

MINUTES

February 17, 2006

Minutes of the special legislative meeting of the State Board of Education held February 17, 2006, at the State Capitol Complex, W325, Salt Lake City, Utah. Meeting commenced at 9:30 a.m. Member Tom Gregory, Vice Chairman of the Law and Policy Committee presided at the meeting.

Members present were:

Chairman Kim R. Burningham
Vice Chairman Janet A. Cannon
Member Dixie L. Allen
Member Tim Beagley
Member Laurel Brown
Member Mark Cluff
Member Bill Colbert
Member Edward A. Dalton
Member Thomas Gregory
Member Greg W. Haws
Member Randall Mackey
Member Richard Sadler
Member Gary Swensen
Member Teresa L. Theurer

Vice Chairman Janet A. Cannon and Teresa L. Theurer participated via Polycom. Members Bonnie Jean Beesley, Debra G. Roberts, and Sara Sinclair, were excused.

Also present were:

Executive Officer Patti Harrington
Associate Superintendent Patrick Ogden
Associate Superintendent Raymond Timothy
Coordinator, Government and Legislative Relations, Carol B. Lear
Board Secretary Twila B. Affleck

Associate Superintendent Myron Cottam was excused.

Members of the press:

Cecelia Baker, Salt Lake Tribune
Jennifer Toomer-Cook, Deseret Morning News
Lynze Wardle, Standard Examiner
Representative Steven Urquhart
Representative J. Stuart Adams
Pat Rusk, Utah Education Association
Dee Larsen, Legislative Research and General Counsel

Legislation Review

Representative Stephen H. Urquhart reviewed his proposed legislation 1SHB181, Education Reform. (1) Provides money for UBSCT Remediation; (2) Helps with Orderly Termination; and (3) 4-6 Math Initiative. (For

complete details, see General Exhibit No.9853.) He expressed appreciation to Superintendent Harrington, Chairman Burningham and Associate Superintendent Ray Timothy for their extra efforts to help him work on this legislation. He indicated this would be a pilot program, but the money would be non-lapsing. However, he would like to have on-going money for this as well.

Member Tim Beagley commented that as you talk about a pilot for the math initiative, and questioned how big is the word “pilot” is. He indicated that we have a teacher quality plan that we would like to implement that goes beyond the math subject. Does this go beyond the math? Representative Urquhart responded that it is just math 4-6 and it is very broad so the Board can work on the details.

Member Teresa Theurer questioned the benefit in lumping, what she considered, three important issues that are possibly divisive among the board members into one bill. Secondly, on UBSCT remediation, one of the things we wanted to do was provide schools with additional funding to help these students. As she has reviewed the bill, the funding does not come until the senior year. She would like to see the money in the school district during the junior year so they can receive the remediation they need at that time.

Representative Urquhart responded that his intent was to move things forward. He had originally proposed a few additional things and this is the package he came up with to move education forward after talking with many people. Of course, politics plays in with what might be a winning mix that would secure passage. With regard to the time for remediation he responded that you have to pick a point and that is why we chose senior year, didn't want to do it after the first test and you would maybe have more after the second failure and there is a finite amount of money in the bill.

Discussion ensued relative to the times the test are given and the results are received. Superintendent Harrington noted that we intend to increase the contract so that we have a shorter turn around time on the tests.

Member Greg Haws commented that the approach in the legislation is it is focused only on the Title I schools and remediation. He indicated that one of the things we focused on in the flat world we live in is we need to raise the achievement of all students particularly in math. Representative Urquhart responded that this is the thing the Board needs to look at. The point of the bill is to make sure that at the end of sixth grade they are at least at the sixth grade level. It is his understanding that in the non-Title I schools we are doing a pretty good job of that, but in Title I we have more difficulty.

Member Haws indicated that one of the concerns we did have was that we have a lot of teachers in that area that need some inservice training, and one of our focus' was to provide that training across the board. Representative Urquhart responded that he hoped that the pilot would contain that inservice training.

Member Gary Swensen commented that we are all in agreement that the welfare of the child comes as number one. One thing that concerns him is when you get a teacher who has been in the system for twenty five or

thirty years and they are not as competent as they should be that means the children suffer. Somewhere along the line we should in their first years of teaching we should have given them help to try to improve that situation or if it is evident that does not work we tell them they need to do something other than be a teacher. That teacher is now 50-60 years of age and they have been able to slide all the way through the system and they are near retirement age and we tell them they no longer have a job. He would like to see what can we do to focus more on new teachers and how we can help them.

