MICROFILM DIVIDER

OMB/RECORDS MANAGEMENT DIVISION
SFN 2053 (2/85) 5M

ROLL NUMBER

DESCRIPTION

2193

2007 SENATE JUDICIARY

SB 2193

2007 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. **SB 2193**

Senate **Judiciary Committee**

☐ Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: January 30, 2007

Recorder Job Number: 2256

Committee Clerk Signature Mavis L Solberg

Minutes: Relating to prohibiting state agencies and political subdivisions from restricting employees access to the legislative assembly; penalty.

Senator David Nething, Chairman called the Judiciary committee to order. All Senators were present. The hearing opened with the following testimony:

Testimony In Support of Bill:

Sen Holmberg, Dist. #17 (meter :04) I have had three different people in three different parts of the government tell there employees "under no circumstance can you come before the assembly and talk". Spoke of his conversation with the A.G.'s office and the importance of a bill like this to send a message that we as legislators do not want any one restricted from coming to talk to us. This law does not allow them to speak as there department but as an individual.

Sen. Dave Nething, Dist #12. (meter 3:06) I signed on to this bill because I am against the intimidation of any kind to any one. I have believed this the majority of my life. He echoed Sen. Holmber's sentiments.

Sen. Nick Hacker, Dist. #42 (meter 4:40) spoke of his support and reviewed current law and also agreed with the above speakers.

Jodee Buhr, NDPEA (meter 5:16) Testified in support of the bill – Att. #1.

Tom Tupa, Independent ND Employee Assoc. (meter 8:16) spoke in support of the bill

Testimony in Opposition of the Bill:

None

Testimony Neutral to the Bill:

None

Senator David Nething, Chairman closed the hearing.

Sen. Lyson made the motion to Do Pass and **Sen. Fiebiger** seconded the motion. All members were in favor and the motion passes.

Carrier: **Sen. Nething**

Senator David Nething, Chairman closed the hearing.

Date: 1-30-07

Roll Call Vote # 1

2007 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES

BILL/RESOLUTION NO. 2193

Senate **Judiciary** Committee

☐ Check here for Conference Committee

Legislative Council Amendment Number

Action Taken Do Pass

Motion Made By Sen Lyson Seconded By Sen. Fiebiger

Senators	Yes	No	Senators	Yes	No
Sen. Nething	✓		Sen. Fiebiger	✓	
Sen. Lyson	✓		Sen. Marcellais	✓	
Sen. Olafson	✓		Sen. Nelson	✓	

Total Yes 6 No 0

Absent 0

Floor Assignment Sen. Nething

If the vote is on an amendment, briefly indicate intent:

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

SB 2193: Judiciary Committee (Sen. Nething, Chairman) recommends **DO PASS** (6 YEAS, 0 NAYS, 0 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). SB 2193 was placed on the Eleventh order on the calendar.

2007 HOUSE JUDICIARY

SB 2193

2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. SB 2193

House Judiciary Committee

☐ Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: 2/27/07

Recorder Job Number: 3963

Committee Clerk Signature N Penrose

Minutes:

Chairman DeKrey: We will open the hearing on SB 2193.

Sen. Ray Holmberg: Sponsor of the bill, this resulted from discussions between sponsors and the Attorney General's office. The question revolves around the rights of states' employees and specifically the rights of state employees to contact and work with members of the legislative assembly. The impetus came from a phone conversation I had with a state employee who said that their leadership had made it very clear that they were to stay away from the legislature and stay away from contacting legislators on issues before the legislature. It was feeling in talking with Rep. Schneider, Sen. Nething, Sen. Hacker, and Sen. Triplett and others, that that kind of intimidation, even if it's only perceived, needs to be clearly stamped out. So I went to the AG's office and asked them to help. This bill was crafted from case law, exactly what those rights are for state employees. We added to a list of prohibited acts by agencies any attempt to restrict or attempt to restrict access of any employee to any member or committee of the legislative assembly. A question came up in the very thorough hearing we had in the Senate Judiciary Committee about the concern that, does that mean then that state employees would just get to walk off the job and go over and lobby legislators. Of course not, there are personnel rules in every state agency and they have to follow all of those. The

interesting thing was just last week I received a phone call from a state employee, who was in his car and this was a person who works in Higher Education, who called at noon and warned me not to call him back at work because the rules are, you do not talk to a legislator. The individual called me about a home school issue, nothing to do with higher education. The sponsors of this bill want to add to the list of prohibited acts, that no agency, a funding authority, organization or employee may directly or indirectly attempt to restrict communication between members of the legislative assembly and their constituents.

