

HB

2410

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
1992 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. CSHB 240 (JUD)

Revision Date: April 20, 1992
Title: Unclaimed Intangible Property
Sponsor: House Labor and Commerce
Requestor: _____

Department Affected: Department of Revenue
BRU: Revenue Operations
Component: Income and Excise Audit

COMPONENT SERIAL NO. | 1 | 1 | 3 |

EXPENDITURES/REVENUES: (Thousands of Dollars)

OPERATING	FY 93	FY 94	FY 95	FY 96	FY 97	FY 98
PERSONAL SERVICES						
TRAVEL						
CONTRACTUAL						
SUPPLIES						
EQUIPMENT						
LANDS & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS						
MISCELLANEOUS						
TOTAL OPERATING	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
CAPITAL						
REVENUE	***	***	***	***	***	***
FUND SOURCE						

FUNDING: (Thousands of Dollars)

GENERAL FUND						
FEDERAL FUNDS						
OTHER						
FUND SOURCE						
TOTAL	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

POSITIONS:

FULL-TIME						
PART-TIME						
TEMPORARY						

Estimate of current year impact: \$0.0

ANALYSIS:

SEE ATTACHED

*** Although the amount of additional revenues which would be generated by this bill is unknown, it is estimated that additional revenues may be up to \$250.0 per year. This bill will only result in additional revenues to Alaska.

Prepared By: Paul Dick Phone: (907) 465-2320
Division: Income and Excise Audit Date: April 20, 1992

Approved by Commissioner: Darrel J. Rexwinkel Date: 4/12/92
Agency: Department of Revenue

Distribution (by preparer): Leg. Fin., Legislative Sponsor, Requestor, CMB/DBR, Gov. Legis. Ofc., & Impacted Agency(ies).

CSHB 240 would add a new section to AS 34.45 pertaining to intangible property subject to the state unclaimed property provisions. Pursuant to the legislation all intangible property held by persons located both within and outside Alaska would be presumed abandoned and deemed to constitute unclaimed property subject to Alaska custody if:

1. the address of the owner is unknown,
2. the owner has not claimed the property within 3 years, and
3. the issuer of the property is this state, a subdivision of this state, or a person incorporated, organized or created in this state.

This section would not apply to property otherwise subject to Alaska custody under another section of the unclaimed property law that provides for a dormancy period different from the three year period established in the bill. The legislation would also apply to property that is considered abandoned prior to the effective date of the act but still in the possession of a holder on the effective date.

The Unclaimed Property Act provisions (AS 34.45) currently cover intangible property. However, in those situations where the address of the owner is unknown, the provisions may only authorize recovery where the holder of the property is domiciled or incorporated in the state. The legislation is intended in part to extend the Unclaimed Property Act to brokerage firms located outside Alaska that hold dividends and interest attributable to securities issued by Alaska or Alaska corporations.

Alaska, along with 37 other states, contends that when the last known address of the owner of unclaimed property is unknown, the property should be subject to the custody of the state from which the security was issued. Delaware asserts the property is subject to the custody of the state of incorporation of the holder. New York asserts the property is subject to the custody of the state of the holder's headquarters. California, the District of Columbia, and the remaining five states assert the property is subject to the custody of the state based on the holder's commercial activity. The dispute is presently before the United States Supreme Court in Delaware v. New York, No. 111 Original, and the legislation is designed to ensure that Alaska will be in a position to recover any property in the event of a favorable decision.

Assuming the favorable decision by the Court, the legislation would bring in additional revenues. However, the department cannot at this time make any reasonable estimate of the extent of those revenues.

STATE OF ALASKA

DEPARTMENT OF LAW

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

February 12, 1992

WALTER J. HICKEL, GOVERNOR

REPLY TO:

1031 W 4th AVENUE SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501-1094
PHONE: (907) 278-3550
FAX: (907) 278-3897

KEY BANK BUILDING
100 CUSHMAN ST. SUITE 400
FAIRBANKS, ALASKA 99701-4873
PHONE: (907) 452-1588
FAX: (907) 458-1317

P.O. BOX K—STATE CAPITOL
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811-0300
PHONE: (907) 485-3800
FAX: (907) 483-5285

The Honorable Drue Pearce
Room 101, Capitol Bldg.
P.O. Box V
Juneau, Alaska 99811

RE: HB 240, An Act relating to
intangible unclaimed property.

