

# 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)



State of Maine  
Senate Chamber

Augusta, Maine 04333


January 10, 1979

TO: Senator Richard Pierce  
Chairman, Legislative Council

SUBJECT: Report to the Legislative Council by a Subcommittee to  
Review the Rule Sunset Law

At its June 14, 1978 meeting, the Legislative Council approved a motion authorizing appointment of a Subcommittee to study certain potential issues concerning the Rules Sunset Law (5 MRSA Chapter 377). Attached is the report of the Subcommittee appointed pursuant to that motion.

For the Subcommittee:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Senator John Chapman

Subcommittee members:

- Senator John Chapman
- Representative George Carroll
- Representative Elizabeth Mitchell
- Representative Mary Najarian<sup>a/</sup>
- Representative Sandra Prescott

BB/elk

---

<sup>a/</sup> Representative Mary Najarian was appointed to take the place of Senator Matthew Levine, who resigned from the Senate.

January 10, 1979

REPORT TO THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL BY A SUBCOMMITTEE  
TO REVIEW THE RULE SUNSET  
LAW (5 MRSA CHAPTER 377)

Subcommittee members:

Senator John Chapman  
Representative George Carroll  
Representative Elizabeth Mitchell  
Representative Mary Najarian a/  
Representative Sandra Prescott

---

a/ Representative Mary Najarian was appointed to take the place of Senator Matthew Levine, who resigned from the Senate.

## BACKGROUND

The 108th Legislature enacted a law to establish a "sunset" procedure for the rules of State agencies--the text of that law, 5 MRSA Chapter 377, is at Appendix 1. Several potential issues in the applications of that Law were called to the attention of the Legislative Council by Legislative Assistants Coordinator Helen Ginder (see Appendix 2 for text of a memo listing the potential issues). At its June 14, 1978 meeting, the Legislative Council approved a motion authorizing appointment of a subcommittee to make recommendations to resolve those issues (see Appendix 3 for minutes of the Council meeting containing text of motion).

This document is the report of the subcommittee appointed pursuant to that motion. It was prepared after several work sessions, which included discussions with members of the Attorney General's and Secretary of State's offices, and legislative staff.

## ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Below are discussed the 9 issues listed in the Appendix 2 memo, and the subcommittee's recommendations.

ISSUE 1--"Should one or more Joint Standing Committees carry out rules review; or should a new rules review committee be established; or both?"

The subcommittee considered several committee arrangements for reviewing rules, including: (1) establishing a new committee to review all rules; (2) supplementing that new committee from time to time with several members from each of the existing committees as rules are reviewed which concern subject matter normally reviewed by the committee; and (3) establishing 3 or 4 new committees to review rules, each of the new committees to be responsible for a broad range of programs such as human relations, business and economics, and general government.

Recommendation 1--The committee review of rules required by the rules sunset law shall be done by the existing joint standing committees, with jurisdiction over a particular rule determined by jurisdiction over the statute which authorizes the rule.

Under this recommendation, all committees will review rules, with, for example, the Agriculture Committee reviewing rules promulgated under the authority of agricultural laws; the Marine Resources Committee reviewing laws promulgated under the marine resources law; and so on.

The advantages of review by all existing committees are:

1. The expertise developed by committees will be available for rule review, which is a process often requiring detailed knowledge of a particular subject
2. The very substantial workload expected from review will be spread over all committees

3. This arrangement will avoid potential conflicts between the current committees and a new rule review committee over the advisability of continuing, modifying, or terminating policies and acts of executive agencies.

ISSUES 2,3,5,7, and 8--These issues are closely related, involving the administration of the review activity:

"2. A formal procedure and time limitation for rules review must be established."

"3. A schedule for implementing the Sunset Provision of the Maine Law must be established. Is the sunset provision as written suitable and sufficient for the purpose?"

"5. When shall the Committee(s) meet (session or interim); a regular schedule must be established."

"7. Necessity for public hearings on both?"

"8. The number of additional staff necessary to assist the Committee(s) in the foregoing."

Insofar as they are consistent with the statute, the committee procedures for rule review should be identical to the procedures for review of Bills. Public hearings are required on every rule reviewed (5 MRSA §11105).

