

SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR

May 15, 1991 Hearing Room 50 03:00 p.m. Tapes 109 -112
MEMBERS PRESENT: SEN. GRATTAN KERANS, CHAIR SEN. LARRY HILL,
VICE-CHAIR SEN. BOB KINTIGH SEN. BOB SHOEMAKER MEMBER EXCUSED: SEN.
PETER BROCKMAN

STAFF PRESENT: ANNETTE TALBOTT, COMMITTEE COUNSEL ROBERTA WHITE,
COMMITTEE ASSISTANT MEASURES CONSIDERED: SB 1002 - PROVIDES THAT
JUSTICES OF PEACE ELECTED OR APPOINTED ON OR AFTER EFFECTIVE DATE OF ACT
SHALL BECOME JUDGE MEMBERS OF PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM -
PUBLIC HEARING SB 704 - AUTHORIZES DENTISTS TO BE ATTENDING PHYSICIANS
FOR PURPOSES OF WORKERS' COMPENSATION LAW - PUBLIC HEARING SB 658 -
REQUIRES REVIEW OF MEDICAL TREATMENT BY CHIROPRACTIC PHYSICIANS
IN WORKERS' COMPENSATION CASES AFTER SPECIFIED PERIOD OF TIME - PUBLIC
HEARING SB 1048 - AUTHORIZES PODIATRISTS TO BE "ATTENDING PHYSICIANS"
UNDER WORKERS' COMPENSATION LAW - PUBLIC HEARING SB 967 - REQUIRES THAT
INTERESTS OF PERSONNEL OF EXISTING EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES OPERATION
OR SYSTEM BE PROTECTED IF OPERATION OR SYSTEM ACQUIRED BY ANOTHER ENTITY
- 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 109, SIDE A

001 CHAIR KERANS calls the meeting to order at 3:16 p.m.

SB 1002 - PROVIDES THAT JUSTICES OF PEACE ELECTED OR APPOINTED ON OR
AFTER EFFECTIVE DATE OF ACT SHALL BECOME JUDGE MEMBERS OF PUBLIC
EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM - PUBLIC HEARING

WITNESSES: RANDY EALY FOR SENATOR BROCKMAN Senate Committee on Labor
Ma, 15, 1991 - Page 2

CHAIR KERANS: Opens the Public Hearing.

022 RANDALL EALY, SENATOR BROCKMAN'S LEGISLATIVE ASSISTANT: Presents
Testimony in support of SB 1002 (EXHIBIT A). -He submits SB 1002-2,
Proposed Amendments and Hand-Engrossed Bill (EXHIBIT A).

SB 704 - AUTHORIZES DENTISTS TO BE ATTENDING PHYSICIANS FOR PURPOSES OF
WORKERS' COMPENSATION LAW - PUBLIC HEARING

WITNESSES: NAN DEWEY, OREGON DENTAL ASSOCIATION KARL FREDERICK,
ASSOCIATION OF OREGON INDUSTRIES DELL ISHAM, OREGON ASSOCIATION OF
NATUROPATHIC PHYSICIANS LARRY D. YOUNG, DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR, WORKERS'
COMPENSATION DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF INSURANCE AND FINANCE 097 NAN
DEWEY, OREGON DENTAL ASSOCIATION: Presents testimony in support of SB
704 (EXHIBIT B).

