
The Rosenberg Report

Vol. XXI
November 25, 2003

Hello!

Another session has come to an end and the Legislature has spent the last few days behaving like students cramming for finals. A lot has happened in the past weeks, and some of it may take some time to sort out. So, here's an update on some of the recent activity, and I'll follow up with another one early next year.

I hope everybody has a wonderful Thanksgiving and a happy holiday season!

Yours,



November Focus

Supplemental budget/UMass update

Late last week, the Legislature overwhelmingly approved a \$105 million supplemental budget that includes \$34 million for the long-awaited higher education contracts and an unprecedented \$10 million for the UMass operating budget, a provision that I initiated and worked for several months to secure. About half of the \$10 million will go to the Amherst campus and will help cushion the blow of the cuts the campus endured in the current state budget.

Getting these two items, totaling slightly less than half the supplemental budget, took a lot of patient, deliberate and unflagging effort from a lot of people. I appreciate the sacrifices higher education employees have made and I appreciate the willingness of my House and Senate colleagues to see the necessity of meeting our contractual obligations and the wisdom of investing in the university. Finally, public higher education had a good day at the State House and the lesson I draw from it is this: Thoughtful lobbying works.

Everybody who understands and appreciates the value of public higher education should remember that as we head into the fiscal 2005 budget debates.

Economic stimulus package

If you were following the debate on the economic stimulus package earlier this month, you might have been focused on the casino gambling bill that Senator Brian Lees (R-

East Longmeadow) had put forward, then withdrew before the Senate could take a formal vote. In the final days of the discussion I had signaled to my colleagues and the general public my intent to vote "no" on the bill -- a vote that I believe is consistent with the majority in my district -- and, apparently, so had a majority of the Senate. But that vote was not easy and the issue is not dead. It will very likely resurface next year as the Legislature struggles to deal with an anticipated \$1-\$2 billion deficit in a no-tax climate.

The atmosphere surrounding the casino gambling issue is very different now than it was about five years ago. I was against casinos then, but it was a much easier position to take because we weren't in a fiscal crisis at the time and the will of my district was much easier to read. But since then, a surprising number of my constituents have informed me that they have changed their thinking on casino gambling. A lot of people -- more than I ever thought -- told me that they participate in recreational gambling at casinos in neighboring states and didn't think it was something that Massachusetts should reject out of hand. Combine that with the fact that three of our six neighboring states have casino gambling and the other three are considering it, I didn't reject the idea of casinos in Massachusetts out of hand either. But at this point, I would have voted "no."

As I said, this debate is not over. I would be happy to hear from more constituents on the casino gambling issue. Use this feedback form to let me know what you think. www.stanrosenberg.com/form.html

There's was much more to the economic stimulus bill than a vote that didn't happen. The \$100 million compromise bill approved by the House and Senate includes:

CAPITAL FORMATION FOR EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES, REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT, AND UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC RESEARCH

* Creation of the Massachusetts Technology Transfer Center (\$2.4 million): This expanded center, to be affiliated with and housed at one of the UMass campuses, will accelerate and improve the efficiency of technology transfer from research institution to industry. A transfer center will facilitate the introduction of new products or services, which will create jobs.

* Capitalization of the Matching Fund for Collaborative Academic Research Centers (\$20 million): Administered through the Massachusetts Technology Collaborative, this \$20 million fund will attract federal research support and private sector investment for industry-university academic research centers. The Matching Fund will improve the competitiveness of our academic community in the pursuit of federal research support and private sector investment.

* Capitalization of the Massachusetts, Mathematics, Science, Technology & Engineering Grant Fund (\$2.5 million): This \$2.5 million fund, also known as the pipeline fund, will increase the number of Massachusetts students who participate in educational programs that support careers in fields related to math, science, technology, and engineering. The Council on Economic Advisors, also created in this proposal, will make recommendations to the Legislature and the chancellor of higher education on the deployment of the grants to be

funded by this program.

* Re-capitalization of the Emerging Technology Fund (\$25 million): Administered by MassDevelopment, the majority of this \$25 million proposal will be used for "bricks and mortar" investments specifically targeted toward technology-based physical infrastructure, assuring a permanent development and manufacturing presence in Massachusetts.

