

SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR .

February 11, 1991

Hearing Room 50 03:00 p.m.

Tapes 12 -13

MEMBERS PRESENT: SEN. GRATTAN KERANS, CHAIR SEN. LARRY HILL,
VICE-CHAIR SEN. PETER BROCKMAN SEN. BOB SHOEMAKER MEMBER
EXCUSED: SEN. BOB KINTIGH

STAFF PRESENT: ANNETTE TALB(ITT, COMMITTEE COUNSEL ROBERTA WHITE,
COMMITTEE ASSISTANT MEASURES CONSIDERED: SB 35 - UNPAID PREVAILING WAGES
(PUBLIC HEARING) SB 36 - PREAPPR ENTICESHIP (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 12, SIDE A

001 CHAIR KERANS: called the meeting to order at 3:08 p.m.

SB 36 - PREAPPRENTICESHIP PROGRAMS IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS - PUBLIC HEARING

WITNESSES: MARILYN COFFEL, DIRECTOR, INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS, BUREAU
OF LABOR AND INDUSTRIES PAUL TIFFANY, ADMINISTRATOR, WAGE AND HOUR
DIVISION, BUREAU OF LABOR AND INDUSTRIES MIKE KAIEL, DEPUTY
COMMISSIONER, BUREAU OF LABOR AND INDUSTRIES JIM WERNING, ROOSEVELT
HIGH SCHOOL JON EGGE, OREGON STATE APPRENTICESHIP AND TRAINING COUNCIL
RAY BAKER, OREGON STATE APPRENTICESHIP AND TRAINING COUNCIL NORM MALBIN,
COUNSEL, OREGON BUILDING TRADES AND IBEW JERRY BRUCE, IBEW LOCAL 48 KIM
MINGO, ASSOCIATION OF GENERAL CONTRACTORS Senate Commilbe on Labor
February 11, 1991 - P - e 2

004 MIKE KAIEL, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER, BUREAU OF LABOR AND INDUSTRIES
(EXHIBIT A) > Details Exhibit A. 177 RAY BAKER, BUSINESS
REPRESENTATIVE FOR THE OREGON STATE DISTRICT COUNCIL OF CARPENTERS.
(EXHIBIT C) > Details Exhibit C. 202 JON EGGE, OREGON STATE
APPRENTICESHIP AND TRAINING COUNCIL > Apprenticeship in Portland
perceived to be closed. > This bill lays the ground work so that people
can be reached earlier in their lives and prepare them in high school
for a trade or occupation. > Urges passage of the bill. 267 JAMES
WERNING, ROOSEVELT HIGH SCHOOL. > There is difficulty in attracting and
keeping students at Roosevelt High School due to surrounding area. >
Roosevelt High School and the Bureau of Labor and Industries have worked
together for the last two years to develop a program to attract and keep
at-risk students in high school. > Goal: To prepare all Roosevelt High
School students with the skills necessary for successful participation
in the 21st Century work place and in life. > Roosevelt Project will
restructure the high school and allow students to participate as full
members of the community. > The Roosevelt Project will integrate
classroom work with meaningful on-the-job experience designed to prepare
the student for a smooth school-to-work transition. > 80% of Roosevelt
High School students do not go on to attend college, and their needs are
currently not being met by the school system. 322 SENATOR BROCKMAN:
Who will be the teachers if these programs are implemented? WERNING:
The teachers who are there right now will be the teachers of the
program. They will help write the curriculum along with people from
industry who will also help write the curriculum. We also hope to have
industry people in to help teach the classes. SENATOR BROCKMAN: But you
don't foresee an increase in faculty size? WERNING: No. I think we can

do it all in a comprehensive high school setting. 343 JERRY BRUCE, IBEW, LOCAL 48 > The State of Oregon has one of the ten finest training programs in the U.S. > It is difficult to find people with adequate skills in reading and comprehension in order to participate in the program. Many times they do not have the mathematical skills required either. > As a result of those inadequacies, four years ago the instituted a 5 year training program instead of a four year training program. 379 NORMAN MALBIN, COUNSEL, IBEW AND COLUMBIA-PACIFIC BUILDING CONSTRUCTION TRADES COUNCIL > Testified in favor of passage of the bill. - . - Senate Committee on Labor February 11, 1991 - Page 3

424 KIM MINGO, ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS > Testified in favor of passage of the bill. SENATOR SHOEMAKER: This seems like such a worthwhile program, one wonders, one, why do we need to legislate, and two, why we haven't been doing it already. Is there something in the school systems that block this kind of thing? 459 COFFEL: We just felt that it was appropriate that before the council set forth on a policy basis, that they have the authority in statute to do that as a policy matter. Certainly they can encourage things, but it's better if we have the foundation in law.