152 CHAIR KERANS: Notes that the Fiscal Analyses for SB 704 and SB
1048 are identical. -Are dentists doing this work now? DEWEY: Yes, but
after 12 visits or 30 days they have to send their patients back to an
M.D., which drives up the cost of the system. 170 CHAIR KERANS: Would
this bill generate an increase in auditing and monitoring abuse
complaints and result in increased work loads? DEWEY: No. CHAIR KERANS:
Are you aware of any auditing and monitoring of abuse complaints
relative to this work? DEWEY: No. CHAIR KERANS: Do you have a preference
regarding another organization wanting to attach themselves to this

bill? DEWEY: The bill should stand on its own. 188 KARL FREDERICK,
ASSOCIATION OF OREGON INDUSTRIES: Testifies in opposition to SB 704. -An
"attending physician" should be an individual possessing as
comprehensive a license as possible, a Medical Doctor or Doctor of
Osteopathy. -The attempts to reform workers' compensation are beginning
to lower costs. We discourage any changes in the law until we have a
good test how these changes are working. . Senate Committee on Labor May
15, 1991 - Page 3

236 SEN. SHOEMAKER: In an MCO there is typically a primary care
physician "gatekeeping" what dentists do. -Typical insurance policies
have separate dental plans and medical plans. -He agrees with the logic
of FREDERICK's argument, but wonders if it applies as well to dentists?

FREDERICK: It is his understanding they are included under the MCO
arrangements.

245 CHAIR KERANS: It's his understanding that a primary physician may
turn over that function to someone else who acts as the primary
physician during or within the MCO structure. -Before the passage of SB
1197 or since it's passage-are you aware of problems related to the
dental profession in its relationship to medical costs--did people have
to be disciplined or were they removed as qualified or reimbursable
providers? FREDERICK: Does not have any information. -They also oppose
SB 1048 for the same reasons they oppose SB 704. 278 DELL ISHAM,
OREGON ASSOCIATION OF NATUROPATHIC PHYSICIANS: Testifies in support of
SB 704. -He submits amendments to include naturopathic physicians and
any physician as "attending physicians" (EXHIBIT C). 324CHAIR
KERANS: Suggests that before the period insert, "within an approved
MCO". ISHAM: Supports the wording. CHAIR KERANS: This amendment applies
to any physician licensed in the state? ISHAM: It treats all licensed
physicians in the state equally under the MCO. 371 SEN. SHOEMAKER:
This would include any specialist and be contrary to the intent of SB
1197. Primary care physicians make reference to specialists as
necessary. That's fundamental to SB 1197. ISHAM: Naturopaths are general
practitioners. SEN. SHOEMAKER: The issue is whether naturopaths are
specialists and whether or not they should be the "gatekeeper" in an
MCO. ISHAM: The wording in the law does not anticipate that any health
care provider within an MCO would automatically be excluded from being
an attending physician. 392 CHAIR KERANS: People are being made to
sign contracts that they won't be or asked to be primary physicians.
This seems to be a waiver of a right that exists. -You seem to be
restating that with your amendment. ISHAM: We feel that right exists
under the law passed during the special session. . . 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 Labor May 15, 1991 Page 4

412 LARRY D. YOUNG, DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR, WORKERS' COMPENSATION
DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF INSURANCE AND FINANCE: Testifies in opposition
to SB 704. 420 CHAIR KERANS: The discussion during the special
session was that MCO's would be a method for providing for managed care
and the organization would have the flexibility to give the most
appropriate care provider the lead on the case. -Physicians are being
asked to sign documents that say they can participate in MCO's as long
as they don't insist on their rights under the law.

TAPE 110, SIDE A

020 CHAIR KERANS: Can a naturopath in an MCO be an attending physicians under SB 1197? 025 YOUNG: SB 1197 addresses the requirements of MCO's and does not discriminate against or exclude from participation any category of medical service providers. -It does not indicate they are given the status of attending physician. -There is nothing that can prevent an MCO from allowing any medical service provider to be attending physicians. 045 CHAIR KERANS: What's your objection to the amendment?

YOUNG: Does not object to anything.

CHAIR KERANS: You are testifying that nothing in the law prevents or requires naturopaths from being attending physicians? That's to be left to the MCO?

