

MINUTES
SENATE AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

DATE: Tuesday, February 11, 2014

TIME: 8:00 A.M.

PLACE: Lincoln Auditorium

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Bair, Vice Chairman Guthrie, Senators Brackett, Tippetts, Rice, Nonini, Patrick and Ward-Engelking

ABSENT/ EXCUSED: Senator Buckner-Webb

NOTE: The sign-in sheet, testimonies and other related materials will be retained with the minutes in the committee's office until the end of the session and will then be located on file with the minutes in the Legislative Services Library.

CONVENED: **Chairman Bair** called the meeting to order at 8:04 a.m.

MINUTES: The Minutes from January 28, 2014 were presented to the Committee for approval.

MOTION: **Senator Brackett** moved to approve the Minutes from January 28, 2014. **Senator Tippetts** seconded the motion. The motion was carried by **voice vote**.

S 1266 **Chairman Bair** introduced **Benjamin Kelly** representing the Idaho Honey Industry Association, who presented **S 1266**, proposed legislation relating to Bees, Section 22-2510. This proposed legislation would allow for beekeepers, who bring non-Idaho hives into the State for indoor winter storage before moving them to another state, to be exempt from paying fees and taxes. They would still be required to register the hives with the ISDA. Changes to Section 22-2809 would replace the subsection lettering with numbering to be consistent with Section 22-2510.

Mr. Kelly added that Idaho beekeepers play a major role in the pollination of many fruit tree crops in California. Some out-of-state producers feel that the geographical position of Idaho is ideal to winter their bees and store them here, until it is time for pollinating crops on the west coast. With the availability of facilities and the care given by Idaho's beekeepers, these hives can be stored and kept dormant until it is suitable to move them to another state. This gives Idaho beekeepers an opportunity to make additional income during the winter. At their annual meeting, they decided to review and introduce language to clarify the issue of indoor winter storage of bees in Idaho. They are proposing that there be no fees or taxes imposed for the hive storage, but registration is still required to keep the ISDA appraised of these hives. This proposed legislation is the outcome of that meeting. He stood for questions.

MOTION **Senator Patrick** moved to send **S 1266** to the floor with a **do pass** recommendation. **Senator Nonini** seconded the motion. The motion carried by **voice vote**. Senator Nonini will carry the bill on the Senate floor.

S 1268 **Chairman Bair** introduced **Wyatt Prescott**, Executive Vice President of the Idaho Cattle Association (ICA), who presented **S 1268**, proposed legislation that will require mandatory testing for all bulls in Idaho. The ICA is a 100 percent voluntary, member-driven organization that represents cattlemen, who own approximately 1.75 million head of Idaho's 2 million head of beef cattle, which conducts all its business through a member-driven resolution process.

Mr. Prescott said this legislation will amend Title 25, Chapter 2, by adding a new Section 207 (c), that states that all virgin beef bulls not consigned to slaughter or to an approved feed lot within the state of Idaho, shall be tested for trichomoniasis (trich) annually. Currently, state rules allow for trich testing exemption for bulls north of the Salmon River. He said that this legislation would unify trich testing required throughout the State, preventing that exemption.

He further explained that trich is a venereal disease that causes abortion in cattle in the first and second trimester. It can be spread from an infected bull to a cow or from an infected cow to a bull. It spreads very rapidly which can cause damage before it is completely detected. An abortion is devastating for the cow/calf producer, whose primary objective is to produce a new calf. **Mr. Prescott** said that, after three years of intense discussion from the producers on both the north and south sides of the Salmon River, the ICA decided to make trich testing a priority because of the significant threat to the industry. He said their primary reason to have this solidified in statute was that it is a major concern for the viability of the entire cattle producer industry.

He finished by paraphrasing a quote from Dr. Schneider, Department of Animal and Veterinary Science, U of I, who, after reading a study on this topic, commented, "...that while it is not known exactly the percentage or chances of contracting this disease, the study found that once it is contracted and not detected within the first year, there is a 70 percent chance of that producer going out of business..." **Mr. Wyatt** stood for questions.

Senator Tippetts asked if the word "annually" is clearly defined in the rules. He asked if it refers to a calendar year or 12 months from the date of testing. **Mr. Prescott** responded that it is defined in the rules which states that testing is required to be done before a certain date every year.

