

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON
GENERAL GOVERNMENT AND REGULATORY REFORM

April 6, 1995 Hearing Room 357
1:00 pm Tapes 85 - 86

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rep. Bob Tiernan, Chair
Rep. Mike Lehman, Vice Chair
Rep. Jerry Grisham
Rep. Cedric Hayden
Rep. Bryan Johnston
Rep. Bill Markham
Rep. Lonnie Roberts
Rep. Barbara Ross
Rep. Charles Starr
Rep. Ken Strobeck
Rep. Sharon Wylie (Arrival: 2:15 pm)

MEMBER EXCUSED:

Rep. Bev Clarno

STAFF PRESENT:

Greg Moore, Committee Counsel
Kay C. Shaw, Committee Assistant

MEASURES HEARD:

HB 2988 Work Session
HB 2299 Work Session
HB 3366 Work Session
HJR 35 Public Hearing
HJR 67 Public Hearing
HB 2188 Work Session
HB 3364 Public Hearing

These minutes contain materials which paraphrase and/or summarize statements made during this session. Only text enclosed in quotation marks

report a speaker's exact words. For complete contents of the proceedings, please refer to the tapes.

TAPE 85, A

007 CHAIR TIERNAN: Calls the meeting to order at 1:41 pm. REP. CLARNO is EXCUSED. REP. WYLIE is ABSENT.
> Announcements.

CHAIR TIERNAN: Opens the work session on HB 2988.

HB 2988 - WORK SESSION

017 GREG MOORE, Committee Counsel: Reviews HB 2988. Submits (EXHIBIT A).

032 MOTION: REP. STROBECK moves HB 2988 be sent to the Floor with a DO PASS recommendation.

REP. STARR: FOR THE RECORD: Oregon State Fire Chiefs at the spring meeting voted unanimously to support this bill. Urges a "yes" vote.

VOTE: In a roll call vote, REPS. GRISHAM, HAYDEN, JOHNSTON, LEHMAN, MARKHAM, ROBERTS, ROSS, STARR, STROBECK and CHAIR TIERNAN vote AYE. REP. CLARNO is EXCUSED. REP. WYLIE is ABSENT.

CHAIR TIERNAN: Declares the MOTION PASSED.

CHAIR TIERNAN: Closes the work session on HB 2988 and opens work session on HB 2299 and HB 3366.

HB 2299 and HB 3366 - WORK SESSION

Witness: Rep. Kevin Mannix (D - District 32)
John Danielson, Oregon Education Association (Portland)
Rich Peppers, Oregon Public Employees Union/Local 503 (OPEU)

054 REP. KEVIN MANNIX (D - District 32): Testifies in support of HB 2299.
> Refers to information in HB_3366 which is similar.
> Submits HB 2299-1 amendments (EXHIBIT B) that modify the language of the bill to simplify the provisions in Section 1.

> Additionally, suggests modifying HB 2299-1 amendments on Line 2 after "plan" delete "to implement" and insert "under" and on Line 3 after "agreement" delete "do not take effect until" and insert "most be".

> Intent of the HB 2299-1 amendments would be to fulfill the original philosophical mission of HB 2299 (i.e., the legislature ought to be looking

at the funds that are required to carry out a collective bargaining agreement as to salaries and making the financial commitment).

> Points out there is no emergency clause in the bill; therefore, the law would not be effective until perhaps September or October -- any current negotiations would not be impeded by this legislation.

084 REP. ROBERTS: Has a problem with the bill totally, because the legislative process is getting involved in the administrative portion of the government's business. Would this legislation augment the process for salary negotiations?

REP. MANNIX: Yes, it would change the way negotiations run.

> Refers to earlier testimony from the Department of Administrative Services that currently they include "subject to legislative appropriation"

in their contracts -- funds have to be appropriated. In reality, the appropriations system was changed in early 1980 so there is not a "wages" category that is unvarying. Instead there is a "services and supplies" category and possibly other categories in a given appropriation. Agencies have been free to "raid services and supplies, if necessary, to fulfill a collective bargaining agreement if they had to spend more money than they had planned on."

> Explains the affect of the legislation and the ratification process.

120 REP. ROBERTS: Refers to discussion about salary plan. Are these the changes made through labor/management negotiations?

REP. MANNIX: Yes.