YOUNG: Correct. 071 SEN. SHOEMAKER: MR. ISHAM, why doesn't the non-discrimination paragraph give adequate protection? -That language had naturopaths and others in mind. Why isn't it adequate? -Are you speaking of attending physicians in terms of being "gatekeepers" or do you think you need more in the law to be able to serve as an attending specialist? 092 ISHAM: Presently naturopathic physicians have signed MCO contracts that specifically states they will not become attending physicians within that MCO. -They are well qualified to perform the "gatekeeper" function. SEN. SHOEMAKER: Are MCO's equating "attending physicians" with "gatekeepers"? ISHAM: Those terms are synonymous within workers' comp. SEN. SHOEMAKER: Are you suggesting that a hospital that is forming an MCO appoint a naturopath to be a gatekeeper? ISHAM: No. Naturopaths shouldn't be forced to sign contracts that prevents them from becoming attending physicians.

These minutes contain material. which paraphrase and/or summarize statements made during this session. Only text enclosed in quotation marks report a speaker's exact words. For complete content of the proceedings, please refer to the tapes. Senate Committee on Labor May 15, 1991- Page 5

-People controlling the contracts are subverting legislative intent. The purpose of the amendment is to clarify the law's original intent.

CHAIR KERANS: Closes the Public Hearing. SB 658 - REQUIRES REVIEW OF MEDICAL TREATMENT BY CHIROPRACTIC PHYSICIANS IN WORKERS' COMPENSATION CASES AFTER SPECIFIED PERIOD OF TIME - PUBLIC HEARING WITNESSES: JOHN KITZHABER, PRESIDENT, OREGON STATE SENATE CHUCK BENNETT, OREGON CHIROPRACTIC PHYSICIANS ASSOCIATION BOB HOVENDEN, D.C. MARIA DE LOYA, CHIROPRACTIC PATIENT LLOYD WATT, D.C. MICHAEL LANG, D.C. DALE ACKLER, CHIROPRACTIC PATIENT JOSEPH CIMINO, D.C. ROSS DWINELL, OREGON SELF-INSURERS ASSOCIATION LARRY YOUNG, DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR, WORKERS' COMPENSATION DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF INSURANCE AND FINANCE

CHAIR KERANS: Opens the Public Hearing on SB 658. 129 JOHN KITZHABER, PRESIDENT, OREGON STATE SENATE: Testifies in support of SB 658.

170 CHAIR KERANS: You are testifying that it is expensive and time consuming for an M.D. to seek authorization for further legitimate treatment by a chiropractor and that authorization is uniformly denied?

KITZHABER: Correct.

CHAIR KERANS: The intent of SB 658 is to effectuate access to that appropriate treatment?

KITZHABER: Correct. 190 CHUCK BENNETT, OREGON CHIROPRACTIC PHYSICIANS ASSOCIATION: Presents testimony in support of SB 658 (EXHIBIT D).

219 SEN. SHOEMAKER: What does it mean when you say that chiropractors have been brought into MCO's as full attending physicians? BENNETT: They have full rights to establish time loss, to establish treatment. They are essentially the administrators of the claim. -That has so far been successful, although limited.

- Senate Committee on Labor May 15, 1991- Page 6 ,

SEN. SHOEMAKER: Are they serving as the "gatekeeper"?

BENNETT: They are attending physicians able to administer claims. -We are trying to deal with the denial of access that occurs at 30 days or 12 visits and the reasons described by SEN. KITZHABER. -He continues with his testimony. -He refers to supporting material (EXHIBIT D).

TAPE 109, SIDE B 012 CHAIR KERANS: Discusses the misuse of data by SAIF. -He refers to SB 658, page 2, lines 27 to 44 and page 3 lines 1 to 3. -We need to make sure the language is consistent. -After the 12 visits, 30 days or 30 lost work days does a person have to be referred back to a chiropractor by another physicians for continued treatment? BENNETT: Answers by referring to lines 41 to 43. 074 CHAIR KERANS: An injured worker going to a chiropractor and who reaches the thresholds can continue seeing the chiropractor until told otherwise? BENNETT: Correct. CHAIR KERANS: They continue "until such authority is terminated pursuant to this subsection. " BENNETT: Yes. 083ANNETTE TALBOTT, COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Pursuant to this subsection means pursuant to a director's order under paragraph (d). BENNETT: Page 2, line 33 is not referenced back in ORS 656.005 (12)(b)(B), describing the chiropractor. -Thirty days of time loss may come at some other time during the process. We'd like to have cases reviewed at 30 days of time loss.

