

ARIZONA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Fifty-first Legislature – Second Regular Session

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND WATER

Minutes of Meeting
Tuesday, February 11, 2014
House Hearing Room 5 -- 2:00 p.m.

Chairman Barton called the meeting to order at 2:37 p.m. and attendance was noted by the secretary.

Members Present

Mr. Escamilla	Ms. Miranda	Mr. Pratt, Vice-Chairman
Ms. Fann	Mr. Mitchell	Mrs. Barton, Chairman
Mrs. Gabaldón	Mr. Shope	

Members Absent

None

Committee Action

HB2149 - DPA (6-2-0-0)	HB2587 - DPA (6-2-0-0)
HB2523 - DPA (8-0-0-0)	

CONSIDERATION OF BILLS

HB2149 - state parks; SLIF fund distribution - DO PASS AMENDED

Ryan Sullivan, Majority Research Analyst, explained that HB2149 specifies eligible recipients of the State Lake Improvement Fund (SLIF) (Attachment 1). The Fann three-line amendment to HB2149 dated 01/28/14 (Attachment 2) removes the Arizona Game and Fish Commission from the entities eligible to receive funds from the Arizona State Parks Board.

Representative Sonny Borrelli, sponsor, indicated that SLIF was established to reinvest in infrastructure along the lakes and rivers throughout the state, but in 2009, SLIF funds were swept to the Arizona State Parks Board. He would like to shift the funds to cities and counties for the original purpose so those resources can be managed by local government. His intention is not to hurt the Board, for which he is looking for another funding source.

Mr. Escamilla noted that state parks play a vital role in economic development. He asked what type of impact this bill will have on Arizona State Parks if another funding source is not found. Representative Borrelli responded that he does not anticipate any harm to Arizona State Parks because this is grant funding, and with local control, the cities and town will be able to complete projects faster. The state generates a lot of money through these programs in tourism revenues.

If he is unable to obtain an appropriation from the General Fund for Arizona State Parks, the bill will likely die, but he is looking for other resources. Arizona State Parks is currently using the money for operating expenses, which is \$3.3 million.

Chairman Barton said another area of expenditure would be for police patrol on the lakes. Representative Borrelli agreed that the county sheriffs and law enforcement could use the money for gasoline for their boats because a police presence is needed on waterways.

Daniel Bogert, County Supervisors Association of Arizona (CSA), in support of HB2149, stated that SLIF is made up of funds from gasoline sold to boaters to redo and provide infrastructure and maintenance on Arizona waterways. Because of the financial downturn, SLIF funds were moved around. Much of the county park infrastructure is beginning to degrade, especially when water is in the equation, so the CSA would like to have these funds put back into a competitive grant program.

Brian Tassinari, Lake Havasu City, in support of HB2149, said no community in the state is more dependent on Arizona State Parks being healthy than Lake Havasu City where 300,000 boats are placed in the water every year. Those people eat in the restaurants and stay in the hotels. If SLIF is restored, the City will apply for grants to build bathrooms along the channel, acquire property adjacent to Rotary Beach and build pagodas, walking trails and other amenities for tourists.

Jay Ream, Deputy Director/Acting Legislative Liaison, Arizona State Parks, neutral on HB2149, said the Board provided 60 percent of SLIF funding in pass-through grants of \$31 million from 2000 to 2009. From 2009 to 2012, \$82 million was swept from Arizona State Parks' fund balances and SLIF. At the same time, the General Fund appropriation was zeroed and the Heritage Fund was eliminated, leaving Arizona State Parks with only SLIF revenues and revenues earned from gate fees. Since 2009, it has been understood by the Governor's Office of Strategic Planning and Budgeting and the Joint Legislative Budget Committee that SLIF funds would be used for agency operations; if the funding is diverted or given out in grants, it would be devastating to the agency.

