

SENATE COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES

Monday March 11, 1991 Hearing Room A 3:15 p.m. Tapes 38 - 39
MEMBERS PRESENT: Sen. Bill McCoy, Chair Sen. Cliff Trow, Vice-Chair
Sen. Shirley Gold Sen. Bill Kenemer Sen. Paul Phillips VISITING
MEMBERS: Sen. Frank Roberts, District 9 Rep. Mary Alice Ford,
District 8 Sen. Larry Hill, District 21 STAFF PRESENT: Janice J.
Fiegenger, Committee Administrator Mike Meriwether, Research Assistant
Michael Sims, Committee Assistant Andra Woodrum, Page MEASURES
CONSIDERED: SB 527, Relating to family-support services, PH/VVS SB
462, Relating to Self-Sufficiency Trust Fund, PH/WS SB 274, Relating to
maternity care, WS SB 318, Relating to OHSU and maternity care, WS
Introduction of LC 3959 as Committee bill

.. 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 38, SIDE A . . 003
CHAIR MCCOY: Calls the meeting to order at 3:16 p.m.

(Tape 38, Side A) PUBLIC HEARING ON SENATE BILL 527

007 JANICE J. FIEGENER, COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATOR: SB 527 is sponsored by
Sen. Frank Roberts, Rep. Beverly Stein and a number of other senators,
and about 20 Oregon groups representing disability organizations: mental
health, family support and most of the senior groups. The bill
establishes a consistent policy of family support throughout all
Department of Human Resources (DHR) divisions. It is a policy bill,
which has been amended. I believe some of the Association for Retarded
Citizens representatives will go through the amendments. The Legislative
Fiscal Office has indicated that the bill has no fiscal impact; if it is
approved today, we would be able to send it directly to the Senate
floor. - Senate Committee on Human Resources March 11, 1991- Page 2

023 SEN. FRANK ROBERTS, DISTRICT 9; CO-SPONSOR: The concept behind SB
527 is that the greatest resource for children is likely to be the
family. Unfortunately, many of our policies dealing with disadvantaged
children, children with disabilities of various kinds, has been
traditionally always to turn to an institution. Even in Oregon, in
modern times, where we have tried to move closer to community support
for children and some family support, we still depend very heavily on
institutions, group homes and foster care. The family choosing to give
this support usually is the last one in line to get any sort of
recompense for its services. It's really pretty discouraging to a family
to realize that if it takes care of the child, pays for insurance,
clothing and care, and actually has to change its life tremendously in
order to provide care for the child, it finds out it gets no pay for
this - because it's family doing it. But if it didn't do it, the state
would turn around and pay a foster home a great deal of money. SB 527 is
a policy bill directing the DHR, in all of its programs, to look first
to the family; to do everything the Department can to change rules and
regulations - including getting waivers from the Federal government - to
give as much support to families as families want to assume in taking
care of disabled children. There is a provision establishing an advisory
council to review and comment on plans and services related to families
caring for individuals with disabilities or chronic illnesses who are
living at home. We recognize that the bill is not really going to
mandate the DHR or provide a basis for suing it. It is establishing a
policy which we feel sure DHR will want to follow; it's an encouragement

to the Department, and a reminder to the Legislature and its Human Resources committees in the two houses and to the Ways and Means Committee, by all those who advocate care for disabled children.

069 SEN. PHILLIPS: To follow up on your last point, one thing that's disturbed me most about the budget preparation and materials we've seen affecting human resources as you look at the very young and the senior population is that we seem to be penny-wise and pound-foolish. We're doing things like cutting Oregon Project Independence (OPI), yet knowing it's going to cost us more in the long term when people enter nursing-homes sooner. Or, on the opposite end, when we seemingly destroy our early-intervention programs and programs for those very young who are disabled and whose families are caring for them. So, seizing upon what you just said, can I leap to an assumption of great faith that the Human Resources Subcommittee when it goes through its budgets will review with great disdain any programs that we'd cut now and would cost us much more in the long run? 085 SEN. ROBERTS: One problem, Senator Phillips, is that we do need to look at the immediate effects of any cuts we make. We recognize that it's like a balloon - if you push it in one spot, it'll push out another. The long-range effects, the long-range investments are the ones that we should be making, but they are bargains we can't afford. We don't have the money to invest in the long range. I've used this analogy a lot of times, but this is a situation in which if you have to send a fire truck out to put out a whole bunch of fires, you may have no money left for fire prevention - but people don't want their houses to burn down while you're making a long-range investment. That, unfortunately, is the problem we're faced with in human resources. There are people who

