

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR

June 7, 1993 Hearing Room D 8:30 a.m. Tapes 129 - 132

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rep. John Watt, Chair

Rep. Lee Beyer Rep. Michael Payne

Rep. Charles Starr

Rep. Bob Tiernan

STAFF PRESENT: Marilyn Johnston, Committee Administrator Kristina
McNitt, Committee Assistant

MEASURES CONSIDERED: HB 2080 HB 2010 HB 2906 HB 3407 HB 2912 HB 3402

[--- Unable To Translate Graphic ---]

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. [--- Unable To Translate
Graphic ---]

TAPE 129, SIDE A

107 CHAIR WATT calls the meeting to order at 8:39 a.m. and opens the
public hearing on HB 2080.

HB 2080 - PUBLIC HEARING

The Preliminary Staff Measure Summary and Legislative Fiscal and Revenue
statements are hereby made a part of these minutes (EXHIBIT A).

011 MARILYN JOHNSTON, Committee Administrator, explains provisions of
the

bill and advises members that a previous hearing was held on March 12.

012 CHAIR WATT, noting there are no witnesses, closes the public
hearing and opens the work session on HB 2080.

(Tape 129, Side A) HB 2080 - WORK SESSION

017 BILL LINDEN, State Court Administrator, requests the committee
move HB 2080 to the Appropriations Committee for further consideration.
>Judges are the only group of public employees who have a cap on their

benefits >The bill requires the judges to give back to the system for
some of the benefits they receive. >Anticipate over a five-year period
expenses of new judges will be avoided that would equal the cost of this
measure.

024 MOTION: REP. BEYER moves that HB 2080 to sent to the Full
Commerce Committee with the recommendation that it be referred

to Appropriations Committee WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION as to passage.

031 VOTE: In a roll call vote, all members present vote AYE.
REP. TIERNAN is EXCUSED.

033 CHAIR WATT declares the motion PASSED, closes the work session on
HB 2080 and opens a public hearing on HB 2010.

(Tape 129, Side A) HB 2010 - PUBLIC HEARING

Witnesses: Mary Wendy Roberts, Commissioner, Bureau of Labor &
Industries (BOLI) Paul Tiffany, Administrator, Wage & Hour Division
(BOLI) Irv Fletcher, Oregon AFL-CIO Mike McCallum, Oregon Restaurant
Association Julie Brandis, Associated Oregon Industries Kay Juran,
Oregon Food Industry

The Preliminary Staff Measure Summary, HB 2010-2 amendments,
hand-engrossed HB 2010-2 bill, HB 2010-3 amendments, hand-engrossed HB
2010-3, ORS 653.315, and the Legislative Revenue statement are hereby
made a part of these minutes (EXHIBIT B).

037 MS. JOHNSTON reviews the provisions of HB 2010.

035 MARY WENDY ROBERTS, Commissioner, Bureau of Labor and Industries,
introduces Paul Tiffany, Wage and Hour Division, submits a prepared
statement, examples of child labor violations, a chart comparing current
law to HB 2010 and the proposed amendments, work permit statistics and
forms, and testifies against HB 2010 (EXHIBIT C).

091 REP. WATT asks for history of reasons for and protections
provided by a certificate.

091 COMMISSIONER ROBERTS gives history of child labor laws and cites
cases of violations and in summary comments: >none of the amendments
enhance protections for working minors >amendments go beyond HB 2010 and
eliminate the Wage and Hour Commission's authority to revoke the
employers' rights to hire minors when the employers violate child labor
laws >the -2 amendments would prohibit the commission from regulating
the hours of work of 16 and 17 year olds. >the -3 amendments are the
worst; they eliminate the entire work permit system >suggest the
committee focus on financing the system, rather than lessening the
protections for working children and safeguarding employers from
inadvertent violations.

371 REP. BEYER asks if the employment certificates are reviewed by
staff,

and whether there is follow up with the employer?