Sandy Bahr, Lobbyist, Sierra Club-Grand Canyon Chapter, in opposition to HB2149, noted that there are no General Fund appropriations for Arizona State Parks in anyone's proposed budget, so if this bill passes, it would be very harmful to the parks system, which is important to the entire state. She asked the Members to reject this bill until something is available to help Arizona State Parks.

Vice-Chairman Pratt announced the names of those who signed up in opposition to HB2149 but did not speak:

William Thornton, representing self

Vice-Chairman Pratt announced the names of those who signed up in support of HB2149 but did not speak:

Todd Madeksza, Director of Legislative Affairs, County Supervisors Association

Jen Sweeney Marson, Lobbyist, Arizona Association of Counties

Trey Williams, Lobbyist, Arizona Association of Counties

Dale Wiebusch, Legislative Associate, League of Arizona Cities and Towns

Vice-Chairman Pratt announced the names of those who signed up as neutral on HB2149 but did not speak:

Leonard Clark, representing self

Ms. Fann remarked that Members are working to obtain more money for Arizona State Parks and asked for support of the bill. Communities with waterways have had to do without and need capital improvements. If this money is returned, hopefully, there will be enough money next year for the communities and Arizona State Parks.

Vice-Chairman Pratt moved that HB2149 do pass.

Vice-Chairman Pratt moved that the Fann three-line amendment to HB2149 dated 01/28/14 (Attachment 2) be adopted. The motion carried.

Vice-Chairman Pratt moved that HB2149 as amended do pass. The motion carried by a roll call vote of 6-2-0-0 (Attachment 3).

HB2523 - projects; water supply development - DO PASS AMENDED

Ryan Sullivan, Majority Research Analyst, explained that HB2523 contains the following provisions (Attachment 4):

- Appropriates \$30 million from the state General Fund (GF) in fiscal year (FY) 2014 to the Water Infrastructure Finance Authority (WIFA); the appropriation is exempt from lapsing.
- Expands the definition of *water provider* so counties that enter into agreements with local municipalities or other water providers are eligible to receive funding for a water supply development project.
- Adds subdivided lands located outside of an active management area (AMA) to the entities eligible to receive financial assistance from the Water Supply Development Revolving Fund if a determination of an adequate water supply is made by the Director of the Department of Water Resources.
- Adds watershed management and protection to the factors to consider when determining order and priority of projects selected for funding.
- Changes the loan repayment maximum contract from 30 to 50 years.

Mr. Sullivan related that the Barton 12-line amendment dated 02/10/2014 (Attachment 5) clarifies language regarding requirements for subdivided lands located outside of an AMA to receive financial assistance from the Water Supply Development Revolving Fund.

Chairman Barton, sponsor, advised that this legislation is the result of ad hoc committee meetings that were held around the state to discuss water issues. It provides another way for WIFA to help local cities, towns and counties provide water development in their communities.

Ms. Gabaldón, referring to the provision to add subdivided lands located outside of the AMA to the entities eligible to receive financial assistance, asked if it could have the effect of diverting

funds outside the AMAs that may have been generated inside the AMAs. Chairman Barton responded that she does not know if that applies because of the way the WIFA Board is established.

Ms. Gabaldón expressed concern about the extension of loan repayment to 50 years, noting that assets may require replacement before loans are fully paid. She asked if safeguards are in place to avoid this. Chairman Barton replied that the water development projects are very expensive. The \$30 million to be placed into the revolving fund is basically earnest money because it will not be enough for large projects. Much of the money that will eventually be needed will have to be derived from the local community.

Ron Doba, Northern Arizona Municipal Water Users Association, spoke in support of HB2523. He said the state's projected water challenges were well identified during the Arizona Department of Water Resources' Water Resource Development Commission (WRDC) process and ADWR's recently released strategic vision. Strategies identified to address those challenges are similar in both reports, i.e., more reuse and conservation, better forest management and treating water to a quality level that it can be used. A number of strategies will have to be used by water providers that will cost system users money. WRDC stakeholders estimate that over \$3 billion will be needed in the next 50 years to construct these water resource development projects in order to meet anticipated water demands. It is becoming more and more difficult to secure matching funds from the Bureau of Reclamation under the Rural Water Supply Act of 2006 for water resource development. In the future, water providers will need a mix of funding as well as a mix of strategies to meet these water resource challenges. WIFA is a well-respected agency in Arizona.