It is too early to establish a detailed schedule for review. The statute requires every executive agency to submit to the Legislature a current, complete set of its rules in effect January 1, 1979. The statute further requires the assignment of these rules to committees for review over several succeeding years, and enactment of a statute containing expiration dates for each rule. The assignment of rules for review and development of a schedule of expiration dates cannot be completed until all rules have been received by the Legislature, which is expected to be in late January, 1979. Both processes--assignment for review and development of expiration schedule--will require a considerable amount of work during the first part of 1979, to be completed in time for Legislative enactment.

Recommendation 2--A new legislative assistant shall be hired in January, 1979 to provide the staff work needed initially to establish sunset review and later to assist standing committees as they review rules. The Subcommittee to Review the Rule Sunset Law shall be reappointed for the 109th Legislature to supervise and assist with implementation of the Act in 1979. The Subcommittee shall be terminated as soon as it is apparent that the review procedure is well underway, but not later than September, 1979.

The bulk of the staff work necessary for the rules sunset law should be provided by the Office of Legislative Assistants, which currently provides staff assistance to the Joint Standing Committees. However, an additional member for that office is

clearly needed, because the additional responsibility for rules review will impose substantial additional work. This work will consist initially in reviewing all rules and assisting in the scheduling of their expiration and assigning their review to Committees. Subsequently, the work will be in the form of assistance to Committees as they review rules. It may be that more than one person will eventually be needed to accommodate the additional workload.--it is not clear how much new work will be generated. But the Subcommittee is certain that at least one additional person will be needed.

The Subcommittee recommends its own reappointment as a Subcommittee of the 109th Legislature to help implement the Act. Such supervision and assistance will especially be needed early in 1979 as joint committees' review responsibility is assigned; expiration dates are developed; and the bill containing rule expiration dates is written, heard, and debated. All current members wish to serve on the new Subcommittee.

ISSUES 4 and 6--These issues suggest certain basic changes in Rule Review:

"4. What powers shall the committee(s) have: suspension, suggestion, proposed legislation?"

"6. Is review of rules only after they are formally adopted efficient and advisable or should proposed rules be reviewed prospectively? (amendment necessary) which should be given priority?"

Recommendation 3--The Subcommittee recommends no changes in the statutory power given to the joint standing committees in the rules sunset law.

Under the law, the committees have the power only to recommend to the Legislature whether a particular rule be continued, modified, or terminated. The Subcommittee has legal advice that to give to committees the power to suspend or delay the effective date of a rule may require a Constitutional amendment.

Expanding review to include review before a rule is enacted is inadvisable at this time. As a practical matter, such authority exists in a different form: the Administrative Procedure Act requires a public notice of intent to adopt rules, and the Legislative Council has the power to give to a standing committee the power to review a proposed rule, and to make recommendations about the rule to the Legislature (but not to suspend or delay the effective date of the rule).

ISSUE 9--"Estimated expenditure for financing the Committee(s) meetings, hearings notice mail, etc.."

The cost for committee meetings and associated costs for the rule review program for the next biennium cannot be calculated until the review schedule (discussed above) is adopted.

OTHER ISSUES--In its work the Subcommittee came upon two other problems.

First is the problem of indexing and codifying the rules of State agencies.

The Administrative Procedure Act requires that every rule be filed with the Secretary of State, in a form that he prescribes (5 MRSA §8056). The requirement for identification and filing of all State agency rules in one place is laudible. It does not go far enough, however, to assist in identifying and referring to rules. For example, rules affecting the disposal of waste water may be found in 3 or 4 State agencies. Yet, there is no index for the public to use to determine which agencies may have such rules.

Further, reference to rules may become very cumbersome in the absence of a State-wide system of codification. For example, the rule sunset law requires the assignment by joint order of rules to committees for review and passage of a Statute listing expiration schedules for rules. In the absence of some form of codification, it may be necessary to refer to each rule by title or promulgating agency, rather than by some short, simple form of reference, such as chapter and section.

Clearly, both for better public access and for ease of reference and use, it would be very useful to have a uniform codification of the rules and an index. Codification and indexing will require statutory authority and an appropriation. It is likely that the indexing effort will take about 1 man-year of time initially to devise an indexing scheme and index the rules, and that the subsequent keeping current of the index will require only a part-time effort.

Recommendation 4--Statutory authority shall be given to the Secretary of State to codify; edit cooperatively with the promulgating agency; and index all rules. An appropriation for 1 professional man-year shall be made for fiscal 1979-1980 for this purpose.