Chairman DeKrey: What is the penalty.

Sen. Ray Holmberg: It is a class B misdemeanor.

Rep. Klemin: Can you elaborate on the penalty, class B misdemeanor, does that apply to the agency or an individual at the agency who does the conduct.

Sen. Ray Holmberg: I would suggest, and I'm not an attorney, it is the individual who was the appointing authority or the individual in charge that attempts in any manner, shape or form to restrict that communication.

Rep. Klemin: I don't see a violation as a penalty for...

Sen. Ray Holmberg: Class B.

Rep. Klemin: So if we go to penalties, it could be applied to the agency.

Sen. Ray Holmberg: I can't tell you how an agency would break the law. There has to be an individual. The Dept. of Labor didn't break the law, it was someone in the Dept. of Labor that did that.

Rep. Klemin: Although the penalty section doesn't limit it to individuals there. It does in another section, but just in looking at the book, there is a statute on organizational fines, which a Class B misdemeanor is $10,000.

Sen. Ray Holmberg: Then they would come to us and ask for the money.

Rep. Klemin: They would have to go through appropriations.

Chairman DeKrey: What was the vote over in the Senate.

Sen. Ray Holmberg: I think there might have been one vote against it.

Chairman DeKrey: Do you want an emergency clause on it.

Sen. Ray Holmberg: Yes, because of the call I had last week. Then I can go and send this to my friend up on the 10th floor.

Rep. Meyer: If this language does get passed and placed in the Code, how could they handle this. How could you restrict them from coming in. It states here, or any attempt to restrict access. If they decided that I am going to go down there on this bill, wouldn't you be subject to a penalty if you said no, we'd prefer you to stay here and do your work.

Sen. Ray Holmberg: I think you will find a person much better able to answer the specifics of that question, will be testifying shortly. She worked many years as a HR person for the state of ND and now works for NDPEA. She can answer exactly that. I believe what she will say is, they can't do it. The policy of the agency are right there, they have to work.

Rep. Koppelman: I've certainly had a lot of contact from public employees and that's not inappropriate. You talked about the restriction, the idea that some agencies are telling folks that they can't come down and testify. Are you talking about in their free time, given what you just said.

Sen. Ray Holmberg: I believe that the testimony that you will hear later today, is that if a state employee comes down to speak for NDPEA or for an independent group, they are on annual leave. Now, if a person from an agency who is speaking in an official capacity, presenting information on HR issues from the Tax Dept. then they are clearly doing their job, but it is the casual and also the other kinds of contacts between legislators and their constituents, that we want to clearly place here. Again, it is case law. We're not writing new

case law. It is just the interest when this bill was put in, I had more than one elected official that asked me, are you talking about me, and my office. I thought those that asked are obviously guilty.

Rep. Koppelman: This would not be applicable in cases where the Dept. of XYZ, says it is the policy of this department, that we support HB? And so they wouldn't have five of their employees coming down and I oppose HB??. They could still set their policy and when their employees were on the clock they would have to follow the policy of that agency.

Rep. Onstad: I don't believe it covers situations where some school teachers, school administrators, school association has directed them that they can not use their school email addresses to contact legislators. This law would not affect that situation, because they aren't public employees.

Sen. Ray Holmberg: That would not overrule over things.

Chairman DeKrey: Thank you. Further testimony in support.

Sen. Dave Nething: Sponsor, support. I signed on to this bill for one reason and that is I don't think we ought to have a process of intimidation with any of our state employees. I think we have our policies in place, they need to be followed. But beyond those policies, I don't think that any agency should be telling employees from the bully pulpit what they could or couldn't do. That's why I'm here.

Sen. Connie Triplett: Sponsor. Support this bill. I think you may have heard about an issue involving the current Chancellor of the Board of Higher Education to order President Kuchella, who was the president, to tell the medical school dean to not be communicating with legislators, to toe the line relative to what the budget policy had been set up. Being a public employee does not cause anyone to lose their first amendment rights to express their personal opinion on their own time. I think there are clear examples.