Vice-Chairman Pratt announced the names of those who signed up in support of HB2523 but did not speak:

Nick Simonetta, Arizona Common Sense, Inc.
Vince Leach, representing self
Shelly Tunis, Yuma Fresh Vegetable Association
Jeffrey Kros, Arizona Municipal Water Users Association

Robert Shuler, Lobbyist, Western Growers Association, thanked Chairman Barton, Vice-Chairman Pratt, Mr. Mitchell and Ms. Otondo for their efforts in holding meetings around the state during the summer of 2013 and expressed support for the bill.

Vice-Chairman Pratt announced the names of those who signed up as neutral on HB2523 but did not speak:

Leonard Clark, representing self

Vice-Chairman Pratt moved that HB2523 do pass.

Vice-Chairman Pratt moved that the Barton 12-line amendment to HB2523 dated 02/10/14 (Attachment 5) be adopted. The motion carried.

Vice-Chairman Pratt moved that HB2523 as amended do pass. The motion carried by a roll call vote of 8-0-0-0 (Attachment 6).

HB2587 - livestock; animal cruelty; violation - DO PASS AMENDED

Ryan Sullivan, Majority Research Analyst, explained that HB2587 reorganizes language regarding livestock cruelty in a new section of statute under Arizona Revised Statutes (A.R.S.) Title 3 (Attachment 7). This section outlines cruelty, investigation authority, responsibilities to report local ordinance restrictions, exceptions, violations, classifications and definitions regarding livestock. Modifications are also made to current statutes regarding animal cruelty within A.R.S. Title 13, including increased penalties for repeat offenders, exemptions, exclusions of livestock and poultry from the definition of *animal* and a new act, hoarding animals, which constitutes animal cruelty.

Mr. Sullivan related that the Barton 13-line amendment dated 02/10/14 (Attachment 8) contains the following provisions:

- Adds poultry to the livestock cruelty statute.
- States that the director must cooperate and coordinate with other law enforcement agencies regarding investigations and may appoint a law enforcement authority as a designee.
- Allows the director to enter into intergovernmental agreements (IGA) for the purposes of this section.
- Changes the penalties for violations of livestock cruelty.
 - Class 1 misdemeanor for intentionally or knowingly causing injury or undue suffering
 - Class 3 misdemeanor for not reporting evidence within five business days

Chairman Barton, sponsor, said this bill addresses animal cruelty by strengthening and defining animal cruelty in the statutes and making it possible for law enforcement and prosecutors to arrest and prosecute those who abuse animals. It adds hoarding to the animal cruelty statutes, which is a growing problem that needs to be addressed, and acknowledges that hoarding and other repeated animal abuses may have a psychological basis. It allows the court to order a psychological evaluation and counseling when those situations arise. It adds stiffer penalties for repeat offenders.

She continued that the bill gives authority to investigate cases of agricultural animal abuse to the Arizona Department of Agriculture (ADAG), which has expertise in these areas. The ADAG currently has 10 Arizona Police Officer Standards and Training Board (AZPOST)-certified officers, 8 of which are dedicated to livestock, and among those responsibilities is to investigate animal cruelty and cruelty issues within agricultural operations. HB2587 requires a person who has collected video or other evidence of animal abuse to submit the evidence within a certain time frame to ensure the allegations are investigated in a timely manner and to prevent further abuse and animal suffering.