Senator Nonini said he appreciated the time **Mr. Prescott** has taken to work with him on this matter. He read from an email he received from one of his constituents, which prompted **Senator Nonini** to ask **Mr. Prescott** to explain why the testing would be necessary for the small ranchers who do not use outside bulls on their ranches.

Mr. Prescott stated that, because of the testing exemption up in the northern areas, the prevalence of the disease is unknown at this time. He did acknowledge that there are some smaller producers who are not dependant on livestock production for their primary source of income. There are some producers who require all their cows to come back bred every year to make ends meet. In response to this particular rancher, he emphasized, that even though he is a smaller producer, the potential is still there for his herd to catch trich from a neighboring herd. The biggest concern they have, is that it goes undetected in a herd and then spreads before it is controlled.

Senator Nonini asked what the cost would be for a small producer. **Mr. Prescott** stated that this test can be between \$25 - \$50 per bull. He said that many producers conduct a breeding soundness exam annually to have the bulls tested for fertility and they could do the test at the same time.

Senator Brackett stated that trich testing has been around a long time in southern Idaho, and has been a very successful program due to the education and outreach conducted. He said that Idaho was one of the leaders in this testing program, and he understood that, following Idaho's example, many other bordering states have adopted this testing program as well. He asked about the status of those states. **Mr. Prescott** responded that Washington and Montana's rules are very similar to Idaho's rules. Wyoming has a similar rule that is run county to county, and Oregon is making a push to try and develop a trich task force and make their rules similar to Idaho's.

Senator Brackett commented that northern Idaho could essentially end up being an "island" within the Northwest. **Mr. Prescott** agreed and said that was true, because Washington and Montana are following the same requirements as southern Idaho.

Russ Hendricks representing the members of the Idaho Farm Bureau, whose members, after a full vetting of this issue through their policy process, are in support of **S 1268**. He stood for questions. **Chairman Bair** asked him how the cattlemen from north Idaho responded to this issue. **Mr. Hendricks** said they participated through the process, the issue was fully discussed on the local and state level, there was a little debate against, and a lot of debate for and in the end the policy was adopted.

Chairman Bair introduced **Jared Brackett**, who stood in support of **S 1268**. He next introduced **Nathan Noah**, of Noah's Angus Ranch in Cambridge, Idaho, who said that his family ranch is situated in Washington County, and the proximity puts them in contact with untested bulls. He stated that trich puts them at financial risk, as well as the other cow-calf operators in the State. He and his family are in support of **S 1268**. He stood for questions.

Chairman Bair introduced Julie Kerner from Weiser, Idaho. **Ms. Kerner** and her husband own of a diversified cattle and a custom feeding operation in Washington County. She is serving as president of the Weiser River Cattle Association, whose members are in support **S 1268**. She said the affect of trich on the local companies that do business with the cattle industry can be devastating if a rancher goes out of business. She said rural businesses are dependent on them for their livelihood. She stood for questions.

MOTION

Senator Brackett moved to send **S 1268** to the floor with a **do pass** recommendation. **Senator Ward-Engelking** seconded the motion. The motion carried by **voice vote**. Senator Brackett will carry the bill on the Senate floor.

S 1337

Chairman Bair introduced **Senator Patrick**, who introduced **S 1337**, proposed legislation relating to agricultural security, which is intended to stop the intentional interference of farming operations, to protect dairies, farms, and ranches from wrongful entry and criminal trespassing; from the theft of records, which he added, has occurred in the seed industry; from obtaining employment by wrongful means; or from taking pictures or recording activities without the owners knowledge or consent (eliminating "staging" an event). He said welcomed all those who came to testify, and to have this bill fully vetted to eliminate any misconceptions. **Senator Patrick** said this proposed legislation also includes definitions, penalty information, as well as a severability clause.

He introduced Dan Steenson, of Sawtooth Law Offices, PLLC, to explain the legal aspects of this bill. **Mr. Steenson** explained that, at the request of the Idaho Dairymen's Association (IDA), he wrote this legislation for the dairy farmer, with the thought of how it could apply to the other agricultural associations, farmers and ranchers he represents. He reiterated that the intent of the bill is to protect Idaho farmers from wrongful interference. He stated that farmers are uniquely vulnerable to interference by wrongful conduct and have the same right to privacy as everyone else, and since the beginning of this process to create this bill, more and more farmers have seen a significant increase in threats.

