

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

HB 7564 (FAT) (PASIO) 1985

Approp: 1277-1282 (6)

Sen: 5056-5057, 5135-5136 (4)

Hse: 9049, 9052, 9714-9721 (10)

20p.

Transcripts from the Joint Standing Committee Public Hearing(s) and/or Senate
and House of Representatives Proceedings

Connecticut State Library

Compiled 2014

JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS

APPROPRIATIONS
PART 4
995-1346

1985

MR. AL MAROTTA: I know the Committee is running late. I'd like to state for the record Mr. Gould relinquished his minutes so that Mr. McGuire and myself -- my name is Al Marotta. I am representing Connecticut State Employees Association. I'm here today urging you to correct an injustice that is being done to certain retired State Employees. I'm here to support the Senate Bill, or SB466, and similar to 466 is another Bill that's HB7564. They both state the same in trying to establish the same thing. But, I want to ask the Committee that we are not looking for a Cost of Living Increase even though these retirees are retirees that retired prior to 1982 and the passage of the Binding Arbitration Cost of Bargaining Agreement which will run through the year 1988. That means that there will be modifications made after 1988 but up until that time everything stays status quo. Now, many of these retired State Employees would like to have a Cost of Living Increase on an Annual basis, that have been retired for a year or so, higher than the 3% that's existing now depending on the Cost of Living Max of 5% similar to the Teachers. We're not here today to ask you for additional funds for that. What we are here to do is try to correct. When the Bill originally and the Statute was passed, the intention was that a Cost of Living would be analyzed from January to December, and whatever that was would be applied to the retiree on January 1 or July 1 depending nine months, the closest date to your retirement date from State Service.

What has happened is in the past four or five years that we have many retirees. We represent over 8,500 retirees at the Connecticut State Employees Association that are not involved under Collective Bargaining. What happens is that in the past two or three years, some of the ones that got a cost of living due on January got less than those that received it in July. We want to keep them under January and July Anniversary Dates -- not to raise any chaos within the State System. What we want to do is take the annualized COLA, whatever it is, and apply it to those that receive it in January and

MR. MAROTTA: (continued)

the same rate to those in July. So, not to disturb the system. We don't want anyone missing out on six months or pushing more money onto the State. What we're trying to do is say that it will be annualized so you'll take the Cost of Living Increase 1985 from January to December, and apply it to those receiving an annual increase in their Cost of Living for Retirees January and the same thing for July.

I hope I'm clear on that. The only other thing I do want to say is, I heard some comments here about people being covered under Cost of Bargaining Agreement for Pensions. Let me state that the retirees and those that have already gone and are retired are not covered under the Cost of Bargaining Agreement. You can Bargain for those that are currently in the System when they Bargained for the 1982 Agreement which was adjusted in 1983. That Six Year Agreement runs through 1988. That would cover those active when they are retired, but the people we're talking about are the people who retired prior to the Tier 2 Bargaining. They're under the Tier 1, and the only method they have to receive any improvement is through the Legislature and through this Committee. And, so, I want to urge Senator Connair and Chairman Graham and the Member of this Committee to look down to this here adjustment that I don't think will cost the State any money, but also for a Cost of Living for Health Insurance for those people that can't keep up with the inflation. And, those are the people that are on Tier 1 that are retired, they'd like to have that increase. There's another Bill I understand that will be coming before your Committee for consideration.

So, I thank you very much for your time.

REP. DYSON: Just so you operate on an even keel and not at a disadvantage. That's Otto Neumann not Graham.

MR. MAROTTA: I'm sorry. And, I wouldn't want to use that against -- I've known Otto's family for awhile, but I was trying to maybe see if I could get some response back from him.

33
kjo

APPROPRIATIONS

March 18, 1985

REP. NEUMANN: May we eliminate then, since there is no Bargaining for retired employees. May we go back to the percentage of health insurance that is required under the Contract for retired employees. Eliminate that provision of the Contract?

MR. MAROTTA: My understanding -- you're talking about the 30 to 45. Okay. My understanding is that the 30 to 45 was to resolve the monies to get from 30 to 45 would be gotten by bidding or attracting proposals for health insurance, Mr. Neumann. So, it wasn't really -- you know -- it was part of a 1/3, 1/3, 1/3 share.

