Bill as Introduced

HB 1448-FN – AS INTRODUCED

2002 SESSION

02-2450
10/01

HOUSE BILL ***1448-FN***

AN ACT relative to the salaries of unclassified state officers.

SPONSORS: Rep. Herman, Hills 13

COMMITTEE: Executive Departments and Administration

ANALYSIS

This bill provides that the salaries of unclassified state officers in the 2001 reorganization of the unclassified salary structure shall begin at least at the minimum of the new salary range or at the next highest step in the range. The bill also provides that no unclassified state officer shall have a reduction in salary from the date before the reorganization.

Explanation: Matter added to current law appears in ***bold italics.***
Matter removed from current law appears [~~in brackets and struckthrough.~~]
Matter which is either (a) all new or (b) repealed and reenacted appears in regular type.

02-2450
10/01

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

In the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand Two

AN ACT relative to the salaries of unclassified state officers.

Be it Enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court convened:

1 Unclassified State Officers. Salary Reorganization; Placement in Salary Range. Notwithstanding the provisions of RSA 94:1-a, III, any unclassified position for which a salary was included in the 2001 reorganization of the unclassified salary structure provided in RSA 94:1-a, I as amended by 2001, 158:101-107 shall be paid at least at the minimum step in the salary range for the position as provided in RSA 94:1-a, I. Any person whose salary prior to December 28, 2001 was within the new salary range for his or her position in RSA 94:1-a, I shall be placed at the salary of the next highest step for the position provided in RSA 94:1-a, I as amended by 2001, 158:101-107. The provisions of RSA 94:3 shall apply to future yearly increases for the person holding such unclassified position. Any sums paid to such unclassified officers of the state in excess of the salary amount authorized in this act, except where otherwise authorized, may be retained as earnings but shall not entitle such unclassified officer to receive compensation in excess of the salary authorized in this act.

2 Unclassified State Officers; Salary Reorganization. An unclassified state employee appointed to an unclassified position whose salary after December 28, 2001 is at a lower level as a result of the 2001 reorganization of the unclassified salary structure provided in RSA 94:1-a, I as amended by 2001, 158:101-107 and section 1 of this act shall be paid at the same level as such employee was paid prior to the effective date of the salary change in RSA 94:1-a, I as amended by 2001, 158:101-107 until the pay for the appointed position, through increases, COLAs, or other pay raises, exceeds the pay the employee was receiving prior to December 28, 2001.

3 Effective Date. This act shall take effect December 28, 2001.

LBAO
02-2450
1/31/02

HB 1448-FN - FISCAL NOTE

AN ACT relative to the salaries of unclassified state officers.

FISCAL IMPACT:

The Office of Legislative Budget Assistant is unable to complete a fiscal note for this bill as it is awaiting information from an agency.

Speakers

SIGN UP SHEET

To Register Opinion If Not Speaking

Bill # HB 1448-FN Date Feb 6, 2002

Committee ED+A

**** Please Print All Information ****

Name	Address	Phone	Representing	(check one) Pro	Con
Commissioner James Casey (Labor Dept)					X
Director Wayne Vetter F+G Dept					X
Deputy Commissioner Dave Wilby (Labor Dept)					X
Donna Ferland DRA					X
Mark Bennett DRA					X
Kathy Sher DRA					X
Theresa Fortier					X
Phil Blatsos					X
Robin Pavaglio					X
John Minther					X
John Hayes					X

Hearing Minutes

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND ADMINISTRATION

PUBLIC HEARING ON HB 1448-FN

BILL TITLE: relative to the salaries of unclassified state officers.

DATE: February 6,2002

LOB ROOM: 100 SH **Time Public Hearing Called to Order:** 2:47 PM

Time Adjourned: 4:15 PM

(please circle if present)

Committee Members: Reps. Peterson, Dyer, Langer, Goulet, Hamel, Zolla, Allan, Cummings, Dexter, C. Hall, Robertson, O'Neil, Lent, Landers, Andosca, Clayton, Pawlak, Schulze and Drabinowicz

Bill Sponsors: Rep. Herman, Hills 13

TESTIMONY

* Use asterisk if written testimony and/or amendments are submitted.

