

3-25-82

H B 6 4 2

S B 7 7 1

S B 6 1 1

HOUSE LABOR & COMMERCE
STANDING COMMITTEE
March 25, 1982
1:10 p.m.

Members Present: Rep. Martin, Chairman
Rep. Bylsma, Vice Chairman
Rep. Randolph
Rep. Rogers

Members Absent: Rep. Gardiner

COMMITTEE CALENDAR

SB 611 An Act revising the criminal penalties for unlawful operation of an aircraft.

SB 771 An Act exempting restaurants, grocery stores, and established fish markets from the labor bond required of fish processors and primary fish buyers; and providing for an effective date.

HB 642 An Act establishing the Alaska natural resource trust; and providing for an effective date.

WITNESS REGISTER

Senator Eliason
Alaska State Legislature
Pouch V
Juneau, Alaska 99811
465-4916
Position Statement: Prime sponsor of SB 771.

Judy Knight
Special Assistant
Department of Labor
Box 1149
Juneau, Alaska 99811
465-2700
Position Statement: Supported SB 771.

Beth Robinson
Administrative Assistant to Rep. Sutcliffe
Pouch V
Juneau, Alaska 99811
465-4940
Position Statement: Supported SB 771.

Roger Painter

United Fishermen of Alaska
no address or phone given
Juneau, Alaska
Position Statement: Supported SB 771.

Don Magnusson
Alaska Retail Association
310 2nd
Juneau, Alaska 99811
586-6706
Position Statement: Supported SB 771.

Jim Lear
LAA Legal Services
Pouch Y
Juneau, Alaska 99811
465-2450
Position Statement: Commented of constitutionality of HB 642.

PREVIOUS ACTION

SB 611 Senate Action: First reading 1/11/82.
Reported from Labor & Commerce 2/9/82.
Reported from Judiciary 2/25/82. Reported
from Rules 3/1/82. Taken up immediately;
went into second reading 3/1/82. Advanced
to third reading by unanimous consent.
Passed third reading 3/1/82.

House Action: First reading 3/1/82. Labor
& Commerce Committee referral added 3/5/82.

Statutory Reference: AS 02.30.040; AS
03.35.120

Action Taken: No action taken. Bill
scheduled for further hearing on 4/14/82.

SB 771 Senate Action: First reading 2/16/82.
Reported from Labor & Commerce 3/11/82.
Reported from Rules 3/12/82. Taken up
immediately; advanced to second reading
3/12/82. Labor & Commerce Committee
Substitute adopted by unanimous consent.
Amendment adopted by unanimous consent.
Advanced to third reading by unanimous
consent. Passed third reading with
effective date vote same as passage on
3/12/82.

House Action: First reading 3/15/82.
Assigned to Labor & Commerce committee.

- Rep. Sutcliffe, referred to HB 744, which is a similar bill. She said they support SB 771. Regarding the cash buyer situation, she gave an example of a situation that could be harmful to a fisherman.
- Number 177 Roger Painter, United Fisherman of Alaska, supported the bill. He said it will make it easier to have a small scale market for fresh fish, and will also promote seafood consumption in Alaska.
- Number 229 Rep. Rogers asked clarification of primary fish buyer. There was discussion.
- Number 266 Don Magnusson, Alaska Retail Association, totally supported the bill. He said it would make the purchase and sale of raw fish much simpler.
- Number 286 Rep. Randolph moved that CSSB 771 (L&C) am be reported out of committee by unanimous consent. There being no objection, the motion passed.
- Number 302 The chairman brought HB 611 before the committee.
- Number 305 Rep. Rogers explained why the bill was introduced. He said most pilots are unaware there are any state laws regarding aviation except for the emergency provisions law. He said the laws are so closely related to federal laws that they are difficult to legislate.
- Number 355 Rep. Martin said he wished to better publicize the bill and bring it back before the committee. He said interested parties would be contacted, and the bill scheduled for rehearing on April 14.
- Number 384 Rep. Rogers went over other portions of the statute which he feels need changes, for instance, references to airmen rather than pilots. He said he would draft proposed amendments in advance of the next hearing. Rep. Martin asked that John Hartle, administrative assistant to Rep. Rogers, work with Kent Woodman of AOPA and Alaska Airmen's Association, on the bill.
- Number 413 HB 642 was brought before the committee. Rep. Randolph, prime sponsor of the bill,

explained the intent of the bill and how the trust would work.

Number 482

Rep. Rogers said he does not completely agree with the findings, but supported it for purposes of expediting the bill.

Number 490

Rep. Martin had questions about resolution and about the fiscal note. Rep. Rogers suggested putting a one-year delay on the effective date.

Number 511

There was discussion of the state's tax structure and how state government could continue if the trust went into effect. Rep. Randolph said the money would come from royalty revenues and bonus sales, not from taxes.

Number 552

Rep. Rogers explained the affect of the fund: decreasing people in state assistance programs, and reducing the need for capital projects funding.

Number 586

Rep. Bylsma said it would amount to people being forced to again pay income taxes. Rep. Randolph felt those wanting services should pay for them. He explained alternatives to income tax. Rep. Bylsma said people would flock to the state. Rep. Rogers said if they weren't residents at the time of enactment, they could not receive benefits of the trust until there was another source of funding of the trust. Rep. Bylsma reiterated that people would move here for the money. Rep. Randolph agreed, but said our social programs draw in just as many. Rep. Rogers disagreed, saying the biggest increase in migration is for the number of jobs created by capital projects, high paid state jobs, and subsidized loan programs.

Number 716

Jim Lear, LAA Legal Services, said the bill was drafted by Tom Sofo, who said the bill was used as a "vehicle", so Lear felt changes may be needed. He said the bill has constitutional problems. He felt that restricting benefits to people who are residents on a date certain and denying those who become residents after that was unconstitutional.

Side B, Number 008

Rep. Rogers disagreed with Lear, as the

state would be distributing an asset. He said this does not create a class of people. Lear said resources provide the funds on an ongoing basis, now and in the future, so future residents would be deprived.

Number 026

Rep. Randolph said he had spoken with several attorneys, and he is certain there are ways to get around this. He said that if there weren't, the past homesteading laws of the entire country would be invalid. He said this bill would give a share, just as though it were a piece of land, which would belong to the people, and the income derived from the share would also belong to them.

Number 046

Rep. Rogers felt the "public purpose" was an even bigger issue. He explained his position about how the issue should be addressed. There was discussion.

Number 104

Rep. Randolph felt these constitutional issues should be looked at by the Judiciary Committee.

Number 106

Rep. Randolph moved to pass HB 642 to the next committee of referral. On the question: for--Randolph, Rogers; opposed--Bylsma, Martin. Motion failed.