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 Senate Committee on Human Resources March 11, 1991- Page 3

are desperately in need, and you try to take care of them as best as you can. You don't have the money, then, to invest in those kinds of changes which in the long run will save us money. I will say that budget does provide, for instance, heavily for pre-natal care and children's care. There will certainly be a strong attempt to do as much as we can in terms of early intervention. But frankly, there is not the direct relationship between nursing homes and OPI that you indicate.

107 SEN. PHILLIPS: Well, maybe there's a difference of opinion, too. But I get an opportunity to preach my cause to at least one member of the Ways and Means Committee in Senator Trow, and now having you here is almost an opportunity too good to resist. 111 SEN. ROBERTS : I should make it very clear that we are not the Revenue Committee. 112 SEN. TROW: I wish we were. 114 SEN. ROBERTS: They come and say they want us to put more money into programs and I say if they'll bring the money in, I'll appropriate it.

116 SEN. PHILLIPS: Well, that's fair enough. But, in taking your answer to the question, let's assume SB 527 now is law. What would be the difference in the deliberations that you and Senator Trow and the rest of Ways and Means would directly apply this time? What's the practicality on today's discussion that you would see if this law was in effect? 122 SEN. PHILLIPS: There might well have been some slightly different programs brought in by the various DHR divisions for us to fund. Basically, the Ways and Means Committee is not in a position to develop programs. It essentially passes judgement on those recommended to it. I think that would be the difference. I don't know if there would

be any difference this time, since out of the whole DHR budget we have identified \$90-100 million in deficiencies in appropriations. I don't know how different the Department recommendations would have been.

131 SEN. PHILLIPS: Maybe that question is more appropriately asked of the DHR director, to get his reaction.

135 REP. MARY ALICE FORD, DISTRICT 8: I'm here to very wholeheartedly support Senator Roberts' SB 527. I am so damn tired of having people come to me and say that if they give their kid up for adoption or place it with the state in a foster home or if they get a divorce, they'll get services for the child. This is the most idiotic policy a state ever had, a state that cared about individuals and families. I think the policy is extremely important. I think the money is extremely important.

And I agree with Senator Roberts - if we'd have these policies in place where you don't have to be Title XIX-qualified in order to get the service, because that makes no sense at all. I'm hoping that if we can get this bill passed quickly through both houses, that maybe while Ways and Means is still deliberating, when they do get money (if they do) and when they back-fill, this will be a policy that committee will look at. These people, who over the years have taken care of their own kids - some until they're 29 to 35 and 40 years old - without any assistance from the state are the first ones to get dumped on this year. And it just isn't fair. Not to mention the fact that if we could get them all, just to set

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. Senate Committee on Human Resources March 11, 1991- Page 4

an example, they might do it. If they all turned their kids over to the state, where would we be? We're going to have to realize that we can't hide some families just because they're quiet and take care of each other - hide them under the carpet and pretend they don't exist. They need to be out there and our policy needs to include them.