Rep. Herman, sponsor. Supports bill. In 2001, were requested to make adjustments to adjust salaries of unclassified officers. Two parts of bill: section I places unclassified officers in salary ranges. Section II handles a salary reorganization.
Linda Hodgdon, Governor's Budget Director. Supports the bill. Need to take action to cut the budget in 2003. Like to remind the committee that the average unclassified employee gets an increase of 2.5%. There are employees that receive pay increase but the total is less than the total pay they were scheduled for.
Rep. Clegg, opposes bill. He was on the committee that worked on the new pay scale. Now is not the time to take the raises back because they were given high pay raises. NEW employee is started at step 3 instead of the basic salary. "We made a mistake but it was our own fault."Recommends we take the bill and do a chapter study!
Rep. Wheeler, House looks to ED&A for system and order in government. Looking at how long term employees are being compared to new employees. Opposes bill.
Commissioner R. Flynn, representing Dept. of Safety. Opposes bill. Says he is in it and feels that the reduction in pay is wrong.
*Jim Fredyma, representing Dept. of Health & Human Services, 271-4333. Opposes bill. Has an amendment. Requests these new position ID's be installed – asking ED&A to approve the changes and to approve the salary changes. Concerned that there might be a reduction of salary. One should have gone to $56,000, went to $70,000. Concerned that person will never get a salary increase until reaches $70,000. Has 21 people who have problems with their salary.
Earl Sweeney, representing himself. 17 Institute Dr., Concord, 271-2133. Opposes bill. Wife said "after 17 years, you aren't going to get a raise," but the study gave him $15,000. Now he has bought a new van with the raise but can expect it to be taken back.
*Barbara Reid, representing Dept. of Revenue Adm. Opposes bill. They have a number of employees' affect by the bill. See written statement.

*Valerie Mahar, representing NHCTC System, Board of Trustees. 26 Cottage Dr., 271-2717. Opposes bill.
John Mintken, representing a group of auditors that works for Dept. of Revenue Adm. 123 Hoit Rd., Concord, 225-7811. Opposes bill. See written testimony.
Dr. William Simonton, President of NH Technical Institute. 271-7737. Wants to testify as "opposed to this bill". There is still a 25% gap within the region. (Must be talking teachers' salaries?) $64,000 vs. $100,000 or $$120,000. For what he does, he is dramatically underpaid. A two- percent raise would put him up to $65,000. Gave up a possibility in getting another position at 2 ½ times current one.
Rep. Herman takes no position - only following through the fiscal committee's position. This bill should not be a commentary on the Hay group's report.

Respectfully submitted,

Rep. Ray Langer, Clerk

Testimony

To: Chairman Peterson and Executive Departments and Administration Committee Members

From: Audit Division, Department of Revenue Administration

John Mintken, Chief Multi-state Audit

Date: February 6, 2002

House Bill 1448-FN paragraph 1 (we do not object to paragraph 2) has been written to restrict the increase in salaries for the unclassified employees who work at a level below the commissioner level. The Department of Revenue Administration Audit Division has a small unit of trained professionals who travel throughout the United States auditing multinational corporations. The Multi-state Audit unit consist of one unclassified manager, nine unclassified auditors and two classified auditors. Thus far, this fiscal year, this group has assessed in excess of $20 million of business taxes. These business taxes would not have collected were it not for the dedication, hard work, and service of these employees.

All auditors are treated equally - their audit assignments, work load, travel requirements, and job performance expectations are the same. However, this bill in its present form will result in several disheartening events. This bill establishes a pay system that pays the unclassified auditors $2,364 per year less than the classified auditors, for the same job! Additionally, eight of the nine unclassified auditors are currently at the maximum pay, and this bill will for a two year period pay individuals within this group at different levels because of differing anniversary dates. The impact of this bill seems contrary to one of the Hay Group's recommended objectives for the Plan Administration Guidelines of: "Promoting the highest possible degree of morale and performance."

We are hired because of our technical ability and tax knowledge. We are highly trained and productive employees. Due to the ever changing tax laws, creative accounting methods used by large multi-national entities, and the sophistication of the tax professionals through-out the United States continual education of the auditors is pertinent in order to protect the revenues of the state. As stated before, this year we have assessed in excess of $20 million and by the end of this fiscal year will approach $25 million. We are not the commissioners, deputy commissioners or other political appointees. We are the employees doing the State's business each day.