Second, two technical amendments to the Rule Review and Administrative Procedure Act ought to be enacted. Specifically:

1. Language should be enacted clarifying that agencies are required to file with the Secretary of State in a form he prescribes both new rules, as they are adopted, and existing rules, so that the Secretary will have a complete set of rules available for the public, and for codifying and indexing. The Law as written is not clear as to whether agencies must submit to the Secretary copies of existing rules (see 5 MRSA §8056)

2. 5 MRSA §11104, 4th paragraph prohibits the termination and re-promulgation of a rule where the purpose is simply to avoid the automatic termination provision of the rules Sunset Law. That paragraph should be amended to prohibit

adoption of new rules and amendment of existing rules (in addition to their termination) in such a way as to avoid review and termination. For example, the law as written probably would permit an agency to amend a rule just before its scheduled expiration, thereby creating a "new" rule which could exist for an additional 5 years and avoiding expiration of the old rule. An amendment to the Law might require that amendments to rules made within a specified time prior to expiration not be considered the adoption of a new rule for purposes of the Act.

Recommendation 5--Technical changes shall be made in the Statutes to (a) clarify responsibility of agencies to file copies of existing rules with the Secretary of State and (b) strengthen prohibitions on certain agency acts taken to avoid automatic expiration of rules.



SUMMARY OF SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

<u>RECOMMENDATION</u>	<u>ACTION REQUIRED</u>	<u>COST</u>
<u>Recommendation 1</u> --Committee sunset review of rules to be done by all joint standing Committees-----	New Joint Rule(s),	Depends on number of rules and review schedule adopted.
<u>Recommendation 2</u> --Additional Legislative Assistant to staff rule review function, beginning January, 1979-----	Legislative Council approval and appropriation.	FY 1978-79 \$8,680 FY 1979-80 \$16,448 FY 1980-81 \$16,448
Continue Subcommittee to Review Rule Sunset Law-----	Legislative Council appointment.	None.
<u>Recommendation 3</u> --No change in statutory powers of standing committees in rules sunset law-----	None	None.
<u>Recommendation 4</u> --Authority for Secretary of State to hire a person for 1 year to index rules-----	Statutory authority and appropriation.	FY 1979-80 \$16,948
<u>Recommendation 5</u> --Technical changes in statutes to clarify agency rule filing responsibility and strengthen prohibitions against actions to avoid automatic termination of rules-----	Statutory authority.	None.

APPENDIX 1

TEXT OF THE STATE AGENCY  
RULE SUNSET LAW (5 MRSA CHAPTER 337)

# ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES 5 § 11102

## CHAPTER 377

### STATE AGENCY RULES

New Sections	New Sections
11101. Statement of intent.	11106. Administering and other agencies to cooperate.
11102. Definitions.	11107. Legislative Administrative Director to cooperate.
11103. Assignment of rules to standing committees.	11108. Savings clause.
11104. Automatic expiration of rules.	
11105. Joint legislative committee review of rules.	

#### § 11101. Statement of intent

The intent of this chapter is to institute a system which will require that all rules promulgated by any state agency of the Executive Department shall automatically expire within a period of not to exceed 5 years, as set out in this chapter, unless the rules are renewed by statute.

1977, c. 683, § 4, eff. March 29, 1978.

#### Amendments:

—1977. Chapter 683 enacted this chapter.

#### Derivation:

1977, c. 566.

Former § 2501 of this title.

#### Library References

Administrative Law and Procedure

§ 122.

C.J.S. Public Administrative Bodies and Procedure § 107.

#### § 11102. Definitions

As used in this chapter, unless the context otherwise indicates, the following words shall have the following meanings.

1. Administering agency. "Administering agency" for a rule shall mean the state agency responsible for promulgating the rule, and shall include any body of State Government authorized by law to adopt rules, including, but not limited to, every authority, board, bureau, commission, department or officer of the State Government so authorized; but the term shall not include the Legislature, the Governor, the courts, including the Administrative Court, the University of Maine, the Maine Maritime Academy, school districts, special purpose districts or municipalities, counties or other political subdivisions of the State.