111 TALBOTT: The option would be to delete line 33 or take it out of that trio of events and put it as an additional trigger. 126 BOB HOVENDEN, D.C.: Presents testimony in support of SB 658 (EXHIBIT E).

236 MARIA DE LOYA, CHIROPRACTIC PATIENT: Testifies in support of SB 658. 265LLOYD WATT, D.C.: Testifies in support of SB 658. CHAIR KERANS: Are there M.D.'s and D.O.'s willing to make referrals or is that a problem? WATT: Soon after the change in the law he had less problems than other colleagues, but as time

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 Labor May 15, 1991- Page 7

went on and the paper work increased it has become very difficult to get referrals back.

CHAIR KERANS: What's the percentage of refusals?

WATT: About 95 percent.

CHAIR KERANS: How do they happen?

WATT: Explains.

305 MICHAEL LANG, D.C.: Presents testimony in support of SB 658

(EXHIBIT F). 361 DALE ACKLER, CHIROPRACTIC PATIENT: Testifies in support of SB 658. -He is an injured worker who would like chiropractic care, but is unable to do so because of SAIF's refusal for chiropractic care. -Without chiropractic care, he may not be able to remain a member of the work force. 408 SEN. L. HILL: This bill doesn't address palliative care. It addresses treatment until a person is medically stationary. ACKLER: Is being covered for his medical treatment. SEN. L. HILL: You're being referred by your M.D.? ACKLER: He sees an M.D. for one problem, a chiropractor for another. TALBOTT: Have you been found to be medically stationary. ACKLER: That's what they term it, although he questions that. SEN. L. HILL: Has your treatment been fully reimbursed? ACKLER: Is paying for it himself. 429 SEN. L. HILL: The bill doesn't deal with care after you're medically stationary. That issue has been frequently flagged. -We have another bill dealing with palliative care.

TAPE 110, SIDE B 014 SEN. L. HILL: Did you receive any permanent partial disability?

ACKLER: Yes.

SEN. SHOEMAKER: What was the extent of the award?

ACKLER: It was 120 percent.

These minutes contain teriale which paraphrase and/or sumnnarize stf ements nude during this session Only text enclosed in quotation marks report ~ speaker's exact words For complete content. of the proceed gs, please refer to the tapes Senate Committee on Labor May 15, 1991 - PaBe 8

024 JOSEPH CIMINO, D.C.: Presents testimony in support of SB 658 (EXHIBIT G). 129ROSS DWINELL, OREGON SELF-INSURERS ASSOCIATION: Presents testimony in opposition of SB 658 (EXHIBIT H). 185 SENATOR SHOEMAKER: What has the Workers' Compensation Management-Labor Advisory Committee done to address this problem? DWINELL: Is not on the committee so he cannot answer. -United Grocers deals with hundreds of cases and the system does work. SEN. SHOEMAKER: Your workers are able to continue with chiropractic care? DWINELL: Yes. This is not an issue in the majority of the claims he is familiar with. SEN. SHOEMAKER: Would like to hear testimony from the workers. DWINELL: He could ask them. 212 CHAIR KERANS: What's wrong with the bill? DWINELL: We believe existing law works. -We're not hearing complaints that the medical physician says they can't do it. -We do receive some complaints on palliative care, but not on active treatment. 239 SEN. L. HILL: Has numerous letters from workers in his file that says there is a problem. 250 LARRY YOUNG, DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR, WORKERS' COMPENSATION DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF INSURANCE AND FINANCE: Testifies in opposition to SB 658. 260 CHAIR KERANS: Are you aware of any of the problems of workers who are denied treatment and the disregard for the rules? YOUNG: The problem is there. CHAIR KERANS: Are you aware of problems where workers have been referred back, but denied? YOUNG: Yes. CHAIR KERANS: There is a problem, but not of any magnitude? YOUNG: The problem arises when nothing is said about the worker's condition or how it is related to the injury. CHAIR KERANS: Closes the Public Hearing.