180 KATHRYN WEIT, ASSOCIATION FOR RETARDED CITIZENS/FAMILIES AS LEADERS, MULTNOMAH COUNTY (EXHIBITS A, A-1): Details Exhibit A and proposes amendments to SB 527 (Exhibit A-1). 273 SEN. KENNEMER: You know, we always tread this ugly line in trying to deal with financial impact. I'm looking at Page 3, Section 5, Line 31 of the hand-engrossed bill (Exhibit A-1). It seems, if I read this, I get the sort of feeling all the way through here that we give something and then we sort of take it away. Let me read this to you; it says (reads from bill) "Subject to the availability of funds there for, a family may be eligible to receive family support services." Subject to the availability of funds, and then we complicate that with the word maybe on top of it, seems like a redundancy that if I understand it correctly destroys the policy. I wonder if we don't need to go back and rehash this a little bit, and look at (reads from bill) "Subject to availability of funds,..." The policy is, families shall.

291 SEN. TROW: But it's (reads from bill) "shall be eligible."

293 SEN. KENNEMER: (Reads from bill) "Subject to the availability of funds "

294 SEN. TROW: (Reads from bill) "...a family shall be eligible to receive family support...if the family meets any of the following requirements:"

296 SEN. KENNEMER: It just seems to me that if this is going to be a policy bill, the policy should be straightforward, that if there is money the preference is in this direction. If there's not money, I guess we're where we sometimes are.

302 SEN. TROW: Then I think you would want to go back to Section 2 and revise all of that language that's been changed from being very positive and assertive to being very conditional language, change that too. In part, I guess the reason was the budget problems.

311 WEIT: Yes, that was the advice that we were given.

313 CHAIR McCOY: By whom? Legislative Counsel?

314 WEIT: Yes. But I think that if we could use that language, "subject to available funds," and then change it back to our more assertive language, we'd like that.

319 KEVIN CONCANNON, DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES: I'm here to speak in favor of this bill. So many of the persons referred to in the prior testimony were persons who fully rely upon their families. I think what is attractive in this legislation as a policy bill is that it expresses a different vision in one place that overarches Oregon's human-resources programs in favor of families. It was noted by Senator Kennemer or Senator Trow in the questioning that it's mitigated or couched by the availability of funds. It's not what I'd call an entitlement at this point, but it certainly brings the state down a road that it should be pursuing

These minutes contain materials which paraphrase and/or summarize statements made during this session. Only text enclosed in quotation marks reports a speaker's exact words. For complete contents of the proceedings, please refer to the tapes. Senate Committee on Human Resources March 11, 1991 - Page 5

more aggressively, and that is being more supportive of families.

Families have variously been described society's best social and health agency. It's pretty hard for other people to duplicate them or other constructs, be they public or private. We don't consciously enough work with families. I might note that isn't a problem unique to Oregon; the roots of our family policy in this state really go back about 500 years to British law, where we separated out families and public responsibilities. We're still only undoing pieces of that in a positive way in more recent years, particularly in the right-to-education law that has made a fundamental change in the lives of school-age persons. It was only enacted in the early 1970s, both in our own state and nationally. It reflects a recognition that persons with disabilities have a basic right, regardless of their need or circumstance.

We are encouraged by the direction I've expressed, by the vision expressed in this law. We think it not only has much to offer for younger persons with disabilities, and their families. But a phenomenon we find ourselves involved with is aging family-members. We conducted a survey in one of our offices and found that state employees were finding themselves spending more time and concern looking after their aging

relatives than they were with children, perhaps, children with special needs or child-care needs. We need to recognize that as the population ages, we're seeing growing numbers of persons coming to public attention and needing the special support of certain programs.

I'd like to think down the road to the point in time when beyond human-resource programs, this policy could be incorporated into our education programs, our tax policy, into the economic development policy of the state. So it isn't seen as a social-welfare or health program, solely. To be successful, we need some of these other policies to be supportive in this direction. But initially, at least, I wholeheartedly support this direction. I wish we could make it an entitlement; I just don't think we're there at this point. So I think this is the best we can hope for.

If I may respond to Senator Phillips' questioning earlier, would such a law make a difference in terms of programs recommended by an agency such as ours? I believe it would most wholly over time. This law reminded me of the early environmental-impact laws of 20 years ago, where we started to look at the environment and our practices. It sort of asked for a culture change. And I think that's what this law will do over time.