376 COMMISSIONER ROBERTS responds affirmatively and adds that
occasionally there is followup. The difficulty is the availability of
staff; there

are 13 compliance people for the entire state.

418 REP. BEYER asks to what extent do BOLI and OROSHA coordinate

their efforts in enforcement.

420 PAUL TIFFANY, Administrator, Wage & Hour Division: The Bureau and OROSHA do coordinate their investigations of serious problems.

438 REP. BEYER asks if there are any interagency agreements so that OROSHA is checking for child labor law violations?

439 COMMISSIONER ROBERTS responds that OROSHA notifies BOLI if there is a

child involved in a violation.

TAPE 130, SIDE A

045 REP. BEYER asks who beyond the owner or manager of the business receive training.

049 COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: The Bureau holds seminars, has a technical assistance program and mailings are provided throughout the state.

057 REP. PAYNE asks about penalty limitations for violations in Section 4

(3) of HB 2010.

065 COMMISSIONER ROBERTS replies that in addition to criminal penalty authority, the Bureau has civil penalty authority of up to \$1,000 per violation.

073 MR. TIFFANY clarifies that the penalties in Section 4 (3) of HB 2010 are OROSHA penalties for violation of child labor laws.

084 REP. BEYER: HB 3565 from 1991, the Education Reform Act, puts more restrictions on child labor, particularly if they are not doing well in school. How does this interface with existing law and would it be any

different with HB 2010?

093 COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: If HB 2010 were amended to eliminate the regulation of 16 and 17 year olds, it would be ignoring the Education Reform Act.

104 MR. TIFFANY explains that working hours for 16 and 17 year olds are becoming increasingly restricted and gives examples in Washington state.

162 REP. BEYER also asks for information about the nature of complaints from employers and youth and/or their parents.

163 COMMISSIONER ROBERTS responds that most complaints surround berry fields which BOLI has no jurisdiction over (it is a federal regulation that relates to pesticides, insecticides, etc.) parents employing their own

children, and people who don't want to go through the paperwork.

186 REP. BEYER: How about employer complaints about the system?

188 COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: The Bureau had a series of hearings on proposed changes to the system to save money. The proposal was to rely on the employment certificate and have that certificate have the parents' signature. Then the individual work permits would not be needed. Testimony from the employer community said they did not want to do that because they didn't want to be required to have the parents sign. They also wanted to keep the work permit.

219 IRV FLETCHER, President, Oregon AFL-CIO, submits a prepared statement

(EXHIBIT D) and testifies in opposition to HB 2010 and the -2 and -3 proposed amendments.

249 MIKE McCALLUM, Oregon Restaurant Association, testifies in support of

the -2 and -3 amendments to HB 2010 and explains how the current system works. >line 14 of page 1 of the -3 amendments requires the ages of minors employed be on the employer's quarterly report; names of minors would take care of information needs >believes there was a drafting error that removes BOLI authority to revoke hiring privileges for repeat offenders; authority should be retained by BOLI >industry is sensitive to concerns that minors are overworked and under protected; the industry doesn't think that is true

TAPE 129, SIDE B

057 REP. BEYER: The -2 amendments talk about limiting rules to the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act, which would exclude any limitation on 16 and

17 year olds. Are you supportive of the limitation or is that also a drafting error?

060 MR. MCCALLUM: I'm sure that is not an error. There is good reason to evaluate 16 and 17 year olds on an individual basis. The blanket restriction on the number of hours includes students who are out of school, those who have dropped out of school and in some cases are supporting families.

073 REP. PAYNE: I'm concerned about eliminating the minor work permit--where is the parent or guardian?

079 MR. McCALLUM: The minor work "permit" today does nothing to address how many hours a minor works, or even where he works. The "certificate" does not require any parental authorization. They are two very different and distinct forms.