Dear Senator Pearce:

House Bill 240 is presently before the Senate Labor & Commerce Committee, having passed the House during the first session. As you may be aware, the bill is designed to ensure that state law conforms to the expected results in *Delaware v. New York*, presently before the United States Supreme Court and in which Alaska has intervened. The case revolves around which state has the right to unclaimed intangible personal property (basically corporate dividends and other money from stock and bond transactions) that is currently in the possession of the State of New York. The Special Master appointed to recommend a decision to the Supreme Court recommended that the property should go to the state where the corporate issuer is domiciled.


Based on the Special Master's report, outside counsel handling the litigation for us has recommended several minor changes to the present language of the bill as passed by the House. Enclosed is a copy of their suggested changes in language and a section-by-section analysis as well as a copy of their letter explaining the necessity for the changes. We have reviewed the suggested changes and conferred with outside counsel. We recommend that the changes be adopted.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me or Gary Amendola at 465-2398.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. COLE
ATTORNEY GENERAL


By: Vincent L. Usera
Assistant Attorney General

VLU:prz
Encs.

FEB 12 1992

STATE OF ALASKA

DEPARTMENT OF LAW

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
February 12, 1992

WALTER J. HICKEL, GOVERNOR

REPLY TO:

1031 W 4th AVENUE SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501-1994
PHONE: (907) 276-3550
FAX: (907) 276-3697

KEY BANK BUILDING
100 CUSHMAN ST. SUITE 400
FAIRBANKS, ALASKA 99701-4679
PHONE: (907) 452-1568
FAX: (907) 456-1317

P.O. BOX K— STATE CAPITOL
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811-0300
PHONE: (907) 465-3600
FAX: (907) 463-5295

The Honorable Drue Pearce
Room 101, Capitol Bldg.
P.O. Box V
Juneau, Alaska 99811

RE: HB 240, An Act relating to
intangible unclaimed property.

Dear Senator Pearce:

House Bill 240 is presently before the Senate Labor & Commerce Committee, having passed the House during the first session. As you may be aware, the bill is designed to ensure that state law conforms to the expected results in *Delaware v. New York*, presently before the United States Supreme Court and in which Alaska has intervened. The case revolves around which state has the right to unclaimed intangible personal property (basically corporate dividends and other money from stock and bond transactions) that is currently in the possession of the State of New York. The Special Master appointed to recommend a decision to the Supreme Court recommended that the property should go to the state where the corporate issuer is domiciled.


Based on the Special Master's report, outside counsel handling the litigation for us has recommended several minor changes to the present language of the bill as passed by the House. Enclosed is a copy of their suggested changes in language and a section-by-section analysis as well as a copy of their letter explaining the necessity for the changes. We have reviewed the suggested changes and conferred with outside counsel. We recommend that the changes be adopted.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me or Gary Amendola at 465-2398.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. COLE
ATTORNEY GENERAL


By: Vincent L. Usera
Assistant Attorney General

VLU:prm
Encs.

7-200 X 6398

Proposed Amendment to Alaska
Unclaimed Property Statute

HOUSE BILL NO. 240

Section 1. AS 34.45 is amended by adding a new section to article 2 to read:

Sec. 34.45.130. INTANGIBLE PROPERTY ORIGINATED OR ISSUED BY THE STATE, A POLITICAL SUBDIVISION OF THE STATE, OR A PERSON INCORPORATED, ORGANIZED, [OR] CREATED OR OTHERWISE LOCATED IN THE STATE. (a) All intangible property, including interest, dividends, and other earnings on the property, less lawful charges, held by a person regardless of the location of the holder, is presumed abandoned and subject to the custody of the state as unclaimed property if

(1) the address of the owner is unknown;

(2) the owner has not claimed the property or corresponded in writing with the holder concerning the property within three years after the date [established] prescribed for payment or delivery by the issuer of the property; and

(3) the person that originated or issued the property is the state, a political subdivision of the state, or a person incorporated, organized, [or] created or otherwise located in the state.