Chairman Barton related that the amendment clarifies the intent, which is to facilitate coordination and cooperation between ADAG and other law enforcement agencies. The director can designate law enforcement agencies to investigate allegations of animal abuse through an IGA or memorandum of understanding (MOU). It includes poultry in the agricultural use statutes, which was an oversight, and reduces the penalty for failure to provide evidence within a

specified time frame. There have been allegations that the bill is intended to prevent the collection of evidence in investigations of systemic abuse; the bill does not prevent a person from using evidence in other matters and other points of time and does not prevent the collection of information. It simply requires that if someone has the information that it be provided to the authorities for review to build a case so the County Attorney can move forward with prosecution.

Representative Kate Brophy McGee, sponsor, discussed legislation sponsored last year regarding animal cruelty developed by the City of Phoenix's Animal Cruelty Task Force in consultation with commercial interests, the Humane Society and animal rights activists, which failed to pass. That legislation updated the definitions and established penalties for animal neglect and abuse, which is in Section 2 of HB2587. These clarified definitions will allow animal welfare officers on the front line to intervene when animal abuse and neglect are evident and make it possible to prosecute animal abusers and toughen penalties on repeat offenders. HB2587 makes the practice of hoarding illegal. She remarked that the fact that legislators have been terrorized and bullied by inflammatory emails and phone calls from constituents accusing them of horrible things if they consider voting for this bill with no regard to what the bill actually says, is appalling. This is a serious piece of policy work that needs serious consideration, debate and discussion. The amendment reflects the fact that the bill needs additional work. The agricultural interests have negotiated honorably and in good faith and pledged to continue doing so.

Chairman Barton stated that she appreciates Representative Brophy McGee's work during the past year.

Kathleen Mayer, Legislative Liaison, Pima County Attorney's Office, spoke in opposition to HB2587. She indicated that she is grateful for the changes that were made in regard to hoarding, repetitive felony abusers and addressing the needs of the livestock community; however, as a prosecutor, the bill as written poses some difficulties that she is willing to work on. The bill states that the director or designee is responsible for spearheading all investigations involving livestock cases when there is not a livestock officer in every county to respond to the large number of livestock abuse cases that occur and it is difficult to have enough manpower to respond when it is necessary. She cited a case in which an elderly couple called 911 after their Barbados sheep was kidnapped by drunken adults from the neighborhood and stabbed to death. The usual practice is to call livestock officers; however, they cannot respond to calls in the middle of the night or for dead animals. The Pima County Sheriff's Department arrived immediately, collected the body and found the murder weapon, which had DNA on it. Local law enforcement, as opposed to livestock officers, can process DNA for evidence, which ultimately led to the perpetrators of the crime.

Ms. Mayer added that under current statute, if someone seriously physically injures or causes the death of a livestock animal, it is a class 6 felony. This bill makes it a class 1 misdemeanor, so if someone kills the neighbor's goats, for example, it is a class 5 felony under Title 3, but if someone allows their own animals to starve to death, it is only a class 1 misdemeanor. She questioned why the latter should be treated better and noted that, more importantly, their right to a jury trial is removed. Regarding the exemptions on page 3, she indicated that those were proposed in last year's legislation and defeated in the Senate because the language was too broad. She lives on a ranch where horses are trained for cutting competitions, and those exemptions would allow her to beat her dog with impunity.

Ana Kennedy, Government Relations Manager, Arizona Farm Bureau, in support of HB2587, stated that this is also a personal issue because her family has a Holstein calf ranch in Casa Grande. The Arizona livestock industry is made up of farmers and ranchers who work to provide a safe quality product to consumers through the proper care of livestock. Animal care is their number one priority and they spend hundreds of millions of dollars in studying and implementing practices that consider the health, safety and comfort of the animals. Past legislation addressed animal hoarding, sale of animals and repeat offenders, but were not successful often because of unintended consequences to livestock and animal agriculture. HB2587 distinguishes pets from livestock and places the authority of investigating alleged violations against livestock under the purview of the ADAG and its director or designee. It is important that those who understand animal husbandry practices are part of the process of investigating a suspected violation that pertains to livestock.