103 REP. PAYNE: I realize the forms may be inadequate and understand they are separate. My concern is there needs to be some parental authorization or some control from a guardian.

107 MR. MCCALLUM: It is not the government's role to tell parents how to

keep track of their child. That is the parent's job.

114 REP. PAYNE: Could the -3 amendments be amended to require that if a

child goes to work, there is some kind of parental or guardian authorization?

117 MR. MCCALLUM: Parents have that authority and ability today to keep track of their child. They don't need another form. Parents should know how to do that.

144 REP PAYNE: There is a big difference between a 14 and 18 year old.

143 MR. MCCALLUM: The employer knows the age of the minor. The employer

simply would not need to report it on the quarterly report.

148 REP. PAYNE: How does BOLI know the age of the child in order to enforce the laws?

160 MR. MCCALLUM: The age of the child is in the employer file with the I9 report. If the Commissioner wants to conduct an investigation, the files are open. >the industry does not object to giving the age of the minor; the industry is looking at it from a data processing standpoint.

195 CHAIR WATT: I hear the Commissioner talking about children dying and

the industry talking about paper work. It is a pretty wide chasm.

201 MR. MCCALLUM: The industry feels the laws that are in place need to be followed by the employers and that information about those laws needs to be disseminated in a regular and readily occurring fashion. The employer certificate does not add to that a lot.

198 JULIE BRANDIS, Associated Oregon Industries, submits a prepared statement (EXHIBIT E) and testifies in favor of the HB 2010-2 and -3 amendments. She explains that most violations occur due to a minor working too many hours within one week or in one day. Regarding HB 3565, the Education Reform Act, and whether the child works is something for the parent to be regulating. AOI has been working with the Department of Education to reach a consensus or understanding of where

they are going. Child labor laws are enforced by BOLI; health and safety is enforced by OSHA.

293 REP. BEYER on option one (page 2 of Ms. Brandis testimony (EXHIBIT E), why do you want to keep the work permit?

299 MS. BRANDIS: There are two reasons. It is convenient for an employer to know the age of the minor--14 and 15 year old regulations are different than regulations for 16 and 17 year olds. The work permit has the date of birth on it. It also has the parental signature.

297 REP. BEYER: Is the work permit legal documentation for the I9?

300 MS. BRANDIS: No. The employee can bring in various documents. Flexibility is granted.

307 REP BEYER: Do you see the loss of the work permit as a major

problem?

313 MS. BRANDIS: Absolutely not.

322 MS. BRANDIS continues presentation of her prepared statement.

348 REP. BEYER: The issue of hours worked has two features. One is total hours worked, start and ending time and the other is different standards for 14-15 and 16-17 year olds and flexible schedules. How does your work plan address that? Are you trying to get to the notion that the work plan would be an acknowledgment by the employer that they understand that the laws exist?

386 MS. BRANDIS: Yes. The employer needs to be responsible for the laws. We are trying to say it is important for BOLI to know who is employing

minors, not individual minors.

425 REP. BEYER: My sense is we are not making any progress here and kids

are still at risk.

428 MS. BRANDIS: That is one reason AOI suggests more pro-active attempts to educate the employer.

TAPE 130, SIDE B

025 MR. MCCALLUM: We may make an appreciable improvement in the system if we move away from trying to individually track each student that goes from job to job and concentrate on educating the employers.

040 REP. PAYNE expresses concerned and desire to have some type of parental authorization and consent.

075 REP. TIERNAN notes that employers he is familiar with have a line on their employment applications for the parent or guardian to sign if the applicant is under 18 years of age. It would be simple to require employers to have a place for a parent or guardian to sign.

082 MS. BRANDIS: I appreciate that suggestion.

090 KAY JURAN, Director, Government Affairs, Oregon Food Industry, representing the grocers in Oregon, testifies in favor of the HB 201 0-2 and -3 amendments.