We respectfully request that you reject the provisions set forth in House Bill 1448-FN paragraph 1.

Luke Biglow
Pamela Downs
Donna Ferland
John Fraiser
Bert Lawlor
Janice Leviton
John Mintken
Santo Presti
Chuck Redfern
David Rozek
Ed Seidl
Victoria Silva

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

129 PLEASANT STREET, CONCORD, NH 03301-3857
603-271-4688 FAX: 603-271-4912 TDD Access: 1-800-735-2964

Donald L. Shumway
Commissioner

Kathleen G. Sgambati
Deputy Commissioner

HB 1448

February 6, 2002

The Honorable Andrew R. Peterson, Chairperson
and members of the House Executive Departments
and Administration Committee
State House, Room 100
Concord, NH 03301

Dear Representative Peterson and Committee members:

Good afternoon. My name is Jim Fredyma, Controller for the Department of Health and Human Services. I appear today on behalf of Commissioner Donald L. Shumway, to offer an amendment to HB 1448.

Action Requested: Amend NH RSA 94:1-a, I.(b), Compensation for Certain State Officers, Unclassified State Employees, effective retroactive to December 28, 2001, to make the statutory law consistent with the final report and recommendations of the Hay Group.

Positions: The following positions require legislative action to change position titles and, in some instances, salary grades to fully implement the recommendations of the Hay Group.

Title and Pay Grade Per Chapter 158	Current Grade	Title and Pay Grade Amended Hay Group Report	Proposed Grade
Administrator, Strategic Planning (9U386)	DD	Legal Services Director	DD
Assistant Director (MMIS) (9U398)	EE	Administrator of Finance	EE
Director of Special Projects, Office of Commissioner (9U403)	GG	Director of Application Management	HH
Asst. Superintendent Professional Service, NH Hospital (9U245)	GG	Associate Commissioner & Director	HH
Physician in Charge, Division of Behavioral Health (9U447)	HH	Director of MMIS	FF
Program Specialist (9U467)	DD	Senior Systems Analyst	EE
Service Specialist, Office of Administration (9U478)	CC	Systems Analyst	DD

Discussion: Chapter 158:101, Laws of 2001 listed the unclassified positions authorized by the legislature and approved pay grades for each position as recommended by the Hay Group. The duties and responsibilities of the positions listed above have substantially changed since the original unclassified position questionnaires were completed in October 2000. Subsequent to

passage of Chapter 158, the Commissioner of the Department of Health and Human Services requested in a letter to the Commissioner of the Department of Administrative Services that the positions be reevaluated by the Hay Group based on the new functions.

New position questionnaires were submitted to the Department of Administrative Services in October 2001, reflecting the new duties for each position. The reevaluations were done, and based on the new assigned duties the Hay Group recommended new titles and, in some instances, new salary grades for these seven positions. The Department of Administrative Services requested of the Fiscal Committee that, in addition to other technical corrections, the position titles and salary grades for the affected positions be amended as requested by the Commissioner of the Department of Health and Human Services and as recommended by the Hay Group. This is identified as Requested Action #6 of FIS 01-331, considered by the Fiscal Committee at their meeting on December 19, 2001. The Fiscal Committee declined to take action on this requested action indicating that the changes requested were substantive and beyond the scope of a technical correction and, therefore, would have to be approved by the legislature.

Incumbent Pay: It appears that no action is required to adjust or maintain the compensation paid to the incumbents in these positions.

- 9U403, 9U467 and 9U478 - are being increased in pay and the incumbents will receive pay raises through the normal administrative process.
- 9U386 is remaining at the current pay grade and the incumbent is paid the correct amount.
- 9U398 is remaining at the current pay grade. The incumbent is paid higher than the salary grade table rate, but was held harmless from salary reduction by the Fiscal Committee on January 15, 2002, FIS 02-002, and the Governor and Council on January 23, 2002, Item No. 14B.
- 9U245 and 9U447 - the incumbents are paid more than the table rate, but were held harmless from salary reduction by the Fiscal Committee on January 15, 2002, FIS 02-002, and the Governor and Council on January 23, 2002, Item No. 14B, although the salary grade table rates quoted in the fiscal item have changed.

I am available to answer any questions that you may have. Thank-you for your support and assistance in completing implementation of the unclassified salary recommendations.