TAPE 13, SIDE A

050 WERNSING: Because we're college driven for our requirements in high school, the universities keep going up with levels that we have to take. Even the general education programs leave very little elective room for the students. We can't have a program where they go to school in the morning and then they work all afternoon with some of these major companies that are involved with this, and then they can still graduate from high school to go to college. So we have some real restructuring to do as far as what we can do within the system back. All we are trying to do here is alert people to what's going on. General studies programs in Florida and New York will be gone in five years. There will either be the college track or the technical area. It is a trend that is starting around the nation to which Oregon should pay attention.

SENATOR SHOEMAKER: In other words most schools are on the academic track and do not acknowledge that there is such a thing as a vocational track which would be appropriate for at least some of their students.

WERNSING: That's very true. We are not giving any of the necessary skills to those students who elect not to attend college.

075 CHAIR KERANS: Somewhere the notion became current that we had emerged into a post industrial society where trades would be obsolete. In actual fact, the majority of people who graduate from high school or leave a high school, do not attend a college on an academic basis for a four year program. Most of the people who go to work in America go to work, if not in a blue collar, then in a tan or gray or pink collar, and are using skills acquired outside of either high school or college in technical and other kinds of areas, often at very high skill levels. We do not have the kind of transition that you are talking about from the eighth, ninth, tenth, eleventh and twelfth grade into the first 3-5 years of apprenticeship emerging at some point into some skilled position.

COFFEL: That's correct. About 70% of the students in Oregon do not go on to college. So we are training students for college or nothing. And they are forecasting that the majority of these jobs are going to need at least two years after high school of some kind of training.

101 SENATOR SHOEMAKER: I thought that community colleges filled that niche. What you're saying is that doesn't quite hit what you're getting at - the apprenticeship programs need to start in high school. I would assume that they would carry over into community college.

. Senate Committee on Labor February 11,1991- Page 4

COFFEL: That's correct. A lot of the related training of the apprenticeship programs does take place at the community college level.

112 KERANS: So we have identified the last two years of high school and the two years of community college as being a combination of technical and other occupational training and education separate and distinct from college for some professional career. But what we don't have is the kind of early identification and awareness of education about and choice offering for preapprenticeship leading onto apprenticeship - whether it's field work, class work at the community college or elsewhere, whether it's under AGC or something else sponsorship. That's what we're looking for here, right?

COFFEL: That's correct.

KAIEL: Right now, there is discussion about what our schools need to produce. It depends on the consumer. We have a lot of small businesses who require a trained person when they walk in the door. The 2+2 connection between the high schools and the community college's is very effective. They do have to provide the transfer courses, the vocational offerings that they have, can be married.

CHAIR KERANS: How do you get any training if you don't have a job and how do you get a job if you don't have any training. For someone who's not going to go into apprenticeship, the vast bulk of the 70%, is also not going to college. That's an awful lot hanging on a few bits of words here in the new sub (4), and I just want to critique starting with SB 36 as printed. That sub (4) doesn't pass the flesh test for readability as printed, and falls even farther from the mark with your own submission of the hand-engrossed bill. Was it political reasons that you did not identify the schools and other appropriate training organizations out of the bill.

COFFEL: That's correct.

180 CHAIR KERANS: Now we'll look at SB 36-1 (EXHIBITS C AND D). I would like for you to work with counsel to provide the reader who may not know a lot of the story behind this, what we're trying to do without stepping on any toes. This has a subsequent referral to the Rules committee, not just because of the suspicion that it might have had a fiscal impact, but also because I understand and I ask Counsel to aslc the President's office to gather up so called work force issues in one area. Let's find out before subsequent referral.

