

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

HB 7102	PA 356	1993
House: 9231-9236		(6)
Senate: 4379-4381, 4480-4481		(5)
Labor & Public Employees: 963-965, 1009, 1112-1116		(9)
		(20)

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

Connecticut State Library
Compiled 2012

H-675

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1993

VOL. 36
PART 26
9151-9472

kfh

217

House of Representatives

Monday, June 1, 1993

REP. NORTON: (48th)

Will the transcript please note that Representative Boughton missed some votes earlier today due to state business. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COLEMAN:

The transcript will so note. Are there any further announcements or Points of Personal Privilege?

Representative Norton.

REP. NORTON: (48th)

Would the transcript also note that Representative Garvey missed some votes this morning due to legislative business? Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COLEMAN:

The transcript will so note. Are there any further announcements or Points of Personal Privilege?

CLERK:

Page 34, Calendar 624, Substitute for House Bill 7102, AN ACT MODIFYING THE MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT ACT. Favorable Report of the Committee on Planning and Development.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COLEMAN:

The Chair recognizes the distinguished gentleman from the 99th District, the Honorable Representative Michael Lawlor.

REP. LAWLOR: (99th)

kfh

House of Representatives

Monday, June 1, 1993

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER COLEMAN:

Question is acceptance and passage. Will you remark further?

REP. LAWLOR: (99th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will. Mr. Speaker, this bill is the product of several attempts to clean up the MERF statute, Municipal Employee Retirement Fund. Among other things, it deletes all references to fund A as distinct from fund B in the statutes. Fund A has only a few people left in it and is no longer something that state employees can participate in.

Secondly, it makes relatively minor changes clarifying when a municipality can join MERF. It will no longer limit it to July 1 of every year, but just allows them to join in essence at any time during the year. It requires, it allows towns to allow police officers and firefighters to continue to pay into MERF after they have reached the age of 65. Under current law, although police officers and firefighters are not required to retire at age 65, they may be allowed to continue on working with a vote of the local town council.

kfh

House of Representatives

Monday, June 1, 1993

If in fact they exercise that option, they will continue to be allowed to pay into MERF towards their retirement after the age of 65. Secondly, it allows the retirement commission to recalculate how the cost of COLAs will be paid in those years when the fund is not generating an interest rate return of greater than 9% pursuant to changes we made over the last couple of years, so with that, Mr. Speaker, I think it's essentially a cleanup piece of legislation. It was relatively non-controversial before our Committee, and I would urge its passage.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COLEMAN:

Will you remark further? Will you remark further on House Bill 7102? If not.

REP. LAWLOR: (99th)

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COLEMAN:

Representative Lawlor.

REP. LAWLOR: (99th)

The Clerk has LCO No. 8850. I'd ask the Clerk to call and I be allowed to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COLEMAN:

Would the Clerk please call LC08850, designated House "A"?

CLERK:

kfh

House of Representatives

Monday, June 1, 1993

LCO8850, House "A", offered by Representative
Lawlor.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COLEMAN:

Representative Lawlor has requested permission to summarize. Is there objection? Is there objection? Without objection, please proceed, Representative Lawlor.

REP. LAWLOR: (99th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This amendment simply clarifies in line 78 of the amendment, it clarifies that in the event of a member of MERF who dies, under what circumstances the spouse will be qualified to collect their pension.

Under current law, it has been interpreted that if the husband and wife have been married for one year immediately preceding the death of the spouse and they were married at the date of death, then they would be eligible. Apparently in the event where there might have been a separation or divorce during that one year immediately preceding the death, even though both parties are still married at the date of death, they might not be able, the surviving spouse may not be able to collect the pension.

This clarifies the intentional law. In other words, the husband and wife must be married at least

kfh

House of Representatives

Monday, June 1, 1993

one year preceding death and must be married at the date of death, not necessarily the one year immediately preceding the death of the spouse. I'd urge adoption.