She said HB2587 also specifies that if a person has knowledge, including video or photographic images, of a suspected violation they must report the crime within five days. Allowing a potential abuse case to continue is wrong and inhumane. The ADAG or law enforcement should be notified of such situations as soon as possible in order to begin investigations. She added that Arizona farmers and ranchers support the amendment which, among other things, further clarifies the director of ADAG is to cooperate, coordinate and enter into IGAs with other law enforcement agencies.

Karen Michael, Board Member/Volunteer, Animal Defense League of Arizona; Humane Voters of Arizona, spoke in opposition to HB2587. She related that she wants to address the bill's potential to criminalize citizens who are concerned about animal abuse and the safety of food. She discussed her involvement in an investigation involving documentation of animal cruelty in Arizona livestock auctions where horses, cows and infant calves were too sick to stand up and left to suffer and die, sometimes for days without food, water or shelter. Sometimes livestock officers euthanized the downed animals, but in most cases, said they did not have the authority to kill an animal without an owner's permission. Help was provided by Dr. Temple Brandon, United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) inspectors, when they were available, and local livestock veterinarians who verified their findings. At the conclusion of the six-month investigation, documentation was given to the ADAG.

She said in 1999, 30 infant calves were dumped at a Phoenix area slaughterhouse over a hot weekend with no food or water. Law enforcement was contacted, which documented employees quickly tossing injured calves into bins with decaying animals, but by the time livestock officers arrived, the scene was cleaned up. The USDA inspector who oversaw the plant did not charge the slaughter facility and business continued as usual, except the slaughterhouse owner built large metal walls around the premises. It was never determined whether those injured calves made it into the food supply. If HB2587 passes, not only citizens, but law enforcement and journalists will be denied the crucial opportunity to document a pattern of animal cruelty. The agriculture lobby claims that the intent of this bill is to help animals, yet instead of addressing incidents of inhumane treatment of farm animals, it continually seeks to criminalize people like her who attempt to expose abuse behind closed doors of factory farms and slaughterhouses. In addition to the animal welfare component, the abuses that were witnessed are directly related to food safety.

Robert Shuler, Arizona Horse Council, testified in support of HB2587 with the amendment. He noted that there is a lack of resources as mentioned by Ms. Mayer, whether it is at the ADAG, local law enforcement or horse rescue operations. In order to address some of the issues raised by various people, everyone needs to work together to identify an appropriate funding source to bring the right resources to this issue.

John MacIntyre, Maricopa County Sheriff's Office (MCSO); Sheriff Joe Arpaio, opposed HB2587. He said Representative Brophy McGee and others did a tremendous job on this bill but there are still areas of concern. Ten inspectors for the ADAG on a statewide basis maintaining evidence in all of the possible cases for livestock cruelty is vastly insufficient manpower, increasing the chances of evidence being misplaced or not handled appropriately, which gives defense attorneys an automatic out. Sheriff Arpaio believes the penalties go the wrong way and has other concerns about the chain of custody. He opposes the bill in its present form, but if those deficiencies are cleared up, he will remove his opposition.

Tom Miller, Executive Director, Arizona Pork Council, spoke in support of HB2587. He related that he has been involved in the pork industry for 50 years. Someone who raises any type of livestock for a living has no reason to allow the animals to be mistreated. Animal abuse should be reported immediately, and if there is video evidence, it should not be allowed to remain in someone's hands because there have been cases in the past where videos were held up and altered. That kind of information needs to be given to the proper authorities; in this case, ADAG, so it can be handled. People in the pork industry are bent on quality production and producing a quality and wholesome product for the American public.