Rep. Koppelman: I'm having trouble reconciling the question. We are all in support that every citizen has a right to speak to legislators, they should not be barred from doing that on their own time, etc. But squaring that with their professional responsibilities, if they are representing an agency of government, etc. The example you gave was the agency saying to an employee, this is the position of this agency, don't contradict to legislators. Are you saying that they should be able to do that. I know the whole Chancellor controversy, which was really a big deal this session, revolves around the Chancellor saying, don't come to the legislature with something different than what we want and a particular institution of higher education and the employees are being accused of doing that. Maybe you can clarify.

Sen. Connie Triplett: Those are two separate issues and the Board of Higher Education apparently has produced a very crisp little policy that says that if anybody wants to go outside the existing budget, they are supposed to make a statement in writing to legislators that said, "First, I suppose the base budget, but if there is money left over, I would respectfully request that you consider X project." They do have a formal policy. In the particular situation that I am referencing, my understanding of it is, that this was part of a context of a hearing where the Chancellor put in the budget, then the University President was allowed to present, and then the Med School Dean was allowed to present and apparently he must have said something about wanting something a little bit different, even though it was clearly presented in context of supporting the overall budget. I wasn't there, but I read about it. The result of it was that there was a pretty no nonsense letter sent from Chancellor of the Board of Higher Education to the University President referencing the behavior of the medical school dean. We all know, we all get frequent contacts from state employees, so just because one of them may have said something in public and then get publicly chastised for it, is wrong. I don't think that ordering people to be muzzled is the appropriate response.

Rep. Koppelman: Just to continue with that line of thought, I glanced at the Code in that section, employment law in general, in that context let me ask a question. I have been in business for many years and had employees, etc. If a business or a manager of an office or division, or a state agency sets a policy and since ND is an at will state, you could say hey you're not doing the job I hired you to do, I'm going to discipline you for that or you're fired. How do we reconcile, the right of everybody to contact their legislator with the idea that you have to let managers manage and offices take positions and so on.

Sen. Connie Triplett: We have someone coming who will answer that.

Rep. Klemin: Isn't there a distinction between public employees speaking in a representative capacity vs. a public employee speaking in a personal capacity.

Sen. Connie Triplett: Yes, I think there is.

Rep. Klemin: It seems like this is directed more toward the personal capacity, where a public employee could come in and contact a legislator on any subject, not necessarily related to what they are working on.

Sen. Connie Triplett: Probably correct in terms of the overall intent of the bill.

Chairman DeKrey: Thank you. Further testimony in support.

Sen. Nick Hacker: Sponsor, support of bill. I also believe that legislation, a lot of times, is passed for several reasons. Sometimes in part to send a message, and in fact I ran into a situation where some individuals could have had retribution taken against them because of an entity, public entity, they were students and there had been so much fear struck in them that they were afraid to speak with legislators about some of the student issues outside what was the position of the gag order had produced. Obviously not employees, but I think if we reel some of this in, maybe these individuals would be willing to speak out on other positions other

than what they are supposed to be standing up for. This doesn't directly address that situation, but in an indirect fashion it might be able to help.

Rep. Koppelman: So, Sen. Hacker, based on your statement about sending a message, what you're saying is you don't necessarily see this, if it became part of the law, being enforced regularly, or people being fined or jailed, but you see it sending a message, depending on the purpose.

Sen. Nick Hacker: Sometimes that purpose is enough.

Chairman DeKrey: Thank you. Further testimony in support.

Jodee Buhr, Executive Director of ND Public Employees Association: (see attached testimony).

Rep. Koppelman: How do we balance that issue.