REP. STROBECK: Is it correct that negotiations occur and a final agreement is reached, but the agreement would not go into effect until ratified by the Legislative Assembly?

REP. MANNIX. All of the agreement could go into effect except for anything requiring a change in the salary plan -- that would be subject to ratification by the Legislative Assembly.

REP. STROBECK: Continues inquiries about what would happen if the

Legislative Assembly failed to ratify this salary plan -- prior to the negotiating process would the structure be the same and what are the guidelines for negotiators once they are into this process?

REP. MANNIX: It would be clear from the statute ahead of time there is a ratification clause and that legislative must ratify the salary plan. Provides examples. The structure prior to negotiating would be changed. Establishing guidelines would be up to the Executive Branch and the Governor.

174 REP. ROSS: Asks for explanation about timing for collective bargaining.

REP. MANNIX: Visualizes it happening before session with an agreement ready that becomes part of the budget appropriation proposals made by the Executive Branch (i.e., a specific figure would then be before the Legislative Assembly rather than "a moving target as to what we need to appropriate funds for."

REP. ROSS: If, for example, the legislature cut the proposal by one-third, would the Executive Department return to the bargaining table and rebargain?

REP. MANNIX: Yes.

187 REP. JOHNSTON: Do you see your proposal easing matters so that government functions smoothly or would it make matters more complicated?

REP. MANNIX: Depends on the timing. Presently, matters would be more complicated, but this bill does not have an emergency clause and, if passed

and signed by the Governor, the legislation would not go into effect until perhaps August or September (i.e., negotiators of contracts that are pending would have ample time before this law is in effect to handle those salary plans). Adds that it is always possible to have a special legislative session if significant contract negotiations have occurred and ratification is needed as well as a decision about appropriations. Intent is that the legislature take fiscal responsibility for those decisions.

206 REP. LEHMAN: Understands that the basic principle is to gain control of the financial costs imposed on the legislature?

REP. MANNIX: That's correct.

REP. LEHMAN: Refers to Rep. Mannix's earlier testimony about benefit/vacation pay packages, holidays, etc. Is it correct those benefit requests do not come to the legislature for approval?

REP. MANNIX: Correct. Only the salary plan would come to the legislature, because that is the biggest financial affect.

REP. LEHMAN: Do you see any confusion created by some of the benefit package being out there, negotiated and in place and some subject to rescission or not approved by the legislature?

REP. MANNIX: Some potential confusion, but opines the negotiators can take care of that. Illustrates example.

REP. LEHMAN: Why not have the legislature take full control over the bargaining process?

REP. MANNIX: There are elements of the collective bargaining agreement that, under current law, a wide range of things are subject to collective bargaining, not all of which has any particular financial impact. The focus is the one financial element that is clear-cut and dollars/cents.

245 CHAIR TIERNAN: What happens currently in county government when the county has the city administrator negotiate? What is the process that takes place with school boards when the school board has the superintendent negotiate?

REP. MANNIX: The regular process is that the school board must ratify the agreement or the county commissioners must ratify the agreement or a city council must ratify the agreement. It depends on the unit of government that is involved.

CHAIR TIERNAN: Your proposal is similar to what is in existence now in many other local jurisdictions?

REP. MANNIX: Yes. In fact less so, in the sense that we are only talking about the salary plan, not the other terms of the agreement.

266 REP. HAYDEN: Confirms this only applies to state employees not county, school or other local governments.

REP. MANNIX: Correct.

270 REP. LEHMAN: Comments about the analogy between local governments and their negotiation process. Don't the legislative bodies, the board or the county commissioners, have more say over the parameters of the negotiation process that are to occur? Don't they have more control over the process than the legislature has over the process by the Executive Department?

REP. MANNIX: Under current law, that is very true. Comments about the uncertainty with SB _750.

287 REP. ROSS: How would this proposed legislation fit with SB 750? Is this compatible with the provisions of SB 750 or not?

REP. MANNIX: Hasn't read the latest version of SB 750. Philosophically it is not totally compatible, but legally it is compatible. Position has been this is a positive bill about the legislature taking responsibility for being supportive of salary plans and joining with the Governor toward that endeavor rather than a negative. SB 750 reflects the fact there is a statutory scheme for collective bargaining.

310 CHAIR TIERNAN: Comments about the introduction of SB 750. Believes this legislation does not conflict with anything in SB 750. Provides example.