115 REP. PAYNE: Would your industry rather have a work permit application be required, or have a state mandate that the employment form have a place for a parent or guardian signature and that the application be sent to BOLI so they could monitor it?

112 MS. JURAN: I'd like to speak with some people regarding that suggestion, but it sounds like a good idea.

123 REP. TIERNAN: It is not my intent to have every employer send the applications to BOLI. 130 CHAIR WATT announces that his intent is to ask the Speaker for special permission to engage in a work group to move this bill through the process.

134 CHAIR WATT closes the public hearing on HB 2010 and opens a public hearing on HB 2906.

(Tape 130, Side B) HB 2906 - PUBLIC HEARING

Witnesses: Marie Keltner, Association of Oregon Counties and League of

Oregon Cities John Junkin, Washington County Tim Nisbitt, OPEU Rich Peppers, OPEU Mary Botkin, AFSCME Randy Leonard, Portland Firefighters Association Tom Chamberlain, Portland Firefighters Association

The Preliminary Staff Measure Summary, a memo from Lori Ives, Local Government Personnel Institute, a memo from the Washington County Board of Commissioners, HB 2906-2 amendments, HB 2902-2 hand-engrossed bill,

HB 2906-3 amendments, HB 2906-3 hand-engrossed bill, HB 2906-4 amendments, HB 2906-4 hand-engrossed bill, and Legislative Fiscal and Revenue statements are hereby made a part of these minutes (EXHIBIT F).

140 MS. JOHNSTON reviews the provisions of HB 2906 and advises the members this is the first hearing on the bill.

153 MARIA KELTNER, Association of Oregon Counties and League of Oregon Cities, advises the committee that the -2 and -3 amendments have been proposed by the cities and counties and have been adopted by both of their legislative groups. The differences in the amendments are that the -2 discuss the level of pay at which an employee who is transferred from one public entity to another is to be paid when they go to the receiving employer. The -3 amendments relate to the application of the law to non-profit organizations. The -4 amendments are broader than the -2 in that they do the same as -2 and also remove the requirements that were added in 1991 for sick leave and vacation leave accrual. She refers members to her memo in the packet and explains what happens when an employee transfers to another entity.

199 JOHN JUNKIN, County Counsel, Washington County, testifies in favor of HB 2906 and specifically in support of removal of non-profits from obligations (See also memo from Washington County Board of Commissioners (EXHIBIT F) and letter from Tom Woodruff, Mental Health Program Coordinator, Washington County (EXHIBIT G).) >would like to see removed the application of statute to non-profit organizations >would like to see removed the language that says there shall be no reduction of salary as a result of the transfer >HB 2906-4 amendments provide other changes that Washington County supports

346 REP. TIERNAN asks if PERS can apply to a private company. 354 MR. JUNKIN replies that ORS 236.620(2) allows the employee to elect to continue under any retirement system.

417 TIM NESBITT, Assistant Executive Director, OPEU, testifies in opposition to proposed amendments HB 2906-2 through HB 2906-4.

TAPE 131, SIDE A

002 MR. NESBITT continues his testimony.

028 RICH PEPPERS, OPEU, advises the committee he is present to answer questions.

031 MARY BOTKIN, AFSCME, testifies in opposition to the amendments to HB 2906: >original language in the transfer laws was developed in an effort to respond to concerns when the City of Portland and Multnomah County did a series of transfers and mergers >concern is if laws are repealed, the issues will be what happens to wages and benefits; there is an effort continually to downgrade the salaries of employees who work in state institutions as they move into

local government or into contracted programs >the effort is intended to save money by reducing or eliminating benefits and reducing significantly salaries >if salaries and/or benefit packages of mental health professionals are continually down graded, they won't stay in the field