Representative Urquhart responded that he is an attorney and one of his clients sends him a note every month of what he is doing wrong. This is just the way this client works with all of their people. This does not mean they are going to fire you, but it means they want you to do better. He indicated we need to inform our principals it is their job to give this kind of criticism. He indicated that one thing we are doing outside this bill is Dr. Harrington and Dr. Kendell are working to see that teachers get their endorsement when they graduate for their teacher license.

Chairman Kim Burningham commented that there have been a couple of issues brought up, the year of UBSCCT where you qualify, and the limitations of Title I schools. He questioned when the bill reaches the floor of the House, how would you feel about any amendments, such as these two issues or others. Representative Urquhart responded that he hoped people would first come to him and put in amendments. He indicated he was very willing to amend this. His desire is to do something very constructive for education. It would be nice to have something that would pass. He indicated he was concerned that we may lose the money for these kids. As far as Title I goes, it is a good place to start. It is a finite amount of money and if we want to spread that to other than Title I we can do it, but make sure we are going to end up with a good product.

Member Greg Haws commented that he concurred with Chairman Burningham. We are too early in the process to know whether if they fail the second that they will pass or fail the third test. The timing issue is real and there is panic in the schools with what will happen when students do not pass. He indicated that he would like to see the bill amended to have the entire senior year or first part of the year for these students to take the test. This would also give the Board some time to monitor it and if the money is not sufficient they could look at that at another time. Representative Urquhart responded that if we move to after second take rather than the first, the remediation money per student would have to drop significantly. At this point he would give the bill a 50/50 chance of passing, and if we lower the amount, does it do enough good to pass it.

Chairman Burningham commented on one other amendment that has not been discussed but there are people talking about that the bill stipulates that at least 50 percent must be used in incentive programs. If someone were to try to change that to 30 percent, what kind of response would he have as well as his observation of the legislature? Representative Urquhart indicated it would make passage more difficult. There are many that would like to see it 100%. He indicated that since it is an experiment divided evenly is the best way to go at this time.

Member Tom Gregory commented that some of the difficulty we will run into is identifying causality. When we have success, what 50% caused that success. Each side is going to point to their side. Representative Urquhart responded that with the hybrid model we might have some difficulty determining where the success is, but felt we could set up some controls and ways to figure out the output and the input. He hoped there would be data that is different enough to draw and some hard conclusions.

Member Laurel Brown questioned if the Representative thought that having UBSCT remediation having the private section in that the law would basically disallow the rest of this bill going forward? Representative Urquhart indicated yes, that the General Fund money would not be spent on remediation.

Member Brown further questioned that if we will always be told that when we need money the only way we will get it is if we privatize it?

Member Dixie Allen commented that the 4-6 math that it does look like remediation, but what we are looking at is in grades 4-6 we move from rational to irrational numbers and to number sense. We have a lot of students who can't do that. We do the rational numbers very well, even in our Title I schools. She is fearful of the philosophical idea which is that we have to have teachers and students understand number sense and understand irrational numbers so they can move into the higher levels of math. She indicated that it really is a wide area of what we were trying to do and she would like to push to upgrade our math curriculum and our math teachers in the 4-6 to get them ready to move into the high school sequencing.

Representative Urquhart responded that it fits very well as part of the pilot.

Vice Chairman Janet Cannon commented that the pilot programs are new innovations since we looked at this bill before. She requested that the Representative review the funding dollars that are attached to the different portions of the bill.

Representative Urquhart responded that there is \$7.5 million General Fund money for remediation - \$500, \$1,000 or \$1,500 depending on how poorly the student did and that can be times three if they did poorly on all three subparts. The other part is the math pilot project which is set at \$1.5 million, one time money, but it would not all have to be spent the next budget year it would be non-lapsing.

Representative Urquhart expressed appreciation to the Board and indicated he was very proud of the Board and the directions they are going. He appreciated the good dialogue between the Board and the Legislature.

Member Tom Gregory expressed appreciation for the consideration the legislature gives to the Board.