(b) This section does not apply to property that is presumed abandoned and subject to the custody of the state as unclaimed property under another provision of law that establishes a dormancy period different from the dormancy period established by this section.

Section 2. This Act applies to all property held on or after the effective date of this Act regardless of when the property [is] became or becomes presumptively abandoned.

note: Underlined words represent additions to bill; bracketed words represent deletions.

January 8, 1992

Explanation of Proposed Amendment to
Alaska Unclaimed Property Statute
Providing for Recovery of Unclaimed Distributions

1. The Amendment is necessary to permit the State to recover the unclaimed property at issue in Delaware v. New York, No. 111 Original, pending before the United States Supreme Court.

2. Although current State law may cover dividends, interest and other securities distributions at issue in the litigation, it may not permit recovery from out-of-State holders when such holders did not originate (issue) the unclaimed funds and are merely intermediaries.

3. The Amendment is limited to circumstances where there is no last known address of the unclaimed property owner.

4. The Amendment authorizes recovery of owner-unknown unclaimed distributions under whatever test the Supreme Court adopts to define the location of issuers of securities.

5. The Amendment applies only to property and situations not otherwise covered by existing State law.

6. (a) The dormancy period is three years because the New York dormancy period is three years. If this becomes a problem with the legislature, the litigation will not be undermined by modifying the three year dormancy period to conform to the traditional State dormancy period.

(b) In circumstances where the same property would be covered both by existing law and this Amendment, and they have different dormancy periods, existing law controls.

7. The Amendment applies to property held at the date of enactment, irrespective of when the property became abandoned, as well as to property becoming abandoned after enactment. This eliminates dispute by explicitly authorizing the State to recover its share of the funds taken by New York prior to enactment of the Amendment.

January 8, 1992

DICKSTEIN, SHAPIRO & MORIN

2101 L STREET, N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20037

202 785-9700

TELEX: 892608 DSM WSH

FAX: 202 887-0689

VIRGINIA OFFICE
8300 BOONE BOULEVARD
SUITE 800
VIENNA, VIRGINIA 22182
703 847-9180

NEW YORK OFFICE
598 MADISON AVENUE
NEW YORK, N. Y. 10022
212 832-1900

BERNARD NASH
DIRECT DIAL
202 828-2209

RECEIVED

Department of Law

JAN 13 1992
AM 11:23 PM 12:34:56

January 8, 1992

ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
CONFIDENTIAL AND PRIVILEGED

Honorable Charles E. Cole
Attorney General of Alaska
P.O. Box K, State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99811-0300

Re: Delaware v. New York, No. 111 Original:
Amendment to State Unclaimed Property Statute

Dear General Cole:

As you know, we have proposed an amendment to the Alaska unclaimed property statute that is necessary to ensure that Alaska is explicitly authorized to recover the unclaimed property at issue in Delaware v. New York. This amendment was incorporated into House Bill No. 240, which passed the House during last year's legislative session but had not yet been voted upon in the Senate when the session ended. With the 1992 legislative session approaching, and the Special Master's Final Report to the Supreme Court likely to be issued this month, we thought it appropriate to enclose a copy of that bill, redlined to reflect additional language that is needed in light of the recommendations in the Draft Report circulated by the Special Master.

We are concerned that Alaska may not be permitted to recover its share of the funds taken by New York if Alaska's statute is not amended prior to the date of the Supreme Court's decision in this case, which could be as early as June 1992. To date, 18 of our client States have enacted such an amendment (Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah and West Virginia). It has not been rejected by any State legislature.

As described in our previous correspondence with your office, Alaska and forty other States contend that when the last-known address of the owner of unclaimed dividends, interest and other securities distributions is unknown, the property is subject

Honorable Charles E. Cole
January 8, 1992
Page 2

to the custody of the State that issued the underlying security, the State in which a political subdivision issued the underlying security, or the State in which the corporation that issued the underlying security has its "chief (or principal) executive offices." Alternatively, the 41 States contend that the State in which the issuer was incorporated should be entitled to custody of such distributions.