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COLEMAN:

Thank you, Representative Lawlor. Will you remark further on House "A"? The question is adoption of House "A". Will you remark further? Will you remark further? If not, the Chair will try your minds. The item before the Chamber is House Amendment Schedule "A". All those in favor, say aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COLEMAN:

All opposed, say nay. The ayes have it. House "A" is adopted, and ruled technical. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, would staff and guests please come to the Well of the House? Would members please be seated? The machine will be opened.

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll call. Members, to the Chamber please. The House is voting by roll call. Members, to the Chamber.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COLEMAN:

kfh

House of Representatives

Monday, June 1, 1993

Have all members voted? Have all members voted, and is your vote properly recorded? If all members have voted, the machine will be locked. The Clerk will please take a tally.

Clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill 7102, as amended by House "A".

Total Number Voting	147
---------------------	-----

Necessary for Passage	74
-----------------------	----

Those Voting Yea	147
------------------	-----

Those Voting Nay	0
------------------	---

Those absent and not Voting	4
-----------------------------	---

DEPUTY SPEAKER COLEMAN:

The bill, as amended, is passed. Are there any announcements or Points of Personal Privilege?

Representative Arthur O'Neill of the 69th.

REP. O'NEILL: (69th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the purposes of an announcement.

DEPUTY SPEAKER COLEMAN:

Please proceed, sir.

REP. O'NEILL: (69th)

I'd like to announce that the Regulations Review Committee will be holding an emergency meeting ten minutes before the beginning of the session tomorrow

S-354

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1993

VOL. 36
PART 12
4089-4481

MONDAY
June 7, 1993

55
tcc

Thank you, Mr. Clerk. The issue before the Chamber is Senate Calendar 606, Substitute HB5213 as amended by LCO6825, Senate Amendment "A". The machine is on, you may record your vote.

Senator DiBella, Senator Larson, Senator Looney, Senator Maloney, Senator Daily. Senator Daily? Have all Senators voted and are your votes properly recorded? Have all Senators voted and are your votes properly recorded? The machine is closed.

The result of the vote:

36	Yea
0	Nay
0	Absent

The bill passes. The Chair would recognize Senator Sullivan.

SENATOR SULLIVAN:

Yes, thank you, Madam President. I would now move that this be immediately transmitted to the House.

THE CHAIR:

Is there any objection to Senator Sullivan's motion for the immediate transmittal of Senate Calendar 606 as amended to the House? Is there any objection? Hearing none, so ordered.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 607, File No. 997, Substitute HB7102,

MONDAY
June 7, 1993

56
tcc

AN ACT MODIFYING THE MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT ACT, as amended by House Amendment Schedule "A". Favorable Report of the Committee on Planning and Development.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much. The Chair would recognize Senator Colapietro.

SENATOR COLAPIETRO:

Thank you, Madam President. I move the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill in accordance with the House.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator. Do you wish to remark further?

SENATOR COLAPIETRO:

Yes, I do, Madam President. This bill would accomplish four things. It would eliminate Municipal Employee Retirement Fund A from the statutes. There are only three individuals left in this fund. It eliminates the requirement that towns that wish to contribute to MERF do so as of July 1st of every year.

It also eliminates the prohibition that public safety employees may not contribute to MERF after age 65, and lastly, the bill makes adjustments in the way that towns pay for their annual COLA increases. The

MONDAY
June 7, 1993

57
tcc

State Retirement Commission requested this bill. There was no opposition and no support for it. I urge its adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much. Would anybody else wish to remark on Senate Calendar 607? Are there any further remarks? If not, would you like to move to place this item on the Consent Calendar?

SENATOR COLAPIETRO:

So moved, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator. Is there any objection in placing Senate Calendar 607, Substitute HB7102 on the Consent Calendar? Is there any objection? Hearing none, so ordered. Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Calendar Page 9, Calendar No. 611, File No. 1000, Substitute HB7279, AN ACT CONCERNING THE RECYCLED CONTENT OF PAPER PURCHASED BY THE STATE AND IMPROVEMENT OF RECYCLING MARKETS, as amended by House Amendment Schedule "A". Favorable Report of the Committee on Finance, Revenue and Bonding.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much. The Chair would recognize Senator Daily.