* Capitalization of the John Adams Innovation Institute (\$15 million): Administered by the Massachusetts Technology Collaborative, this \$15 million Institute will leverage long-term, public and private sector investment in innovation technologies to provide dedicated infrastructure support for emerging technology and regional industry clusters in the Commonwealth.

* Re-capitalization of the Brownfields Redevelopment Access to Capital Fund (\$6 million): The section provides \$6 million to recapitalize the first state-sponsored program to promote private financing for the remediation and redevelopment of Brownfields. By subsidizing environmental insurance, this proposal will continue to make Brownfield redevelopment a financially sound position that will enhance the Commonwealth's economy.

* Re-capitalization of the Massachusetts Technology Development Corporation (\$5 million): This \$5 million commitment bolsters the state's quasi-public development agency as it provides long term capital investment in 15-20 emerging technology companies.

BUSINESS INCENTIVES

* Makes the Investment Tax Credit Permanent: This section, it is argued, will provide a stable business climate allowing companies to retain revenues and invest them in jobs and increase capital reserves that are critical to economic growth.

* Research & Development Tax Credit Update (\$8 million): Significant change to R&D tax credit to allow more companies to qualify for the R & D tax credit to include those companies who spend more than 2/3 of expenditures (not just receipts) on Research & Development. Updates the current state tax code to mirror federal research credit by including intangible expenses to be included as R & D. R & D is critical to Massachusetts economy as Commonwealth's per capita R & D is 2.2 times the national average. To date, competing states, RI and Connecticut, provide more generous R& D credits. Furthermore, the Commonwealth is world-renowned for its biotech, telecomm, medical device, and pharmaceutical companies that are incubators of new technology and products and are reliant on such credits to create new jobs, products, and life-saving medicines.

* One-Day Sales Tax Holiday (\$5 million): Scheduled for August 14, 2004, this holiday will provide parents and children who are doing "Back-to School" shopping relief from the sales tax, boosting economic activity and consumer buying power.

* Targeted tax rebate for new manufacturing jobs. Of the 160,000 jobs lost in this recession, over 50 percent (82,000) were in the manufacturing sector. This program will reduce the cost to relocate or expand manufacturing in Massachusetts by providing a rebate of 50 percent of the state income tax withheld for new jobs created. This rebate will be piloted for

biotechnology, life sciences and medical device manufacturing.

* Medical Device User Fee (\$1 million): First state in the nation, to allow a 50 percent tax credit for amount spent on FDA pre-approval application fees. This ground-breaking initiative leverages the Commonwealth's traditional strength in health care and research to support a burgeoning medical device industry in the Commonwealth. Tax incentive supports current Massachusetts companies and lures new medical device manufacturers to the Commonwealth. The credit also aids the development process for new products.

* Research & Development Tax Credit Transfer (\$2 million): Administered by the Department of Revenue, this \$2 million program will allow mid- sized companies with high growth potential to raise cash by selling tax losses and unused research and development credits. Companies must demonstrate high rates of job growth in previous years and must continue to grow every year that they are in the program.

* Historic Development Tax Credit: This proposal will provide a 20 percent tax credit for redevelopment of historic commercial and residential real estate that is at least 50 years old, encouraging the redevelopment of older properties in urban areas and promoting smart growth rather than suburban sprawl. It is modeled upon a federal credit and has been implemented in 24 other states.

* Brownfields Tax Credit Extension: This section extends the Brownfields Tax Credit Program for two years. Through this revision, net response and removal costs for waste site cleanups that are incurred by a taxpayer between August 1, 1998 and January 1, 2007 will be eligible for the credit provided that the taxpayer commences and diligently pursues an environmental response action before August 5, 2005, rather than 2003.

* Liability Protections for Cleaned Up Brownfields Site Owners or Operators: This section amends the current Brownfields Law which provides liability relief for any owner or operator of real property who has achieved and maintained either a permanent solution or a remedy operation status and has employed the use of an activity and use limitation (AUL) to do so. The changes proposed herein would strike language that requires that the owner or operator that receives liability relief must never have conducted, or been required to conduct, a cleanup of hazardous substances pursuant to the federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) or the federal Comprehensive, Environmental, Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA, aka the Superfund law), in order to be afforded the liability relief. Without this legislation, an owner or operator of real property would still be liable to parties other than the state if the owner or operator has conducted or been required to conduct a cleanup of hazardous substances pursuant to RCRA or Superfund anywhere.