In the difficult area we're in right now in terms of budgets, I need to note that many of the large dollar-increases do, in fact, go to persons living at home. There are some cuts that are very difficult that relate to both adult-age persons with disabilities and to younger children. But if you look at our budget carefully, you'll see that the large increases Senator Roberts noted in the prenatal care program or in the Medicaid program relating to children younger than 18 years, or in the most costly part of our Medicaid program - that being services provided to persons with disabilities - one of the few benefits government does provide to these individuals and their families, particularly beyond age 21, is a Medicaid card - a lifesaver to many of these persons. It is a costly innovation - one we're making more of as a state. The record isn't wholly ragged, I guess, in terms of family support.

428 SEN. PHILLIPS: It may not be wholly ragged and I'll concede that point to you, but when you admit it's even partially ragged, it hurts some people who can't afford to be hurt and are the least able to advocate for themselves because, in fact, they're doing what we deem societally

. Senate Committee on Human Resources March 11, 1991- Page 6

responsible by caring for their own family members. So it's a double-edged sword.

440 CONCANNON: It is indeed. It's one of those very difficult sets of choices around the problem of what one does when one has limited public monies. That is, unfortunately, the situation in which Oregon finds itself for the immediate future.

TAPE 39, SIDE A

002 SEN. TROW: We might have been able to do a little more during the last session of the Legislature to fund some of these programs if there hadn't been an expenditure limitation, which we felt kept us from moving monies into these programs. 018 JUDY RINKIN, OREGON ALLIANCE FOR MENTALLY ILL AND OREGON FAMILY SUPPORT, SHEDD (EXHIBIT B): Speaks in support of SB 527 and details Exhibit B. 119 RANDY FULGHAM,

CONSULTANT, WASHINGTON-YAMHILL COUNTY FAMILY SUPPORT PROGRAMS (EXHIBIT C): Speaks in support of SB 527 and details Exhibit C.

184 PHILFERGUSON, CO-CHAIR, FAMILIES AS LEADERS, EUGENE: I'm always speaking on behalf of my son, who is 21 and has multiple disabilities. But today, specifically, I'm here speaking on behalf of Families As Leaders, of which I'm co-chair. We've been actively involved in all stages of the planning and formulation of SB 527. The make-up of the group actually reflects the philosophy and approach of the bill in several important respects. We come from all parts of the state; we're a network of more than 300 families who have family members with a variety of disabilities. There is a variety of ages, and variety of needs, which the philosophy and approach of SB 527 would address. Like the legislation before you, our group is important in that we cut across the usual categories of services and agencies, in the same spirit that the philosophy of family support embedded in this bill tries to accomplish. We live in your communities, down your blocks and across your streets. We come in all colors and all religions, all income brackets. That's how we differ. What we share in common is the vision, the commitment to share the challenges posed by having a family member with a disability or chronic illness. We hope that some day will be matched by the state's commitment to help us succeed. No matter what the label - child or adult, living in Portland, Burns or Coos Bay - families caring for these individuals face an array of physical, emotional and financial challenges. Those challenges are always unique, and will no doubt get worse as the effects of Measure 5 decimate what few programs exist to address those needs. SB 527 asks that the state at least establish a philosophy for the future - give us hope in the face of the horrors of the current cuts - at whatever level or type of support the state finds the wherewithal to provide, consistent with a philosophy that is family-driven, community-based and flexibly-designed. I urge you to support the families who are supporting this legislation. 257 SHERI LONG, PARENTS FAMILY SUPPORT, TIGARD (EXHIBIT D): Speaks in support of SB 527 and details Exhibit D.

These minutes contain materials which paraphrase and/or summarize Otatomonta made during this session. Only text enclosed in quotation mark report a speaker's exact words. For complete contents of the proceed ~gs, please refer to the tapes. Senate Committee on Human Resources March 11, 1991- Page 7

349 HANK BERSANI, POLICY ANALYST, ASSOCIATION FOR RETARDED CITIZENS OF OREGON; REPRESENTING JANNA STARR, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, ASSOCIATION FOR RETARDED CITIZENS OF OREGON (EXHIBIT E): Speaks in support of SB 527 and details Exhibit E.