Sincerely,

James P. Fredyma

State of New Hampshire
Department of Revenue Administration
45 Chenell Drive, P.O. Box 457
Concord, NH 03302-0457

Stanley R. Arnold
Commissioner

Barbara T. Reid
Assistant Commissioner

February 5, 2002

Andrew Peterson, Chairman
Executive Departments and Administrative Committee
State House, Room 100
Concord, NH 03301

Dear Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I apologize that I am unable to attend today's hearing on this bill addressing the unclassified pay system. I have asked a member of my staff to present my remarks because I believe this is an unfortunate piece of legislation that will do more harm than good. Let me start by explaining that whatever the outcome of this legislation, at least in its current form, it will have no impact on my pay. My position has only one pay step. I also share every citizens' concern that the state eliminate unnecessary expenditures. However, the pay raises that were granted to the unclassified employees in this state were hardly unnecessary expenditures. They arose from a study that showed raises were long overdue.

For purposes of discussion, we need to look at four classifications of employees. We have the classified system, legislative employees, the Governor's office and the unclassified system. Of these four groups, the legislature paid ~~$300,000~~ $281,000 to study only one group-the unclassified system. Why? Because the legislature rightly concluded that the system was long due for an overhaul and many positions were no longer competitive with the private sector. The study confirmed that the legislature's suspicions were correct and concluded that, on average, the unclassifieds were earning 21 percent less than those in the private sector. The legislature decided that the state couldn't afford a 21 percent increase and proposed an increase less than 21 percent.

Here is where the logic breaks down. The Legislature and the Governor determined during the budget process that the classified employees should receive an average 3.5% - 4.5% raise. The Governor's office then decided that its employees also deserved a 4.5% raise. Finally, the Legislature determined that its' employees deserved a comparable raise. Does this bill give the unclassified employees a 4.5% raise? This is the group that the State paid $300,000 to study so does this bill give these employees more than a 4.5% raise? No! This bill takes money away from some employees and some employees see less than a one percent raise. For this result, the State could have saved the ~~$300,000~~ $281,000 or used it to give at least a two percent raise.

Over the last couple of very difficult years, I have heard a number of appreciative comments about the unclassified employees of my department. They have been complemented on their willingness to work long hours and sacrifice personal time to help the Legislature and Governor's office reach difficult decisions. If this bill becomes law, some will only receive several hundred dollars a year. "Thanks for all your efforts, we may need to call on you again soon."

In addition, I have unclassified auditors that travel all over the United States to audit companies. These highly skilled auditors account for additional tax assessments in the range of $20 million per year. In the current year, they have assessed over $20 million in the first six months! The State decided in 1983 to establish unclassified auditor positions to attract the highly skilled individuals needed in these positions and it has worked to the benefit of the State for nearly 20 years. There are still several "classified" auditor positions within the department that will be changed to unclassified when the incumbents leave those positions. Prior to this year, the unclassified auditor's made slightly more than the classified. However, this bill will result in the unclassified making significantly less than the classified. Worse, the only unclassified auditor's that make out are the ones with the least experience and skills!

I cannot comment on the quality of the unclassified study because I don't know enough about how it was conducted. Therefore, I assume that the Legislature wouldn't have paid $300,000 for poor quality work. If the study is valid, how can we end up with a situation whereby the only individuals to come out on the "short end of the stick" are the unclassified? Please reject this bill and leave the raises in place. There may be one or two positions that get the "outrageous pay increases" quoted in the press, but the vast majority of the unclassified employees will still end up making far less than comparable positions in private industry.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Stanley R. Arnold,
Commissioner

NH Community Technical College System

26 College Drive, Concord, NH 03301-7400
TDD Access: Relay NH 1-800-735-2964
E-mail: system@tec.nh.us

603-271-2722
1-800-247-3420
Fax: 603-271-2725

JOHN O'DONNELL, Ph. D
Commissioner

February 5, 2002

The Honorable Andrew Peterson, Chairman
Members of Executive Departments and Administration Committee
State House
Concord, NH 03301

Re: HB 1448-FN, relative to the salaries of unclassified state officers

Representative Peterson and Members of the Committee:

On behalf of the Board of Trustees for the NH Community Technical College System, I feel compelled to relay our position to HB 1448 and respectfully request your consideration to this matter. As proposed, House Bill 1448 would reverse a salary increase for our public service executive administration; the NHCTCS Trustees oppose the bill and ask the Committee to reject the passage of this legislation.