MONDAY
June 7, 1993

156
tcc

5811. Calendar 430, House Bill No. 6014.

Calendar Page 3, Calendar No. 447, Substitute for
House Bill 5200.

Calendar Page 4, Calendar 565, Substitute for House
Bill 6714.

Calendar Page 7, Calendar No. 599, Substitute for
House Bill 6900. Calendar No. 600, Substitute for
House Bill 7041.

Calendar Page 8, Calendar 605, Substitute for House
Bill 7113. Calendar No. 607, Substitute for House Bill
7102.

Calendar Page 9, Calendar No. 611, Substitute for (HB 7279)
House Bill 7270.

Calendar Page 14, Calendar No. 636, Substitute for
House Bill 5994. Calendar No. 638, Substitute for
House Bill 6605.

Calendar Page 15, Calendar No. 640, Substitute for
House Bill 5307. Calendar 641, Substitute for House
Bill 5435. Calendar No. 642, House Bill 7283.

Madam President, that completes the second Consent
Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Mr. Clerk. You have heard the
items that have been placed on Consent Calendar No. 2
for today, Monday, June 7th. The machine is on. You

MONDAY
June 7, 1993

157
tcc

may record your vote.

Senator DiBella and Senator Balducci. Is Senator Balducci about some place? Have all Senators voted and are your votes properly recorded? Have all Senators voted and are your votes properly recorded? The machine is closed.

The result of the vote:

36	Yea
0	Nay
0	Absent

Consent Calendar No. 2 for today has been adopted.

Thank you.

SENATOR DIBELLA:

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator DiBella.

SENATOR DIBELLA:

Thank you, Madam President. I would ask that Calendar Item 599, Substitute for House Bill No. 6900, be sent to the House. There's a Senate Amendment on that that will require further House business.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much. Is there any objection to the immediate transmittal of Senate Calendar 599, Substitute for House Bill 6900, as amended by Senate

JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS

LABOR AND
PUBLIC
EMPLOYEES
PART 4

1038-1390

1993

kfh LABOR AND PUBLIC EMPLOYEES

March 4, 1993
2:00 p.m.

PRESIDING CHAIRMEN: Senator Colapietro
 Representative Lawlor

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

SENATORS: DeLuca, Maloney

REPRESENTATIVES: Eberle, Andrews,
 Boughton, Buonocore,
 Dargan, DeMarinis,
 Donovan, Esposito,
 Jackson-Brooks, Powers,
 Sellers

SENATOR COLAPIETRO: (Tape begins at this point) -- so that we have a little order and decorum in this public hearing. Hopefully we'll get out of here before 9 o'clock tonight. Should the meeting go on, 9 o'clock will be the end of it. We will end it at nine and so try to keep to your three minutes if possible and we might be able to do that, and get everybody in.

The first hour as usual will be the agency heads. Just one more thing that you'll have to forgive some of our members will be getting up and leaving including myself going back and forth to two other hearings. Some of our colleagues here have to go to Bridgeport, and they have to go down there for their own purposes. They have I guess a public hearing down there, so if they get up and leave it's not because they're bored with with you. It's because we have other business to attend.

The first hour will be the agency heads and legislators and I'll start with Steven Weinberger.

STEVEN WEINBERGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee. Good afternoon. My name is Steven Weinberger. I'm the Director of the State Employees Retirement Systems and I'm here to testify in support of HB7102, which was raised by the Committee at the request of the State Employees Retirement Commission.

This bill is intended to produce four amendments to the Municipal Employees Retirement Act as follows. First to eliminate references to Fund A. That fund has not existed since 1973 and we're attempting to implement a recommendation of the state auditors to eliminate statutory references to it. Number two, to eliminate the requirement that participating municipalities enter the system on July 1st. This is intended to promote more flexibility with respect to the time at which municipalities may enter the system.