REP. MANNIX: That's a fair analogy.

REP. LEHMAN: Disagrees with the analogy somewhat, because there is always much more input from the Board of Directors about what is going on, what can/can't be offered -- they are much more involved. An important distinction is that the legislature is not involved at all until the legislature gets the "bill at the end."

335 CHAIR TIERNAN: Clear analogy is the process now -- the legislature signs the check and the check is given to the Governor. The proposed process is the requester fills out the check, the legislature reviews the check and then signs it. The question is which way should the legislature operate. Suggests that the more responsible way is "that instead of writing blank checks . . . see what the check is all about . . . then sign it."

REP. MANNIX: Comments about memberships on the Ways & Means Committee this session and House Appropriations Committee last session and that the

legislation is a response to how government was run from the appropriations side.

CHAIR TIERNAN: Allows further testimony.

384 JOHN DANIELSON, Oregon Education Association (Portland): Testifies in opposition to HB _3366 and HB 2299. Explains reasons for opposing the legislation:

> Believes the legislation is impractical. Says McLaren and Hillcrest lead the State of Oregon in having more client-imposed workers' compensation claims than any other agency of government, because they are difficult places to work and the bargaining situation is different.

> OEA hasn't finished a contract during the time the legislature was in session. Explains the delay and issues surrounding the change in executive management.

TAPE 86, A

014 MR. DANIELSON: Continues testifying:

> Suggests adding the potential for approval by the E-Board.
> Explains another reason why this is not good legislation (i.e., separation of powers, salaries and management of the state falls into the jurisdiction of the Executive Branch government which is lead by the Governor).
> Opines it is the legislature's responsibility to dictate or legislate the

level of services not the level of pay.

046 > Comments about "bad faith" bargaining.
> Opines this legislation will not result in cost savings to the state, but will result in confusion to the legislature, a downgrading of the level of negotiations and is "bad law."

REP. WYLIE: Arrives at 2:15 pm.

080 CHAIR TIERNAN: Is it correct that as a union, the union brings the tentative agreement back to the membership for ratification?

MR. DANIELSON: Yes.

CHAIR TIERNAN: The membership is more or less the Board of Directors or the people obligated by the contract. Why isn't it also fair that the management side bring back the contracts to the people who will be obligated for approval (i.e., the legislature)?

MR. DANIELSON: Opines it is the Governor, as head of the Executive Department, who directs the bargaining. Explains the process when dealing with a bargaining team.

100 REP. LEHMAN: Would the legislature be better off to assume full responsibility for bargaining or leave it as is, rather than go this halfway step in between?

MR. DANIELSON: If the legislature wishes to ratify the contracts and the legislature would open the process where the E-Board could, then that is a decision that the legislature makes. Opines it is a bad decision, because it is not an appropriate role for the Legislative Assembly.

REP. LEHMAN: If the legislature is going to be involved in this at all, wouldn't it be better for the legislature to be fully involved or not involved at all, rather than this halfway step of "just ratifying"?

MR. DANIELSON: Doesn't know whether the legislature can supersede the responsibilities of the Governor. Opines that to be partially involved is

not appropriate; therefore, if the legislature wants to become involved, the legislature would have to be involved in the strategy sessions that preceded the final, last offer by the state.

129 RICH PEPPERS, Political Director, Oregon Public Employees Union/Local 503 (OPEU): Testifies from prepared testimony on HB 2299 and HB 3366. Submits (EXHIBIT C).

- > Labels the issues raised Rep. Mannix's as appropriations issues.
- > Describes the developments with the proposed bill as a question of whether the legislature will micromanage collective bargaining. Cautions against that.
- > Explains current system of contract negotiation.
- > Refers to Rep. Mannix's concern about bargaining agreements exceeding allocated amounts in the budget. Explains the issue.
- > Opines it is best to remain with the current system process.
- > Points out concerns about HB 2299:

Many issues are dealt with at the bargaining table and they do have interplay.

Interest arbitration under the proposed bill would be undercut. Timing under the proposed bill is very difficult.

- > Concludes that the current system has worked, budgets for salaries have been "lived within," there is no evidence of gross misuse of the current system and approval of this bill would be a step toward micromanagement of salary issues rather than allowing the duly-appointed Executive Department to handle the issues.