Number 118

There being no further business to come before the committee, the meeting was adjourned at 2:06 p.m.



AIRCRAFT
OWNERS
AND
PILOTS
ASSOCIATION

THE HONORABLE RAMONA L. BARNES
Chairperson, House Judiciary Committee
The Capitol Building, Room 122
Pouch V, Juneau, Alaska 99811

Atten: Mr Dave Stancliff

064-22

Dear Dave,

05 March 1982

This letter, with attachments, will confirm our several conversations, and provide the input to SB 611 from both the Alaska Airmen's Association (the largest general aviation organization in the State of Alaska, representing the interests of over 12,500 pilots) and the AOPA (the largest general aviation organization in the world).

We were alarmed by press reports of some of the impact of SB 611 on certain Alaskan flying operations, and this caused the research. First let me tell you that that research into Title 2 of Alaska Statutes was an eye-opener for me, a pilot in Alaska for over 20 years! Virtually every pilot I have spoken to had absolutely no knowledge of Alaskan flying regulations with the exception of 02.35.110; Emergency rations and equipment.

As it turns out, the Associated Press coverage of the intent and effects of the bill were incorrect, but we completed our researches in any event, with the idea of allowing this opportunity to present a complete review of the Statute and to update and fix it all in one shot. Attached to this letter are two documents:

- a. A proposed amendment to SB 611, containing all the "repairs" we feel are required to update.
- b. A description sheet providing all the rationale and references for each of the proposed changes.

Thank you so much for the opportunity of visiting with you on the bill. It would be our pleasure to participate in teleconference, in-person testimony on the bill and/or subcommittee efforts to complete proper language for a substitute. Please be advised that we feel strongly enough about these provisions to lobby as required, and this is not casual input. After you have reviewed the materials herein, please comment on the timing and appropriateness of releasing it to the Senate sponsors so that they may be ready for joint committee. We intend to go public with the positions as required.

KENT LEE WOODMAN
Regional Representative

Box 2386 STAR RFD
Anch. AK 92507

encl: Amended SB 611
Data sheets

cy to: Alaska Airmen's Association
Alaska Air Carriers Association

IN THE SENATE

BY RAY AND DANKWORTH

HOUSE COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE

FOR

SENATE BILL NO. 611

IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

TWELFTH LEGISLATURE - SECOND SESSION

BILL

For an Act entitled: "An Act revising the criminal penalties for unlawful operation of an aircraft."

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

* Section 1. STATEMENT OF INTENT CONCERNING CHAPTERS 30 & 35 OF TITLE 2, ALASKA STATUTES. It is recognized by the Legislature, that from time to time certain Statutes require revision in order that they comply with Federal provisions, state of the art and public concern and safety. For these reasons, the intent of the Legislature in this bill is to make those revisions to the two above noted Chapters of Alaska Statutes which will at once cause them to operate in concert with applicable Federal Aviation Regulations, actual operating characteristics of the aircraft and aircrews involved, and to focus attention on the several areas of violation which the Legislature perceives as areas of major public concern. The Legislature recognizes that Air Commerce is an invaluable portion of the activities of the State, but that safety and operations of those aircraft so involved are such that without a high degree of professionalism and carefully prepared and enforced controls, the public is hopelessly at the mercy of the various operators. Therefore the following provisions are hereby enacted to provide workable statutes which do not provide duplication of penalties without genuine purpose.

* Section 2 AS 02.30.010 is repealed effective June 1, 1982 and will hereinafter be referred to the applicable Federal Aviation Regulation in accordance with AS 02.35.010.

* Section 3. AS 02.30.030 (a) is repealed effective June 1, 1982 and will hereinafter be referred to the applicable Federal Aviation Regulation in accordance with AS 02.35.010.

* Section 4. AS 02.30.030 (b) is amended to read:

Sec. 02.30.010 (a) No person may operate an aircraft occupied by a crew member [or passenger] who is obviously under the influence of intoxicating intoxicating liquor or [habit-forming] drugs.

* Section 5. AS 02.30.030 (c) is repealed effective June 1, 1982 and will hereinafter be referred to the applicable Federal Aviation Regulation in accordance with AS 02.35.010.

* Section 6. AS 02.30.030 (d) is repealed effective June 1, 1982 and will hereinafter be referred to the applicable Federal Aviation Regulation in accordance with AS 02.35.010.

* Section 7. AS 02.30.040 is repealed and reenacted to read:

Sec. 02.30.020. PENALTIES A person violating AS 02.30.010 shall be guilty of a class B misdemeanor.

* Section 8. AS 02.35.010 is amended to read:

Sec. 02.35.010. Federal law followed. It is declared that the policy, principals, and practices established by the United States Air Commerce Act of 1958 [1926], and all amendments to it are adopted and extended and made applicable to cover all air traffic in this state, so far as not covered by federal law.

* Section 9. AS 02.35.020 is repealed effective June 1, 1982 and will hereinafter be referred to the applicable Federal Aviation Regulation in accordance with AS 02.35.010.

* Section 10. AS 02.35.030 is repealed effective June 1, 1982 and will hereinafter be referred to the applicable Federal Aviation Regulation in accordance with AS 02.35.010.

* Section 11. AS 02.35.040 is repealed effective June 1, 1982 and will hereinafter be referred to the applicable Federal Aviation Regulation in accordance with AS 02.35.010.

* Section 12. AS 02.35.050 is repealed effective June 1, 1982 and will hereinafter be referred to the applicable Federal Aviation Regulation in accordance with AS 02.35.010.

* Section 13. AS 02.35.060 is repealed effective June 1, 1982 and will hereinafter be referred to the applicable Federal Aviation Regulation in accordance with AS 02.35.010.

* Section 14. AS 02.35.070 is repealed effective June 1, 1982 and will hereinafter be referred to the applicable Federal Aviation Regulation in accordance with AS 02.35.010.

* Section 15. AS 02.35.080 is repealed effective June 1, 1982 and will hereinafter be referred to the applicable Federal Aviation Regulation in accordance with AS 02.35.010.

* Section 16. AS 02.35.090 is repealed effective June 1, 1982 and will hereinafter be referred to the applicable Federal Aviation Regulation in accordance with AS 02.35.010.

* Section 17. AS 02.35.100 is repealed effective June 1, 1982 and will hereinafter be referred to the applicable Federal Aviation Regulation in accordance with AS 02.35.010.

