

please report to the Chamber and check in. We are voting on the motion to cease debate. Senator Cudaback has authorized call-in votes.

CLERK: Senator Will voting yes. Senator Janssen voting yes. Senator Warner voting yes. Senator Vrtiska voting yes. Senator Withem voting yes. Senator Maurstad voting yes. Senator Brown voting yes. Senator Engel voting yes.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Senator Lindsay, Senator Lynch, Senator McKenzie, would you please check in. Senator Schellpeper, Senator Schrock. Senator Engel, would you please check in. We're looking for Senator Landis.

CLERK: Senator Schimek voting yes. Senator Lindsay voting yes. Senator Lynch voting yes. Senator Avery voting yes. Senator Landis voting yes.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 25 ayes, 1 nay to cease debate, Mr. President.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Debate has ceased. Senator Withem, to close on your amendment to the amendment.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Yes, I'll try to be fairly brief. The amendment is on the desk. It's a penciled up version. All of the language there would be new language added. It's not...I'm not altering the language of the free existing amendment. That's not what the intention of this does. This is an edited version of what will be added. It adds a condition prior to the department having to feel obligated to do this analysis of the potential taking of property and that would be if the proposed rule or regulation or the amendment or repeal of the rule or regulation may constitute or allow a taking of property. Again, I understand it's fairly nebulous but it's adding another nebulous feature to an already nebulous piece of legislation. The goal of this would be to not force every agency on every rule that they're making to do this analysis, only in those cases where there was a reasonable expectation that the rule might constitute some taking of property. Probably other things need to be done to tighten this up further but I think this tightens it up and would remove some of the burden on the state agencies to do this analysis when it's clear that the analysis would not...clear on the face of a proposed rule or amendment to