REP. POLINSKY: But, it went beyond that.

MR. MAROTTA: Right. No. Right now. The way it was Bargained is 1/3, 1/3, 1/3. Now, for active employees, an Arbiter is supposed to be making the decision whether it's an Annual saving or just a one time saving. Our position is that it's an Annual saving because if you save money in one year by going out, if you go out every year and solicit proposals, you're going to be saving money, not only the first year, but other years. But, you know, that was done to be implemented last year, and what happened, and I think what you're alleging to, is it started -- it was retroactive to January, 1984, and the funds were for one year. And so, the funds ran out in December, supposedly that 1/3, and then from January, 1985 to July 1 or June 30, 1985, there's a six-month gap in the funding, but there were the Office of Collective Bargaining and the Insurance Committee, which I'm not on, and the retirees were not represented on that as far as the retirees having a chance to bargain back and forth were not. They elected that the coverage -- the 45 -- would start as of the proposal date, when they went out for proposals to solicit savings for insurance, and that was January. So, January ran through December, and right now there's a gap of six months in the funding, and I think that's what you're alleging to.

34
kjo

APPROPRIATIONS

March 18, 1985

SEN. CONNAIR: Representative Polinsky.

REP. POLINSKY: Going along that same basis, and we only digressed for a moment, and I don't want to make this long winded, but -- that 1.9 million dollars, even if it were on a twelve month basis period, is still too little for 45% and next year, let's assume it's 1.9 million dollars, let's assume the premiums go up, would that mean we should lower the rate we pay those retired teachers to maybe -- if it were 1.9 million dollars if it equated to 42%, shouldn't we go down to 42%? What the savings reflect is what we actually should buy.

MR. MAROTTA: Okay. The wording was that whatever the savings were, they would be distributed 1/3, 1/3, 1/3 equally for active. The State already took it out of your Budget last year and also the retirees. Now, the retirees did not have, like I say, any seat at the Bargaining Table, and the Arbiter is going to make the ruling whether that's an Annual savings. With the same respect, if there were a greater savings the second year, then it should be going up.

What I do want to say is that I don't really, you know, agree with the principle for those that are already out and retired, but I do want to say that I testified before the Labor Committee, and I brought them facts and figures, from the Controller's Office, and an each of 15% increase would not cost 1.9 million. My understanding was that the 1.9 million also included the cost of Administrative Cost and also Bargaining Cost that went into this Agreement, and we have gotten -- the latest was the end of February -- payroll. What the State is paying and what the employees are paying for health insurance -- all price. Some have Medicare A and B -- all types, and the bottom line was that it should cost less for one year, to answer your question, than 1.9 million. And, I don't know what the State did in the first year with the 1.9 million.

35
kjo

APPROPRIATIONS March 18, 1985

REP. POLINSKY: But, the second part of the question is let's assume that next year -- forget last year -- it was 1.9 million -- 2 million dollars, let's make it easy. And, for whatever reason, health insurance premiums went up, that would only give it 42% or 39% or 43% -- something under 45%. Shouldn't that be what the State pays? That's the 1/3 savings.

MR. MAROTTA: Okay. I believe, because the State has a responsibility to people that worked the best years of their lives providing services for the taxpayers which they are also in the State of Connecticut, that that increase should be picked up by the State, because, equally it's being picked up by a retiree. In other words, Mr. Polinsky, there's also an increase for the retiree. In other words, right now retiree's picking up 65%, okay. I mean 55%.

REP. POLINSKY: What I'm really just asking about is the Pension Agreement which says they get 1/3 savings. And, where I'm coming from is that whatever that 1/3 savings is, that's -- if it doesn't hit 45%, then so be it, they get less. If it hits more, then give them more. Whatever that 1/3 savings is in that year, that's what (inaudible).. That's what the Agreement says. That's all I'm saying.