198 REP. ROSS: Is the language in either HB 2299 or HB 3366 more appropriate than the other?

MR. PEPPERS: The bill that deals with collecting bargain situations is discriminatory toward people who are represented employees. OPEU objects to both bills.

REP. ROSS: Do you have any suggestions about how the legislature could get a better handle on the appropriation of salaries? Gives an example.

MR. PEPPERS: The legislature does have the ability in biennial reviews of budgets to demand accountability by the agencies. If it is found that money should have been kept/spent in one category was inappropriately spent elsewhere, that is an issue that can be addressed through Ways and Means.

232 CHAIR TIERNAN: Would you have a problem with a bill that provides that the legislature shall appropriate funds and no more than what is appropriated by the legislature for salaries or benefits shall be exceeded in any negotiations?

MR. PEPPERS: Refers to Mr. Danielson's testimony that the responsibility for negotiating these contracts is with the Governor's office. Gives an example of the Governor negotiating with unions, etc. and settlements that exceed what has been allocated by the legislature. The parties would have no alternative but to return to the legislature for a larger appropriation.

249 CHAIR TIERNAN: Understands that is not necessarily so?

MR. DANIELSON: In the past, parties have gone with a delayed implementation of the raise.

CHAIR TIERNAN: If the legislature allocates \$50 Million, the Governor can spend/give away more than that so long as the funds are found in other already allocated budgets?

262 PETER DELUCA: That is correct.

CHAIR TIERNAN: Would you have a problem negotiating if the legislature, who has the responsibility for allocating funds, decides to say that the

most that can be spent in the budget is \$50 Million?

MR. PEPPERS: OPEU would work toward such a bill, but there are other concerns that need to be considered.

CHAIR TIERNAN: No problem with the concept?

MR. PEPPERS: It depends on how it is worked out.

REP. LEHMAN: Requests more information about the negotiating process for state employees.

282 MR. PEPPERS: Explains that some employees are non-strikeable as public safety employees. There is an interest arbitration process in lieu of fact-finding and mediation.

REP. LEHMAN: Continues inquiries about fact-finding and mediation and the collective bargaining process.

CHAIR TIERNAN: Closes work session on HB 2299 and HB 3366

CHAIR TIERNAN: Announcements about change to HB 2299-1 amendments.

358 REP. ROSS: Is the focus on HB 2299 v. HB 3366?

CHAIR TIERNAN: Yes.

CHAIR TIERNAN: Opens public hearing on HJR 35 and HJR 67.

HJR 35 and HJR 67 - PUBLIC HEARING

376 GREG MOORE, Committee Counsel: Reviews the Preliminary Staff Measure Summary on HJR 35. The Preliminary Staff Measure Summary is hereby made a part of these Minutes (EXHIBIT D).

GREG MOORE, Committee Counsel: Reviews the Preliminary Staff Measure Summary on HJR 67. The Preliminary Staff Measure Summary is hereby made a part of these Minutes (EXHIBIT E).

TAPE 85, B

003 REP. MARKHAM: Has the Senate Bill moved?

COUNSEL MOORE: It has left the Senate and has arrived in House Rules.

REP. MARKHAM: Explains the intent of the bill. Issue is the perception of interference between the separation of the Executive and Legislative Branches of government.

CHAIR TIERNAN: Why is this proposed bill a constitutional amendment?

022 COUNSEL MOORE: The entire legislature makes a decision to give an agency authority to pass the rule. Authority is delegated. The situation now is a limited number of legislators, those on this legislative committee

in one case, or the 15 legislators in the other case would be coming back and suspending the operation -- what the entire body had agreed on. It is a delegation issue.

REP. HAYDEN: Clarifies in HJR 67 that it is five Senators or 10 Representatives to require suspension of administrative rule by Governor.

CHAIR TIERNAN: Closes the public hearing on HJR 35 and HJR 67. Opens work session on HB 2188.

HB 2188 - WORK SESSION

Witnesses: Jim McIntosh, Department of Administrative Services (DAS)

048 COUNSEL MOORE: Reviews HB 2188 history. Submits HB 2188-1 amendments (EXHIBIT F). Explains that the language is similar to that contained in SB

750, except for the term "managerial official" and "managerial status."

CHAIR TIERNAN: Explains the background of the two bills. Requests an update and preference between the two bills.