Other Initiatives

* Sunday Liquor Sales: These section lift the prohibition on the Sunday sale of alcohol. Local communities will have the option to opt out of this requirement.

Massachusetts International Tourism Initiative (\$2 million): This \$2 million initiative will establish an international tourism program to attract international visitors and dollars to the

state by leveraging both public and private dollars to increase tourism. The tourism industry generated more than \$11 billion in revenue in 2001 and provided 147,000 jobs.

* Recapitalization of the Massachusetts Community Development Finance Corporation (\$1 million): This \$1 million proposal will provide funding for economic development projects in urban and minority communities.

* Workforce Training Grants (\$6 million): This section will invest \$6 million for workforce training and development. Dollars will target training in specific sectors, help workers develop new skills, and provide re-training for older and dislocated workers.

* Reforms to the Worker Training Fund: These changes give the fund greater flexibility by allowing companies that are moving in-state to access the fund, raising the cap on awards to \$1 million and allows for rolling applications.

* Funding for Existing Workforce Training Grants: This change will allow the Department of Workforce Development to keep the state's commitments for grants issued in prior years.

* HMO Solvency - Establishes minimum net worth and financial solvency standards for health maintenance organizations doing business in the Commonwealth. The legislation is based on standards developed and adopted by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners (NAIC) and/or existing standards contained in Chapter 175 of the General Laws. The standards are also consistent with the recommendations of the January 2002 Blue Ribbon Health Care Task Force.

In addition, several amendments that I fought for as necessary for the western Massachusetts economy were included in the bill. Although no money was earmarked for these amendments, the language in the bill will lay the groundwork for new programs once our economy begins to grow again.

Those amendments include:

Broadband Internet Access

Because some areas of the state do not have access to high-speed Internet service, which has stalled economic development in those areas, this amendment calls for creating grant and loan programs and conducting planning and infrastructure studies to increase broadband Internet access to underserved communities. The program would be overseen by the 12-member Massachusetts Broadband Access Oversight Council within the Massachusetts Technology Collaborative. The Council would include one designee from the following organizations: Franklin-Hampshire Connect, Berkshire Connect, the Massachusetts Association of Regional Planning Agencies, the Massachusetts Municipal Association, the Secretary of Economic Affairs, the Chief of Commonwealth Development, the Chair of the Department of Telecommunications and Energy, and one representative from the telecommunications industry appointed by the Governor.

Sustainable Business Initiative/Downtown Upper Floor Reinvestment

The substance of the Sustainable Business Initiative caught the attention of Doug Foy, the Commonwealth's Chief of Development, who will integrate its strategies into current programs. The idea behind my amendment was creating a task force to develop a program to improve the sustainable business climate in Massachusetts by, among other things, supporting business initiatives and investments that provide the following benefits:

Economic benefits, such as:

- Increased productivity or competitiveness from reduced operating costs or avoided capital costs;
- Increased capacity and revenues;
- Increased employment; and,
- Job retention.

Environmental benefits, such as:

- recycling and waste reduction;
- mitigating climate change;
- promoting environmentally preferable products;
- reducing the use of mercury and toxics;
- sustainable design and construction; and,
- water conservation and quality.

I am pleased that Mr. Foy has seen some value in this initiative and I'm looking forward to working with him in the coming months. I'm also pleased that Mr. Foy had a similar reaction to my proposal for Downtown Upper Floor Reinvestment. This main street, downtown revitalization proposal focuses on upper floor development strategies. It focuses on buildings where the value of rents is insufficient to support the addition of elevators into the buildings. This would assist in the removal of blight from upper floors in downtown buildings and increase the volume of rentable commercial, residential and light industrial space in downtown areas where marketplace forces are inadequate to support this development. I'm looking forward to working with Mr. Foy on this as well.

I was pleased that the Senate version the economic stimulus package included the Food and Farmland Protection Act, a bill I worked on with a number of my western Massachusetts colleagues, including Senator Stephen Brewer (D-Barre) and Representative Stephen Kulik (D-Worthington), but I was disappointed that it didn't survive the conference committee. The bill is still alive, however, and we'll be able to put it forward next year as a separate piece of legislation.

The Food and Farmland Protection Act would help keep land and people in farming by:

- Improving market connections between farmers and consumers;
- Helping farmers succeed in the marketplace (rather than through reliance on subsidies such as those the federal government provides in other regions), and;
- Providing incentives to preserve farmland for future generations.