These minutes contain materials which paraphrase and/or summarize stternents made during this session. Only text enclosed in quotation marks report a speaker's exact words. Por complete contents of the proceedings, please refer to the tapes. Senate Committee on Labor May 15, 1991- Page 9

SB 704 - AUTHORIZES DENTISTS TO BE ATTENDING PHYSICIANS FOR PURPOSES OF WORKERS' COMPENSATION LAW - PUBLIC HEARING WITNESS: BRIAN DELASHMUTT, OREGON SOCIETY OF ORAL AND MAXILLOFACIAL SURGEONS CHAIR KERANS: Reopens the Public Hearing on SB 704.

BRIAN DELASHMUTT, OREGON SOCIETY OF ORAL AND MAXILLOFACIAL SURGEONS: Testifies in support of SB 704 364 CHAIR KERANS: Are you aware of any problems or abuses by the surgeons?

DELASHMUTT: No.

CHAIR KERANS: Closes the Public Hearing.

SB 1048 - AUTHORIZES PODIATRISTS TO BE "ATTENDING PHYSICIANS" UNDER WORKERS' COMPENSATION LAW - PWLIC HEARING

WITNESSES: DAVID KNOWLES, OREGON PODIATRIC MEDICAL ASSOCIATION GERALD PETERSEN, D.P., OREGON PODIATRIC MEDICAL ASSOCIATION LARRY YOUNG, DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR, WORKERS' COMPENSATION DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF INSURANCE AND FINANCE

CHAIR KERANS: Opens the Public Hearing. 390 DAVID KNOWLES, OREGON PODIATRIC MEDICAL ASSOCIATION: Testifies in support of SB 1048. -In 1989 SAIF indicated podiatrists were paid \$83,000 out of a total of \$36 million.

430 CHAIR KERANS: The Fiscal Analysis says it will cost \$86,000 to regulate podiatrists.

TAPE 111, SIDE A 011 KNOWLES: That means it would cost more than \$1,000 per podiatrist to regulate the anticipated fraud and abuse complaints. -Workers' comp is a relatively small, but significant part of podiatrists' practice. -By not allowing podiatrists to be attending physicians, we believe that interferes with getting people medically stationary and back to work. -Podiatrists were not represented during the special session. 049SEN. L. HILL: Asks DR. PETERSEN questions about the scope of practice. 057GERALD PETERSEN, D.P., OREGON PODIATRIC MEDICAL ASSOCIATION: Presents information on training and the scope of practice.

These minutes contain material which paraphrases and/or summarizes the testimony 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 Labor May 15, 1991 - Page 10

-He testifies on the current workers' comp system.

108 CHAIR KERANS: Are you familiar with any abuses involving podiatrists?

PETERSEN: No.

CHAIR KERANS: Are you aware of any podiatrists abusing the workers' compensation system?

PETERSEN: No. 128 SENATOR L. HILL: Don't podiatrists provide specialized care not provided by other practitioners.

PETERSEN: Yes. SEN. L. HILL: Are many M.D.'s specializing in foot care?

PETERSEN: No.

150 CHAIR KERANS: Are you aware of any problems involving regulation and oversight?

PETERSEN: No. He elaborates.

168 LARRY YOUNG, DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR, WORKERS' COMPENSATION DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF INSURANCE AND FINANCE: Testifies in opposition to SB 1048. -He discusses the Fiscal Impact Statement. -When you increase the physicians in the system you increase the complaints, whether real or imagined, hence the need for the increased FTE's.