Mr. Steenson emphasized that "Idaho dairymen have nothing to hide", and are very committed to preventing cruelty to farm animals. They care for their own animals with a sense of moral obligation and know that proper care of their animals, leads to a higher quality and volume of dairy products that feed the world's expanding population. The IDA provides programs for animal care, education and verifiable self-regulation to their members. He stated that, although the State of Idaho protects animals from cruelty through provisions of Title 25, Chapter 35, their authority to investigate animal cruelty is not absolute, and that entry to a farm to investigate animal cruelty requires either a regulatory basis for the inspection, consent or a warrant.

Mr. Steenson said he patterned the bill after the existing statute, Idaho Code §18-7040, Crimes and Punishments, Interference to Agricultural Research, and included language from Idaho Code §21-213, Aeronautics, Chapter 2, State Law for Aeronautics, 21-213, that pertains to the use of drones and the right to privacy and security. Components of the proposed Section 18-7042, Subsection 2 (a), "agricultural production", were taken from Idaho's Right to Farm Act. He said the definition in the proposed Section 18-7042, Subsection 2 (b), "agricultural production facility", was patterned after the "agricultural research facility". He spoke to the concern around the language in this definition, specifically the wording of "...land, whether privately or publicly owned..." , and agreed it was too broad a definition. In order to make the bill appropriate to constitutional concerns and enforcement issues, they modified the language, and Section 1 (d) "Enters an agricultural production facility that is not open to the public and, without the facility owner's express consent or pursuant to judicial process or statutory authorization..." should cover those circumstances where someone might have access to this production facility that is situated on open, public land. There were also changes per the recommendations of Deputy Attorney Brian Kane, as well as his opinion that the bill was constitutional, and did not impinge upon free speech.

Mr. Steenson said, given the breadth of this legislation, the penalty provision was lessened to a misdemeanor, which is the lowest offense under the animal cruelty statutes. The restitution provision refers to an existing code section, which give the judge instructions on how to determine and assess restitution. The severability clause was added to assure that, if any provisions are declared invalid, the remaining portions will not be affected. The emergency clause was added so that this act would be in full effect on and after it's approval. He stood for questions.

Senator Brackett commented that, in his tours of various agricultural facilities, he was required to either wear plastic over his boots or have a foot wash prior to entering the facility. He wondered if Mr. Steenson knew why. **Mr. Steenson** said he was not sure, and wondered if it was to keep your boots clean and from spreading disease. **Senator Brackett** replied that with unauthorized entry in livestock facilities, as well as crop fields, that diseases could be brought in and organisms could be spread around.

Senator Ward-Engelking asked if this bill would prevent an employee from reporting abuse, and if the employee photographs an abuse, does this impact the recording. **Mr. Steenson** replied that while it prohibits filming in the facility, it does not stop an employee from reporting abuse to the proper authorities. If an employer prohibits recording and does not consent to it, then yes, it would be impacted.

Senator Nonini said he saw the video, and the abuse he saw was very alarming. He asked if he had any details on the workers committing the abuse. **Mr. Steenson** replied that he understood them to be workers and not imposters and that their conduct was not condoned or known by the owner of that facility, who then took immediate action. **Bob Naerebout**, Executive Director of the Idaho Dairymen's Association, answered that the five employees responsible were fired after ISDA did their investigation. He said arrest warrants were issued for three of them, one was prosecuted and found guilty.

Chairman Bair introduced **Roger Batt** representing the Idaho Eastern Oregon Seed Association, who is in support **S 1337**. **Mr. Batt** said this bill adds a "much needed" layer of protection for the seed producers against the anti GMO activists seeking to destroy seed crops destined for other countries, steal research documents, or video application of pesticides. There is much concern in their industry, and they have been urged to take security measures against these similar threats. He thanked the Committee for having a hearing on this legislation. He stood for questions.

Chairman Bair introduced **Lisa Kaufmann**, Idaho State Director of the Humane Society of the United States, who spoke in opposition to **S 1337**. She stood for questions.

Chairman Bair introduced **Matt Domiguez**, Public Policy Director, Humane Society of the United States who spoke in opposition to **S 1337** as it jeopardizes food safety, worker's rights, and animal welfare. He stood for questions.