Third, to eliminate a requirement that police and fire fighters employed beyond age 65 be prohibited from maintaining their membership in the system. We were presented with a claim from the Commissioner on Human Rights and opportunities which caused us to examine the provision. We were faced with a police officer who had been retained beyond age 65. He was under existing statutory provisions barred from membership.

We were unable to convince ourselves that a legitimate basis existed for continuing this, so we entered into a settlement agreement which obligated us to introduce this statutory amendment repealing the provision which all members of the Commission support, and finally one of the problems the Commission was finding with respect to the funding of the system was that contribution rates tended to vary at time significantly from year to year so the Commission conducted a funding and experience study which had as its objectives bringing in some stability to the funding process so there would be some predictability in the municipal budgeting process.

These recommendations have been adopted by the Commission. They're incorporated in the proposed legislation. Their intent is to produce this long term stability they do not impact negatively or in any way diminish or affect the funding of the system. They're merely actuarial devices to permit us to fund the system in a more stable fashion. Those are the purposes of the bill. I'm available to answer any questions you might have. If not, I would thank you for your attention.

SEN. COLAPIETRO: Thank you for the brief testimony.
Any questions from the Committee? Thank you.
Peter Allen.

PETER ALLEN: Good afternoon. My name is Peter Allen. I'm the Labor Relations Manager for the Department of Administrative Services. With me today is Linda Yelmini who is my assistant. We're here in opposition to three bills on your agenda today. All three of these bills deal with matters which are subject to collective bargaining, and as such we believe that they should be dealt with at the bargaining table rather than legislatively.

First, Raised SB906, AN ACT RESTRICTING THE USE OF PERSONAL SERVICES AGREEMENTS BY STATE AGENCIES. Several weeks ago we suggested to you that the issue of subcontracting and privatization should be removed from the scope of collective bargaining. This Committee rejected that bill and in doing so, I'm told, stated that they felt that the matter should be left to the bargaining table, so my written testimony I've given you several other reasons why we think that this bill should be defeated, and I'll refer you to that, but basically this is a matter that should be left to the bargaining table.

The second bill is Raised HB7008. This is a bill that would prohibit the state from contracting out public employment for reduced wages and benefits. Again this is matter that should be left to the bargaining table, and the third is Raised 7011. This is a a bill which would allow certain state employees to purchase retirement at bargain prices. The State Employees Retirement System is extremely complex and has been subject to several rounds of collective bargaining negotiations and interest arbitration. The existing system is the result of considerable give and take and we think that this should be left to that process and not dealt with legislatively.

More importantly, this proposed change is far in excess of the Rule of Parity as provided under ARISA and the State Employees Retirement System, so again we believe that this bill should be defeated and if you have any questions, we'd be happy to try to answer them.

47
kfh

LABOR AND PUBLIC EMPLOYEES

March 4, 1993

REP. LAWLOR: Dominick, if you could sum up a little bit, the bell went off a few moments ago.

DOM BADOLATO: SB979 we support, SB981 we support, HB7101, it's a question of this provision, look into divide and conquer, look into -- it doesn't really respond to the town's cry of poverty. They are looking to set up multi-units in the police and fire department.

As a member of the commission that studies collective bargaining for public -- municipal employees, many years ago, it was clear the intent there that -- the work involved in police and fire, when they are on the line together, placing ranking members out of the bargaining unit would conflict with the work schedules and not only with the work schedules, with the work that's performed.

At a fire, the firefighters all work together regardless of rank. In a police demonstration or in a police action, all of them work together and it's going to create all kinds of problems if you were to adopt that kind of provision.

We support HB7102 and -- HB7102 we support, HB7103 is an attempt to overturn rulings of the State Board and also rulings of the Court in that Department Heads are clearly defined in those rulings. It appears that the employers here are looking to weaken the provisions of the State Board of Labor Relations also weaken the decision that came out of a Southington case with Department Heads and I would urge the defeat of that Bill.

HB7116 --

REP. LAWLOR: Give us a break here. Why don't I ask the question. Let me ask the -- What do you think of HB7116. Go ahead.

It's just so we can -- technicality. We're in the question period now.

DOM BADOLATO: If you want to ask questions, go ahead.