Pat Rusk, President of the Utah Education Association urged the Board to oppose this legislation. She read a statement relative to the Board's requests for remediation, the 4-6 grade math initiative (based on the reading initiative based on student performance). She stated that this proposal was supported by the Governor's office and would have had broad support from everyone else as well. She indicated these two great ideas were now being

presented in a convoluted passage that is more about passing a voucher and merit pay program than it is what is best for students. They look nothing like what the Board envisioned. (For complete details of Ms. Rusk's statement, see General Exhibit No. 9854.)

Motion was made by Member Teresa L. Theurer and seconded by Member Dixie L. Allen to oppose HB 181 for the reason that our number one priority for the last two years has been our math 4-6 initiative, we didn't get it last year because of funding. Further, Member Theurer expressed that she was offended by title of the bill - Education Reform, and does not like three very important issues in education being put into one bill.

Superintendent Harrington reported that we suggested to the Representative that they entitle the bill Education Quality. We submitted the Board's 4-6 math initiative with the expectation that it would go for intervention rather than for rewards and with a heavy piece going to professional development. The Orderly Termination portion of the bill is exactly as we submitted it. However, the educator quality initiative is a broad and in its way far more than not positive in its nature. It is recognizing great teaching, providing support in early years, it is awarding teachers for additional endorsement such as the National Board Certification; it suggests of a need to study a compensation plan that is performance based and has in part student achievement as one indicator. There is no question that the piece that seemed to appeal most to the legislature was the one that is the most negative about the educator quality initiative. Dr. Harrington continued that the first part of the bill are words that come directly from Senator Stephenson because he has, for some weeks now, been indicating his desire to see a UBSCT results based plan. We have met with him multiple times to implore him to think through the administration of such a plan and how difficult that would be. Nonetheless, it remains about in the same form as it was weeks ago. Representative Urquhart has been very transparent with us to help us understand that this is Senator Stephenson's will and if we want it to succeed in the Senate it will have to have the UBSCT portion on it. It comes down to pragmatism versus practicality, versus principles and how you fall in that in making a policy decision.

Member Greg Haws commented that he appreciated the comments made by the Representative, particularly his own experience. He is troubled that we all have personal experiences and he has a senior who took this as a sophomore and she and a group of her friends were at his home and he asked them about the test and their comment was that this test was the easiest test they had ever taken and could not believe how easy it was. He indicated that these are all top students and will be attending very fine universities next year so for them this basic skill was so low that they could not even believe we took the time to test them. He is sensitive that we have a great population in the state who are not meeting the basic skills. Our interest should be about remediation after the second taking of the test. Further, if we are going to raise the level of the world to come up to the world, it is not the students who need the remediation to pass the UBSCT that need the additional help. The focus of the Board should be to focus on all of the students like we did with reading. He indicated that he felt the middle was put in to appeal because everyone want to

terminate teachers who are not performing. He stated that he has been involved in this for a long time - having eight children go through the system, and if he had to come up with one example of one teacher that he thought should be terminated he could not come up with one. He did not feel that age was a factor that makes a bad teacher. He is concerned that we have bad principals that are not willing to deal with these types of things and only shift them to another school. The middle part is intended to pass the bill, and does not tie to these other two issues.

Member Tim Beagley spoke in opposition to the motion. He expressed his respect Pat Rusk over the years and he understands everything she says and she is exactly right that we have been had by a very good politician but it has stuff in it we need. He reported that he has one school in his district where the composite CRT score has one number. There are several where the composite CRT score starts with a digit of one. He realizes we are taking a bone from the legislature, but he will take it.

Chairman Kim Burningham expressed appreciation to all of the Board Members for being at the meeting, and stated that he values the Boards opinion. He spoke in opposition to the motion it is not everything he want nor doe he agree with everything, but he has to vote for the students. Many educators will not like some of the features. He had hoped we could move toward a performance base system together and that is what he still would like to do. He commented that this legislation offers money to help remediate kids who would be failing. He is not bothered that it includes private sources because we already in some cases send our students to private sources if that is the best in the situation. We are not giving money to private schools, we are giving it to students to pass a public school test. He felt that the ones that will take advantage of this will be teachers who are already working in public schools who will open a personal school to help the students pass.

Chairman Burningham commented that he has more trouble with math initiative because he is sold on the one thing. A week ago we had a bill that would have put a pittance of money into two small pilots. This changed and this puts a significant amount of money into it. He further commented that he felt there is still possibilities for amendments. He indicated the Board should talk with the Representative to change the Title I issue.