Senator Tippetts said that the language in Section 1 (d) says it is legal to make audio or video recordings pursuant to judicial process or by statutory authorization. He asked who were these investigators working for if they were not working for a law enforcement agency. **Mr. Domiguez** said most of the investigations that expose animal cruelty are not done under the guise of law enforcement, and said the investigator was a legitimate employee of Bettencourt Dairy, who, upon his investigation, turned his video over to Mercy for Animals, an animal welfare protection group. They (typically) work with law enforcement agencies once they have gotten the undercover footage.

Senator Patrick asked who is paying this "professional investigator" who found the abuse at the dairy, and does he get paid only if he finds abuse. **Mr. Domiguez** responded that he could not speak for Mercy for Animals and their practice, he did say that there is no agenda to find abuse by the investigators his organization uses. The only misrepresentation would be the affiliation to an animal welfare group on the job application.

Senator Rice asked how the sites to investigate are selected. **Mr. Domiguez** responded that he does not work on the investigation side, and, for the safety of their employees, he doesn't know how or when they are being done. He did say that the investigations are not targeted. Most of their investigation are at large-scale industrial farms. They have not done any at small or medium size facilities. He said he would take any questions back to his investigation department to get answers.

Senator Rice said he was interested in getting specific criteria on how these investigations were conducted.

Senator Nonini asked if there were any specific incidences in Idaho that his organization is aware of and would consider investigating. **Mr. Domiguez** said he knew of none. He reiterated that the investigation was done by Mercy for Animals, and he is not aware of any investigation taking place at this time.

Senator Patrick asked if he knew how much money Mercy for Animals paid to have this investigation done, and did his organization pay to get a copy of the video. **Mr. Domiguez** said he could not speak to Mercy for Animals, but in his organization, the investigators are not paid by what they find or by the video they provide. The video they acquired was given so that they could make a TV ad and was not paid for.

Chairman Bair asked the Committee to stay until 10:30. He told the audience that any testimonies would be limited to 3 minutes.

Chairman Bair introduced the following people who spoke in support of **S 1337**:

- **Brent Olmstead**, Executive Director of Milk Producers of Idaho. His members do not want to be targeted by these agricultural activists with an agenda. He personally knows Mr. Bettencourt and said that had that employee gone to him regarding this abuse, it would have been handled the same. Abuse is simply not tolerated. It is counterproductive to their business.
- **Sid Freeman**, Canyon County farmer, who is concerned for the safety of his family and employees, and for the economic viability of his operation
- **Elizabeth Criner**, representing the Northwest Food Processors Association (NWFPA), who said this bill will provide appropriate protection for the food processing facilities that may be targeted by activists who could fraudulently gain access to the businesses with the express purpose of causing damage. There are concerns regarding food safety as well.
- **Terry Jones**, a small family farmer from Emmett who is permitted for Concentrated Animal Feeding Operation (CAFO) use. He said his tenant was subjected to a cascade of regulatory complaints and evasive oversight, with complaints about flies, odors, noise, traffic, animal disposal, pollution, disease, waste handling and animal abuse to name a few. He was subjected to dozens of frivolous complaints with the intent to shut his operation down. His CAFO had a payroll of over \$600,000 and generated over \$6 million in revenue. He said it was all gone due to regulatory terrorism.
- **Dan Gilbert**, a dairyman from Eastern Idaho who came to show his support.
- **Lou Magurdio**, a dairyman who spoke about the importance of taking care of his animals that are the economic drivers to his success. He is also a farmer, that struggles with the ever increasing amount of people he needs to farm around.
- **Jared Brackett**, President of the Idaho Cattlemen's Association, said this bill is important legislation that will protect all of Idaho agriculture. Without this, the entire industry is at risk, with property rights jeopardized, and the risk of feed contamination by fraudulent employees with an agenda. The anti-animal agricultural agenda goes to great lengths to misrepresent the industry to the public without sufficient credibility, leading consumers away from their product. Activists have been known to attack retailers and distributors, blackmailing those who continue to use or market a product of a targeted producer.
- **Russ Hendricks**, Idaho Farm Bureau Federation, said it is the duty of the State to provide laws and penalties for those that would intentionally do harm to someone's business or property. He said it was no coincidence that there have been similar laws enacted across the nation. The activities of the activists have been increasing, and have become more aggressive and brazen, even desperate. He said this once cottage industry has become big business and has millions at stake. They create sensational headlines to keep donations flowing in, without ever really addressing any real or imagined problems. This evidence was not immediately turned over to the authorities, but instead was held (sometimes for months) and then turned over to the media, timed for optimum viewing and

opinion of the public. He finished by saying that it's the illusion of problems that pays their salaries.