* Section 17. AS 02.35.110 is amended to read:

Sec. 02.35.020. Emergency rations and equipment. (a) No airman may make a flight inside the State with an aircraft unless emergency equipment is carried as follows:

(1) The minimum equipment to be carried during the summer months is as follows:

(A) food for each occupant sufficient to sustain life for two weeks;

(B) one axe or hatchet;

(C) One first aid kit with capacity for each passenger and crew-member carried, as stated by the kit manufacturer;

(D) one pistol, revolver, shotgun or rifle, and ammunition for same in the following minimum quantities: pistol or revolver: 50 rounds
shotgun or rifle: 20 rounds;

(E) one small gill net, and an assortment of tackle such as hooks, flies, lines, sinkers etc.;

(F) one knife with a blade at least 5" long;

(G) [two small boxes of matches] two waterproof containers of matches each containing at least 25 matches, or equal;

(H) one mosquito headnet for each occupant;

(I) [~~two~~] four small signaling devices [~~such as~~] to include 2 colored smoke bombs, [railroad fuses] and 2 colored rocket or flare devices or Very pistol shells, in sealed metal containers, accompanied by the appropriate pistol or launching device.

(2) In addition to the above, the following must be carried as minimum equipment from October 15 to April 1 of each year:

(A) one pair of snowshoes or one pair of cross country skis with proper bindings, poles and boots;

(B) one sleeping bag;

(C) one wool blanket for each occupant over four years of age, for whom a sleeping bag is not provided;

(b) However, operators of multi-engine aircraft licensed to carry more than 15 passengers need carry only the food, mosquito nets and signalling equipment at all times other than the period from October 15 to April 1 of each year, when two sleeping bags, and one blanket for every two passengers shall be carried. All of the above requirements as to emergency rations and equipment are considered to be minimum requirements which are to remain in full force and effect, except as further safety measures may be from time to time imposed by the department, in the form of published regulations.

* Section 18. AS 02.35.115 is repealed effective June 1, 1982 and will hereinafter be referred to the applicable Federal Aviation Regulation in accordance with AS 02.35.010.

* Section 19. AS 02.35.120 is repealed and reenacted to read:

Sec. 02.35.030. Penalties for violation of this chapter. A person who violates a provision of this chapter shall be guilty of a class B misdemeanor.

* Section 20. AS 02.35.130 is repealed effective June 1, 1982 and will hereinafter be referred to the applicable Federal Aviation Regulation in accordance with AS 02.35.010.

* Section 21. AS 02.35.140 is amended by changing its identification to AS 02.35.040.

* Section 22. AS 02.35.150 is amended by adding a second paragraph to read:

AS 02.35.050 (b) "AIRCRAFT" is defined in this chapter means a device that is used or intended to be used for flight in the air, and includes helicopters, gyrocopters, airplanes, sailplanes and gliders.

RATIONALE' AND EXPLANATION

SEC. 02.30.010. Two-way radios required.

Inasmuch as this section refers to "Commercial" aircraft operations with passengers, the applicable portions of the FAR's are found in Part 135. We note that those commercial operations that do not carry passengers, are not covered in the present language, thus allowing training flights with crew or ferry flights in uncontrolled airspace, and we feel that this is correct and needs no attention.

Part 135.157, however, provides that:

(a) No person may operate, under VFR, an aircraft carrying passengers at night, in a control zone or, except as provided in paragraph (c) of this section, over-the-top unless that aircraft has two-way radio communications equipment able, at least in flight, to transmit to, and receive from, ground facilities 25 miles away.

This part goes on with additional, similar language for other conditions, as shown in parts (b) and (c), but they are redundant for these purposes.

RATIONALE': The FAR is much more comprehensive and far better wording. The State statute is vague and sloppy. As one simple example, almost no aircraft radio will work 50 miles on the ground, and no other provision is allowed in the State language. Inasmuch as Sec. 02.35.010 Specifically adopts all the FAR's for State compliance, there is no need to lay this additional one on and attempt to enforce it.

Finally, the effect of SB 611, as written, would add CRIMINAL penalties to what is basically a technical equipment area of concern. As a practical matter, all part 121 (airline) aircraft always comply. Additionally, it would be a rare situation to find a part 135 (air-taxi/Charter) operator without at least one such aircraft radio; they often have 2 or more!

SEC. 02.30.030. (a) Reckless operation.

This section is also found, almost verbatim in several FAR's, and is redundant.

Part 91.8, provides:

No person may assault, threaten, intimidate, or interfere with a crewmember in the performance of the crewmember's duties aboard an aircraft being operated.

Part 91.9, provides:

No person may operate an aircraft in a careless or reckless manner so as to endanger the life or property of another.

RATIONALE': The FAR's more than adequately cover the problem and provide penalties for violation. Inasmuch as Sec. 02.35.010 Specifically adopts all the FAR's for State compliance, there is no need to lay this additional one on and attempt to enforce it.

If the desire is to provide stiffer penalties, then this may be accomplished by simply making reference to the specific FAR and provide Class A or B misdemeanor status.

Sec. 02.30.030 (b) (liquor or drugs)

The Alaska Airmen's Association and AOPA both heartily agree that aircrew members who violate this or parallel FAR's are a serious threat to public safety and are a discredit to an honorable profession. We have no objection to the State tacking on Criminal penalties to his portion.

We do however, have problems with the language of the present section, wherein

"No person may operate an aircraft occupied by a crew member --"

Part 91.11, provides:

(a) No person may act as a crewmember of a civil aircraft-

- (1) Within 8 hours after the consumption of any alcoholic beverage;
- (2) While under the influence of alcohol; or
- (3) While using any drug that effects his faculties in any way contrary to safety.

(b) Except in an emergency, no pilot of a civil aircraft may allow a person who is obviously under the influence of intoxicating liquors or drugs (except a medical patient under proper care) to be carried in that aircraft. (emphasis added)

Part 135.115, provides:

(a) No person may drink any alcoholic beverage aboard an aircraft unless the certificate holder operating the aircraft has served that beverage.

(b) No certificate holder may serve any alcoholic beverage to any person aboard its aircraft if that person appears to be intoxicated.

(c) No certificate holder may allow any person to board any of its aircraft if that person appears to be intoxicated.

(d) Each certificate holder shall, within 5 days after the incident, report to the Administrator the refusal of any person to comply with paragraph (a) of this section, or any disturbance caused by a person who appears to be intoxicated aboard any of its aircraft. (emphasis added)

RATIONALE: Inasmuch as the FAR's are explicit and more comprehensive than the current State statute section, recommend they be the controlling directive; especially in light of Sec. 02.35.010 Specifically adopting the FAR's for State compliance.

We do however, have difficulty in making it a CRIMINAL offence as relates to the passengers. Terms such as "obviously under the influence" also include those suffering a hangover from the previous night, and they do not offer a threat to the Public traveling aboard an aircraft. As a matter of fact, they are docile. Terms such as "appears to be intoxicated" and the like are often used in this context. We submit that rigid enforcement of this portion would, as a practical matter, cut air commerce in this State in half over night.