2. Committee report. "Committee report" shall mean the report prepared by a joint standing committee pursuant to this chapter. At a minimum, the report shall include the text of the rule and a brief description of it; an evaluation of the rule, treating the criteria defined in subsection 3 and other arguments for and against termination and the committee's recommendations and the reasons therefor.

3. Criteria. "Criteria" shall be the variables by which a joint standing committee shall evaluate and recommend to the Legislature whether a rule shall automatically terminate. At a minimum, the criteria shall include the following:

A. Whether the rule is consistent with and necessary to the intent of the legislation which authorized its promulgation;

B. Are the effects of the rule suitable, including its benefits and costs, including costs of compliance and of administration; and

C. Whether circumstances have changed since either the promulgation of the rule or the passage of the legislation which authorized its promulgation, which changed circumstances may, in the joint committee's view, suggest that a change be made in that legislation or in the methods of accomplishing its purposes, including the appropriateness of using a rule to accomplish that purpose.

4. Rule.

A. "Rule" means the whole or any part of every regulation, standard, code, statement of policy, or other agency statement of general applica-

## 5 § 11102 ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

bility, including the amendment, suspension or repeal of any prior rule that is or is intended to be judicially enforceable and implements, interprets or makes specific the law administered by the agency, or describes the procedures or practices of the agency.

B. The term does not include:

- (1) Policies or memoranda concerning only the internal management of an agency or the State Government and not judicially enforceable;
- (2) Advisory rulings issued under chapter 375, subchapter III;<sup>1</sup>
- (3) Decisions issued in adjudicatory proceedings; or
- (4) Any form, instruction or explanatory statement of policy which in itself is not judicially enforceable and which is intended solely as advice to assist persons in determining, exercising or complying with their legal rights, duties or privileges.

5. Standing committees. "Standing committee" shall mean a joint standing committee of the Legislature as identified in the Joint Rules of the Legislature.

1977, c. 683, § 4, eff. March 29, 1978.

<sup>1</sup> Section 9001 of this title.

Amendments:

—1977. Chapter 633 enacted this section.

Derivation:

1977, c. 566.

Former § 2503 of this title.

### § 11103. Assignment of rules to standing committees

Not later than September 1, 1978, every administering agency shall submit to the Legislature a copy of each rule promulgated by it which is in effect on July 15, 1978, a list identifying each rule by title or descriptive phrase and a brief description of each rule, including a reference to the Title and section of the law which is the authority for the rule. Every agency shall submit to the Legislature on January 1, 1979, any rules or amendments of rules adopted after July 15, 1978, and before January 1, 1979.

Each rule in effect on January 1, 1979, or taking effect on a subsequent date, shall be assigned by joint order of the Legislature to be reviewed by a joint standing committee of the Legislature. The assignment may be done by identifying classes of rules on some reasonable basis, such as administering organization, or object or person regulated.

Every standing committee shall recommend to the Legislature an expiration schedule for all rules in effect on January 1, 1979, which are assigned to it pursuant to this section. The expiration schedule shall provide for the expiration of every such rule not later than January 1, 1984. The expiration schedule shall, to the extent possible, schedule the expiration date of these rules so as to provide an equal workload for committee review in each of the 5 years between January 1, 1979 and January 1, 1984.

The Legislature shall approve by statute an expiration schedule for each rule in effect on January 1, 1979. The expiration schedule shall provide for the expiration of every rule not later than January 1, 1984.

1977, c. 683, § 4, eff. March 29, 1978.

Amendments:

—1977. Chapter 633 enacted this section.

Derivation:

1977, c. 566.

Former § 2503 of this title.

Library References

Administrative Law and Procedure

§ 103.

C.J.S. Public Administrative Bodies

and Procedure § 101.

### § 11104. Automatic expiration of rules

Every rule in effect on January 1, 1979, shall expire January 1, 1984, unless terminated earlier by the administering agency or by statute.

Every rule taking effect after January 1, 1979, shall expire on January 1st of the 5th year of its operation unless terminated earlier by the administering agency or by statute.

## ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES 5 § 11107

Any rule shall continue in effect for 3 years past its expiration date, or for a shorter period specified by statute, when its continuation is authorized by law.

No rule shall be terminated and promulgated again in the same or similar form, or with the same or similar purpose or effect, where the purpose or effect of the termination and promulgation is to avoid automatic or statutory termination of the rule. The Attorney General shall sue to stop the promulgation.