Senator Rice asked if he knew how long the video was held. **Russ Hendricks** said he did not have that information.

- **Jim Lowe**, Food Producers of Idaho, said he would not repeat the good testimony heard today, but that he would say, that across the spectrum of their membership, they strongly support this bill.
- **Travis Jones**, Executive Director of the Idaho Grain Producers, said his organization does not have any specific policy yet regarding agriculture security, but grain farmers are concerned about this issue and give their support. He said that grain farmers have not experienced the same kind of targeted, deceptive, and malicious acts as the livestock industry and its production facilities. They recognize the threat, however. He said that some farms in other states have been dealing with activists filming on their farms over the GMO issue, even going so far as to destroy them. He stood for questions.

Chairman Bair introduced the following people who spoke in opposition of **S 1337**

- **Marty Durand**, representing the Idaho Building Trades Council, a labor organization in the construction industry, said that this bill would prohibit labor unions from organizing at non-labor job sites, a right protected by federal law. She feels this would stop the whistle-blowers from reporting unsafe working conditions or product defects. She stood for questions.

Senator Rice asked how would this bill prohibit any union organizing activities. **Ms. Durand** said there are union organizers that go on to job sites as employees, to organize a union, and this activity is protected by law. **Senator Rice** asked her to point out the section in the bill that prohibits that activity. **Ms. Durand** said the bill does not specifically say union activity, but could be interpreted as harmful by the employer to allow this activity.

Senator Nonini asked her to point to the part of the bill that references not being allowed to take videos for reasons of safety violations, such as a blocked fire door. **Ms. Durand** referred to Section 1 (d), and said this could be interpreted to include any safety violations.

Senator Nonini asked for Mr. Steenson to provide a response to this question as well, and if he agreed with Ms. Durand, that the bill prohibits reporting safety violations. **Mr. Steenson** replied that it does not prevent reporting any safety violations either to an employer or the authorities. All that is prohibited is the taking of an audio or video recording, without the consent of the owner.

- **Monica Hopkins**, Executive Director of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), said this bill would restrict an employee's right to freedom of speech, with video taping being a form of content restriction. She also said that employees would not report abuses out of fear of potentially committing a crime. She said there are enough laws on the books that deal with these issues which would only further burden the over taxed public defense system. She stood for questions.

Senator Rice asked what the position of the ACLU is on requiring people to have the owner's permission to have video recordings made on their private property and wouldn't this violate the 4th Amendment. **Monica Hopkins** said she would have to consult with her attorneys to get an answer to that question. She said their concern is that even on private property, people have that overriding 1st Amendment right. **Senator Rice** asked for an explanation about a picture being a 1st Amendment expression and what the connection is between saying something and being able to take a picture of something. **Monica Hopkins** said the 1st Amendment was written broadly to cover not only the speech that comes out of mouths, but expressions in various forms (photos, paintings, videos).

- **Julie Hart**, representing the Idaho Press Club, asked for consideration of their three concerns: 1) The "One Party Consent" law regarding recordings, 2) video distribution and the liability, fines or penalties for the reporter or news station that reports on or distributes the video, and 3) and consider author, Upton Sinclair's book, "The Jungle", and that style of reporting.

Senator Rice asked Ms. Hart to point to the section of the bill about reporters who receive information. **Julie Hart** said in Section 1 (d) as well as Section 3 could be interpreted as such.

- **Courtney Washburn**, representing the Idaho Conservation League, spoke about the bill criminalizing whistle-blowers who may expose environmental regulation violations and deter citizens from making complaints about agricultural operations. She is also concerned with Section 2 (b) regarding public lands. She asked if a person on public land who is photographing the facility on leased public lands be able to be prosecuted.

Senator Patrick said the State owns land in downtown Boise. He said it is highly unlikely that those businesses leasing that property would not allow a person to come in and start filming their operation without permission. He asked for her opinion on that scenario. **Ms. Washburn** responded that she meant federally protected lands, not commercial properties owned by the State.