Recommend that the FAR's be adopted and that the more severe penalty for Air Crew members be adopted on its own.

Sec. 02.30.030 (c) (over water)

This section is more than adequately covered in the FAR's, with little confusion and excellent language:

Part 91.33 (11) provides:

If the aircraft is operated for hire over water and beyond the power-off gliding distance from shore, approved floatation gear readily available to each occupant, and at least one pyrotechnic signaling device. (is required)

Part 91.79 (a) provides:

Except when necessary for takeoff or landing, no person may operate an aircraft lower than the following altitudes:

(a) ANYWHERE. An altitude allowing, if a power unit fails, an emergency landing without undue hazard to persons or property on the surface.

Part 135.167 provides:

No person may operate an aircraft in extended overwater operations unless it carries:

(note: This section is extremely long, and contains all manner of specific relations to rafts, floatation and signalling devices and the like. None of that is required here to make the point that there is no reference to any specific distances from land; only equipment

RATIONALE': To begin with, the current State language, if enforced, would halt approximately 50% of the air commerce in the State immediately. Here are several obvious examples:

1. A single-engine land plane flying from Anchorage to Kodiak. (not uncommon)

To comply with this part, the aircraft would need to fly higher than 25,000 feet! Only those aircraft equipped with both turbochargers and pressurization could possibly comply.

2. A single-engine land plane flying from Anchorage to Juneau or Ketchikan. (not uncommon)

After Yakutat, heading southeasterly, the beach rapidly ends, replaced by beautiful mountains, covered with large trees, ending in rocks and surf. There is no beach; no "landing" is possible. One ditches in the Gulf of Alaska near shore and wades ashore with survival gear.

We feel that the Federal regulations more than adequately cover this contingency, with far better language, in all instances. Inasmuch as Sec. 02.35.010 adopts the FAR's for compliance by the State, it is redundant and confusing to establish still another, poorly worded criteria.

Finally, we feel that enforcement of this regulation is more than adequately covered by the FAA and no CRIMINAL record needs be developed, and no more severe penalties need be applied to this section of the code than is already provided.

Recommend deleting the section.

Sec. 02.30.030 (d) (snow and ice)

This section is more than adequately covered by FAR's:

Part 135.85, provides:

(a) *No pilot may take off an aircraft that has-*

(1) *Frost, snow, or ice adhering to any rotor blade, propeller, windshield, or powerplant installation, or to an airspeed, altimeter, rate of climb, or flight attitude instrument system;*

(2) *Snow or ice adhering to the wings, or stabilizing control surfaces;*
or

(3) *Any frost adhering to the wings, or stabilizing control surfaces, unless that frost has been polished to make it smooth.*

(there are additional sections, but they are redundant for these purposes)

Part 91.209 provides virtually identical text.

RATIONALE': The FAA language is far more comprehensive. Inasmuch as Sec. 02.35.010 adopts the FAR's for State compliance, it is redundant and confusing to establish yet another, less comprehensive and confusing standard.

Finally, we feel that enforcement of this regulation is more than adequately covered by the FAA and no CRIMINAL record needs to be developed, and no more severe penalties need be applied to this section of the code than is already provided.

Recommend deletion of this section.

Sec. 02.35.010 Federal law followed

This is an excellent section, and would and is referred to above and in other sections not herein noted. Unfortunately the United States Air Commerce Act of 1926 has been void since it was replaced with the 1958 edition. Recommend adoption of the current one.

Sec 02.35.040 Registration of Aircraft

This section provides that all the registration and documentation already required by applicable FAR's, and already on file with the FAA in Oklahoma City, and already available to the public upon request, and already printed in a government circular at least semi-annually, also be duplicated and filed with the Department of Transportation and Public Facilities.

We are unaware of any general aviation pilot who is aware of this provision or complies. We are unaware of any attempts by DOTPF to implement this section. We are unaware of any requirement for it. Recommend its deletion as an unnecessary, expensive and duplicating bureaucratic requirement with no valid requirement.

Sec. 02.35.050, Registration of Airmen

See section 02.35.040 above. Recommend deletion of this ineffective portion as well for the same reasons.

Sec. 02.35.060, 070 & 080.

See items above. Recommend deletion of these sections, which provide administrative control of the previous sections.

COMMENT: Inasmuch as these four (4) sections appear to have been in Public Law since 1949, and no attempt to comply has ever been initiated to our certain knowledge, this fact alone attests to the lack of requirement.

Sec. 02.35.090 License and permit to be exhibited on request.

Part 61.3, provides:

(a) No person shall act as pilot in command or in any other capacity as a required pilot flight crew member of a civil aircraft of United States registry unless he has in his personal possession a current pilot certificate issued to him under this part.

(h) Each person who holds a pilot certificate, flight instructor certificate, medical certificate, authorization, or license required by this part shall present it for inspection upon request of the Administrator, an authorized representative of the National Transportation Safety Board, or any Federal, State, or local law enforcement officer.

Part 91.27, provides:

(a) Except as provided in part 91.28 (foreign aircraft), no person may operate a civil aircraft unless it has the following.

(1) An appropriate and current airworthiness certificate. Each U.S. airworthiness certificate used to comply with this subparagraph (except a special flight permit, a copy of the applicable operations specifications issued under 21.197(c) of this chapter, appropriate sections of the air carrier manual required by parts 121 or 127 of this chapter containing that portion of the operations specifications under 21.187(c), or an authorization under 91.45), must have on it the registration number assigned to the aircraft under part 47 of this chapter. However, the airworthiness certificate need not have on it an assigned special identification number before 10 days after that number is first affixed to the aircraft. A revised airworthiness certificate having on it an assigned special identification number, that has been affixed to an aircraft, may only be obtained upon application to an FAA flight standards district office.

(2) a Registration Certificate issued to its owner.

(b) No person may operate a civil aircraft unless the airworthiness certificate required by paragraph (a) of this section or a special flight authorization issued under 91.28 is displayed at the cabin or cockpit

RATIONALE' Obviously the Federal language more than adequately covers the entire situation and others not even dreamt of by State officials. Recommend deleting it and relying on Sec. 02.35.010 for application of the FAR's in Alaska.

Sec. 02.35.100 Temporary permit.

This entire section covers an area expressly preempted by the Federal Government. There simply is no legal way for the State of Alaska to license pilots under any circumstances. This is 100% an FAA matter.

As a practice matter, here is what would happen should there be an earthquake, major fire, flood or other State emergency: The authorized State official on the scene (Civil Defense Director, member of the National Guard etc), invoking whatever emergency authority may be available under other statutes, would notify the pilot/owner of an aircraft that it was required for service to say, send a generator to Bethel, evacuate something, haul medicine or supplies or the like. At that moment, the operator of the aircraft is under control and contract of the State of Alaska, and may operate any aircraft with no licenses at all.