TAPE 38, SIDE B

001 EUGENE ORGAN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, OREGON DISABILITIES COMMISSION (EXHIBIT F): I appear before you today in support of SB 527. Technically, our commission voted to be a co-sponsor, but we didn't get the word to the drafters of the bill in time to be listed on the bill as a co-sponsoring organization, and I'd like to note for the record that we intended that. We are here today in support of this bill because I think it does what so many of the preceding testifiers have said - it provides a policy by which, hopefully, decisions will be made in support of families in the future. Had this bill been passed in 1989, I suspect some parts of the Department of Human Resources budget would look far different in 1991 than they actually do. For example, the Supported Employment Program is about to lose 100-plus slots, to use the word that was alluded to previously. Individuals who are going to be involved in

supported employment - the first to go are the ones who live with their families. That decision has been made already. That seems counter to what the family-support bill is talking about. Many of those family members who have continued support for an individual in their family who happens to have a disability - who for a number of years have been the backbone of support services in this state - are about to lose the Supported Employment Program upon which they rely for that individual to have some degree of independence. I think the family-support bill speaks to that, and I urge its passage for that reason. I want to echo some concerns raised by Mr. Concannon - not some concerns but an issue. This does not apply just to children. It applies to adults with disabilities who are family members, as well, adults who choose to remain in their own homes. I've a bit of personal experience in this respect. When I was 10 years old, my mother was diagnosed as having multiple sclerosis. By the time I was 15, she had died. I was the last child who was left at home, and our family was the one that was responsible for her care. I could have used the support. I urge the passage of this bill. -Offers testimony on behalf of Oregon Advocacy Center (Exhibit F) with amendments. 040 MURIEL GOLDMAN, MENTAL HEALTH ASSOCIATION OF OREGON (MHAO) (EXHIBIT G): Speaks in support of SB 527 and details Exhibit G. 082 JIM DAVIS, UNITED SENIORS OF OREGON AND OREGON STATE COUNCIL OF SENIOR CITIZENS: The arguments for the family-support system and unique in-home, community-based care that they provide seniors are pretty much the same for the developmentally-disabled. They enable them to remain independent and to live fulfilled lives, to be with family and friends, to work and contribute to their communities. Above all, it's a very cost-effective approach. It saves them from the very expensive alternative of institutionalization.

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. Senate Committee on Human Resources March 11, 1991 - Page 8

But the other reason that we're here supporting this bill - and I might add that United Seniors and the Oregon State Council of Senior Citizens are co-sponsors of this bill - is for our concern for the care providers, who are often seniors, who have dedicated their lives to the support of developmentally-disabled loved ones. They've also given tremendous financial, physical and emotional sacrifices. This is why this family-support system, and the policy contained in this bill, is so very, very important. The emphasis on support of caring families, and the holistic approach that they provide - consultation, information-referral, the outreach and respite care, the day care. Senator Phillips mentioned Oregon Project Independence. You'll see a very similar approach here in the family-support system to what we have long fought for in OPI. So we come here to give our full support to this very important policy, and we urge your support of SB 527.

107 SEN. TROW: There has been a series of articles in the Gazette-times about the effects of Measure 5 on certain human beings in the Corvallis community. One story, and picture, was of a 90-year-old woman who was taking care of her 55-year-old developmentally-disabled son. That son was eligible for some of the medically-needy monies, I believe, and they're being cut back for him. That's going to make it very difficult for that family to stay together. I don't know what would happen if it didn't stay together; it's tremendously cost-effective. So that's just an example.

109 DAVIS: The effects of the cuts are intergenerational.

126 BOB CASTAGNA, OREGON CATHOLIC CONFERENCE: Given the range of choices families have available today and the pressures on the families, psychological, emotional, physical, financial, etc. for families to lovingly want to take care of a disabled individual in their own home, we see this as a heroic act given choices available in society today. We hope the public policy in the State of Oregon would help those families as much as possible, to continue maintaining their loved ones in their own home settings, and not have our state fiscal policy or state budgetary policies dictate that family members be removed from the home for financial pressure reasons. These families are engaging in very loving and heroic acts and the state of Oregon's public policy should encourage that family activity.