MR. MAROTTA: Okay. If that's what the Agreement means, the retirees were not parties to the negotiations, and they still want it. They don't have even -- what I would like to see is a meet and confer set up for those retirees that are outside of Collective Bargaining to meet with a panel of Legislators representing both sides of the aisle, both Senators and Representatives from both sides, and come up with what they think is a responsible for the retirees on an Annual basis. Right now, we have to come up here and beg, and it's going to continue, and at this point, gets worse, because they're on fixed income, they're proud people, they don't want to go out and go onto Social Service and Welfare rolls. Some have had to do that. Give up their homes. But, if you just look at the cost of that health insurance, it keeps right on escalating,

36
kjo

APPROPRIATIONS

March 18, 1985

MR. MAROTTA: (continued)

you're right. I think that it's a small token that the State can do for career State Employees is at least to pick up that. But, the retirees right now are picking up 55% even if the State was picking up 45%. Okay.

REP. POLINSKY: Thank you very much. Sorry it was long.

SEN. CONNAIR: Thank you Mr. Marotta. Let's see next John Malsbanden, Connecticut State Federation of Teachers.

MR. JOHN MALS BANDEN: Thank you Senator Connair. Members of the Appropriations Committee. My name is John Malsbanden. I'm the Vice President for Legislation of the Connecticut State Federation of Teachers.

The Federation favors HB5591, an Act concerning eligibility for membership in the Teachers Retirement System. The Bill would make it possible for teachers who were employed for less than half the day, half a week or year. To be eligible for retirement credit. If enacted the Retirement System would encourage rather than discourage job sharing and the hiring of teachers in critical areas -- a shortage. The CSFT also favors Bill 96, an Act concerning the purchase of credited service in the Teachers Retirement System for authorized wages. If passed, the System would encourage Leaves of Absence, something important to the keeping of teachers updated and not burned out. It's also a Bill I happen to have a personal interest in.

The CSFT favors House Bill 5003, an Act concerning the payment of health insurance premiums for retired teachers. If passed, it would bring the Teachers Retirement System into conformance with the State Employee Retirement System and improve the quality of life for Connecticut's Retired Teachers.

We also favor proposed Bill 5322, an Act concerning the transfer of the State's Employee Retirement System by members who are eligible for retirement. The proposal would eliminate the age discrimination against older State Employees who wish to enter the

S-245

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1985

VOL. 28
PART 15
4891-5198

Regular Session
Friday, May 31, 1985

5056²⁴⁷
dk

THE CLERK:

Page 9, Cal. 886, Substitute for House Bill No. 7564,
File 1119. An Act Amending the State Employees Retirement
System. (As amended by House Amendment Schedule "A".)
Favorable Report of the Committee on Appropriations.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Connair.

SENATOR CONNAIR:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the joint Committee's
Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

As amended by House Amendment "A"?

SENATOR CONNAIR:

As amended by House Amendment "A".

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR CONNAIR:

This bill codifies the provisions agreed upon in an
agreement between the State of Connecticut, and the Pension
Coordinating Committee, the Connecticut State Employees
Association, and the Connecticut Employees Union Independent.
We voted upon this pension agreement a few weeks ago, and this
bill merely codifies some of those agreements, to conform the
statutes to the pension agreement. If there is no objection,

Regular Session
Friday, May 31, 1985

5057 248
dk

I would ask that this be placed on the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Any objection? Hearing none, so ordered. Senator
Benson.

SENATOR BENSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. At this time, I would like to move for suspension of the rules so that we might take up, from Senate Agenda No. 2, Substitute House Bill 7664, File No. 808.

THE CHAIR:

Now, is this done with the concurrence of the Majority and Minority Leaders? Because we usually go along with some order, and now you're taking this out of order, actually, from the regular calendar. Does this meet the approval of both sides of the aisle? To take this out of order? This is the so-called Super Lien Bill.

SENATOR SMITH:

Mr. President, I believe there is agreement between the Majority and Minority, with regard to taking this particular item up, Sir. Suspending the rules, and taking it up at this point.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. The motion is to suspend the rules, for the purpose of taking up this item. Is there any objection? The

Regular Session
Friday, May 31, 1985

5135³²⁶
dk

a thousand children, perhaps even more, missing in the State of Connecticut. So I think that this legislation is indicative of the heart and the spirit of where we are going on this issue in the State of Connecticut. And I'm proud to be a member of this Circle. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Markley.

SENATOR MARKLEY:

If there's no objection, I would move that this be placed on the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Hearing none, so ordered.