He or she is operating in what is called the PUBLIC SERVICE, much the same as FAA pilots, military pilots, and even State pilots.

Recommend deletion of this entire section.

Sec. 02.35.110 Emergency rations and equipment.

This is an important part of the aviation Safety field in Alaska, and it should remain. There are, however, two (2) items which require updating:

1. Item (2) (A) requires showshoes. We recognize that a pair of cross-country skis, poles and boots are superior to snowshoes for survival travel, and recommend addition of the skis as shown on the attached proposed amended bill.
2. Item (1)(D) requires a firearm and ammunition. While this is an excellent suggestion, there are two (2) problems with the provision:
 - a. In most cases a hand-gun is not a suitable survival weapon. Of far more value would be a lightweight shotgun and a supply of slugs and shot. We will not, however, offer this as an amendment at this time, as we have been counseled that it may be a controversial enough issue to bog down passage of the more important safety items. We urge consideration, however.
 - b. There is no specified amount of ammunition, and one round could qualify. Recommend a minimum amount such as 25 or 50 rounds.

Sec. 02.35.115 Downed aircraft transmitting devices. (ELT's)

Sec. 91.52, provides

(a) Except as provided in paragraphs (e) and (f) of this section, no person may operate a U.S. registered civil airplane unless it meets the applicable requirements of paragraphs (b), (c) and (d) of this section.

(b) To comply with paragraph (a) of this section, each U.S. registered civil airplane must be equipped as follows:

- (1) For operations governed by the supplemental air carrier and commercial operator rules of part 121 of this chapter, or the air travel club rules of part 123 of this chapter, there must be attached to the airplane an automatic type emergency locator transmitter that is in operable condition and meets the applicability requirements of TSC-C91;*

operable condition and meets the applicable requirements of TSO-C91;

(3) For operations governed by Part 135 of this chapter, there must be attached to the airplane an automatic type emergency locator transmitter that is in operable condition and meets the applicable requirements of TSO-C91; and

(4) For operations other than those specified in subparagraphs (1), (2) and (3) of this paragraph, there must be attached to the airplane a personal type or an automatic type emergency locator transmitter that is in operable condition and meets the applicable requirements of TSO-C91.

(Note: there are 2 more pages of technical details that are not required to demonstrate sufficiency here.)

RATIONALE' There is obviously very complete and thorough Federal regulation to cover the installation, maintenance and operation of ELT's in all aircraft operations in this state; commercial and private. This is an area over which the state has no authority whatsoever, and where the state regulations CONFLICT with the appropriate Federal regulations.

Additionally, and as a much more practical matter, one notes that under the FAR's, such ELT is inspected each year during the annual inspection of the aircraft under FAA criteria, and the aircraft is grounded if the ELT is not present, not in proper order or has an expired battery date. There is no such inspection system established or required under State authority.

Recommend that the item be deleted in its entirety and that reference to the FAR's via Sec. 02.35.010 for application in Alaska be sufficient.

Sec. 02.35.120, Penalties for violation of Chapter

This section will be reduced in scope by the actions above. The only requirement for the section remaining in in those areas which the State desires to inflict CRIMINAL penalties on top of Federal penalties. These re reflected in the attached, proposed substitute bill.

Sec. 02.35.130, Penalty for violation of 90 or 110 of this chapter.

Same as above.

Sec. 02.35.150, Definitions

Because of difficulties in interpretation, we suggest that "aircraft" and "airplane" be defined here precisely as they are in FAR's.

AIRCRAFT means: a device that is used or intended to be used for flight in the air, and when used in air traffic control terminology, may include the aircrew. (includes aircraft, helicopters, gyrocopters and all other heavier-than-air equipment, as well as gliders and sail planes)

AIRPLANE means: a device such as above, but not including helicopters or gyrocopters.

GENERAL: Penalties under the FAR's are found in two (?) areas:

Sec. 609: wherein the Administrator has authority to revoke, suspend, or modify certificates. This includes pilot certificates, aircraft certificates and operator certificates. This is considered severe and serious penalty authority, and exceeds anything the State is empowered to do.

Sec. 901; wherein the FAA may impose Civil Penalties. Such penalties are limited in current law to \$1,000 for each violation.

SEC. 02.30.01U. Two-way radios required.

Inasmuch as this section refers to "Commercial" aircraft operations with passengers, the applicable portions of the FAR's are found in Part 135. We note that those commercial operations that do not carry passengers, are not covered in the present language, thus allowing training flights with crew or ferry flights in uncontrolled airspace, and we feel that this is correct and needs no attention.

Part 135.157, however, provides that:

(a) No person may operate, under VFR, an aircraft carrying passengers at night, in a control zone or, except as provided in paragraph (c) of this section, over-the-top unless that aircraft has two-way radio communications equipment able, at least in flight, to transmit to, and receive from, ground facilities 25 miles away.

This part goes on with additional, similar language for other conditions, as shown in parts (b) and (c), but they are redundant for these purposes.

RATIONALE': The FAR is much more comprehensive and far better wording. The State statute is vague and sloppy. As one simple example, almost no aircraft radio will work 50 miles on the ground, and no other provision is allowed in the State language. Inasmuch as Sec. 02.35.010 Specifically adopts all the FAR's for State compliance, there is no need to lay this additional one on and attempt to enforce it.

Finally, the effect of SB 611, as written, would add CRIMINAL penalties to what is basically a technical equipment area of concern. As a practical matter, all part 121 (airline) aircraft always comply. Additionally, it would be a rare situation to find a part 135 (air-taxi/Charter) operator without at least one such aircraft radio; they often have 2 or more!

SEC. 02.30.030. (a) Reckless operation.

This section is also found, almost verbatim in several FAR's, and is redundant.

Part 91.8, provides:

No person may assault, threaten, intimidate, or interfere with a crewmember in the performance of the crewmember's duties aboard an aircraft being operated.

Part 91.9, provides:

No person may operate an aircraft in a careless or reckless manner so as to endanger the life or property of another.

RATIONALE': The FAR's more than adequately cover the problem and provide penalties for violation. Inasmuch as Sec. 02.35.010 Specifically adopts all the FAR's for State compliance, there is no need to lay this additional one on and attempt to enforce it.

If the desire is to provide stiffer penalties, then this may be accomplished by simply making reference to the specific FAR and provide Class A or B misdemeanor status.

Sec. 02.30.030 (b) (liquor or drugs)

The Alaska Airmen's Association and AOPA both heartily agree that aircrew members who violate this or parallel FAR's are a serious threat to public safety and are a discredit to an honorable profession. We have no objection to the State tacking on Criminal penalties to his portion.