The bill's provisions promote Massachusetts-grown agricultural products and the farms and farmers that produce them. One provision establishes a preference for Massachusetts-grown food in state procurement, and at local option, in local procurement, and would streamline the procurement process. A "truth in labeling" provision would require that when food is labeled or advertised as "local" or "native", the state of origin be identified. Other provisions include a loan program, targeted regulatory relief, and improvements to the existing Massachusetts Agricultural Preservation Restriction Program (APR).

SJC ruling on same-sex marriage

Years from now, the ruling handed down November 18th by the seven-member Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court declaring the prohibition on same-sex marriage to be unconstitutional, will likely join *Rowe v. Wade*, *Brown v. The Board of Education*, the Civil Rights Act and the U.S. Voting Rights Act as a defining moment in our nation's history. It is that monumental a pronouncement.

So, where do we go from here? The 4-3 ruling, which essentially states that the Massachusetts Constitution, as currently written, allows same-sex couples to marry, gives the Legislature 180 days to adopt any regulation it deems necessary. That's a rather vague direction to the Legislature, and, from what I've learned from our Senate counsel, the actions available to the Legislature are fairly limited. For example:

If the Legislature deems that no action is necessary, then at the end of 180 days from the November 18th ruling same-sex marriages can take place even without legislative action;

The Legislature cannot substitute "civil union" for marriage because, according to the SJC ruling, such a maneuver would be challenged in court and would likely wind up back with the SJC, which has rejected "civil unions" as a substitute for the right of same-sex couples to marry. Recently, Attorney General Tom Reilly suggested that it may be possible to substitute "civil union" for marriage, so this particular issue may end up being tested before the courts;

The Legislature and the voters can amend the state constitution to explicitly define marriage as the union of one man and one woman. But it's important to note that the majority of the justices stated that such an effort would be foolhardy. The justices stated that if, in 2006, the earliest the state constitution could be changed, such an amendment were adopted, it would likely be challenged in federal court. If the amendment survived the federal court challenge, it would go to the U.S. Supreme Court, where, the Massachusetts justices said, it would likely be struck down on the basis that the Massachusetts Constitution, probably the most protective of individual liberties of any state constitution and the model for the U.S. Constitution, unambiguously provides equal protection under the law for all citizens. That is the same foundation that the Massachusetts SJC's decision of November 18th is built upon.

Keep this in mind as this issue continues to play out over the next couple of years: six of the seven Massachusetts Supreme Court justices were appointed by Republican governors; three of those by Governor Weld.

Here is a link that should take you directly to the SJC's ruling.

<http://weblinks.westlaw.com/Search/default.wl?RP=%2FWelcome%2FFrameless%2FSearch%2Ewl&n=4&ACTION=SEARCH&bhcp=1&CFID=0&DB=MA%2DORSLIP&Method=TNC&query=to%28allsct+allsectrs+allsectoj%29+&RLT=CLID%5FQRYRLT19371911&rs=MAOR1%2E0&sp=MassOF%2D1001&ssl=n&strRecreate=no&sv=Split&vr=1%2E0&serialnum=2003847757>

The link above should work, but if it doesn't, use the link below and then click "Opinions" under Supreme Judicial Court, and when that page loads, click #4Hillary Goodridge and others v. Department of Public Health.

Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court website
<http://www.massreports.com/welcome.htm>

Unemployment Insurance Reforms

The Legislature approved a major package to save the nearly insolvent unemployment insurance program. The package would generate funds for the ailing system by raising the base on taxable income and revising the sliding scale under which businesses utilize the benefits trust fund, punishing those who routinely lay-off workers.

Without legislative action to replenish the nearly depleted unemployment insurance fund, businesses would have faced a \$610 million increase on January 1st, 2004. But the package limits the automatic business contribution to \$455 million while imposing restrictions on worker benefits during prosperous times. The package divides the state into nine economic development regions. That restriction on benefits would reduce benefits from 30 to 26 weeks when the unemployment rate is 5.1 percent or less in all nine economic development regions.

Perhaps the most significant reform is that we're going to switch to a performance based system that rewards businesses that use the system less and charges more to businesses that abuse the system. Under the bill, the amount of salary that can be taxed will increase from \$10,800 to \$14,000 per employee. Businesses that routinely lay off workers, such as seasonal industries, would see costs per worker nearly double from \$780 to \$1,534. Businesses with good layoff records, meaning those that layoff few workers, would be subject to only minimal increases, from \$143 to \$156 per employee.