Associate Superintendent Ray Timothy clarified that the legislation does give priority to Title I schools, but it does not have to only be for Title I schools. The district plan could include other schools, but priority will be given to Title I schools.

Member Laurel Brown commented that we need the money for the math, we need help, and schools need help with UBSCT, but they will continue to work with the kids in the public schools, they will do it during the day, stay after school or do whatever they have to with whatever money they have. With this bill, it is parallel to what happened years ago with SB 154, and what was happening politically is there a need out there to start requiring a lot of things. She questioned if the Board had taken a position to support merit pay? Have we taken a position to support privatization? If we support this bill these are things we are supporting. Don't believe that the politician because they

will come around and say you supported that through this legislation. She continued that if these separate entities in a separate bill can't stand on their own - they don't deserve to stand and she felt we were being held hostage. If we say we have to have the money we are "prostituting" ourselves if we take the money. If we are going to take a stand this is a good place to do it. She indicated that there are too many things in the bill, and we have not decided as a group that we agree on all of these concepts.

Member Richard Sadler commented that this is a complex bill, it has been put together with people's agendas added, in part, so we will support it and in part so that other peoples agendas will go through. If we support, the bill we support it long term. It is both a political bill and a financial bill. The question for us is, are we willing to take half loaf rather than none. Are we willing to say we agree for the children even though the bill will probably pass. Should we exercise our opposition to the bill, even though the bill may pass, to suggest that there are parts of it we don't agree with. He stated that he is particularly opposed to the payment of 4-6 grade teachers for those who may teach to the test or for improvement rather than all teachers 4-6 grades who are teaching math being tutored and brought up to speed. He is opposed to the idea that someone who graduates from the university and then becomes a teacher should have everything they need, and knows everything they need and not over the next twenty to thirty years and doesn't need some assistance. That was our plan on reading and it has proven successful. This is not our plan in this bill. How many difficult things should be in a bill to have us vote against it versus how many good things to vote for it. This is complex, but he spoke in favor of opposition to the bill because it does not contain enough good things.

Member Teresa Theurer commented that she did not see the concerned as we talk here that we say we want to help the children. As a Board we have never said we would like to help half the children or some of the children. We felt with our UBSCT remediation that we were going to help all the children. The money we had was for districts to go help everyone. Our math 4-6 wasn't to help some of the children, it was to help all the children. We wanted the money to have professional development for all teachers. We have students who are struggling that are not in Title I schools. Maybe professional development for a teacher would help that student be able to pass. She stated that this is political blackmail, this is not right and we need to take a stand to say it is not right for them to force us to accept something other than what we requested.

Member Gary Swensen commented that it concerns him that the Representative indicated if we go along with this bill Senator Howard Stephenson will be pleased with us. He fails to see the crown that Howard Stephenson apparently feels is on his head. In his opinion, Senator Stephenson does not represent the best interest of the students in the state of Utah and will vote in opposition to the legislation.

Member Dixie Allen commented that she has been in education for twenty-five years and she has applied for an received many pilot programs. Unfortunately, the movement and demonstrating that they work is very difficult. Even if they do shows that you are making progress, to put it into action and have it be funded for the future doesn't

happen. She indicated that years ago there as a five-base grant which she received for her school; \$40,000 for two years, it made a slight difference for her school but not for the state or her district. She stated she had great fear that this pilot will be lost and so will the money.

Member Ed Dalton expressed appreciation for the discussion. His thought is that we are violating a number of principals we have agreed upon if we support the bill.

Motion to oppose 1sHB 181 carried with Members Allen, Brown, Dalton, Haws, Mackey, Sadler, Swensen and Theurer voting in favor; Members Beagley, Burningham, Cannon, Cluff, Colbert, and Gregory opposed.

2S HB 172 - Local Land Use Provisions Relating to Schools

Superintendent Harrington commented that this is not a job she is seeking, and it does not mesh with the job of a superintendent. The League of Cities and Towns oppose this bill. This is not a natural relationship between our office and what should be locally determined.

Motion was made by Member Dixie L. Allen and seconded by Member Edward A. Dalton to oppose. Motion carried with Members Allen, Beagley, Burningham, Cannon, Cluff, Colbert, Dalton, Haws, Mackey, sadler, Swensen and Theurer voting in favor; Member Brown absent.