Vice Chairman Guthrie asked Ms. Washburn if she saw anything in the legislation that would prevent an employee from reporting an inappropriate activity to the proper authorities. **Ms. Washburn** said that she believed that this was covered in previous testimony.

- **Ron Bright**, a concerned citizen, spoke to the dairy practices that have continual 24/7 production, and that an owner should want to monitor their own farms to make sure proper practices and procedures are being met. He feels this bill does not look after the welfare of the cattle.
- **Peter Brockett**, a concerned citizen, said the video recording from the Bettencourt Dairy proves that these types of investigations are necessary to stop the abuse. He said that he heard that the "ag gag" bill in Utah has been challenged and on the 1st and 14th Amendment and other grounds, and is in court right now. He thinks Idaho should wait for the outcome of this lawsuit to determine the constitutionality of the bill.
- **D. Monsees**, a concerned citizen, whose main concern involves protection for whistle-blowers.
- **Sue Brooks**, a concerned citizen, said the bill was redundant and Idaho already has similar laws. Animals need to be protected.

Chairman Bair introduced **Bob Naerebout**, Executive Director of the Idaho Dairymen's Association, who said that a good part of his talk had been covered by other testimonies, but that he wanted to address a question Senator Rice had asked. He said the employee that was working for Mercy for Animals, started his employment at the Bettencourt Dairy on July 29, 2012, and worked there until August 17, 2012, when he was pulled off the dairy. They thought "he was compromised", which **Mr. Naerebout** said was an exact quote. It's his belief that this investigator was hired by Mercy for Animals, and was not a freelance job when he started at the dairy. Mercy for Animals gave the ISDA notice on August 17, 2012. They all had a meeting on the following Monday, August 20, 2012, and on Tuesday, Mr. Bettencourt, accompanied by Mr. Naerebout, was shown the video. By Friday, August 24, 2012, ISDA did a thorough investigation, and within a week, they issued three arrest warrants. The video was not released to the public until around October 10th or 11th, 2012. The email responses (copies provided to the Committee), started coming in to Mr. Bettencourt around the 12th of October.

Mr. Naerebout said the board members were well aware of the public's reaction to this proposed legislation. This legislation is not redundant, is not covered under any of the other laws but "adds strength and adds teeth" to the current laws. Currently, the ISDA does about four inspections annually at the dairies, and he spoke of an incident where the inspector reported the owner, who ended up serving jail time, all without any video. The ISDA also provides a hotline for reporting issues, either animal cruelty or environmental issues. **Mr. Naerebout** said he has made three complaints himself, some actually initiated by fellow dairymen who contacted him. He reiterated that the system "does work" and is already in place. This will provide protection from those activists who have an agenda.

Mr. Naerebout called attention to the barrage of threatening emails, and pointed out one where they received an apology, and another where a contractor working at the dairy said it was a set-up by the activist group. There were also threatening letters to a cheese processor. In closing, he pointed out the letter from Mr. Bettencourt, who was warned about being made the poster child, but stated that the risk was worth it, if he could protect others from what he has had to endure.

Chairman Bair introduced **Senator Patrick** who stated he was pleased with the meeting and discussion. He talked about undercover investigators with these videos, and the fact that farmers are being persecuted, tried and prosecuted in the press. There needs to be due process with the right to prove if the video is accurate. He said this bill is not just for the dairymen, but will provide security for all agricultural industries by protecting crops, animals, and proprietary information.

Senator Tippetts asked that the minutes reflect his declaration of a potential conflict of interest, as his current employer manufactures commercial fertilizers.

MOTION

Senator Rice moved to send **S 1337** to the floor with a **do pass** recommendation. **Senator Tippetts** seconded the motion.

Senator Nonini said their questions were adequately answered and he will be supporting **S 1337**.

Senator Ward-Engelking supports the intent of the bill and is equally worried about activists that have an agenda, but said the bill was too broad.

Senator Rice said this was a property issue, that people have the right to privacy, that it is not an infringement on the 1st Amendment for a person to be able to control the actions of people who come onto their property, with or without permission. This is one of the fundamental things that makes America, America. He supports the bill.

Vice Chairman Guthrie said that we need to protect against others that are given authority that exceeds law enforcement or regulatory departments. He is in support of the bill.

The motion carried by **voice vote**

ADJOURNED: **Chairman Bair** adjourned the meeting at 10:45 a.m.

Senator Bair
Chair

Denise McNeil
Secretary