192 SENATOR L. HILL: We know podiatrists are providing care. If we already are dealing with the disputes and paperwork, where is the additional fiscal cost if we eliminate the loop between the M.D. and podiatrist after 30 days? YOUNG: A lot of the disputes are handled by the attending physicians and non-attending physicians. -If podiatrists become attending physicians disputes come straight to the department.

SEN. L. HILL: If we pass this bill the disputes would still be handled by the attending physician, the podiatrist. -Where's the increase, the growth in paperwork and other trouble? YOUNG: Tried to answer with his last statement. 224 CHAIR KERANS: We are not finding problems with podiatrists and dentists like we did with chiropractors. -There is an additional cost to the system when an attending physician sends a person to a _ . , These minutes contain materials which paraphrase and/or summarize stateTnenb 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 Labor May 15, 1991- Page 11

podiatrist or dentist. -He will ask counsel to draft a letter to the director to ask for reconsideration of the Fiscal Impact Statement in light of today's testimony. YOUNG: We're asked to do Fiscal Impacts based on some assumptions. Anytime a claim is initiated and time loss is authorized our assumption is there will be more complaints than there are under the current system.

310 CHAIR KERANS: Does not understand where all of the problems will come from 75 podiatrists, who are being already supervised.

CONTINUATION OF DISCUSSION BETWEEN CHAIR KERANS AND LARRY YOUNG. 384 CHAIR KERANS: Would like to see some evidence that there a problems with correctly referred podiatrists and dentists.

YOUNG: The Fiscal Impact Statement addresses what would happen if podiatrists and dentists became attending physicians.

403 SEN. L. HILL: Understands that the potential for problems would be increased. Why are you saying they would be more trouble than M. D.'s.

YOUNG: We're not saying they would be more trouble.

SEN. L. HILL: You're saying they'll cost a net increase. ~, YOUNG: We're only suggesting our workload will increase, not that there will be more problems.

425 SEN. L. HILL: You are already funded for potential problems, the money follows the patient.

TAPE 112, SIDE A 015 CHAIR KERANS: If we reduce the number seen by one doctor and that portion of patients sees another doctor, the total pool of claims does not grow and total pool of attending physicians does not grow. Why is there a problem?

YOUNG: The current attending physicians know the requirements and won't have as many disputes. -When the number of attending physicians increase, the complaints will increase.

038 CHAIR KERANS: Understands. -Podiatrists and dentists were attending physicians for 25 years. Was your workload reduced and your workforce reduced when podiatrists and dentists were eliminated as attending physicians?

YOUNG: Can't answer.

CHAIR KERANS: Want's that answer.

These minutes contain materials which paraphrase and/or summarize
~temonts ml de during this session. Only text enclosed in quotation
marks report a speaker's exact words. For complete contents of the
proceed ~gB, please refer to the tapes. Senate Committee on Labor M6,
15, 1991- Page 12

-He closes the Public Hearing.

(EXHIBIT I) -- Chiropractic Care: The Issue of (Cost)-Effectiveness,
submitted by JOANNE NYIENDO, PH.D.

SB 967 - REQUIRES THAT INTERESTS OF PERSONNEL OF EXISTING EMERGENCY
MEDICAL SERVICES OPERATION OR SYSTEM BE PROTECTED IF OPERATION OR SYSTEM
ACQUIRED BY ANOTHER ENTITY - PUBLIC HEARING WITNESSES: RON HEINTZMAN,
AMALGAMATED TRANSIT UNION TERRY MCCUE, PARAMEDIC, BUCK AMBULANCE SERVICE
NAN HEIM, OREGON AMBULANCE ASSOCIATION MARK DRAKE, OREGON AMBULANCE
ASSOCIATION

CHAIR KERANS: Opens the Public Hearing. 069 RON HEINTZMAN, AMALGAMATED
TRANSIT UNION: Testifies in support of SB 967 .