078 REP. TIERNAN and OPEU representatives discuss the reorganization of OPB, employee wages and benefits.

149 RANDY LEONARD, President, Portland Firefighters Association, testifies in support of HB 2906 as printed, and in opposition to the proposed amendments, informs the committee that the bill was requested by their

association and gives history of problem that the bill addresses: >would allow transferred firefighters and police officers to have 90 days to elect to return to the Portland system >abolishes the two systems in the Portland Fire Bureau and Portland Police Bureau; allows the employees one more chance at selection >for those employees who have chosen to go to the fire and police system, it saves the taxpayers 6.88 percent of payroll costs

199 TOM CHAMBERLIN, Secretary-Treasurer, Portland Firefighters Association and a member of the Portland Fire, Police Disability and Retirement Board, testifies in favor of HB 2906: >there is a cost savings to the plan if HB 2906 is adopted; members' employee contributions could be transferred to the Portland Plan which

would reduce the milage rate levy >the two existing systems cause morale problems

212 CHAIR WATT closes the public hearing on HB 2906 and opens a public hearing on HB 3407.

(Tape 131, Side A) HB 3407 - PUBLIC HEARING

Witnesses Rep. Tony Van Vliet Jack Sollis, Oregon PERS Retirement PAC Jean Peters, PERS retiree

The Preliminary Staff Measure Summary and Legislative Revenue and Fiscal statements are hereby made a part of these minutes (EXHIBIT H). (NOTE:

Legislative Fiscal Statement was received after the public hearing was concluded).)

217 MARILYN JOHNSTON, Committee Administrator, gives an overview of HB 340 7.

220 REPRESENTATIVE TONY VAN VLIET, testifies in support of the HB 3407-2 amendments (EXHIBIT I): >bill is intended to address the problem

faced by employees who want to retire but are fearful because of high medical costs >there were hopes of solving the problem of high cost of medical insurance for those under 65 by merging BUBB and SEBB, however there are no distinct advantages of doing that but the HB 3407-2 amendments address the problem in the SEBB Board >in SEBB the populations were subdivided and many employees under 65 saw the plans increase; the intent of the amendments is to correct that and treat them as a single population in SEBB. BUBB is already doing it, but the language continues what they are already doing >with this, PERS will no longer cover people under the age of 65, but will cover employees in health plans after 65 with Medicare and with plans that basically support Medicare. PERS would continue to make payment to both SEBB and BUBB boards to cover the amount for the employees as an offset to the cost and leveling the playing field

313 CHAIR WATT asks Rep. Van Vliet questions about the 1991 task force which reviewed combining SEBB and BUBB.

318 REP. VAN VLIET: BUBB was leveling the cost of insurance across their

entire group of employees. SEBB subdivided out the older group from the younger group and consequently the health costs rose dramatically on that subgroup. That was not the intent of HB 2090 from 1991 session, nor was it the intent of PERS to stand in the way of any of that occurring.

329 CHAIR WATT: Why isn't it feasible to combine the two boards?

320 REP. VAN VLIET: Their populations were large enough that the combining of the employees with different union contracts and unrepresented employees didn't gain any distinctive advantage in buying medical insurance; they were big enough in themselves to negotiate a fairly good cost savings.

361 CHAIR WATT advises he has a fiscal impact statement from the Executive Department, not Legislative Fiscal, that indicates the costs would be \$750,000 in 1993-95 and \$1.4 million in 1995-97.

366 REP. VAN VLIET responds he does not know where the costs would come from other than internal costs.

385 JACK SOLLIS, Oregon PERS Retirement PAC, submits a prepared statement

(EXHIBIT J) and testifies in favor of HB 3407 with the HB 3407-2 amendments.

TAPE 132, SIDE A

004 JEAN PETERS, PERS Retiree, submits a prepared statement and testifies in support of HB 3407 (EXHIBIT K).

052 CHAIR WATT advises the members that he would like to see a Legislative Fiscal statement prior to discussing the subsequent referral to the House Appropriations Committee.