Alaska and forty States reject the contention of Delaware that the property may be claimed by the State of incorporation of the brokerage firm or other intermediary holding the distributions, the contention of New York that it is entitled to keep all of the property at issue because most of the brokerage firms are headquartered in New York and certain intermediaries are incorporated in New York, and the contentions of California, five other States and the District of Columbia that the Supreme Court's prior decisions should be discarded in favor of some contrived "commercial activity" formula.

The Special Master has circulated a Draft Report to the Supreme Court which recommends that, as advocated by the 41 States, the Court should give the State of the issuer priority to custody of owner-unknown unclaimed distributions. The Draft further recommends that the location of the issuer for purposes of implementing that rule be defined as the issuer's "chief (or principal) executive offices." This latter recommendation represents a modification of the existing locational test, which looks to the State of incorporation of the issuer. Although the 41 States did not initially propose that the locational test be modified, they support the Special Master's proposed modification, arguing as a fallback their original position that owner-unknown unclaimed distributions go to the issuer's State of incorporation.

Although Sections 34.45.110, 34.45.120 and 34.45.200 of the Alaska statute cover unclaimed distributions, the statute only explicitly authorizes recovery of owner-unknown unclaimed distributions in circumstances in which the holder of the distributions is domiciled (incorporated) in Alaska. Because our litigation involves brokerage firms and other intermediaries incorporated in Delaware and New York (and therefore not domiciled in Alaska) that are holding the distributions, the Alaska statute needs to be amended to authorize recovery of distributions held by non-domiciliaries of Alaska, provided that the issuer of the underlying security is Alaska, a political subdivision of Alaska, or a corporation headquartered or incorporated (domiciled) in Alaska (depending upon the locational test adopted by the Supreme

Honorable Charles E. Cole
January 8, 1992
Page 3

Court). Section 1(a) of House Bill No. 240 provides this necessary modification. We have redlined the bill to reflect proposed new language that authorizes Alaska's recovery under the modified locational test. We do not know whether it is feasible at this stage of the legislative process for the bill to be revised to incorporate the new language. If it is feasible, we recommend that the bill be so revised.

Section 1(b) of House Bill No. 240 ensures that the amendment applies only to property not otherwise covered by the Alaska statute.

Section 2 of House Bill No. 240 provides that the amendment also applies to property that became abandoned prior to enactment. This provision should eliminate dispute by explicitly authorizing Alaska to recover its share of the funds taken by New York prior to enactment of this amendment. We have redlined this section to indicate proposed new language that makes explicit its application to property that New York already has seized.


As you will also note, the bill shortens the dormancy period for unclaimed property covered by the proposed section to three years. This provision is important because the dormancy period of New York is three years. A longer dormancy period for Alaska would allow New York to retain custody of property it has unlawfully taken for several years after judgment. Although the disparity in dormancy periods would not prevent Alaska from eventually obtaining the unclaimed property, we recommend adoption of the three year dormancy period for ease of administration.

Copies of House Bill No. 240, as redlined, and an explanation of the bill are enclosed for your convenience. We also are providing the material to Patty Smith, Unclaimed Property Administrator, Income & Excise Audit Division, Department of Revenue. Because of the sensitive nature of this amendment to the pending litigation, we would appreciate it if you would try to limit publicity and discussion with other States.

Honorable Charles E. Cole
January 8, 1992
Page 4

Please call me if you have any questions, or if you believe it would be helpful for me to communicate with any of your legislative or other executive branch officials.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Bernard Nash".

Bernard Nash

Enclosures

cc: Gary I. Amendola, Esq.

STATE OF ALASKA

DEPARTMENT OF LAW

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

March 3, 1992

Bill Miles
Legislative Aide
Office of Senator Drue Pearce
Capitol Building, Room 101
Juneau, Alaska 99811

RE: HB 240, An Act relating to
intangible unclaimed property


Dear Mr. Miles:

As you recall, we recently forwarded recommended changes to HB 240 received from our counsel in Washington, D.C. These changes are designed to ensure that Alaska's statutory scheme will allow the state to receive its expected share of unclaimed property now in the custody of New York State. I wanted to alert you to the fact that the Supreme Court of the United States has received and accepted the Report of the Special Master on February 24, 1992. The Court further ordered that exceptions to the report be filed within 45 days and replies be filed within 30 days after that.

If you have any questions, please contact either myself or Gary Amendola at 465-2398 at your convenience.