We do however, have problems with the language of the present section, wherein

"No person may operate an aircraft occupied by a crew member or passenger who is obviously under the influence of intoxicating liquor or habit-forming drugs." (emphasis added)

(a) No person may act as a crewmember of a civil aircraft-

- (1) Within 8 hours after the consumption of any alcoholic beverage;
- (2) While under the influence of alcohol; or
- (3) While using any drug that effects his faculties in any way contrary to safety.

(b) Except in an emergency, no pilot of a civil aircraft may allow a person who is obviously under the influence of intoxicating liquors or drugs (except a medical patient under proper care) to be carried in that aircraft. (emphasis added)

Part 135.115, provides:

(a) No person may drink any alcoholic beverage aboard an aircraft unless the certificate holder operating the aircraft has served that beverage.

(b) No certificate holder may serve any alcoholic beverage to any person aboard its aircraft if that person appears to be intoxicated.

(c) No certificate holder may allow any person to board any of its aircraft if that person appears to be intoxicated.

(d) Each certificate holder shall, within 5 days after the incident, report to the Administrator the refusal of any person to comply with paragraph (a) of this section, or any disturbance caused by a person who appears to be intoxicated aboard any of its aircraft. (emphasis added)

RATIONALE': Inasmuch as the FAR's are explicit and more comprehensive than the current State statute section, recommend they be the controlling directive; especially in light of Sec. 02.35.010 Specifically adopting the FAR's for State compliance.

We do however, have difficulty in making it a CRIMINAL offence as relates to the passengers. Terms such as "obviously under the influence" also include those suffering a hangover from the previous night, and they do not offer a threat to the Public traveling aboard an aircraft. As a matter of fact, they are docile. Terms such as "appears to be intoxicated" and the like are often used in this context. We submit that rigid enforcement of this portion would, as a practical matter, cut air commerce in this State in half over night.

Recommend that the FAR's be adopted and that the more severe penalty for Air Crew members be adopted on its own.

Sec. 02.30.030 (c) (over water)

This section is more than adequately covered in the FAR's, with little confusion and excellent language:

Part 91.33 (11) provides:

If the aircraft is operated for hire over water and beyond the power-off gliding distance from shore, approved floatation gear readily available to each occupant, and at least one pyrotechnic signaling device. (is required)

Part 91.79 (a) provides:

Except when necessary for takeoff or landing, no person may operate an aircraft lower than the following altitudes:

(a) ANYWHERE. An altitude allowing, if a power unit fails, an emergency landing without undue hazard to persons or property on the surface.

Part 135.167 provides:

No person may operate an aircraft in extended overwater operations unless it carries:

(note: This section is extremely long, and contains all manner of specific relations to rafts, floatation and signalling devices and the like. None of that is required here to make the point that there is no reference to any specific distances from land; only equipment required when flying off shore.)

RATIONALE: To begin with, the current State language, if enforced, would halt approximately 50% of the air commerce in the State immediately. Here are several obvious examples:

1. A single-engine land plane flying from Anchorage to Kodiak. (not uncommon)

To comply with this part, the aircraft would need to fly higher than 25,000 feet! Only those aircraft equipped with both turbochargers and pressurization could possibly comply.

2. A single-engine land plane flying from Anchorage to Juneau or Ketchikan. (not uncommon)

After Yakutat, heading southeasterly, the beach rapidly ends, replaced by beautiful mountains, covered with large trees, ending in rocks and surf. There is no beach; no "landing" is possible. One ditches in the Gulf of Alaska near shore and wades ashore with survival gear.

We feel that the Federal regulations more than adequately cover this contingency, with far better language, in all instances. Inasmuch as Sec. 02.35.010 adopts the FAR's for compliance by the State, it is redundant and confusing to establish still another, poorly worded criteria.

Finally, we feel that enforcement of this regulation is more than adequately covered by the FAA and no CRIMINAL record needs be developed, and no more severe penalties need be applied to this section of the code than is already provided.

Recommend deleting the section.

Sec. 02.30.030 (d) (snow and ice)

This section is more than adequately covered by FAR's:

Part 135.85, provides:

(a) *No pilot may take off an aircraft that has-*

(1) *Frost, snow, or ice adhering to any rotor blade, propeller, windshield, or powerplant installation, or to an airspeed, altimeter, rate of climb, or flight attitude instrument system;*

(2) *Snow or ice adhering to the wings, or stabilizing control surfaces;*
or

(3) *Any frost adhering to the wings, or stabilizing control surfaces, unless that frost has been polished to make it smooth.*

(there are additional sections, but they are redundant for these purposes)

Part 91.209 provides virtually identical text.

RATIONALE: The FAA language is far more comprehensive. Inasmuch as Sec. 02.35.010 adopts the FAR's for State compliance, it is redundant and confusing to establish yet another, less comprehensive and confusing standard.

Finally, we feel that enforcement of this regulation is more than adequately covered by the FAA and no CRIMINAL record needs to be developed, and no more severe penalties need be applied to this section of the code than is already provided.

Recommend deletion of this section.

Sec. 02.35.010 Federal law followed

This is an excellent section, and would and is referred to above and in other sections not herein noted. Unfortunately the United States Air Commerce Act of 1926 has been void since it was replaced with the 1958 edition. Recommend adoption of the current one.

Sec 02.35.040 Registration of Aircraft

This section provides that all the registration and documentation already required by applicable FAR's, and already on file with the FAA in Oklahoma City, and already available to the public upon request, and already printed in a government circular at least semi-annually, also be duplicated and filed with the Department of Transportation and Public Facilities.

We are unaware of any general aviation pilot who is aware of this provision or complies. We are unaware of any attempts by DOTPF to implement this section. We are unaware of any requirement for it. Recommend its deletion as an unnecessary, expensive and duplicating bureaucratic requirement with no valid requirement.

Sec. 02.35.050, Registration of Airmen

See section 02.35.040 above. Recommend deletion of this ineffective portion as well for the same reasons.

Sec. 02.35.060, 070 & 080.

See items above. Recommend deletion of these sections, which provide administrative control of the previous sections.

COMMENT: Inasmuch as these four (4) sections appear to have been in Public Law since 1949, and no attempt to comply has ever been initiated to our certain knowledge, this fact alone attests to the lack of requirement.

Sec. 02.35.090 License and permit to be exhibited on request.