TAPE 13, SIDE A

SB 35 - PREVAIUNG WAGE - PUBLIC HEARING

WITNESSES: MARILYN COFFEL, DIRECTOR, INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS,
BUREAU OF LABOR AND INDUSTRIES (EXHIBIT D) PAUL TIFFANY, ADMINISTRATOR,

WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION, BUREAU OF LABOR AND INDUSTRIES SUSAN SCHNEIDER,
CITY OF PORTLAND VALERIE SALISBURY, LEAGUE OF OREGON CITIES NORM
MALBIN, COUNSEL, IBEW (LOCAL 48), AND COLUMBIA PACIFIC CONSTRUCTION
TRADES COUNCIL. Senate Committee on Labor February 11, 1991- Page 5

- JERRY BRUCE, IBEW LOCAL 48 222 MARILYN COFFEL, DIRECTOR,
INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS, BUREAU OF LABOR AND INDUSTRIES (EXHIBIT
E) > Details Exhibit E. 236 CHAIR KERANS: Define for purposes of the
committee a wage assignment. COFFEL: A wage assignment is basically a
claim. Someone says they are not being paid, we call that a wage
assignment, and we pursue it on behalf of the claimant. > Continues to
detail Exhibit D. 314 CHAIR KERANS: What is retainage and how does it
work? COFFEL: Retainage is usually 5% of the value of the contract that
is held out by the contracting agency for such purposes as this. I think
in statute it's something listed as the difference between what the
contractor has earned and what the contracting agency has paid. >
Continues to Detail Exhibit D. 364 SENATOR HILL: If the employee has
not yet filed a claim, how do you know there is a claim out there to be
paid? COFFEL: Usually the employees will call us anonymously, or
another contractor feels that the contractor working on the project is
getting an unfair advantage because they are not paying the prevailing
wages, or often a member of a labor organization will contact us, and
then we perform a wage audit. We have done this wage audit quite
successfully. Usually, it is timely and more efficient because we get to
find out about all the problems at the same time. In other words, if
they are not paying one person, they are probably not paying someone
else.

387 TALBOTT: I would like to clarify some of the language. Are ORS
279.334 and .356 the two statutes that reference the ability to collect
wages and liquidated damages? Is that what your intent is? TIFFANY: ORS
279.334 pertains to overtime to be paid on public works projects, ORS
279.348-.365 is the entire prevailing wage section of the statutes.
279.356 rests within that particular reference and that is the only
place in there that does make reference to actual payment of prevailing
wages and liquidated damages.

TAPE 12, SIDE B

006 NORMAN MALBIN, COUNSEL, IBEW (LOCAL 48), AND COLUMBIA-PACIFIC
CONSTRUCTION TRADES COUNCIL: > Testifies in favor of the bill. > Notes
that the Bureau's position is that the Statutory language .348-.365
includes .365, and notes that the committee might want to consider
whether the language should be "to" or "through". Mr. Tiffany advises
that an Attorney General opinion says that "to" is sufficient to include
the last number -but he questions if that is sufficient. Senate C o a
Labor February 11, 1991- e 6

045 SENATOR HILL: If an employer is subject to collection action by the
agency, it will know who is the subject of that collection action, and
if retaliation is going to occur, it will occur whether or not a
complaint has been filed.

MALBIN: It will not necessarily know who. A worker right now can call,
or I can call on the worker's behalf, lay out all of the facts
sufficient to give the Bureau good cause to go after that employer. The
Bureau would look at the employer's records or other documents that I'm
identifying to let them come to the conclusion that there is a problem,
and they are at that point seeking unpaid wages for every worker who
works on a public works project who did not receive a prevailing wage.

Lots of time, most of the time, if an employer is going to cheat on the Davis ' Bacon law, they're not just doing it with one employee, they are doing it with a bunch of employees, and if they think that the Bureau is going after them because somebody ratted on them, then to retaliate they are going to have to get rid of everybody. Otherwise, they are not going to know who the individual was. However, I will note that the Bureau is reluctant to go after somebody unless they have real good evidence that the person knows what they are talking about.

070 SENATOR SHOEMAKER: Do you have any concern that passing this bill might have negative implications for your lawsuit which is still on appeal?

MALBIN: Lost business you mean?

SENATOR SHOEMAKER: No, that you might lose the case. They are going to say that obviously, the legislature decided that the law as it existed at the time of your case didn't allow these anonymous matters, and so the legislature fixed that, but as it concerns your case which happened before this, trial court was correct.