144 CHAIR McCOY: Closes public hearing on SB 527.

(Tape 38, Side B) WORK SESSION ON SENATE BILL 527

145 CHAIR McCOY: Opens work session. 203 MOTION: SEN. KENNEMER moves to adopt the dash two LC amendments to SB 527 dated 3/8/91 to SB 527, and add the Oregon Disabilities Commission as a sponsor to the bill. (Exhibit H). VOTE: Hearing no objection, Chair McCoy so moves.

209 MOTION: SEN. TROW moves SB 527 be referred to the floor with a "do pass" recommendation, and the subsequent referral to Ways and Means be rescinded.

VOTE: In a roll-call vote, the motion carries with all members voting AYE.

These minutes contain materials which paraphrase and/or cummartze stE ements made during this session. Only text enclosed in quotation marks report a speaker's exact words. For complete contents of the proceedirggs, please refer to the tapes. Senate Commitbe on Human Resources March 11,1991- Page 9

(Tape 38, Side B) PUBLIC HEARING ON SENATE BILL 462

232 SEN. LARRY HILL, DISTRICT 21 (EXHIBIT D): Speaks in support of SB 462 and details Exhibit I. 325 SEN. TROW: Why is the Treasury Department not doing some oversight for the programmatic administration of the funds? 326 SEN. HILL: The State Treasurer would still have custody of the monies. The treasurer would continue to minister the funds, invest the funds, manage the account and keep the balance, but the expenditures would be according to the needs of the client as administered by the Director of the Department of Human Resources.

342 LOREN SIMONDS, SENIOR AND DISABLED SERVICES DIVISION (EXHIBIT J) Speaks in support of SB 462, offers proposed amendments and details Exhibit J. 402 SEN. TROW: Do we have people involved in the trust funds?

TAPE 39, SIDE B

009 SEN. HILL: There are a number of families who have been excited about the possibility, but the rules were not adopted until last summer. Although the law was adopted in 1989, the rules were only adopted recently. We expect several families to utilize this over the next several years.

017 SEN. TROW: Is there counseling available for the families so

they will know of the existence of the opportunity? 019 SEN.
HILL: The private advocacy groups will be an important channel to get
the information to the families on how to take advantage of this and
what steps must be taken. 034 SIMONDS: We have no objection to
the proposed amendments by the Treasurer's office. 038 SEN. HILL:
There will be no fiscal impact on this bill. 046 GARY BRUEBAKER,
DIRECTOR OF CASH MANAGEMENT, OREGON STATE - TREASURY (EXHIBIT K):
Details Exhibit K.

060 SEN. TROW: What kind of role would the State Treasurer play in this
operation?

062 BRUEBAKER: We would invest the monies, record deposits, honor
warrants authorized by the director of the Department of Human Resources
and process withdrawals. We would also report back to the department, as
well as working with the audits division.

083 MAURICE REECE, LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE VICE-CHAIRMAN, OREGON
HEALTH CARE ASSOCIATION (EXHIBIT L): Speaks in support of SB 462 and
details Exhibit L.

These minutes contain materials which paraphrase and/or summarize
rtaternerdr rn de during this session Only text enclosed in quotation
marks report a speaker's exact words Por complete contents of the
proceedinp, please refer to the tapes Senate Committee on Human
Resources March 11,1991- Page 10

124 CHAIR McCOY: Closes public hearing on SB 462.

(Tape 39, Side B) WORK SESSION, SENATE BILL 462

135 MOTION: SEN. TROW moves to adopt the dash one (Exhibit M, dated
3/8/91) and dash two (Exhibit N, dated 3/11/91) amendments to SB 462.
VOTE: Hearing no objection, Chair McCoy so moves. 137 MOTION: SEN.
TROW moves SB 462 to the floor with a "do pass" recommendation. VOTE: In
a roll-call vote, the motion carries with all members voting AYE.