054 CHAIR WATT closes the public hearing on HB 3407 and opens public hearings on HB 2912 and HB 3402.

(Tape 132, Side A) HB 2912 AND HB 3402 - PUBLIC HEARINGS

Witnesses: Rep. Lee Beyer Don Patton, Lane Community College Pamela Zatham, student Jerry A. Madsen, student Irv Fletcher, Oregon AFL-CIO Pamela Mattson, Oregon Employment Division

The Preliminary Staff Measure Summary and Legislative Revenue statement on HB 2912 are hereby made a part of these minutes (EXHIBIT L).

The Preliminary Staff Measure Summary and Legislative Revenue statement on HB 3402 are hereby made a part of these minutes (EXHIBIT M).

058 MARILYN JOHNSTON, Committee Administrator, gives overview of HB 2912 and HB 3402.

067 REP. BEYER, sponsor of HB 2912 and HB 3402, explains that the bills are companion bills and provide extensive benefits to dislocated workers: >books and tuition are generally covered, but there is not adequate support for living expenses >persons are not unemployed as a result of their own actions, but as a

result of public policy; most have been hard-working individuals who have paid taxes for 15, 20 or 25 years >two issues have been identified: (1) people are living on unemployment insurance; how long is that available versus the length of the training, and (2) taxation; unemployment insurance benefits are taxed but nothing is withheld. >HB 2912 exempts taxation of unemployment compensation for those people in an approved dislocated worker training program >the fiscal impact is about \$2 million for the biennium. >HB 3402 relates to the length of time unemployment compensation benefits are available >Oregon has been fortunate in that the regular unemployment insurance program which provides 26 weeks of coverage has been supplemented by a

federal program extending the coverage to about one year; that program

ends in October and may not be extended by Congress >the intent of HB 3402-1 amendment (EXHIBIT N) is to extend the state's benefit period from 13 to 26 weeks to match the dislocated worker unemployment insurance supplemental program to provider coverage for a

full year >there could be a cost; a one-time appropriation during last session diverted \$12 million out of the Employers Trust. The fund is down to about \$7 million and the Employment Division does not believe those funds will last very far into the next biennium. >the HB 3402-1 amendments would extend the \$12 million diversion and make it a biennial diversion and would not increase employer taxes at all; it may keep the tax from going down. The program has been supported by AOI and other employers in the past. >retraining programs average about six months; at Lane Community college it is nearly two years >introduces LCC staff and students enrolled in worker retraining programs

192 DON PATTON, Advisor, Dislocated Worker Program, Lane Community College, submits a prepared statement, grade statistics and list of dislocated worker programs (EXHIBIT O), and testifies in support of HB 3402 and HB 2912.

260 PAMELA ZATHAM, student, LCC Dislocated Worker Program, submits and reads a prepared statement in support of HB 3402 and HB 2912 (EXHIBIT P).

322 JERRY A MADSEN, student, LCC Dislocated Worker Program, submits and reads a prepared statement in support of HB 3402 and HB 2912 (EXHIBIT Q).

Prepared statements submitted but not presented by other students in the Dislocated Worker Program are hereby made a part of these minutes: Robert L. Martin (EXHIBIT R), Albert D. Gaines (EXHIBIT S) and Virginia Pilaczynski (EXHIBIT T).

TAPE 131, SIDE B

020 IRV FLETCHER, President, Oregon AFL-CIO, submits a prepared statement

and testifies in support of HB 2912 (EXHIBIT U) and HB 3402 (EXHIBIT X).

040 CHAIR WATT advises the members that he previously considered introducing a bill that would exempt all unemployment benefits from taxation and was told that it was unconstitutional; therefore the committee needs to get verification from the Revenue Department on the constitutional question.

053 PAMELA MATTSON, Oregon Employment Division, submits a prepared statement taking no position on HB 3402 (EXHIBIT V) and HB 2912 (EXHIBIT W: >clarifies "diversion" and the "cap" within the fund >the bill extends the cap; it does not go to the diversion element 068 REP. BEYER agrees that the bill would extend the cap.