MALBIN: I'm sorry, I missed the preamble.

SENATOR SHOEMAKER: You have a case which is on appeal.

MALBIN: I don't.

SENATOR SHOEMAKER: Oh, I thought you did.

MALBIN: The Bureau of Labor has one that's on appeal. They sued Tigard Electric for not paying prevailing wages to workers employed.

SENATOR SHOEMAKER: But it's your client.

MALBIN: I had one worker who came to me, and I sent them to the Bureau of Labor.

085 SENATOR SHOEMAKER: My question still applies. Is there a negative implication here that because we felt we had to fix the law, therefore the law as it applied at that time would not have allowed the Bureau of Labor to do what it did.

MALBIN: I think there is that possibility. I think that's a risk my client may not be willing to take, but what I'm telling you is that it's important that the Bureau be able do this. If it means Senate Comm; - e on Labor February 11, 1991- Page 7

that a court might misinterpret what you're doing, so be it I would hope that the record is clear from the Bureau's perspective that it believes that it does have the authority currently

SENATOR SHOEMAKER: I hope the record will be clear in that regard, and that we have any support from the Bureau within the record to make it clear that we are not doing this because we think the law formerly did not cover this.

MALBIN: Exactly

101 CHAIR KERANS: The Bureau asserted that in their testimony, and it's within the record of the committee As the Chair of the committee, I

understood them to say that they were of the opinion that they have the right, maintain that right, and that they have not yielded that right. But not withstanding that assertion, wish to add this amendment to the law in order to remove any question.

107 JERRY BRUCE, BUSINESS REPRESENTATIVE, IBEW: > Investigated the Tigard Electric case four years ago. > The Bureau of Labor and Industries undertook the case because it was significant enough to warrant investigation. Later in the investigation, it became necessary to involve the Attorney General's Office. The process took so long (three years) that when the case finally got to court the judge determined that because the jobs had been completed, the case was not substantive. > Testifies in support of this bill. 164 SUSAN SCHNEIDER, CITY OF PORTLAND: > Concerned about the scope of this bill. The City fears that this bill has a much broader reach than simply to fix the problem of the tinfiled wage assignment. > Specifically, the bill would make the retainage on the public works contract available to the Bureau for collection purposes, as well as give the Bureau authority to file a claim against the performance bond. > This bill has the potential to substantially effect the two tools the City has to deal with a difficult contract situation. > The City would become liable for wages twice, and could be placed in the middle of a dispute where the public agency is neither the guilty party, nor the enforcement agency. > Neither the retainage nor the performance bond are related to the problem of the tinfiled wage assignment. > We are sympathetic to the problem, but the retainage of the performance bond does seem to be appropriate to the City. CHAIR KERANS: Under the statute, if there is an assignment, the Bureau is permitted to take action against either the retainage or the bond or both, serially. First the retainage, and if it's not adequate, then go behind it to the bond if there is an assignment. Is that not correct? SCHNEIDER: This seems to go directly to that issue. CHAIR KERANS: I'm saying that if there is an assignment for wage claim, they may go against the retainage and after that the bond today under the statute. SCHNEIDER: I'm not an expert on that.

These minutes contain materials which paraphrase and/or summarize all amendments 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 transcript. Senate Committee on Labor February 11, 1991-
e 8

205 TALBOTT: Under ORS 652.322(6) they have the authority to go after the retainage when a wage claim is filed. This merely makes it consistent when they have no wage claim. Your argument that it goes further is true, but it is being consistent with existing statutes.

215 VALERIE SALISBURY, LEAGUE OF OREGON CITIES: > The League of Oregon Cities has some of the same concerns as the City of Portland. > On page 1, Lines 8, 18 and 26, there is language that would appear to make the agency responsible for paying unpaid prevailing wages. The agency will have already paid the contractor based on prevailing wages, and request that agency language be deleted. CHAIR KERANS: We will have staff investigate to determine if that is what the Bureau or the drafter of the bill really meant. 237 SENATOR SHOEMAKER: Do the cities have any suggestions for fixing the problem which you have outlined? SALISBURY: There is retainage left after the contract is completed and the costs from the contract administration have been satisfied out of that. SENATOR SHOEMAKER: In other words, give the priority to the cities access to retainage before it can be reached for these wage claims. SALISBURY: Give the priority for the completion of the project and the full value for the contract. If there is money left over, I don't think