REP. LAWLOR: No, that was it. You wanted to say something about HB7116.



001112

CONNECTICUT CONFERENCE OF MUNICIPALITIES

900 Chapel St., 9th Floor, New Haven, CT 06510-2807 • Phone (203) 498-3000 • FAX (203) 562-6314

Testimony of the

Connecticut Conference of Municipalities

before the

Labor and Public Employees Committee

March 4, 1993

JTM Finley
line 18

CCM is here today to testify on several bills of concern to cities and towns.

Reform of the Heart and Hypertension Benefits Mandate

CCM supports the thrust of Committee Bill No. 5049 to reform the costly and unfair heart and hypertension benefits mandate.

C.B. 5049 embodies the compromise proposed by CCM in each of the last two years, and which was narrowly defeated in the House in 1992.

This compromise eliminates the heart and hypertension mandate prospectively, and retains benefits for current and former police officers and firefighters.

If C.B. 5049 was enacted, applicants for police officer and firefighter jobs in our cities and towns would know -- before they were hired -- that special H&H benefits would not be available to them. Current and former public safety employees, however, would still be eligible for these benefits.

The current mandate, as the exhaustive materials attached to our testimony clearly shows, is not supported by medical evidence, is not needed to attract applicants to public safety employment, and is not serving the best interest of the citizens of our state. In fact, the H&H mandate is costing the property taxpayers of Connecticut millions of dollars each year.

C.B. 5049 contains additional reforms that provide for (1) limitations on the amount of H&H benefits to claimants, (2) managed care requirements for medical benefits, and (3) a rebuttable presumption for grand-fathered claimants.

Again, the major element of this proposal would eliminate special H&H benefits for new hires only. This compromise is the price municipalities and their property taxpayers are willing to pay to be done with this unfunded state mandate.

Cities and towns urge you to finally enact real reform of the heart disease and hypertension mandate. The changes made last year were window dressing and provided little or no relief to hard-pressed cities and towns.

Residential and business property taxpayers can no longer afford to fund the H&H gravy train. Police officers and firefighters should receive benefits under the workers' compensation and disability retirement systems, in the same way that other employees -- public and private -- are treated.

Stand up for what you know is right, reform the heart disease and hypertension mandate once and for all. Do it without taking benefits away from current police officers and firefighters. Do it for your constituents.

CCM urges the Committee to favorably report C.B. 5049.

Separate Bargaining Units for Police and Fire Supervisors

CCM supports Raised Bill No. 7101.

R.B. 7101 attempts to remove a special exception from the statutes that never should have existed in the first place.

Current statute, CGS 7-471(2), sets up criteria that (1) determine whether a municipal employee is a "supervisor" or not, (2) provide such supervisory employees with collective bargaining rights at their option, and (3) require supervisory employees to form bargaining units separate from those units representing the employees they supervise.

These standards and requirements, though not perfect, have worked. They are based on generally accepted collective bargaining, labor relations and organization management precepts. They are also based on common sense.

Yet, police and fire supervisory personnel are treated differently.

Municipal police and fire supervisory personnel that wish to collectively bargain are mandated by CGS 7-471(3) to join the same bargaining unit as the personnel they supervise.

What compelling reasons exist for this special treatment? CCM believes there are none.

Requiring police and fire supervisors to join the same bargaining units as the employees they supervise doesn't make sense.

- It does violence to the labor relations concept -- supposedly supported by organized labor -- that employees with a community of interest should be allowed to bargain collectively in separate units.

- It inhibits the development of effective department management.
- It has (at least) the potential of establishing divided loyalties.
- It often places supervisory employees in a difficult position. These supervisors can recommend promotions, make work assignments, and handle grievances for fellow union members.
- Many police and fire departments have only two or three non-union personnel -- the chief and his deputies.

CCM suggests that R.B. 7101 be amended, in the following ways, to ensure that police and fire supervisors are treated like other municipal supervisors under the collective bargaining laws:

- eliminate (bracket) the sentence that begins on line 87 and concludes on line 89.
- insert a "." after "employees" in line 97, and eliminate (bracket) the rest of the sentence until its conclusion on line 102.
- eliminate (bracket) the sentence that begins on line 102 and concludes on line 103.