Over the last two years, the NHCTCS Board of Trustees has been negotiating with the Executive and Legislative branches for an increase in Presidents' salaries. It has been universally acknowledged that the salary structure is far below, not only national compensation levels but, what is normative in higher education in New Hampshire. During this time, we had been told that action could not take place given the pending Unclassified Salary Study and we awaited those results.

Since December 28, 2001, the Community Technical College Presidents have been compensated at a new level. What the Board of Directors and I consider an egregious breach of faith is that these salaries are now up for reconsideration. It is to this end that I strongly urge the Committee to reject any legislation that proposes to reverse the salary increase. A reversal will return the Presidents to an inappropriate and unacceptable level of compensation.

If you have questions or concerns regarding our position, I will be happy to continue the conversation.

Sincerely,

Claudette Mahar

Claudette Mahar, Chair
NHCTCS Board of Trustees

cc: Governor Jeanne Shaheen
NHCTCS Board of Trustees

Voting Sheets

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND ADMINISTRATION

EXECUTIVE SESSION on HB 1448-FN

BILL TITLE: **relative to the salaries of unclassified state officers.**

DATE: {Type DATE} 2-13-2002

LOB ROOM: 100 SH

Amendments:

Sponsor: Rep. OLS Document #:

Sponsor: Rep. OLS Document #:

Sponsor: Rep. OLS Document #:

Motions: OTP, OTP/A, (ITL) Interim Study (Please circle one.)

Moved by Rep. O'Neil

Seconded by Rep. Goulet

Vote: 13/2 (Please attach record of roll call vote.)

Motions: OTP, OTP/A, ITL, Interim Study (Please circle one.)

Moved by Rep.

Seconded by Rep.

Vote: (Please attach record of roll call vote.)

CONSENT CALENDAR VOTE: NO

(Vote to place on Consent Calendar must be unanimous.)

Statement of Intent: Refer to Committee Report

Respectfully submitted,

Rep. Ray F. Langer, Clerk

OFFICE OF THE HOUSE CLERK 2001 SESSION

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND ADMINISTRATION

Bill #: HB 1448 Title: _____

PH Date: ____/____/____ Exec Session Date: 2 / 13 / 2002

Motion: ITL Amendment #: _____

MEMBER	YEAS	NAYS
Peterson. Andrew R. Chairman		
Dver. Merton S. V Chairman		
Langer. Rav F. Clerk		1
Goulet. Maurice E	1	
Hamel. Albert W	2	
Zolla. William R	3	
Allan. Nelson S		2
Cummings. Ravmond C	4	
Dexter. Judson K	5	
Hall. Charles Q	6	
Robertson. Carl G	7	
O'Neil. Michael	8	
Lent. Donald R	9	
Landers. Dana L		
Andosca. Marv L	10	
Clavton. William K		
Pawlek. Marion J	11	
Schulze. Joan H	12	
Drabinowicz. A Theresa	13	
	13 / 2	

TOTAL VOTE:
Printed: 12/5/2001

Committee Report

COMMITTEE REPORT

COMMITTEE: **Executive Departments and Administration**

BILL NUMBER: **HB 1448-FN**

TITLE: relative to the salaries of unclassified state officers.

DATE: February 14, 2002 CONSENT CALENDAR YES ☐ NO ☒

☐ OUGHT TO PASS

☐ OUGHT TO PASS WITH AMENDMENT

☒ INEXPEDIENT TO LEGISLATE

☐ REFER TO COMMITTEE FOR INTERIM STUDY
(Available only in second year of biennium.)

