptions		TAX	Carry Over Req.	13 (4 Legislators)	FY 02=2; FY 03=4		DEP/ REV. SVCS	Legislators: Per Diem & Expenses; Others: Expenses Only						
		GRAND TOTAL: ADDITIONAL STUDY	COSTS							-	\$73,810	\$160,32	5 \$234,135	\$19,085	\$56,650	\$75,735

Page 10

Notes:

BIENNIAL GRAND TOTAL

\$309,870

<sup>1/</sup> Committee Priorities have been extracted from individual committee memos. In some cases, these memos combined priorities for both the Appropriations Table and the Study Table. Priority numbers may reflect staff interpretation so as to show study priorities only.

 $<sup>^{2/}</sup>$  As a "two year" study, 2nd year costs already budgeted in 2002-2003 "Part 1."