THE CLERK:

I'd like to call the consent calendar. An immediate roll call on the consent calendar has been ordered in the Senate, will all Senators please return to the Chamber. An immediate roll call on the consent calendar has been ordered in the Senate, will all Senators please return to the Chamber.

THE CHAIR:

Please give your attention to the Senate Clerk, who will call the items on the consent calendar.

THE CLERK:

HB 6040 HB 7678 HB 5091
Page 3, Cal. 844. Page 8, Cal. 879. Page 9, Cal. 883
HB 7564 HB 7748
and 886. And on page 10, Cal. 889.

Regular Session
Friday, May 31, 1985

5136³²⁷
dk

THE CHAIR:

Any changes or omissions? The machine is open, please record your vote. Has everyone voted? Has everyone voted? Senator O'Leary, have you voted? Thank you. The machine is closed, Clerk, please tally the vote.

Result of the vote: 35 yea, 0 nay. The consent calendar is adopted. The Senate will stand at ease.

THE CLERK:

Senator Smith, before I call the last bill, it is my understanding that Cal. 807 is pass retaining?

SENATOR SMITH:

That's correct, Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Page 2, Cal. 768, Substitute for House Bill 7398, Files 618 and 915. An Act Allowing Municipalities To Encourage Business Development Through Two-Year Property Tax Agreements If Construction Cost Thereof Exceeds Five Hundred Thousand Dollars, and Increasing Property Tax Exemptions For Veterans. Favorable Report of the Committee on Appropriations.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Robertson.

SENATOR ROBERTSON:

Mr. President, thank you. Mr. President, I move acceptance of the joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage, Sir, of

H-412

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1985

VOL. 28
PART 24
8706-9055

kok

9047 221

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 28, 1985

On page 12, Calendar No. 814, Bill No. 7388, File No. 1058, AN ACT CONCERNING THE ALLOCATION OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BONDS.

Calendar No. 816, Bill No. 7115, file No. 1067, AN ACT CONCERNING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO INDUSTRIES FOR THE REDUCTION, RECYCLING OR PROCESSING OF HAZARDOUS WASTES.

On page 14, Calendar No. 835, Bill No. 6951, File No. 1096, AN ACT APPROPRIATING FUNDS TO THE JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT FOR THE CHILDREN IN PLACEMENT PROGRAM.

On page 15, Calendar No. 838, Bill No. 7410, File No. 1088, AN ACT CONCERNING TAX EXEMPTIONS FOR RAILROADS.

Calendar No. 842, Bill No. 6014, File No. 1091, AN ACT CONCERNING THE GENRAL ASSEMBLY PENSION SYSTEM.

On page 16, Calendar No. 844, Bill No. 7509, File No. 1106, AN ACT INCREASING CERTAIN MOTOR VEHICLE FEES.

Calendar No. 848, Bill No. 7729, File No. 1108, AN ACT CONCERNING BENEFITS FOR SURVIVORS OF PREVIOUSLY DECEASED STATE POLICEMEN.

On page 18, Calendar No. 859, Bill No. 7564, File No. 1119, AN ACT AMENDING THE STATE EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT SYSTEM.

Calendar No. 860, Bill No. 5328, File No. 1129, AN ACT CONCERNING THE STATE BOARD OF ACCOUNTANCY.

kok

9052 226

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 28, 1985

859, Bill No. 7564, File No. 1119, that's on page 18, be
removed.

SPEAKER VAN NORSTRAND:

Calendar No. 864, Calendar No. 859 are removed.

Is there further objection?

REP. MEYER: (135th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER VAN NORSTRAND:

Rep. Alice Meyer.

REP. MEYER: (135th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask to have
Calendar 816, House Bill 7115, File 1067, removed for
purposes of an amendment.

SPEAKER VAN NORSTRAND: objection?

Calendar 816 is removed.

Is there further objection?

If not, --

REP. STOLBERG: (93rd)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER VAN NORSTRAND:

Rep. Stolberg.

REP. STOLBERG: (93rd)

Just for a point of clarification. Some members

H-415

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1985

VOL. 28
PART 27
9714-10117

9714²⁹⁴

kdc

House of Representatives

Wednesday, May 29, 1985

CLERK:

Calendar No. 859, Substitute for House Bill No. 7564, File No. 1119, AN ACT AMENDING THE STATE EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT SYSTEM. Favorable Report of the Committee on Appropriations.