Noteworthy

October revenues

The Department of Revenue announced that October 2003 revenues were \$1.07 billion, or \$139 million above October 2002 collections. Now four months into the fiscal year the state has collected \$218 million above projections. That's good, because it shows that our economy is heading in the right direction. But it continues to move at a creaking pace -- kind of like the way a lot of us move on these cold mornings! And the October news was tempered by the announcement that non-tax revenues -- Lottery revenue, federal reimbursements, etc. -- came in about \$200 million below expectations. It seems that during the past few months for every step forward we've taken a half-step back. It's frustrating, and precarious, but it is better, even if only somewhat better, than last year.

Selective service registration

This bill, which would have required all young people to automatically be registered for selective service whenever they conduct any sort of transaction at the Registry of Motor

Vehicles, created something of stir among many of my constituents, so I'd like to explain a little bit about what we've done to fix it.

The original bill was filed by Senator Jarrett Barrios (D-Cambridge) with what I considered to be the very best of intentions. Senator Barrios was concerned that legal resident immigrants might not be aware, because of language barriers, that they were required to register for selective service. Senator Barrios understood that if a legal immigrant failed to register, that person could be subject to dire consequences, including loss of financial aid for education, loss of government benefits, denial of citizenship, even prosecution and deportation. In an effort to solve that problem, Senator Barrios filed a bill that made selective service registration automatic whenever a young person conducted business at the RMV.

What troubled me, and many of my constituents, including people with the American Friends Service Committee and the American Civil Liberties Union, about the original bill was that the selective service registration was the result of an automatic government action, not a conscious action by the individual. Young men, when they turn 18, are required by federal law to register for selective service. That is not in question. What was in question with the original bill was that it held the risk of young people being registered by the government without their knowledge and perhaps without their understanding of the consequences of registering.

I agreed with the AFSC and ACLU that registering for selective service should be done knowingly, so I filed an amendment to Barrios' bill that makes registering for selective service at RMV offices -- which is done in 34 other states -- a voluntary procedure.

The amended bill was approved overwhelmingly in the Senate and now awaits action in the House of Representatives.

Municipal census

Massachusetts can legitimately make a claim for being at the cutting edge in many fields, like education, medical and computer technology. But when it comes to something as fundamental to our democracy as compiling jury lists, it's almost like we haven't even discovered fire yet.

The problem, as I see it, is the annual municipal census, which costs cities and towns about \$6 million a year, based on research conducted 10 years ago. Massachusetts is the only state that requires an annual municipal census, which is used as the source material for compiling jury lists. It's bad enough that this is an unfunded state mandate. But another consequence of using a municipal census for jury lists is that in communities where census participation rates are low, the diversity of juries can be compromised.

I have been working to eliminate the municipal census as an unfunded state mandate, leaving it to each community to decide whether they wish to continue the practice. The state currently compels communities to do the census as part of compiling jury lists and purging the voter lists. Massachusetts stands alone in its use of a census inquiry as the means to placing a voter on the inactive list. HAVA (Help America Vote Act) recommends

methods for purging the voter list, none of which include a municipal census. A decade ago, in response to the Federal Motor Voter Act, Massachusetts dramatically improved its voter registration system for the purpose of encouraging and making it easier for persons to register to vote. We moved from being one of the most restrictive states in the country to one of the easiest states in the country, with regard to registration opportunities. HAVA is intended to continue that progress by insuring that those who register to vote are not disenfranchised at the polling place. By continuing to mandate the use of the municipal census as the first step in decertifying a voter, we work against the spirit of HAVA.

I want Massachusetts to adopt what's called the "merge and purge" system for assembling jury lists, a system used by every other state. This system employs a series of data bases -- voter registration, vehicle registration, employment insurance -- merges them and eliminates duplication to provide the basis for jury lists. This system is significantly less expensive than the municipal census technique, and whatever costs are associated with it are borne by the state, not local governments, which, as you know, are financed by property taxes, the most regressive tax on the books.