it would be a problem from the city's point of view. SENATOR SHOEMAKER: It may be a problem from the employee's point of view, because for one thing, it may be a year or two before you release retainage, I know from having represented contractors in these situations. Under that version, the employee would have to wait all that time, and that doesn't seem fair. Also, what if there isn't enough money, and there often isn't, especially with the very kind of contractor we're talking about. We end up with an empty pocket, and the bond is probably inadequate as well. How do we deal with this? SCHNEIDER: I don't have an answer for you now, but I would like to come back with an answer for you. 281 CHAIR KERANS: (Asks Bureau employees to return to the stand for additional questions.) Asks if in the past the Bureau has gotten retainage at the end of a project. COFFEL: Could I back track and start at the beginning? First of all, I am listening to the concern about double payment. In 1983 Senator Hendrickson got a provision 279 .356 which allows us only the blame or payment to the contracting agency only if they don't include a provision for the payment of prevailing wages in the specs of the contract. That's the only time they will be stuck with a payment. 315 TALBOTT: That's why there is the reference in there to the agencies. COFFEL: That' is correct. Senate Committee on Labor February 11, 1991- Page 9

TIFFANY: As a common practice now, when we investigate a case, we have sufficient suspicion to believe that there are certain amounts due, we will file a claim against the bond right away. We'll file notice of claim against the bond whether we have a wage claim or not. And it is in the execution of the formal action against the bond where we eventually have to get a wage claim from all the employees in order to actually go forward in a legal sense. That is what the Attorney General has told us. So right now as part of our regular process, when we begin a case and we have reason to believe that there are sums due, we will file notice of claim against the bond right away.

CHAIR KERANS: So yours is a matter of preservation of standing.

TIFFANY: That's correct.

CHAIR KERANS: So you have the authority to do that now and you do it as a matter of course. Tell me about retainage and the idea that a wage claim of significant amount might prevent the agency from signing off on occupancy or acceptance or something else, there won't be enough money there to bring the project up to the level where they believe the contract that was going to be - they are then left to go after the contract for additional sums above the retainage, you having exhausted that amount.

TIFFANY: As a practical matter, we have not resorted to retainage. We have asked various agencies to withhold certain amounts while we conducted our investigation, and in the past, especially with the Department of Transportation, we've had a good relationship and worked closely with them, and so through inter-agency cooperation we've been able to get compliance. We have never actually made and received formally any money from retainage.

CHAIR KERANS: You have the ability to do so, and it goes back to 1981, is that correct?

TIFFANY: That's correct, and the ability to do so in itself as an enforcement tool. Even if you never have to use it, that's one of the reasons why it's so good.

368 CHAIR KERANS: If you have already filed a claim against a bond on a project which is near completion, and you think you are going to do something about the retainage, would you go to the construction manager for the City of Portland prior to doing that? How would you work that?

TIFFANY: Normally, we try to work with the contracting agency to figure out what's the best for all concerned. If the City of Portland, or any other contracting agency, did not want us to come against their retainage, and we did have a good ability to go against a performance bond to get these wages, then I think that would be worked out. We don't want to do something they don't want to do. Obviously we're going to be working with them a long time and we want to get a cooperative relationship. The ability to do it is what's at issue here, because it's the contractor who has to believe that you will do that if you have to in order to get the wages paid. That's what the contractor has to believe and that's what you have to do if you need to do it.

SENATOR SHOEMAKER: Would it follow from that if your position regarding the retainage was subordinate to the contracting agency's possible claims against the retainage, that would not interfere with what you are trying to do?

Senate Comm~tee on Labor February 11, 1991- e 10

TIFFANY: I guess as a last resort, that might interfere. I guess our interest is the employees' wages, and we'd like to see that the primary purpose. In the Federal law it is. If you have a federal Davis-Bacon contract and the U.S. Department of Labor asks for that money, they get it. And they get it before anybody else.

419 CHAIR KERANS: They have first standing in all cases on the federal Davis-Bacon?

TIFFANY: That's right. They can contract, or for that matter, the Federal Service Contracts Act, the same thing. It acts as a deterrent and it's a big one, but I guess I would not want to be subordinated if I had my choice.

SENATOR SHOEMAKER: Do you think it's clear from the way you've drafted this that you would have priority against the agency's claims against retainage?