REP. NEUMANN: (62nd)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

Rep. Neumann.

REP. NEUMANN: (62nd)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

The motion is for acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill. Will you remark, sir?

REP. NEUMANN: (62nd)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The last time we voted on this bill it was in a slightly different form and it was unanimous. I assume it may well be the same today. This bill merely codifies the statutory language in the pension agreement which this body ratified about a month ago. In doing so, we in essence have conformed the

kdc

9715 295

House of Representatives

Wednesday, May 29, 1985

statutory language to what we approved in the bargain contracts, so that we clean up the language, so that per se, there is nothing new in here and it makes good sense to bring our statutes in line. It's a form of technical corrections. And therefore I would urge its passage.

There is an amendment, however, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to call that at this time. I would ask the Clerk call LCO 7733 and I be allowed to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

Will the Clerk please call LCO No. 7733, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule "A"?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A", LCO 7733, offered by Rep. Neumann.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

The gentleman has requested permission to summarize to summarize. Is there objection? Hearing none, please proceed, Rep. Neumann.

REP. NEUMANN: (62nd)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this amendment summarizes, incorporates the recommendations of the quality control, quality control commission of the management indentives plan that has been working for

kdc

9716 296

House of Representatives

Wednesday, May 29, 1985

the last year. In essence, it calls for a breakdown of two different bonus or incentive plans for State managers depending on the nature of their employment. I would urge passage.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

The gentleman has moved for adoption of House "A".

Will you remark further on House "A"?

REP. NEUMANN: (62nd)

In explaining the amendment, I explained its purpose and I just would urge this body to approve.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

Will you remark further on House "A"? If not, I would try your minds. All those in favor of adoption of House "A", please indicate by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

All those opposed, nay. All those opposed, nay. If not, the ayes have it. House "A" is adopted and ruled technical.

House Amendment Schedule "A".

After line 1428, insert sections 31 to 33, inclusive, as follows and renumber the remaining sections accordingly:

"Sec. 31. Section 5-210 of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof:

(a) A permanent employee in the classified service who has nine months' service or more in any position or positions shall receive an annual one-step salary increase for his class of position. The annual salary increase shall become effective on the first day of the payroll period which includes the employee's anniversary date, as determined under subsection (b) of this section.

(b) Each permanent employee in the classified service prior to July 1, 1967, shall be considered to have an anniversary date on the first day of July. Permanent employees entering the classified service on or after July 1, 1967, shall have an anniversary date on either the first day of January or the first day of July, whichever occurs nearer to the day of the month of the employee's initial employment in the classified service.

(c) No employee shall receive such annual salary increase if a service rating less than "good" has been filed with the director of personnel and labor relations by the employee's appointing authority during any part of the twelve-month period immediately preceding the employee's anniversary date.

(d) THE COMMISSIONER OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES MAY ESTABLISH ONE OR MORE STATE INCENTIVE PLANS FOR EMPLOYEES WHOSE POSITIONS HAVE BEEN DESIGNATED MANAGERIAL OR CONFIDENTIAL. Notwithstanding the provisions of this section, annual salary increases OR LUMP-SUM PAYMENTS for employees whose positions have been designated managerial (shall) OR CONFIDENTIAL MAY be based on annual performance appraisals made by agency heads or their designees in accordance with state (agency management) incentive (program) plans approved by the commissioner of administrative services.

Such salary increases shall be in accordance with the provisions of the (managerial) compensation schedule then in effect. Such employees shall receive an increase for "good" performance up to the position rate. (Employees eligible for an annual increase July first and who received an annual increment January first shall be granted a prorated increase effective July first.

An annual salary increase shall become effective on the first day of the payroll period which includes the anniversary date of July first. Increases greater than three and one-half per cent up to position rate and any increases above position rate may take the form of lump-sum payments or salary increases. The commissioner of administrative services may require reports and review the continuing administration of management incentive program plans, disallow payments that do not conform to plans and withdraw approval of plans. In the absence of a state agency plan approved by said commissioner, managerial employees shall receive annual increases of three and one-half per cent up to the position rate for the salary range for such employee's class for "good" performance.