(Tape 39, Side B) WORK SESSION. SENATE BILL 274

150 FIEGENER: Explains letter addressed to Sen. Roberts and the fiscal
impact statement. (Exhibit O)

203 ART KEIL, OREGON HEALTH DIVISION: The fiscal impact should read
\$750,000, as opposed to the \$1,032,000. There was testimony regarding
the \$750,000 before the fiscal impact came with a different figure.

217 MOTION: SEN. TROW moves SB 274 to the Ways and Means Committee
with a "do pass" recommendation.

VOTE: In a roll-call vote, the motion carries with all members voting
AYE. (Tape 39, Side B) WORK SESSION ON SENATE BILL 318

227 FIEGENER: Explains the proposed amendments from the Oregon Society
of Physician Assistants. (EXHIBIT P)

239 MOTION: SEN. TROW moves to adopt the dash one LC amendments dated
3/8/91 to SB 318 (Exhibit P). VOTE: Hearing no objection, Chair McCoy so
moves. 241 MOTION: SEN. TROW moves SB 318 to the Ways and Means
Committee with a "do pass" recommendation.

These minutes contain materials which paraphrase and/or summarize

staternenb made during this session. Only text enclosed in quotation marks report a speaker's exact words. For complete contents of the proceedinge, please refer to the tapes. . Senate Committee on Human Resources March 11, 1991- Page 11

VOTE: In a roll-call vote, the motion carries with all members present voting AYE.

(Tape 39, Side B) INTRODUCTION OF COMMITTEE BILL:

253 MOTION: SEN. TROW moves that LC 3959 (E xhibit Q) be introduced by this committee. VOTE: Hearing no objection, Chair McCoy so moves. CHAIR McCOY submits written testimony into the record. (EXHIBITS R, S, T, U, and V). 259 CHAIR McCOY: Adjourns meeting at 5 p.m.

Submitted by: Reviewed by:

Michael Sims Janice J. Fiegenger Assistant Administrator

Debbie Schieno Assistant

EXHIBIT LOG:

A - Testimony on SB 527 - Kathryn Weit - 2 pages A-1- Amendments to SB 527 - Hank Bersani - 8 pages B - Testimony on SB 527 - Judy Rinkin - 1 page C - Testimony on SB 527 - Randy Fulgham - 5 pages D - Testimony on SB 527 - Sheri Long - 2 pages E - Testimony on SB 527 - Hank Bersani - 1 page F - Testimony on SB 527 - Eugene Organ - 2 pages G - Testimony on SB 527 - Muriel Goldman - 2 pages H - Amendments to SB 527 - Committee staff- 2 pages I - Testimony on SB 462 - Sen. Larry Hill - 3 pages J - Testimony on SB 462 - Loren Simonds - 1 page K - Testimony on SB 462 - Gary Bruebaker - 1 page L - Testimony on SB 462 - Maurice Reece - 2 pages M - Amendments to SB 462 - Committee staff - 1 page N - Amendments to SB 462 - Committee staff - 1 page

These minutes contain materials which paraphrase Sand/or summarize statemcmts made during this session. Only text cncloacd in quotation marks report a speaker's exact words. Por complete contents of the proceeding., pie&se refer to the tapes. Senate Committee on Human Resourees March 11, 1991- Page 12 O - Correspondence on SB 274 - Sen. Bill McCoy, Committee staff - 2 pages P - Amendments to SB 318 - Committee staff - 1 page Q - LC draft 3959 (Committee bill) - Committee staff - 5 pages R - Testimony on SB 527 - Nancy Terry - 1 page S - Testimony on SB 527 - Macky Courchere - 3 pages T - Testimony on SB 462 - Eugene Organ - 1 page U - Testimony on SB 274 - Ian Timm - 3 pages V - Testimony on SB 274 - Lynne Weidel - 1 page

. . .