2S HB 155 - Education Testing Amendments

Motion was made by Chairman Kim R. Burningham and seconded by Member Dixie L. Allen to support. Motion carried with Members Allen, Beagley, Brown, Burningham, Cluff, Colbert, Dalton, Haws, Mackey, Sadler, and Swensen voting in favor; Members Cannon and Theurer absent [note that we lost the teleconference link.]

HB 201 - Fee Waiver Eligibility Verification

Motion was made by Member Mark Cluff and seconded by Member Edward A. Dalton to hold. Motion carried with Members Allen, Beagley, Brown, Burningham, Cannon, Cluff, Colbert, Dalton, Haws, Mackey, Sadler, Swensen and Theurer voting in favor; Member Theurer absent [again for loss of teleconference link].

HB 184 - Parent Choice in Education Act

Representative J. Stuart Adams explained his proposed legislation. He noted that the bill makes an appropriation, and that appropriation will be determined by legislature out of the General Fund to fund a voucher. The voucher amounts are in the bill, they range from \$500 to \$3,500 with the average being \$2,291. He explained how the money is distributed using the voucher from the General Fund with the \$3,900 weighted pupil unit plus in the district and the reserve account. He said that there is one theory that this is going to hurt the public education system. His commitment does not want to hurt public schools. The reserve account is critical because there would not be any damage to the district. He indicated that this is a compromise bill to make sure we don't hurt public education, but give an opportunity for those that would like to attend private schools.

Member Tim Beagley commented that one of the arguments people have often used for tuition tax credit or

a voucher program is it will help improve public education through competition. The Board's current Legislative Tracking Sheet listing all of the proposed legislation dealing with public education is 20 pages. He did not understand how people could think that public education, buried under this kind of red tape, can compete with the private schools. Representative Adams responded that may be some peoples idea, but he personally believed we have a great public school system in Utah. However, the competition is quality. He has heard that the biggest complaint from teachers is the number of tests. This legislation requires one test. We need to reduce testing in our public school system to try to get one test to get good comparisons and good data.

Member Gregory expressed appreciation to Representative Adams for taking time to come and meet with the Board.

Representative Adams stated that he had great admiration for what the Board is trying to do and he would welcome their comments because he is trying to make this as good a bill as possible. They are making changes to try to move it forward, but there are some things he would like to have remain in the bill which will give some flexibility to allow us to accomplish some of these things.

Member Greg Haws questioned how this bill relates to HB 340. Representative Adams indicated that this is Representative Dee's bill with a few changes. The main difference is that HB 340 leaves 100 percent of the money with the district. Some members of the legislature did not see this as good policy. This bill separates it and leaves \$1,800 in the district and puts the other in a reserve account which you would access by showing damage. He further indicated that it was his understanding that Representative Dee was pulling HB 340.

Member Ed Dalton commented that it looks like there has been a tremendous effort to make previous objections no long objections. However, it still remains a tuition tax credit or voucher bill. Even though the money is taken from the General Fund versus the Uniform School Fund, It still seems it is still public money going to private education. He felt this was contrary to the Constitution.

Representative Adams responded that he has been told this is Constitutional. The General Fund is used for a lot of things and this bill proposes that some of it be used for public education.

Motion was made by Member Mark Cluff and seconded by Member Bill Colbert to support HB 184.

Member Cluff stated that this is about children and the parents' responsibility for providing the best education possible. For him the family is the fundamental unit of society and parents have an obligation and are accountable before God for their children. The Board, as a government entity, should do all we can to support families and parents that they can provide for their children. There are some issues in the bill he may not agree with, but it is the best compromise. We have to look at the best we can do for the children of our state. He further stated that it is important that we have our parents involved. Where parents are involved in the education of their children, their children will do better.

Member Cluff further observed that last year when the tuition tax credit bill was before the committee it was interesting to see those that were talking against the bill and those talking for it. On one side we had individuals whose income and employment was based on public education on the other side we saw parents who were trying to get the best for their kids. For him, it is the kids that have priority over a system or organization. Parents have the responsibility and obligation to find the best for their children.

Member Ed Dalton stated in behalf of the Utah School Boards Association that through their delegate assembly they have clearly indicated they are opposed to this bill. They do not think the compromise is the answer, there is no compromise and it is not constitutional. There are 40 school districts who are opposed to this legislation.

Vice Chairman Janet Cannon commented that it was her understanding that the court decision in Florida found vouchers to be unconstitutional. She did not want to see our state go into legal battle over this issue. Therefore she would vote in opposition.