096 TERRY MCCUE, PARAMEDIC, BUCK AMBULANCE SERVICE: Testifies in
support of SB 967.

120 CHAIR KERANS: Are you covered by a collective bargaining agreement?

MCCUE: Yes; that's a recent development.

CHAIR KERANS: You're asking for succession?

HEINTZMAN: Yes. -Once a provider takes over the service we're asking
that they continue the existing agreements until we go back to the
bargaining table. 143 NAN HEIM, OREGON AMBULANCE ASSOCIATION:
Suggests an amendment. -On line 5, after "system" insert "by competitive
bid". -She describes the need for the amendment. 174 SEN. L. HILL:
What about a straight sale? Your language excludes a sale. 179 MARK
DRAKE, OREGON AMBULANCE ASSOCIATION: Submits testimony in support of SB
967 (EXHIBIT J). -It would exclude a sale, but there are very few sales
in Oregon. -Most counties go out to competitive bid. -About 72 percent
of the cost is in employee wages and benefits. -This provides protection
for the pay and benefits. CHAIR KERANS: Who owns the equipment? DRAKE:

The company. Equipment cost is low overall.

. . . These minutes contain materials which paraphrase and/or summarize datemeots made during this session Only text enclosed in quotation marks report a speaker's exact words For complete content of the proceedings, please refer to the tapes Senate Commi~ee on Labor May 15, 1991Page 13

DISCUSSION BETWEEN CHAIR KERANS AND MARK DRAKE ON COSTS.

CHAIR KERANS: Are the amendments satisfactory to the sponsors? They nod yes.

229 SEN. L. HILL: Would this run afoul of Federal Labor Law?

TALBOTT: If you go from one private person who has the contract to another private person who has the contract, the obligation to bargain and continue collective bargaining rights is already covered under existing Labor Law. What layer are you putting over current law? What is your intention?

DRAKE: Explains.

TALBOTT: Refers to line 10.

DRAKE: This would fit in the request for proposal document prepared by the governmental agency. It would be cod)ified in the request for proposal.

262 CHAIR KERANS: As part of the bid process, through the RFP process, the basis for qualified bidder shall be agreement to these things as part of the contract process. NAN HEIM: That's what we're looking for. CHAIR KERANS: We may need additional language. -He closes the Public Hearing. -He adjourns the meeting at 5:56 PM. (EXHIBIT K) -- Letter expressing concern on SB 967 submitted by VALERIE A. SALISB URY, LEAGUE OF OREGON CITIES. (EXHIBIT L) -- FISCAL ANALYSES of SB 1002, SB 704, and SB 1048. Submitted by: Reviewed by: Edward C. Klein Annette Talbott Committee Assistant Committee Counsel

EXHIBIT LOG:

A - Testimony on SB 1002 - Sen. Peter Brockman - 7 pages B - Testimony on SB 704 - Nan Dewey - 3 pages C - Amendments to SB 704 - Dell Isham - 1 page D - Testimony on SB 658 - Chuck Bennett - 56 pages - Senate Commi - e on Labor May 15, 1991- Page 14 E - Testimony on SB 658 - Robert Hovenden - 4 pages F - Testimony on SB 658 - Michael Lang - 4 pages G - Testimony on SB 658 - Joseph Cimino - 2 pages H - Testimony on SB 658 - Ross Dwinell - 2 pages I - Chiropractic Care (SB 658) - Joanne Nyiendo - 9 pages J - Testimony on SB 967 - Mark Davis - 1 page K - Letter on SB 967 - Valerie SaliSB ury - 1 page L - Fiscal Analyses of SB 1002, SB 704, and SB 1048 - Staff - 3 pages

These minutes contain materials which paraphrase and/or summarize
statements made during this session. Only text enclosed in quotation
marks represent a speaker's exact words. For complete content of the proceed-
ings, please refer to the tapes.