Sincerely,

CHARLES E. COLE
ATTORNEY GENERAL

By: 

Vincent L. Usera
Assistant Attorney General

VLU/prm

WALTER J. HICKEL, GOVERNOR

REPLY TO:

- 1031 W 4th AVENUE SUITE 200
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501-1994
PHONE: (907) 276-3550
FAX: (907) 276-3697
- KEY BANK BUILDING
100 CUSHMAN ST. SUITE 400
FAIRBANKS, ALASKA 99701-4679
PHONE: (907) 452-1568
FAX: (907) 456-1317
- P.O. BOX K— STATE CAPITOL
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811-0300
PHONE: (907) 465-3600
FAX: (907) 463-5295

FISCAL NOTE

No. 1

Bill Version: HB 240

(H) Publish Date: 4/3/91

STATE OF ALASKA
1991 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Revision Date: _____
Title: An Act relating to Unclaimed
Property
Sponsor: House Labor & Commerce
Requestor: House Labor & Commerce

Department Affected: Department of Revenue
BRU: Revenue Operations
Component: Income and Excise Audit

COMPONENT SERIAL NO. | 1 | 1 | 3 |

EXPENDITURES/REVENUES: (Thousands of Dollars)

OPERATING	FY 92	FY 93	FY 94	FY 95	FY 96	FY 97
PERSONAL SERVICES						
TRAVEL						
CONTRACTUAL						
SUPPLIES						
EQUIPMENT						
LANDS & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS						
MISCELLANEOUS						
TOTAL OPERATING	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
CAPITAL	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
REVENUE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

FUNDING: (Thousands of Dollars)

GENERAL FUND	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
FEDERAL FUNDS						
OTHER						
TOTAL	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

POSITIONS:

FULL-TIME	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
PART-TIME	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TEMPORARY	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Estimate of current year impact: 0.0

ANALYSIS: Attach a separate page for analysis.

SEE ATTACHED

Prepared By: Carl Meyer, Chief of Appeals *Carl Meyer* Phone: (907) 465-2320
Division: Income and Excise Audit Division Date: March 29, 1991

Approved by Commissioner: Lee E. Fisher *Lee E. Fisher*
Agency: Department of Revenue Date: 4-1-91

Distribution (by preparer): Legislative Finance, Legislative Sponsor, Requestor, OMB, & Impacted Agency(ies).

March 29, 1991

HB 240
FISCAL NOTE ANALYSIS
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE

HB 240 would add a new section to AS 34.45 pertaining to intangible property subject to the state unclaimed property provisions. Pursuant to the legislation all intangible property held by persons located both within and outside Alaska would be presumed abandoned and deemed to constitute unclaimed property subject to Alaska custody if:

1. the address of the owner is unknown,
2. the owner has not claimed the property within 3 years, and
3. the issuer of the property is this state, a subdivision of this state, or a person incorporated, organized or created in this state.

This section would not apply to property otherwise subject to Alaska custody under another section of the unclaimed property law that provides for a dormancy period different from the three year period established in the bill. The legislation would also apply to property that is considered abandoned prior to the effective date of the act but still in the possession of a holder on the effective date.

The Unclaimed Property Act provisions (AS 34.45) currently cover intangible property. However, in those situations where the address of the owner is unknown, the provisions may only authorize recovery where the holder of the property is domiciled or incorporated in the state. It is our understanding that the legislation is intended to extend the Unclaimed Property Act to brokerage firms located outside Alaska that hold dividends and interest attributable to securities issued by Alaska or Alaska corporations.

Alaska, along with 37 other states, contends that when the last known address of the owner of unclaimed property is unknown, the property should be subject to the custody of the state from which the security was issued. Delaware asserts the property is subject to the custody of the state of incorporation of the holder. New York asserts the property is subject to the custody of the state of the holder's headquarters. California, the District of Columbia, and the remaining five states assert the property is subject to the custody of the state based on the holder's commercial activity. The dispute is presently before the United States Supreme Court in Delaware v. New York and the legislation is designed to ensure that Alaska will be in a position to recover any property in the event of a favorable decision.

Assuming the favorable decision by the Court, the legislation would bring in additional revenues. However, the department cannot at this time make any reasonable estimate of the extent of those revenues.