067 JIM MCINTOSH, Division of Human Resource Management, Department of Administrative Services (DAS): Testifies that the proposed HB 2188-1 amendments and the provisions in SB 750 are similar, except that it only applied to State of Oregon employees which is consistent with DAS' request.

DAS has no problem with the amendment.

076 REP. JOHNSTON: Concerned that the proposed bill makes everybody a manager in many areas. Is that incorrect?

082 MR. MCINTOSH: DAS doesn't view that the bill and this change lead to that kind of result. Suggests looking at the changes in the workplace insofar as "leveling out organizations and removing . . . layers of supervisory staff." By removing the supervisory layers, a need is created for replacing some of those with people aligned with management who have specific program- and skill-types of responsibilities.

REP. ROSS: Cynical view of the bill might be that it is DAS' strategy to get as many people out of the union as possible so that when there is strike there is enough management people to work.

MR. MCINTOSH: That's not the purpose behind the bill.

REP. ROSS: What substantiation do you have that that is not the purpose?

MR. MCINTOSH: Best substantiation is to state "that it is not. That is not the reason we drafted the bill and had it filed."

REP. ROSS: Reflects on her experience as part of management in 1988 when there was a strike. At that time it was very much in management's interest to have as many people as possible who were not in the union.

MR. MCINTOSH: Points out that using the existing supervisory definition and simply to create more supervisors "flies in the face of your span of control or new management kinds of techniques."

118 MR. DELUCA: Comments about the current strike planning. Ranks of management do not need to be expanded in order to cover the situation described. Assuredly, this is not the intent of the bill.

129 MOTION: REP. HAYDEN moves that HB 2188-1 amendments be ADOPTED.

VOTE: In a roll call vote, REPS. GRISHAM, HAYDEN, JOHNSTON, LEHMAN, MARKHAM, ROBERTS, ROSS, STARR, STROBECK, WYLIE and CHAIR TIERNAN vote AYE.

REP. CLARNO is EXCUSED.

CHAIR TIERNAN: Declares the MOTION PASSED.

REP. HAYDEN: Opines that with this amendment the Governor's requirements have been satisfied.

MOTION: REP. HAYDEN moves HB 2188 as amended to the Floor with a DO PASS

recommendation.

157 REP. JOHNSTON: Explains his intent to vote "no." Refers to DAS' memo and the sentence about the need for legislation: "This places employees in the untenable situation of being asked to make management decisions that may conflict with the position of their unions." Says that is a conclusion

and opines that conclusion was unsupported in any of the testimony heard about the bill. Doubts it has been demonstrated there is a need for this when at the same time we are striving for decisions lower and lower in the work force. Excepting the good intentions of DAS now, this type of determinate for managerial structure could easily put everybody in that class at some point in the not too distant future. Opines the bill is a mistake and will ultimately cause more dissension in the workplace as unions are forced to tell their people "don't take those positions, because it will exclude you from the bargaining unit."

176 REP. ROBERTS: Adds to Rep. Johnston's remarks. Opines that people will be discouraged from being a part of the decision-making process and to streamline government. Joins Rep, _Johnston in a "no" vote on the bill.

192 REP. WYLIE: States her intention to vote "no" for the same reasons as Rep. Johnston. Involving people in management decisions is critical to helping organizations move forward, change and adapt. This legislation would make it more difficult.

199 REP. ROSS: States her intention to vote "no." Agrees it is desirable to push decision-making down, but it is a natural desire of management to get as many people on their team as possible, especially when a strike is contemplated. This legislation "opens the door to taking a lot of people out of the union in order to swell management's ranks and also we, ultimately, will pay those people more and it wastes money."

210 REP. LEHMAN: States his intention to vote "no."

CHAIR TIERNAN: Requests that one of the members intending to vote "no", consider voting "yes" to get the bill on the Floor so Rep. Clarno doesn't have to come?

REP. JOHNSTON: Proffers that Rep. Ross and he intend to vote "no" first and if one vote will make the difference, they will supply that to the Chair.

220 REP. STROBECK: Points out that the testimony heard addressed the same concerns and this is an efficiency move. States intent to vote "yes."

CHAIR TIERNAN: Views this as a streamline of government.