I have been working on this with experts from Connecticut, which purportedly has one of the best "merge and purge" systems, and officials from the Massachusetts court system. I've also had several meetings with Lt. Governor Kerry Healey, who has expressed an interest in this project. One of her assigned duties is to work on municipal relief, with a special eye toward unfunded state mandates. My view is this: If a city or town wants to conduct a municipal census, that option should be available. But there's no longer any excuse for the state to require it for the purpose of compiling jury lists, then not paying for it, when a cheaper option is available to create a jury list that is as good or better than the current one.

Based on my research no other state uses the annual municipal census process as part of purging their voter lists because as far as we've been able to determine from our research thus far, no other state has a state mandated annual census for all communities.

Smoking ban

Both the House and Senate have approved different versions of the statewide smoking ban. About half of the communities in the Commonwealth currently have locally established smoking bans in public places of one sort or another. These bans are based on public health and medical research concerning the dangers of second-hand smoke. A number of major statewide associations representing businesses have asked the Legislature to create a single statewide consistent set of policies in order to address the competitive problems their members are experiencing by having some communities with smoking bans and neighboring communities without. Employee organizations have similarly urged the Legislature to act because all too often people have to choose between taking or keeping a job and compromising their health. This is not a choice people should have to make when it comes to earning a living. The House and Senate versions are different, so a conference committee will be appointed to work out those differences.

Roundup

2004 Municipal Conference

It's that time of year again, time to start preparing for the 2004 Municipal Conference. It will be held Saturday, March 27th, 2004, at The Clarion Hotel and Conference Center in Northampton.

I am very happy to announce that I am teaming up with the Hampshire and Franklin Councils of Governments to bring you the 2004 conference. We are well along in the planning and are looking forward, once again, to attracting the top legislative leaders and administration officials. Already, Senate President Robert Travaglini has agreed to be our keynote speaker. I have always seen this conference as an opportunity for us in western Massachusetts to present our perspectives to policymakers in Boston. I will keep you posted about the program as we get closer, but if you have any questions or comments, contact Tom in my district office at 413-587-6289 or at tumitch@sprynet.com.

Constitutional convention

The Constitutional Convention scheduled for November 12th was recessed until February 11th, 2004. A number of constitutional amendments are likely to come up at that time, including an amendment to change the number of signatures required to get a referendum on the ballot, the Defense of Marriage Act, which would change the constitution to define marriage as a union of one man and one woman.

State grants

On Sept. 17th, the state Aeronautics Commission awarded a \$210,200 grant to the Turners Falls Airport Commission for reconstruction of the airport's main and west aprons. The state grant is part of the total \$802,000 project, which also includes a \$579,500 grant from the federal government and \$12,300 from the town of Montague.

Office hours

Here is my schedule for office hours for the rest of this year. I hope you'll be able to stop by sometime. No appointments are necessary, but if you need more information, contact Tom in my district office, 587-6289.

Friday, Dec. 19 -- Greenfield, Meeting Room, Town Hall, 10-11 a.m.

Trivia

Now for the answer to last month's question -- Name the last vice presidential candidate from Massachusetts. The answer is: Henry Cabot Lodge, who ran with Richard Nixon in 1960 against JFK and LBJ.

And our winner is Michelle M. from somewhere in cyberspace. We'll send Michelle information on who to contact in my Boston office and we'll look forward to seeing her at the State House. Congratulations Michelle! And thanks to everybody who played along!

Now to this month's question and another chance to win lunch and a State House tour.

The last time the Red Sox won the World Series was in 1918. Who did they beat?

Submit your answer to tumitch@sprynet.com and watch this space for the correct answer and the prize winner.

Links

Here are a few links. Until next time, happy surfing!

Click here tumitch@sprynet.com if you want to be removed from our list.

Click here for our on-line feedback form www.stanrosenberg.com/form.html

Forward this link to a friend www.stanrosenberg.com/issues/rosenreportreg.html

Guide to Lawmaking -- <http://www.state.ma.us/legis/lawmkng.htm>

Massachusetts State Government Home Page -- <http://mass.gov/>

The Legislature's web page -- <http://www.state.ma.us/legis/>

Senate's Bill Text System -- <http://www.state.ma.us/legis/billsrch.htm>

Legislative Tracking System -- <http://www.state.ma.us/legis/ltsform.htm>

My personal website -- <http://www.stanrosenberg.com/>

The Rosenberg Report (September, 2003, edition) --
<http://www.stanrosenberg.com/issues/sept2003.html>