STATEMENT OF INTENT
(Include Committee Vote)

This bill proposes placing all unclassified employees covered by the 2001 Hay Study of the Unclassified Salary Structure on either the minimum step in the newly adopted salary range or on the next highest step if the employee's salary prior to the change was already within the new range. This placement was the recommendation included in the Hay Group Final Report. However, when HB 170 was adopted last year and the new Hay Study salary ranges were approved, there was still a law in place that required employees to be placed in a new salary range "as their length of service justifies." (RSA 94:1-a,III) Therefore when the new ranges went into effect on December 28, 2001, virtually all employees were placed at a higher range than the Hay Study recommended pursuant to the current law. This bill would decrease those salaries by placing the employees at lower steps in the new range. The Committee doesn't support lowering the salaries contrary to current law. Additionally the committee received testimony that the Governor and Council have recently approved starting salaries for new unclassified employees at the maximum step in the new range. The Committee does not think it is fair for new state employees to be treated better than current loyal and dedicated state employees. The Committee concludes that the unclassified employees should continue at the higher steps in the new ranges as required by the current law. The second section of the bill regarding employees receiving a higher current salary than recommended by the Hay Study has been addressed by the Fiscal Committee and is not therefore needed.

Vote 13-2.

Rep. Michael O'Neil
FOR THE COMMITTEE

Original: House Clerk
cc: Committee Bill file

USE ANOTHER REPORT FOR MINORITY REPORT

Executive Departments and Administration

HB 1448-FN, relative to the salaries of unclassified state officers. **INEXPEDIENT TO LEGISLATE**

Rep. Michael O'Neil for Executive Departments and Administration: This bill proposes placing all unclassified employees covered by the 2001 Hay Study of the Unclassified Salary Structure on either the minimum step in the newly adopted salary range or on the next highest step if the employee's salary prior to the change was already within the new range. This placement was the recommendation included in the Hay Group Final Report. However, when HB 170 was adopted last year and the new Hay Study salary ranges were approved, there was still a law in place that required employees to be placed in a new salary range "as their length of service justifies." (RSA 94:1-a,III) Therefore when the new ranges went into effect on December 28, 2001, virtually all employees were placed at a higher range than the Hay Study recommended pursuant to the current law. This bill would decrease those salaries by placing the employees at lower steps in the new range. The Committee doesn't support lowering the salaries contrary to current law. Additionally the committee received testimony that the Governor and Council have recently approved starting salaries for new unclassified employees at the maximum step in the new range. The Committee does not think it is fair for new state employees to be treated better than current loyal and dedicated state employees. The Committee concludes that the unclassified employees should continue at the higher steps in the new ranges as required by the current law. The second section of the bill regarding employees receiving a higher current salary than recommended by the Hay Study has been addressed by the Fiscal Committee and is not therefore needed **Vote 13-2.**

Draft

COMMITTEE REPORT

COMMITTEE: **Executive Departments and Administration**

BILL NUMBER: **HB 1448-FN**

TITLE: relative to the salaries of unclassified state officers.

DATE: February 14, 2002 CONSENT CALENDAR YES ☐ NO ☒

☐ OUGHT TO PASS

☐ OUGHT TO PASS WITH AMENDMENT

☒ INEXPEDIENT TO LEGISLATE

☐ REFER TO COMMITTEE FOR INTERIM STUDY
(Available only in second year of biennium.)

STATEMENT OF INTENT
(Include Committee Vote)

This bill proposes placing all unclassified employees covered by the 2001 Hay Study of the Unclassified Salary Structure on either the minimum step in the newly adopted salary range or on the next highest step if the employee's salary prior to the change was already within the new range. This placement was the recommendation included in the Hay Group Final Report. However, when HB 170 was adopted last year and the new Hay Study salary ranges were approved, there was still a law in place that required employees to be placed in a new salary range "as their length of service justifies." (RSA 94:1-a,III) Therefore when the new ranges went into effect on December 28, 2001, virtually all employees were placed at a higher range than the Hay Study recommended pursuant to the current law. This bill would decrease those salaries by placing the employees at lower steps in the new range. The Committee doesn't support lowering the salaries contrary to current law. Additionally the committee received testimony that the Governor and Council have recently approved starting salaries for new unclassified employees at the maximum step in the new range. The Committee does not think it is fair for new state employees to be treated better than current loyal and dedicated state employees. The Committee concludes that the unclassified employees should continue at the higher steps in the new ranges as required by the current law. The second section of the bill regarding employees receiving a higher current salary than recommended by the Hay Study has been addressed by the Fiscal Committee and is not therefore needed.

Vote 13-2.

Rep. Michael O'Neil
FOR THE COMMITTEE

ok

Original: House Clerk
cc: Committee Bill file

USE ANOTHER REPORT FOR MINORITY REPORT