Donna Mulvey, representing self, opposed HB2587. She stated that she is a police officer in the City of Scottsdale. In 2012 and 2013, the Scottsdale Police Department responded to 77 horse-related calls; she personally responded to 12. The reports included suspected cruelties, such as failure to feed, provide medical care, groom, provide shelter, etc. After initiating an investigation, she is often able to unfound the allegations and educate the reporting parties and/or the horse owner. She has had a positive working relationship with ADAG, which is a resource for her to call if the elements of the scene are above her training and experience. She noted that when she has not unfounded the situation, she has seen cases go through successful prosecution. She is happy to see a hoarding statute defined, but it has been possible to successfully prosecute numerous counts of suspected cruelties in Scottsdale without that clause, even if it cannot be called hoarding. She submitted that this bill strips her ability as a local law enforcement officer to respond and initiate an investigation for these calls, which is an invaluable service to the citizens and alleviates the overwhelming demand on the ADAG.

Mike Williams, Arizona Police Association; Phoenix Law Enforcement Association, opposed HB2587. He remarked that under Arizona law, any certified police officer, defined under A.R.S. § 38-1101, is required and given the duty to enforce any state, county or local ordinance, including federal law. With the language and even with the amendment, it still states a police officer cannot investigate unless they are the designee or authorized. He suggested inserting on page 1, subsection B, after "DESIGNEE" "OR CERTIFIED POLICE OFFICER AS DEFINED IN A.R.S. § 38-1101". He added that with regard to subsection C relating to any person who possesses video or photographic evidence, police often carry cell phones and have incidents on video. When it is part of an active investigation and under a chain of custody, it will probably not be turned over to a state agency until the investigation is completed.

Sara Presler, representing self, in opposition to HB2587, stated that she agrees with the concerns related to law enforcement and other issues. While she appreciates the idea of empowering the ADAG, it is important to keep in mind what happens in the "nooks and crannies" of rural Arizona where people rely on local law enforcement and strong laws. She suggested finding another avenue, such as funding local law enforcement or developing community collaborations between ADAG and local law enforcement, opining that this bill is not the right solution to this problem.

Chris Green, Incoming Chair, Animal Law Committee, American Bar Association; Legislative Director, Animal Legal Defense Fund, opposed HB2587. He stated that for the past two decades, he has managed a family farm in Illinois so he understands the concerns of the agricultural community, but it is also in the best interest of everyone to root out systematic patterns of illegal animal abuse because "bad actors" give everyone else a bad name. Unfortunately, the quick reporting requirement in HB2587 will prevent the gathering of evidence to show systemic patterns of animal abuse that may not be the actions of a few isolated individuals, but may actually be the policy at a particular facility. It took several weeks to gather evidence in an undercover investigation in California that led to the single largest beef recall in U.S. history of 142 million pounds. It is not just an animal welfare issue; it is a human health issue. It was the systemic policy at that facility, which was eventually shut down, but without the ability for investigators to investigate for the time that was needed, there never would have been enforcement and the diseased beef would have gone into the food supply.

Patrick Bray, Lobbyist, Arizona Cattlemen's Association, spoke in support of HB2587. He said his family raised sheep for a long time in Arizona and went on to cattle; now he raises 75 mother cows on the range, so he takes this issue not only professionally but personally. The livestock community in Arizona has never been convicted of animal cruelty and does not tolerate animal abuse at any level. Currently, the ADAG takes animal cruelty calls on horses and several local agencies call upon them for their expertise, including the MCSO and Phoenix Police Department. The industry wants to utilize the expertise of the certified officers at ADAG because it is often difficult to tell the difference between a sick horse and an old horse. The agents know what to look for and how to conduct investigations.

He stated that many terms have been used, such as the "Ag-Gag" bill, implying that it gags entities from conducting an investigation, which is offensive. This bill merely requests that any evidence be turned over in a timely manner. Title 3 relates to ADAG who has expertise in these matters, but the option of law enforcement can be discussed. Experts testified that they need to see animal cruelty three or four times in an investigation, but when ADAG sees it, they know what it is and want it stopped because it is a safety factor in the food chain. The largest problem is cats and dogs, which are 82 percent of animal cruelty, so the intent is to separate livestock and have it recognized in Title 3, while allowing other individuals to deal with cats and dogs.