Cities and towns are willing to pay the negotiating price of additional police and fire supervisory units in order to solve this long-standing problem.

R.B. 7101, with the modifications CCM suggests, would restore parity by treating police and fire department supervisors in the same manner as all other municipal supervisors. It would protect the collective bargaining rights of supervisory employees in police and fire departments and remove the potential for conflict of interest.

CCM urges the Committee to favorably report R.B. 7101 with the suggested modifications.

Clarifying the Definition of Municipal "Department Head"

CCM supports Raised Bill No. 7103.

The language in the amendment is necessary to clarify which municipal employees are to be considered department heads and therefore exempt from collective bargaining.

In 1978, the General Assembly extended collective bargaining rights to municipal supervisory employees, but specifically excluded municipal "department heads" from collective bargaining.

However, the 1978 bill did not define the term "department head".

The State Board of Labor Relations, in interpreting the statute, defined "department head" very narrowly. In a precedent-setting decision the Board said "we conclude that when a municipal charter itself uses the word "department" to define the large division of municipal government only the heads of those named departments come within the exclusion" (Town of Stratford, Case No. ME-4779, March 9, 1979).

This reasoning had led the State Board of Labor Relations to rule that the Director of Recreation and Parks in Norwalk was not a "department head" because his department was not mentioned in the Norwalk charter even though he managed (at the time) a \$1 million budget and supervised 60 employees.

The present statutory definition of "department head" was enacted at in 1983 (Public Act No. 83-503).

By virtue of P.A. 83-503, "department head" is now defined by the following three pronged test: 1) heads any department in a municipal organization; 2) has substantial supervisory control of a permanent nature over other municipal employees; and 3) is directly accountable to the Board of Selectmen or the Chief Executive Officer of a municipality.

Actually, there is a fourth prong to the test because subsection (5) goes on to define "department" to mean "any major functional division in a municipal organization, notwithstanding the provisions of any charter of special act to the contrary".

In a subsequent State Board of Labor Relations decision involving the Town of Southington (and upheld by the courts), these definitions have also been very narrowly construed. As recent events in East Haven and elsewhere have shown, the 1983 change did not have the desired effect. The General Assembly in adopting the 1978 supervisors amendment never intended that the heads of functional divisions of municipal governments -- people with high-level managerial responsibility -- be given the right to collectively bargain.

CCM suggests that the following modifications be made to R.B. 7103:

- add "or relevant board, commission or authority" after the word "officer" in line 43, and
- add a bracket after the word "organization" in line 46; remove the bracket in line 47 and replace it with a comma.

These changes will ensure that (1) department heads reporting to boards, commissions or authorities (e.g. police chief reporting to a board of police commissioners) are excluded from collective bargaining, and (2) out-dated charter or special act references are not the sole determinant for what constitutes a "department" in a municipality.

CCM urges you to favorably report R.B. 7103 with the suggested modifications.

Municipal Employee Retirement

CCM is opposed to Raised Bill No. 981 and Raised Bill No. 7102 because of potentially costly fiscal impacts on cities and towns.

CCM requests that a fiscal impact statement detailing the costs to municipalities of R.B.s 981 and 7102 be provided to committee members and the public prior to committee action.

Miscellaneous Issues

CCM questions why Raised Bill No. 978 is needed. The General Assembly enacted CGS 7-421 to prohibit a municipal employee from serving on a number of local boards and commissions of the town in which he resides. What hardship has R.B. 978 caused?

CCM supports Committee Bill No. 5461 which would allow municipalities to enact residency requirements for municipal employees.

#

Thank you for your consideration.

Attachments (3)

- *State Mandates on Cities and Towns: A CCM Issues Brief*
- *The Heart and Hypertension Mandate: What It Costs Municipalities and Local Property Taxpayers*
- *Medical Testimony on CGS 7-433(c)*