

# Senate State Affairs Committee

Wednesday, February 14, 2024 - 8:00 A.M.

## TESTIMONY ON: All Subjects

### Written Testimony

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
Daniel Murphy	S 1311	IP	Personal	Boise	For	Y	18

Deceased veterans' families need assurances they will have a honorable memorial service at Idaho's veterans' cemeteries even if their remains are sent to another state.

Kaaren Brodresser	S 1311	IP	Self	Boise	For	Y	14
-------------------	--------	----	------	-------	-----	---	----

I support S.1311 because I was the wife of a veteran who passed in 2023, who was initially denied an honorable memorial service because of our family cemetery plots are in Oregon. Daniel Murphy helped and went with me to the Boise Veterans Cemetery and met with a gal to settle our chances of a memorial. We had our memorial in September.

Trent Wright	S 1291	IP	Idaho Bankers Assoc.	Boise	For	Y	19
--------------	--------	----	----------------------	-------	-----	---	----

Senate State Affairs Committee

Re: Testimony on SB 1291 - Prohibition on Contracts with Companies Boycotting Certain Sectors

Dear Members of the Senate State Affairs Committee,

The Idaho Bankers Association recommends that SB 1291 be sent to the amending order for amendments. While we acknowledge the importance of ensuring that public contracts uphold principles of fairness and nondiscrimination, we believe that the following amendments would improve the clarity and effectiveness of the legislation:

Requirement for Sole Sector-based Boycott: To strengthen the legislation's focus, we suggest requiring that boycott or discrimination

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
------------------------	---------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

Trent Wright	<i>cont.</i>						19
--------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	--	----

must be "solely" on account of a sector such as fossil fuels or firearms to be subject to the legislation. Additionally, we recommend revising the list of business sectors to reflect those directly pertinent to banking operations in the geographic boundaries of Idaho. For instance, if a bank does not finance every business on the list, such as nuclear energy, hydroelectric power, businesses removing timber in the Amazon, diamond mining operations, or certain types of firearms, then certification may be problematic. (Page 1, 17-21)

Government Entity Exclusion: We propose excluding political subdivisions from the definition of "public entity." Local governments are better equipped to determine the needs of their communities, and a top-down approach contradicts conservative principles. (Page 2, 15-17)

Contract Scope: We recommend changing the language on amount paid to the company for the contract. For example:

- Ensure that restrictions don't apply when something like a pre-existing credit of a government entity is used as compensation.
- Apply the legislation only to contracts that will pay or may pay a company \$200,000 over the term of the contract.
- Additionally, this subdivision should apply separately to all companies in a multiple-party contract. (Page 1, lines 35-36)

Extensions of Contracts: We suggest amending the language relating to extensions of contracts executed prior to the effective date of the legislation. Current language mandates that contracts shall not be renewed unless there's a written certification required in subsection (1). We propose adding language to allow for waivers of the requirements under subsection (2) when appropriate. (Page 2, lines 25-33)

In conclusion, we believe that these amendments will enhance the effectiveness and clarity of SB 1291 while ensuring fairness in public contracting practices. Thank you for considering our testimony on this important matter.

Laurie Anderson	S 1291	W	Self	Boise	Against	N	16
-----------------	--------	---	------	-------	---------	---	----

As I understand it, in Idaho it is permissible for a business to refuse to provide goods or services to another business or individual based on their personal beliefs. Example: a wedding photographer, caterer or cake baker can refuse to provide their goods or services to a gay couple based on that company's stance on that institution. That, to me, constitutes a boycott. This law would prohibit any state agency from doing business with a company that boycotts another. So if this law is enacted, wouldn't it prohibit Idaho from doing business with a wedding caterer that boycotts a gay marriage? Given that logic, I would almost be in support, but I don't think that is the intention of the bill. I believe the intention is to prohibit doing business with any companies that won't do business with companies

Name (First & Last)	Subject	Manner Testifying	Representing Company/Organization	City	For / Against	Wish to Testify	District #
Laurie Anderson	<b><i>cont.</i></b>						16

based on their social policies. Like Micron? I am against this bill, as it looks like another attempt to over-reach and over-regulate in a state that touts itself as the least regulated.