Sec. 32. Section 5-237a of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof:

(a) Any employee (designated as a managerial employee) IN A STATE INCENTIVE PLAN whose annual increase as a result of a performance evaluation is less than three and one-half per cent, and provided that such employee's existing salary plus the performance increase would not be more than the position rate for the salary range for the employee's class, may request a review by a (managerial) salary review committee consisting of one member chosen by the employee, one member chosen by the director of personnel and labor relations, and one permanent member who shall be appointed by the governor for a term of two years from a list of names submitted by the state board of mediation and arbitration.

In no event may a nonpermanent member be chosen who is currently or was formerly in the direct line of supervision of the employee in his employment. Within thirty days after such committee has completed its review, it shall forward to the director of personnel and labor relations its written recommendation and supporting data and such other information as such committee considers appropriate. A copy of the recommendations shall be sent to the employee and the employee's agency head.

(b) ANY EMPLOYEE WHOSE POSITION HAS BEEN DESIGNATED MANAGERIAL OR CONFIDENTIAL WHO IS AGGRIEVED BY THE DECISION OF THE COMMISSIONER OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES PURSUANT TO SECTION 5-210, AS AMENDED BY SECTION

kdc

9719 299

House of Representatives

Wednesday, May 29, 1985

31 OF THIS ACT, CONCERNING WHICH STATE INCENTIVE PLAN IS APPLICABLE TO SUCH EMPLOYEE, MAY REQUEST A REVIEW BY A SALARY REVIEW COMMITTEE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF SUBSECTION (a) OF THIS SECTION.

(b) (c) Members of the committee who are not state employees shall be paid seventy-five dollars for each day during which they are engaged in the duties of the committee.

Sec. 33. Section 5-237b of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof:

(a) There is established a quality control committee to review and evaluate the ongoing performance of (the management) STATE incentive (plan) PLANS established by (subsection (cc) of section 5-196 and sections 5-208, 5-209, 5-210, 5-211, 5-213, 5-213a, 5-237 and 5-237a) THE COMMISSIONER OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES PURSUANT TO SECTION 5-210, AS AMENDED BY SECTION 31 OF THIS ACT. The committee shall consist of the commissioner of administrative services, the secretary of the office of policy and management and the chairman of the management advisory council, or their designees, the chairmen and ranking members of the joint standing committee of the general assembly having cognizance of matters relating to appropriations and the budgets of state agencies, or their designees, and two public members appointed by the commissioner of administrative services.

(b) The committee shall (1) consider ways to make (the management) STATE incentive (plan) PLANS more effective and (2) review and evaluate, on a continuing basis, the effectiveness of the implementation by state agencies of (management incentive) SUCH plans, including improvements in productivity and the establishment of standards for such agencies. The committee shall periodically report its findings and recommendations to the commissioner of administrative services."

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

Will you remark further on the bill as amended?

kdc

9720 300

House of Representatives

Wednesday, May 29, 1985

Rep. Neumann.

REP. NEUMANN: (62nd)

Thank you. I think I commented on the purpose of the bill, Mr. Speaker, and I would urge adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Immediate roll call will be ordered. The Clerk will announce the roll call.

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is now voting by roll. All members please return to the Chamber immediately. The House of Representatives is now voting by roll. All members please return to the Chamber immediately.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

Have all the members voted? Please check the board to determine if your vote is properly recorded. Have all the members voted? All members of the Chamber must vote. Rep. Balducci, you must vote. The machine will be locked. The Clerk will take a tally.

The Clerk please announce the tally.

kdc

9721 301

House of Representatives

Wednesday, May 29, 1985

CLERK:

House Bill No. 7564, as amended by House "A".

Total number voting 148

Necessary for passage 75

Those voting yea 148

Those voting nay 0

Those absent and not voting 3

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

The bill as amended is passed.

CLERK:

Page 9, Calendar No. 354, Substitute for House Bill No. 7748, File No. 424, AN ACT CONCERNING THE REGULATION OF COMMUNITY ANTENNA TELEVISION COMPANIES. Favorable Report of the Committee on Energy and Public Utilities.

REP. ANDERSON: (45th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

Rep. David Anderson.

REP. ANDERSON: (45th)

I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER BELDEN:

The motion is for acceptance of the Joint