Member Bill Colbert commented that out of due respect to the Florida Supreme Court, it was a partisan vote and it gave it little credibility. He supports the legislation because he represents an area in the valley that is growing very fast and as you look at growth projections in public education over the next ten or fifteen years, if we don't do something to provide some alternatives to constructing all new schools, we are going to place an undo burden on tax payers. Giving parents a choice for a private component of our education system may alleviate some of the impacts of that growth and high costs in dealing with it.

Member Colbert further commented that some people who are opposed to any system, even if you could prove choice would lead to better education for students - they would still be opposed to it. He feels that parents are best to choose what is best for their children. This offers parents who are disenfranchised or economically challenged to give them special opportunities for meeting their child's needs.

Member Gary Swensen asked that Carol Lear give us the constitutionality of this bill.

Carol Lear responded that the Attorney General has not taken a position on it. The bill has a notation on it that states "based on a limited legal review, this legislation has not been determined to have a high probability of being held unconstitutional." She reported that she has not done an in-depth analysis. However, some of her concerns about its constitutionality is that the money is from the General Fund. In deference to another part of the Constitution that says that the public schools are to be managed by the State Board of Education, the State Board is managing this program. This poses two problems: (1) You can't spend Uniform School Fund money to manage the program because the amount of money in it is not adequate. If it is General Fund money there is no need to have the State Board manage it because it puts the program outside the public school system. (2) This restrictive or reserve account money would go into something other than the Uniform School Fund and the State Constitution is very clear indicating that the Uniform School Fund money will fund public schools. Florida is only one state that has declared vouchers unconstitutional,

there are several others. The Florida court relied heavily on using its own states language to say that if it says Uniform School Fund money fund public education then that is what is supposed to fund public education.

Member Greg Haws commented that he did not feel that compromise is inherently evil, but if the Board supports this bill it will be a headline in the paper. When we were talking about Representative Dee's bill he suggested the Board take no position on it. He does not feel the Board should take a position on this bill. The legislature wants to give money to private schools because they feel like it is important, then let them do that - don't trouble us with it. We are not in the business of running the private schools. He encouraged the Board to rethink this and take no position and send the message that this is not our issue. He agreed with what has been said relative to parents having the choice.

Substitute motion was made by Member Greg W. Haws and seconded by Member Edward A. Dalton to take no position on this bill.

Motion failed with Members Allen, Cluff, Colbert, Dalton, Haws, and Swensen voting in favor; Members Brown, Burningham, Cannon and Theurer opposed; Member Sadler abstained indicating he felt the Board needed to take a position on this because it is crucial to public education.

Substitute motion was made by Member Richard Sadler and seconded by Chairman Kim R. Burningham to oppose the bill. Motion failed with Members Brown, Burningham, Cannon, Dalton, Sadler, Swensen and Theurer voting in favor; Members Cluff, Colbert, Gregory and Haws opposed; Members Allen, Beagley and Mackey absent.

Motion to support offered by Member Cluff failed with Members Cluff, Colbert, Gregory, Haws and Swensen voting in favor; Members Brown, Burningham, Cannon, Dalton, Sadler and Theurer opposed; Members Allen, Beagley and Mackey absent.

HB 351 - Carson Smith Scholarship Program Amendments

Motion was made by Member Bill Colbert and seconded by Member Mark Cluff to support HB 351.

Superintendent Harrington explained the amendments in the bill that clean up some of the concerns we have had with the previous legislation.

Motion failed with Members Cluff, Colbert, Dalton, Haws, Sadler and Swensen voting in favor; Members Brown, Burningham and Theurer opposed; Member Cannon abstained.

SB 196 - Revisions to Redevelopment Agency Provision

Motion was made by Chairman Kim R. Burningham and seconded by Member Mark Cluff to support SB 196 [it was noted that the Board had earlier been polled on this legislation and the poll indicated the Board was in support]. Motion carried with Members Brown, Burningham, Cannon, Cluff, Colbert, Dalton, Haws, Sadler, Swensen and Theurer voting in favor; Members Allen, Beagley, and Mackey absent.

(For complete details of the legislative materials, see General Exhibit No. 9855.)

Motion to adjourn was made by Member Laurel O. Brown and seconded by Member Greg W. Haws to adjourn.

Meeting adjourned at 11:35 a.m.