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
HOUSE BILL NO. 240

HISTORY IN THE HOUSE

HISTORY IN THE SENATE

1991
3/27 Read first time and referred to:
L&C Jud FIN

4/3 L&C RPT CS() New Title
2 DP 0 DNP 2 NR 0 AM
FN 0 FN Previous FN

4/17 Jud RPT CS(Jud) New Title
4 DP 0 DNP 0 NR 0 AM
FN 0 FN 0 FN Previous FN 0

4/24 Fin waived RPT CS() New Title
DP DNP NR AM
FN 0 FN Previous FN

5/3 Read second time
CS(Jud) Adopted

Amended

5/3 Advanced

5/3 Read third time

Return to second for specific amendment

5/3 PASSED EFD Same ___ or
Yeas 38 Yeas
Nays 0 Nays
Excused 1 Excused
Absent 1 Absent

Intent adopted

Reconsideration
Reconsideration not taken up

PASSED ON RECON. EFD Same ___ or
Yeas Yeas
Nays Nays
Excused Excused
Absent Absent

Intent adopted

5/3 Reported correctly engrossed
Signed by Speaker, to the Senate

Robert Gray
Chief Clerk of the House

1991
5/6 Read first time and referred to:
L&C, JUD

RPT() CS DP NR DNP AM
New Title Same Title Previous FN
FN 0 FN To

RPT() CS DP NR DNP AM
New Title Same Title Previous FN
FN 0 FN To

RPT() CS DP NR DNP AM
New Title Same Title Previous FN
FN 0 FN To

Rules Calendar() CS AM C ner
New Title Same Title Previous FN
FN 0 FN

Read second time

CS Adopted () New Title
Amended Advanced

Read third time

Letter of Intent adopted
Return to second for specific amendment

PASSED EFD Same ___ or
Yeas Yeas
Nays Nays
Excused Excused
Absent Absent

Reconsideration
Reconsideration not taken up

PASSED EFD Same ___ or
Yeas Yeas
Nays Nays
Excused Excused
Absent Absent

Reported correctly engrossed
Signed by President, to the House

Secretary of the Senate

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
HOUSE BILL NO. 240

HISTORY IN THE HOUSE

HISTORY IN THE SENATE

1991
3/27 Read first time and referred to:
L&C Jud FIN

4/3 L&C RPT CS() New Title
2 DP DNP 2 NR AM
FN OFN Previous FN

4/17 Jud RPT CS(Jud) New Title
4 DP DNP NR AM
FN OFN Previous FN

4/24 Fin waived RPT CS() New Title
DP DNP NR AM
FN OFN Previous FN

5/3 Read second time
CS(Jud) Adopted

Amended

5/3 Advanced

5/3 Read third time

Return to second for specific amendment

5/3 PASSED EFD Same ___ or
Yeas 38 Yeas
Nays Nays
Excused Excused
Absent 1 Absent

___ Intent adopted

Reconsideration
Reconsideration not taken up

PASSED ON RECON. EFD Same ___ or
Yeas Yeas
Nays Nays
Excused Excused
Absent Absent

___ Intent adopted

5/3 Reported correctly engrossed
Signed by Speaker, to the Senate

Robert Gray
Chief Clerk of the House

1991
5/6 Read first time and referred to:
L&C, Jud

RPT() CS DP NR DNP AM
New Title Same Title Previous FN
FN OFN To

RPT() CS DP NR DNP AM
New Title Same Title Previous FN
FN OFN To

RPT() CS DP NR DNP AM
New Title Same Title Previous FN
FN OFN To

Rules Calendar() CS AM Other
New Title Same Title Previous FN
FN OFN

Read second time

___ CS Adopted () ___ New Title
___ Amended ___ Advanced

Read third time

___ Letter of Intent adopted
___ Return to second for specific amendment

PASSED EFD Same ___ or
Yeas Yeas
Nays Nays
Excused Excused
Absent Absent

Reconsideration
Reconsideration not taken up

PASSED EFD Same ___ or
Yeas Yeas
Nays Nays
Excused Excused
Absent Absent

Reported correctly engrossed
Signed by President, to the House

___ Secretary of the Senate