070 MS. MATTSON further explains that the division would use the \$7 million of the cap for this biennium and add about \$5 million. Also, does not

believe the bill would extend the discretionary amount.

080 REP. TIERNAN points out that the HB 3407-2 amendments have been proposed by Rep. Beyer (EXHIBIT N).

086 REP. TIERNAN requests the Employment Division prepare a matrix showing the differences in benefits of the various programs.

095 MS. MATTSON clarifies that the bill would not affect a rate reduction. The Employment Division is anticipating quite a drop in rates for the calendar year 1994 because the experience of 1982 comes out of the calculations, and clarifies that HB 3407 would not increase rates nor would it lower rates because the division is projecting that even with

an idea like this, the rates would go down.

122 CHAIR WATT closes the public hearings on HB 2912 and HB 3402, asks that members review the bills on the day's agenda and be prepared for a work session on Wednesday, and declares the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Reviewed by,

Annetta Mullins
Coordinator

Marilyn Johnston
Administrator

EXHIBIT SUMMARY

A - HB 2080 - The Preliminary Staff Measure Summary and Legislative Fiscal and Revenue statements are hereby made a part of these minutes, staff, 3 pp B - HB 2010 - The Preliminary Staff Measure Summary, HB 2010-2 amendments, hand-engrossed HB 2010-2 bill, HB 2010-3 amendments, hand-engrossed HB

2010-3, ORS 653.315, and Legislative Revenue statements, staff, 20 pp C - HB 2010 - Prepared statement, examples of child labor violation, a chart comparing current law, HB 2010 and the proposed amendments, work permit statistics and forms, Mary Wendy Roberts, 15 pp D - HB 2010 - prepared statement, Irv Fletcher, 1 p E - HB 2010, prepared statement, Julie Brandis, 3 pp F - HB 2906 - Preliminary Staff Measure Summary, memo from Lori Ives, Local Government Personnel Institute, memo from the Washington County Board of Commissioners, HB 2906-2 amendments, HB 2902-2 hand-engrossed bill, HB

2906-3 amendments, HB 2906-3 hand-engrossed bill, HB 2906-4 amendments, HB 2906-4 hand-engrossed bill, and Legislative Fiscal and Revenue statements, staff, 28 pp G - HB 2906 - letter from Tom Woodruff, Mental Health Program Coordinator, Washington County, John Junkin, 1 p H - HB 3407 - Preliminary Staff Measure Summary, Legislative Revenue and Fiscal Statements, staff, 4 pp I - HB 3407, HB 3407-2 amendments, Rep. Van Vliet, 6 pp J - HB 3407, prepared statement, Jack Sollis, 2 pp K - HB 3407, prepared statement, Jean Peters 1 p L - HB 2912, Preliminary Staff Measure Summary and Legislative Revenue statement, staff, 3 pp M - HB 3402, Preliminary Staff Measure Summary and Legislative Revenue statement, staff, 2 pp N - HB 3402, HB 3402-1 amendments, Rep. Beyer, 2 pp O - HB 3402, HB 2912, prepared statement, Don Patton, 4 pp P - HB 3402, HB 2912, prepared statement, Pamela Zatham, 2 pp Q - HB 3402, HB 2912, prepared statement, Jerry Madsen, 2 pp R - HB 3402, HB 2912, prepared statement of Robert Martin, Don Patton, 1 p S - HB 3402, HB 2912, prepared statement of Albert D. Gaines, Don Patton, 2 pp T - HB 3402, HB 2912, prepared statement of Virginia Pilaczynski, Don Patton, 2 pp U - HB 2912, prepared statement, Irv Fletcher, 1 p V - HB 3402, prepared statement, Pam Mattson, 2 pp W - HB 2912, prepared statement, Pam Mattson, 2 pp X - HB 3402, prepared statement, Irv Fletcher, 1 p