A grace period shall extend for a period of one year past the expiration date of each rule. During that period the administering agency is authorized to conduct any reasonable activities, including the obligation and expenditure of funds, which are necessary to terminate the rule as expeditiously as possible while minimizing any adverse effects on the public. The administering agency shall give timely written notice, in advance of the grace period, to the Legislative Administrative Director of the details of any planned grace period.

1977, c. 683, § 4, eff. March 29, 1978.

**Amendments:**

—1977. Chapter 683 enacted this section.

**Derivation:**

1977, c. 566.  
Former § 2504 of this title.

**Library References**

Administrative Law and Procedure  
C-422  
C.J.S. Public Administrative Bodies  
and Procedure § 107.

### § 11105. Joint legislative committee review of rules

A joint standing committee shall hold a public hearing on every rule assigned to it for review under section 11103. At least 7 days and not more than 21 days before public hearing, the committee shall publish notice in a newspaper of general circulation in the area of the State affected. Notice shall refer to the statutory authority under which the rule was adopted, identify the rule by title or brief descriptive phrase, describe the purpose of the hearing and state the time and place of the public hearing and the manner in which oral or written testimony may be submitted.

A committee report shall be submitted to the Legislature for each rule reviewed. Any members of the joint standing committee shall have the opportunity to prepare a minority report, which shall be made a part of the committee report.

1977, c. 683, § 4, eff. March 29, 1978.

**Amendments:**

—1977. Chapter 683 enacted this section.

**Derivation:**

1977, c. 566.  
Former § 2505 of this title.

### § 11106. Administering and other agencies to cooperate

All state agencies shall cooperate in the conduct of this chapter. This cooperation shall include, but not be limited to, the providing of information, assistance, including evaluation, and advice to the joint standing committees, as is requested.

1977, c. 683, § 4, eff. March 29, 1978.

**Amendments:**

—1977. Chapter 683 enacted this section.

**Derivation:**

1977, c. 566.  
Former § 2506 of this title.

### § 11107. Legislative Administrative Director to cooperate

The Legislative Administrative Director shall determine the amount of staff and other support required for the purposes of this chapter, and shall provide it, subject to the approval of the Legislative Council. The director shall submit a written evaluation of the operation of this chapter from time to time, but not less often than February 1st of the even-numbered years.

1977, c. 683, § 4, eff. March 29, 1978.

**Amendments:**

—1977. Chapter 683 enacted this section.

**Derivation:**

1977, c. 566.  
Former § 2507 of this title.

## 5 § 11108 ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

### § 11108. Savings clause

The provisions of this chapter shall not apply to any rule where the application would prevent the administering agency or another state agency from participating in any cash or in-kind grant-in-aid program of the Federal Government. The Legislature may, by statute, suspend the operation of this section for such a rule.

Each administering agency shall conduct a continuing review of its rules and its participation in federal grant-in-aid programs to determine whether participation will be affected by this chapter. Each agency shall give timely notification, in writing, to the Legislature of the nature of the effect.

1977, c. 683, § 4, eff. March 29, 1978.

#### Amendments:

—1977. Chapter 678 enacted this chapter.

#### Derivation:

1977, c. 683.

Former § 2503 of this title.

#### Library References

Statutes ~~683~~(2).  
C.J.S. Statutes § 35 et seq.

APPENDIX 2

MEMO FROM HELEN GINDER, COORDINATOR,  
LEGISLATIVE ASSISTANTS, TO THE  
LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, IDENTIFYING  
POTENTIAL ISSUES IN RULES SUNSET  
LAW (DATED JUNE 12, 1978)

To Legislative Council

Dept. \_\_\_\_\_

From Helen Ginder, Coordinator

Dept. Legislative Assistants

Subject Maine's Agency Rules Law

Meeting On May 2, 1978 Legislators and Staff took part in a seminar provided by the National Conference of State Legislatures on Maine's Agency Rules Law, 5 MRSA § 11101 et seq., a list of attendees is attached.

Issues Raised Since many issues were raised and much information provided, it was recommended by Representative William Garsoe that a committee be established to meet this summer, including those legislators attending and assisted by the staff, to review our law and other pertinent legislation.