TIFFANY: No.

SENATOR SHOEMAKER: It ought to be clear, should it not, whichever way it falls out?

CHAIR KERANS: Yours is a matter of timing, though, isn't it?

TIFFANY: I believe it is a matter of timing.

432 SENATOR SHOEMAKER: Is it the same as a lien claim, then, first in time, first in right against retainage?

TIFFANY: I'm not sure about that.

TAPE 13, SIDE B

001 CHAIR KERANS: Why don't you work with counsel on that, because it

was my understanding that it was. The actual making of the claim is why you go against the bond as a matter of standing.

TIFFANY: That's correct. It's very clear about where you stand with the bond.

SHOEMAKER: How about the bond that's filed with the builder's board. Is that a possibility, should be bring that into this process? It's not a very large bond I know, but it not only is an additional pot that you can go after, but there's also sanctions within the builder's board that might be useful in cases such as this.

015 TIFFANY: In fact we do that in cases where we feel we can. The laws on the builder's board have changed somewhat. There are some contractors that have to have that and some that don't, depending if they're residential or commercial construction, highway contractor or building contractor, or something, so I'm not sure where we stand on that and I'll have to check our processes to see if we still do that. I think we do.

SENATOR SHOEMAKER: We are spelling out in the statute the process and the different avenues that you have to make sure that these people get paid. I wonder if we ought not specify Senate Comm~tee on Labor February 11,1991- Page 11

the builder's board to the extent that there is a bond.

023 CHAIR KERANS: Let's have counsel flag that as a potential avenue. In the last decade, would you say there have been hundreds or more than hundreds state Davis-Bacon wage cases taken up under prevailing wage and overtime that you have had to pursue?

TIFFANY: Last year we investigated 80 prevailing wage cases, this year we're already at 87 cases, and we're half way through.

036 CHAIR KERANS: So you have had 750 cases over the decade, of which none have gone against retainage.

TIFFANY: That's correct.

SENATOR SHOEMAKER: Assume you've had a successful prosecution of a claim and it's quite clear that the contractor knew that he was violating the minimum wage - is that contractor entitled to come in on the next public agency job and bid for it and go forward?

TIFFANY: There is a provision in the statute for debarment in such cases, and that is where the agency can show that the contractor or subcontractor intentionally refused to pay the prevailing wage. We have some of those cases - they are contested quite heavily as you might imagine. We have a couple of them in the system now. Our particular thrust is to only target debarment cases for those that are particularly egregious and try to get everybody else in compliance.

060 CHAIR KERANS: Debarment is for a period of three years?

TIFFANY: That's right.

COFFEL: I wanted to step back to the question as to whether or not this bill would affect our court case. We're very sensitive to that issue - that's why we filed a bill that created a whole separate section of the

statute and did not pretend to address the earlier section passed in 1981.

076 CHAIR KERANS: I have the memo from counsel on introduction of LC Drafts (EXHIBIT F). I would strike LC 2365 by virtue of the fact we've got the wrong LC number there and we're going to bring it back with the correct LC number.

083 MOTION: CHAIR KERANS moved the introduction of LC Drafts in block as outlined in Exhibit F. VOTE: Hearing no objection, the motion carries. 088 CHAIR KERANS: I serve notice of intent to move for reconsideration of the vote by which SB 54 was sent to the floor with a "do pass" recommendation. Since its exit here, it's undergone further examination. TALBOTT: And some LC consistency and conforming amendments did not get attached. You need to give a 24-hour notice of the vote to reconsider. Today was just your notice.

Senste Committee on LSB or February 11,1991- Page 12

101 The meeting was adjourned at 4:37 p.m. Submitted by: Reviewed
by: Roberta White Annette Talbott Assistant Committee Counsel

EXHIBIT LOG: A - Testimony on SB 35 - Mike Kaiel - 7 pages B - Testimony on SB 35 - Ray Baker - 1 page C - Amendments to SB 36 - Staff- 1 page D - Hand-engrossed version of SB 36 - Staff- 1 page E - Testimony on SB 36 - Marilyn Coffel - 12 pages F - Introduction of Committee Bills - Staff - 1 page G - State Measure Summaries - Staff- 2 pages H - Fiscal Analyses - Legislative Fiscal Office - 2 pages