VOTE: In a roll call vote, REPS. GRISHAM, HAYDEN, JOHNSTON MARKHAM, STARR, STROBECK and CHAIR TIERNAN vote AYE. REPS. _LEHMAN, ROBERTS, ROSS and WYLIE vote NAY. REP. CLARNO is EXCUSED. REP. _JOHNSTON changes vote to AYE (see tape at 241). Carrier of the bill is REP. STARR.

241 REP. JOHNSTON: Inasmuch as one more vote is needed, reserves right to vote "no" and speak in opposition on the Floor, changes vote to "AYE".

CHAIR TIERNAN: Declares the MOTION PASSED.

CHAIR TIERNAN: Declares a recess at 2:55 pm.

CHAIR TIERNAN: Reconvenes meeting at 3:04 pm. Opens work session on HB 3364.

HB 3364 - PUBLIC HEARING

263 CHAIR TIERNAN: Introductory comments.

GREG MOORE, Committee Counsel: Preliminary Staff Measure Summary is hereby made a part of these Minutes (EXHIBIT G).

REP. STROBECK: Submits that the process for ratification by the Senate at the national and state levels, in general, goes along with the privilege of the Executive to appoint the person desired unless they "are way outside the bounds in terms of competence, experience, relevance, etc." Opines this bill would not be burdensome and doubts the Senate, under most scenarios, "blocking" an appointment unless the person was "way out in left field." This is a fine idea.

CHAIR TIERNAN: Illustrates an example of appointing a former labor union official. Opines there would be problems.

REP. STROBECK: Agrees and the Executive, recognizing that the authority would be in the Senate, is not going to appoint somebody who is clearly outside the bounds of approval.

CHAIR TIERNAN: Explains the discussion is about whether or not the Senate should approve the Governor's appointment for whom is heading up labor relations. Currently, the position is not confirmed by the Senate.

301 REP. MARKHAM: Agrees that it is a good idea.

CHAIR TIERNAN: Closes the public hearing on HB 3364 and opens public hearing on HJR _35 and HJR 67.

HJR 35 and HJR 67 - PUBLIC HEARING

Witness: Ole Olson (West Linn)

CHAIR TIERNAN: Provides comments about the bills and intent to use HJR 35 as the main vehicle for the legislation.

330 OLE OLSON (West Linn): Testifies in support of HJR 35 and HJR 67 in principle.

> Introductory comments.

> Explains experience when rules are adopted/interpreted improperly and working with Department of Consumer Business Services, Building Codes agency and other groups.

CHAIR TIERNAN: Requests background information about his situation involving making/assisting with elevator lifts for homes whereby the State of Oregon allegedly has regulated him out of business.

436 MR. OLSON: Continues testifying:

> Gives history of the Elevator Division since the 1970s.

> Talks about departmental changes since 1987.

TAPE 86, B

054 MR. OLSON: Continues testifying:

> Describes interpretation of laws and adoption of administrative rules that deviate from the federal laws.

> Discusses the legislature's role, various codes and the Administrative Procedures Act.

092 CHAIR TIERNAN: Summarizes his understanding of the situation. Explains the intent of the bill.

REP. MARKHAM: Who should figure out this problem? Suggests he submit a list.

CHAIR TIERNAN: Requested Mr. Wilson work with Committee Counsel Greg Moore to assist in sorting out the problem. Consideration to be given to HJR 36 and HJR 67 as means of a check and balance system.

REP. GRISHAM: Suggests there is a benefit by all committee members viewing the testimony presented.

CHAIR TIERNAN: Closes the public hearing on HJR 35 and HJR 67. Adjourns the meeting at 3:30 pm.

Submitted by, Reviewed by,

Kay C. Shaw Gregory G. Moore
Committee Assistant Committee Counsel

EXHIBIT SUMMARY:

- A - Revenue and Impact Analysis Statements -- Staff -- 2 Pages
- B - Proposed Amendments to HB 2299 -- Rep. Kevin Mannix -- 1 Page
- C - Prepared Testimony on HB 2299 and HB 3366 -- Rich Peppers -- 3 Pages
- D - Preliminary Staff Measure Summary on HJR 35 -- Staff -- 2 Pages
- E - Preliminary Staff Measure Summary on HJR 67 -- Staff -- 2 Pages
- F - Proposed Amendments to HB 2188 -- Staff -- 2 Pages
- G - Preliminary Staff Measure Summary on HB 3364 -- Staff -- 2 Pages