Part 61.3, provides:

(a) *No person shall act as pilot in command or in any other capacity as a required pilot flight crew member of a civil aircraft of United States registry unless he has in his personal possession a current pilot certificate issued to him under this part.*

(h) *Each person who holds a pilot certificate, flight instructor certificate, medical certificate, authorization, or license required by this part shall present it for inspection upon request of the Administrator, an authorized representative of the National Transportation Safety Board, or any Federal, State, or local law enforcement officer.*

Part 91.27, provides:

(a) *Except as provided in part 91.28 (foreign aircraft), no person may operate a civil aircraft unless it has the following.*

(1) *An appropriate and current airworthiness certificate. Each U.S. airworthiness certificate used to comply with this subparagraph (except a special flight permit, a copy of the applicable operations specifications issued under 21.97(c) of this chapter, appropriate sections of the air carrier manual required by parts 121 or 127 of this chapter containing that portion of the operations specifications under 21.187(c), or an authorization under 91.45), must have on it the registration number assigned to the aircraft under part 47 of this chapter. However, the airworthiness certificate need not have on it an assigned special identification number before 10 days after that number is first affixed to the aircraft. A revised airworthiness certificate having on it an assigned special identification number, that has been affixed to an aircraft, may only be obtained upon application to an FAA flight standards district office.*

(2) *a Registration Certificated issued to its owner.*

(b) *No person may operate a civil aircraft unless the airworthiness certificate required by paragraph (a) of this section or a special flight authorization issued under 91.28 is displayed at the cabin or cockpit entrance so that it is legible to passengers or crew.*

RATIONALE Obviously the Federal language more than adequately covers the entire situation and others not even dreamt of by State officials. Recommend deleting it and relying on Sec. 02.35.010 for application of the FAR's in Alaska.

Sec. 02.35.100 Temporary permit.

This entire section covers an area expressly preempted by the Federal Government. There simply is no legal way for the State of Alaska to license pilots under any circumstances. This is 100% an FAA matter.

As a practice matter, here is what would happen should there be an earthquake, major fire, flood or other State emergency: The authorized State official on the scene (Civil Defense Director, member of the National Guard etc), invoking whatever emergency authority may be available under other statutes, would notify the pilot/owner of an aircraft that it was required for service to say, send a generator to Bethel, evacuate something, haul medicine or supplies or the like. At that moment, the operator of the aircraft is under control and contract of the State of Alaska, and may operate any aircraft with no licenses at all.

He or she is operating in what is called the PUBLIC SERVICE, much the same as FAA pilots, military pilots, and even State pilots.

Recommend deletion of this entire section.

Sec. 02.35.110 Emergency rations and equipment.

This is an important part of the aviation Safety field in Alaska, and it should remain. There are, however, two (2) items which require updating:

1. Item (2) (A) requires snowshoes. We recognize that a pair of cross-country skis, poles and boots are superior to snowshoes for survival travel, and recommend addition of the skis as shown on the attached proposed amended bill.

2. Item (1)(D) requires a firearm and ammunition. While this is an excellent suggestion, there are two (2) problems with the provision:

a. In most cases a hand-gun is not a suitable survival weapon. Of far more value would be a lightweight shotgun and a supply of slugs and shot. We will not, however, offer this as an amendment at this time, as we have been counseled that it may be a controversial enough issue to bog down passage of the more important safety items. We urge consideration, however.

b. There is no specified amount of ammunition, and one round could qualify. Recommend a minimum amount such as 25 or 50 rounds.

Sec. 02.35.115 Downed aircraft transmitting devices. (ELT's)

Sec. 91.52, provides

(a) Except as provided in paragraphs (e) and (f) of this section, no person may operate a U.S. registered civil airplane unless it meets the applicable requirements of paragraphs (b), (c) and (d) of this section.

(b) To comply with paragraph (a) of this section, each U.S. registered civil airplane must be equipped as follows:

(1) For operations governed by the supplemental air carrier and commercial operator rules of part 121 of this chapter, or the air travel club rules of part 123 of this chapter, there must be attached to the airplane an automatic type emergency locator transmitter that is in operable condition and meets the applicability requirements of TSC-C91;

(2) For charter flights governed by the domestic and flag air carrier rules of Part 121 of this chapter, there must be attached to the

operable condition and meets the applicable requirements of TSO-C91;

(3) For operations governed by Part 135 of this chapter, there must be attached to the airplane an automatic type emergency locator transmitter that is in operable condition and meets the applicable requirements of TSO-C91; and

(4) For operations other than those specified in subparagraphs (1), (2) and (3) of this paragraph, there must be attached to the airplane a personal type or an automatic type emergency locator transmitter that is in operable condition and meets the applicable requirements of TSO-C91.

(Note: there are 2 more pages of technical details that are not required to demonstrate sufficiency here.)

RATIONALE' There is obviously very complete and thorough Federal regulation to cover the installation, maintenance and operation of ELT's in all aircraft operations in this state; commercial and private. This is an area over which the state has no authority whatsoever, and where the state regulations CONFLICT with the appropriate Federal regulations.

Additionally, and as a much more practical matter, one notes that under the FAR's, such ELT is inspected each year during the annual inspection of the aircraft under FAA criteria, and the aircraft is grounded if the ELT is not present, not in proper order or has an expired battery date. There is no such inspection system established or required under State authority.

Recommend that the item be deleted in its entirety and that reference to the FAR's via Sec. 02.35.010 for application in Alaska be sufficient.

Sec. 02.35.120, Penalties for violation of Chapter

This section will be reduced in scope by the actions above. The only requirement for the section remaining is in those areas which the State desires to inflict CRIMINAL penalties on top of Federal penalties. These are reflected in the attached, proposed substitute bill.

Sec. 02.35.130, Penalty for violation of 90 or 110 of this chapter.

Same as above.

Sec. 02.35.150, Definitions

Because of difficulties in interpretation, we suggest that "aircraft" and "airplane" be defined here precisely as they are in FAR's.

AIRCRAFT means: a device that is used or intended to be used for flight in the air, and when used in air traffic control terminology, may include the aircrew. (includes aircraft, helicopters, gyrocopters and all other heavier-than-air equipment, as well as gliders and sail planes)

AIRPLANE means: a device such as above, but not including helicopters or gyrocopters.

GENERAL: Penalties under the FAR's are found in two (2) areas:

Sec. 609: wherein the Administrator has authority to revoke, suspend, or modify certificates. This includes pilot certificates, aircraft certificates and operator certificates. This is considered severe and serious penalty authority, and exceeds anything the State is empowered to do.

Sec. 901; wherein the FAA may impose Civil Penalties. Such penalties are limited in current law to \$1,000 for each violation.

Absent:
Gardiner

3/25/82

H. Labor & Commerce

Tapo # 46

SB 771 HB 642

SB 611

Senator Eliason

1: 10

000 Call to order

CSSB 771 / Sen. Eliason - effort to strike a blow for uncl. liberties.

006 Went over situations ~~in~~ which this bill wd alleviate.

044 Rogers said he supported bill. ^{other} saw problems with bonding statute, _{buyer} such as being req'd to post a bond when he pays cash.

Discussion.