Names of persons who signed up in support of HB2587 but did not speak:

Linda Coy, representing self

Joe Sigg, Director of Government Relations, Arizona Farm Bureau

Jeff Sandquist, United Dairymen of Arizona

Chris Udall, representing self

Names of persons who signed up in opposition to HB2587 but did not speak:

Karen Duran, representing self
Effie Craven, representing self
Sara Gromley, representing self
Bonnie West, representing self
Martha German, Lobbyist, Humane Voters of Arizona
Robyn Seaton, representing self
Melissa Slavsky, representing self
Nancy Vargo, representing self
Michelle Andria, representing self
Linda Kavanagh, representing self
Joe Romack, representing self
Stacey Newlon, representing self
Cheryl Naumann, representing self
Lisa Sanzone, representing self
Roger Williams, representing self
Kathy Olson, representing self
Kari Nienstedt, Arizona State Director, Humane Society of the United States
Sally Andrade, representing self
Rivko Knox, representing self
Robert McCormick, representing self
Jose Hernandez, representing self
Valerie Deluccia, representing self
Ashsuire Forrest, representing self
Candice Crossey, representing self
Richard Andrade, representing self
Andrea Chilcote, representing self
Erin Becker, representing self
Kris Lecakes Haley, representing self
Cynthia Anderson, representing self
Kelly Ames, representing self
Suzanne Rowe, representing self
Angela White, representing self
Susan Rodriguez, representing self
Jessie Armendt, Lobbyist, Arizona Humane Society
Victoria Lopez, Lobbyist, American Civil Liberties Union of Arizona
Sharon Wilson, representing self
Mayra Driessen, representing self
Christopher West, representing self
Jessica Everett-Garcia, representing self
Paula Casey, Arizona Newspapers Association
Gigi Hill, representing self
Halina Brooke, representing self
Leonard Clark, representing self
Kathleen Mayer, Lobbyist, Pima County Attorney's Office
Michael Duffey, representing self
Kathryn Kobor, representing self
Josephine Sanzone, representing self

Craig Haley, representing self
Barbra Heller, representing self
Ronald Sanzone, representing self
Steven Hansen, representing self
Leanna Taylor, representing self
Stephanie Nichols-Young, Animal Defense League of Arizona
Roger Naumann, representing self
Jordan Cowan, representing self
Alicia Fremling, representing self
Cyndy Gartside, representing self
Emily Colon, representing self
Christian Gort, representing self
Tracy Graley Ferrick, representing self
Beverly Rania, representing self
Michael Charlesworth, representing self
Marianne Sage, representing self
Christine Richert, representing self
Kathryn Salmon, representing self
CW Jensen, representing self
Miryam Gutier-Elm, Lobbyist, Maricopa County
Alexander Blount, representing self
Julie Phillips, representing self
Pamela Pearson, representing self
Michele Kemp, representing self
Laura Laizure, representing self
Melissa Gomez, representing self
Conner Dennison, representing self
Stephanie Jaffa, representing self
Kristin Gwinn, representing self
Laurie Lyon, representing self
Sherry Celine, representing self
Valerie Caliendo, representing self
Paula Ruth, representing self
Rebekah Friend, Arizona State AFL-CIO
Alissa Metzger, representing self

Vice-Chairman Pratt moved that HB2587 do pass.

Vice-Chairman Pratt moved that the Barton 13-line amendment to HB2587 dated 02/10/14 (Attachment 8) be adopted. The motion carried.

Vice-Chairman Pratt moved that HB2587 as amended do pass. The motion carried by a roll call vote of 6-2-0-0 (Attachment 9).

Without objection, the meeting adjourned at 4:43 p.m.

Linda Taylor, Committee Secretary
February 21, 2014

(Original minutes, attachments and audio on file in the Chief Clerk's Office; video archives available at <http://www.azleg.gov>)