Some of the issues raised and commented on are:

- Committee(s) 1. Should one or more Joint Standing Committees carry out rules review; or  
Should a new rules review committee be established; or both?
- Procedure 2. A formal procedure and time limitation for rules review must be established.
- Schedule 3. A schedule for implementing the Sunset Provision of the Maine Law must be established. Is the sunset provision as written suitable and sufficient for the purpose?
- Powers 4. What powers shall the committee(s) have: suspension, suggestion, proposed legislation?
- Meetings 5. When shall the Committee(s) meet (session or interim); a regular schedule must be established.
- Adopted vs Proposed rules 6. Is review of rules only after they are formally adopted efficient and advisable or should proposed rules be reviewed prospectively? (amendment necessary) which should be given priority?
- Hearings 7. Necessity for public hearings on both?
- Staff Support 8. The number of additional staff necessary to assist the Committee(s) in the foregoing.
- Cost 9. Estimated expenditure for financing the Committee(s) meetings, hearings notice mail, etc..



MAINE PROGRAM ON  
REGULATION REVIEW

May 2, 1978

NAME

TITLE

Christine Holden	Legislative Staff
John R. Selser	Legislative Staff
John Bailey	Legislative Staff
Jon Hull	Legislative Staff
Barbara Gottschalk	Legislative Finance Office Staff
Peter Schwindt	Legislative Staff
Senator Walter W. Hichens	Co-chairman Agriculture Committee Member Human Services & Local and County Government Committees
Elizabeth Mitchell	House Member
Judy C. Kany	House Member
Bill Brown	Legislative Staff
Edward C. Kelleher-Bangor	House Member
Ted Potter	Legislative Staff
Robert Flewelling	Legislative Staff
Helen Ginder	Legislative Staff Coordinator
David Elliott	Secretary of State's Office
Jim McKenna	Legislative Staff
Sandra Prescott	House Member - Member Health & Insti- tutional Services Committee
Edward A. Miller	Vermont Legislative Staff
John D. Chapman	Senator
Carroll Webb	Director, Joint Administrative Pro- cedures Committee
Bill Garsoe	Legislative Council
George Carroll	Representative
Bob Clarke	Legislative Staff
Bonnie D. Post	House Member - Member of Marine Re- sources Committee
Leon Simpson	Idaho Senate
David Buger	Wisconsin Senate

APPENDIX 3

PAGE 5 MINUTES OF JUNE 14, 1978  
LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL MEETING,  
CONTAINING MOTIONS WHICH  
AUTHORIZED CREATION OF A SUBCOMMITTEE  
TO RECOMMEND ON POTENTIAL ISSUES IN RULES SUNSET  
LAW

Draft Probate Code Hearings. Rep. Martin advised that the Judiciary Committee submitted a request to hold four public hearings regarding the probate code. He related that these meetings are scheduled for Aroostook County, Bangor, Lewiston and Portland.

MOTION

Rep. Tierney moved that the Council approve the request by the Judiciary Committee for four public hearings on the probate code as requested.

The motion was seconded by Sen. Conley and carried.

At this time the Council took up Item #4.

#4 - Federal Fund Transfers. Ronald Lord distributed a memo which would acquaint the members with a technical problem that may come up this fall concerning the budgeting of State expenditures of federal funds. The memo refers to transfers from the General Fund Account to the Federal Account which permit timely expenditures from the Federal Account and which are later reimbursed by the federal government. Mr. Lord explained that the memo points out that technically some of the advances we have to make in this year's budget could be interpreted as transfers. He requested approval of the Council that these transfers be allowed for the 1978-79 year only, stating that instead of these transfers coming to the Council, the Finance Office will review them with the Council's approval and only those not related to the federal fund would come to the Council for action.

MOTION

Sen. Sewall moved to approve the recommendation of the Finance Officer on the transfer of federal funds.

The motion was seconded by Sen. Conley and carried.

At this time the Council took up the report of the Legislative Assistants Coordinator.

Legislative Assistants Coordinator - Helen Ginder presented a list of those who attended the seminar on Regulation Review. She advised that Rep. Garsoe had attended the meetings and that he suggested a committee be comprised of some of those who attended the seminar to make recommendations to the Council resolving some of those revisions.

MOTION

Rep. Tierney moved that a subcommittee of 5, to be selected by the Council ~~Chairman~~ from those who attended the Regulation Review Seminar, be assigned to work on revisions.

The motion was seconded by Sen. Huber and carried.