068 Martin asked why grocery stores were included. Sen Eliason said stores are legit. businesses that have assets, so shd'nt have to post bond.

Discussion.

097 Judy Knight, DOL - dept supports passage of bill, & explained their points

115 Rogers had q's; there was discussion of cash payments & what people shd be included in the law.

143 Martin asked clarification abt f/n

159 Beth Robinson, AT to Sutcliffe; ref'd HB 744, which is similar. Support SB 771. Re cash buyer sit'n, gave example of sit'l that cd be harmful to fisherman.

177 Roger & Paynor, UFA - supported bill; will make easier to have small scale market ~~of~~ for fresh fish; wd also promote seafood consumption in Alaska.

229 Rogers asked clarification of primary fish buyer. Discussion.

266 Don Magnuson, ^{NUSSON} at Retail Assn - totally support bill.

Wd make purchase & sale of raw fish much simpler.

Apr. 14(?)

Jim Fear
legal secs

- 286 Randolph moved SCS SB 771 (29C) can be reported out by unan consent. Mo passed w/o objection.
- 302 ~~Rogers~~ HB 611 was brought before comm.
- 305 Rogers explained why bill was int'd. Rogers said most pilots are unaware there are state laws except the ~~single~~ emergency provisions law. Laws so closely related to federal laws; difficult to legislate.
- 355 Martin said he would better publicize the bill & bring it back before committee. Said to wire people & to schedule bill for 4/14.
- 384 Rogers went over other portions of the statute which he feels need chng, eg ref to airmen rather than pilot. Said he would draft prop'd amdn'ts in advance of next mtg. Martin asked that John Hartle work w/ Woodman on bill.
- 413 HB 642; Randolph explained intent of bill & how trust would work.
- 482 Rogers said he doesn't completely agree w/ findings, but supports it for purposes of expediting bill.
- 490 Martin had got no abt resolution & abt fl/n. Rogers suggested putting 1 yr delay on effective date
- 501 There was discussion of the state's tax structure ^{how state govt. wd continue if} ~~of how~~ whether money for the trust etc went into effect. Randolph said money wd come from royalty revenues & bonus sales, not taxes.

557 Rogers explained effects of the fund - decreasing people in state assistance pgms; need for some capital projects wd be reduced.

586 Bylsma ~~felt~~ said it wd amt to people being forced to again pay income taxes. Randolph felt those wanting services shd pay for them. He explained alternatives to income tax. Bylsma said people wd flock to the state. Rogers said if they weren't residents at the time of enactment, they ^{until there was another source of funds.} could not receive benefits of the trust. Bylsma reiterated that people wd move here for the money. Randolph agreed, but said our social pgms draw just as many. Rogers said biggest increase in migration is # jobs created by capital projects, state jobs, & subsidized loan pgms.

716 ^{Lear} Jim Lehr, LAA Legal Secs - said bill was drafted by Sofo, who said bill was used as "vehicle" so chngs may be needed. Said bill has const'te prov's - restricting benefits to people who are residents on date certain & denying those who become residents after that.

Side B

008 Rogers disagreed as it wd distribute an asset. Doesn't create a class of people. Lehr said resources provide funds on an ongoing basis, now & in the future, so future residents wd be deprived.

026 Randolph spoke w/ sev attys & is certain there are ways
to get around this. If there weren't, the ^{past} homesteading
laws of the entire go country wd be invalid.

This is giving a share, just as though it were a piece
of land; belongs to people & income that share derives
belongs to them.

046 Rogers felt "public purpose" was even bigger issue.

Explained his posn abt how the issue shd be addressed.
Discussion.

104 Randolph felt these constl issues shd be looked
at by judiciary.

106 Rand moved to pass bill to next comm of referral
for - R, R opp'd Byloma, Martin
Motion failed

2:06

118 Adjourned.

LABOR & COMMERCE COMMITTEE
DAILY COMMITTEE HEARING

Date: 3/25/82

Place: _____

<u>Members</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>	<u>Time Arrived</u>	<u>Time Left</u>
Rep. B. Bylsma, V. Chair	_____ ✓	_____	1:10	
Rep. D. Randolph	_____ ✓	_____	1:05	
Rep. B. Rogers	_____ ✓	_____	1:08	
Rep. T. Gardiner	_____	_____ ✓		
Rep. T. Martin, Chair	_____ ✓	_____	1:05	

Subject Matter:

House Bill No. 642 _____

Senate Bill No. 771 611 _____

Special Orders:

RULES

**** ** **
 SB 611 SENATE ACTION
 DATE SEQ PAGE

09:40 3/26/82 PAGE 2 OF 3

LEGISLATIVE ACTION

01/11/82 01 0005
 02/09/82 02 0236
 02/25/82 03 0388
 03/01/82 04 0411

FIRST READING -- COMMITTEE REPORTS

L&C -- DP02. R01

JUD -- DP03

RLS -- OTHER04

TAKEN UP IMMEDIATELY

03/01/82 05 0412
 03/01/82 06 0412
 03/01/82 07 0412
 03/01/82 08 0412

SECOND READING

ADVANCED TO 3RD READING BY UNAN CONSENT

THIRD READING

PASSED BY DIV 17-00-02

**** ** **
 SB 611 HOUSE ACTION
 DATE SEQ PAGE

09:40 3/26/82 PAGE 3 OF 3

LEGISLATIVE ACTION

03/01/81 09 0631
 03/05/82 10 0701

FIRST READING -- COMMITTEE REPORTS

L&C CMTE REFERRAL ADDED

LABOR & COMMERCE

JUDICIARY

RULES

**** ** **

**** ** **

SB 771 SENATE ACTION
DATE SEQ PAGE

02/16/82 01 0299
03/11/82 02 0530
03/12/82 03 0555
03/12/82 04 0559
03/12/82 05 0559
03/12/82 06 0559
03/12/82 07 0559
03/12/82 08 0559
03/12/82 09 0560
03/12/82 10 0560

***** **

SB 771 HOUSE ACTION
DATE SEQ PAGE

03/15/82 11 0793

09:40 3/26/82 PAGE 2 OF 3
LEGISLATIVE ACTION

FIRST READING -- COMMITTEE REPORTS

L&C -- CS05
RLS -- OTHER03

TAKEN UP IMMEDIATELY

SECOND READING

L&C CS ADOPTED BY UNAN CONSENT

AM01 ADOPTED BY UNAN CONSENT

ADVANCED TO 3RD READING BY UNAN CONSENT

THIRD READING

PASSED BY DIV 17-00-03

EFFECTIVE DATE VOTE SAME AS PASSAGE

***** **

09:40 3/26/82 PAGE 3 OF 3
LEGISLATIVE ACTION

FIRST READING -- COMMITTEE REPORTS

LABOR & COMMERCE