Jodee Buhr: We've seen when employees feel that they have been restricted. I can offer a very objective point of view because of my experience as an HR person and as Executive Director now. There are really two questions in the question you asked. One is about, how do we deal with the issue of, if everyone wanted to leave tomorrow and go testify on a bill as far as time. There are rules in place for agencies that ultimately give the agency the final authority to allow leave on a basis that does not, in the administrative code language is, in 4-07-12-07, approval required. A leave request may be denied if the employee's absence would unduly disrupt the operations or services of the agency. So on whether or not I am going to allow you, if you come to me and say I need to take an hour annual leave because I am going to do something, and it might be testifying on a bill, allowing you that leave should be on the basis of will it disrupt the work that you have to do in the agency. Not whether or not what you're going to say, is something I believe, something you should say. That falls under the employee's rights and is a whole different discussion. So if you asked me for an hour leave, technically by

the letter of the law, if I'm taking annual leave as an employee, I don't really need to tell you what I am going to do. I don't say that arrogantly, I'm saying it as administrators may not want to know what you are going to do on your hour of annual leave. There are really two categories that I think put checks and balances in place, and a safety net to balance this out. The employer has the ultimate authority to grant the leave, if the leave is requested. That's one issue. I think that's taken care, both in administrative code and also in the Century Code, agencies are required to implement and adopt policy to set out that leave approval and leave request. But then on the right side of the issue, that is why I think it is very significant that we, as an employee organization that advocates for a strong stand on employee's rights are here supporting this bill. I hope that gives you some comfort in knowing that we won't support something that we thought would work adverse to employees. We believe this bill does send a message as you've heard from some of the sponsors. Not just to the agencies that need to hear the message, but also to employees who have very valuable input to offer you on many issues and who quite honestly, have been subjected to fear and intimidation. It happens. We believe this bill eliminates that. If I'm granting leave solely on the basis of ensuring that I can provide the services, then I have every right to do so and a responsibility to do so as the administrator. If I am denying your leave because you told me that you are going to testify in support of SB 2193, that's wrong. It shouldn't happen and having 10 policies in place won't prevent that.

Rep. Koppelman: I support what you're saying, people have the right to communicate with legislators and to hear from all of our constituents, certainly public employees bring valuable information to that process. I think what Sen. Triplett said was that the Chancellor was concerned because of something the dean of the medical school said. Under your scenario, the dean of the medical school could ask for some leave and come as an individual and testify.

But as legislators, if we're listening to a budget or listening to a bill that's brought by the Secretary of State's office and somebody from that office walks in and says I'm the deputy Secretary of State but I'm not testifying in that capacity, I'm testifying as Joe Public, that still carries a different context, than someone walking in off the street and saying I'm here testifying on this bill. Not that we have any less appreciation for his testimony, but it comes from a different perspective. How do we keep this from escalating into something where you have an agency of government trying to set down policies and positions on issues, which happens every hour, every day of legislative session and 20 employees coming in and voicing 20 different views on that same issue, on leave that their agency had said five minutes ago, this is the position of the agency. Do you understand the concern as a legislator.

Jodee Buhr: There were a number of questions in there. Let's just use your scenario as far as whether or not, let's pick an agency budget hearing, and so the agency comes in and says their policy, here is the funding we need, here is what we need, here is what we plan to do with it. If an employee of that agency came in and spoke counter to what you had just heard as legislators and members of a committee, first of all, I offer you this. I do not think, based on the fear and intimidation that I think these employees feel, that you would see an employee necessarily standing here before a committee if they felt contrary to what they knew that agency's position was. They would likely contact you at home or send you an email or anonymously contact you. Why is that. Because they would fear the retaliation that may likely come. I would also offer for you, if that occurred, if you had an employee that stood before you and said I want to be clear, that I am here on my own, and let's say I have insight that I think has not been presented to you. I would think that you as legislators and as a committee, would want to hear that. Does it put you in a situation where you may need to say, now we've heard that this is the position and now we're hearing this. It absolutely does. But isn't that how

great bills and good laws come to be. I don't think you are going to have this influx of state employees, like you talked about. I really don't. I also offer to you, to please consider, in a positive light, that if you have someone come before you to offer you that other perspective that is a good thing.

Rep. Delmore: Without this bill, don't we have two levels of citizens that we're looking at, the ones that can come in here, we can have two doctors, two lawyers, two states attorney that vehemently disagree on a bill, they have the right to come forward and say, I'm from Williams County and you're from Stark, we have different views. Without this, we're telling our public employees, sorry you don't have the right to do that, because you work for state government and we follow the rules of your specific department and you just have to suck it up and do whatever. Isn't that what we're trying to open up with a fairness here, of saying because you're also a citizen of this state, you have a right to come to me personally or to come to this committee or any other; because you are a citizen just like everybody else that comes before us.

Jodee Buhr: Excellent question, two things. I think it sends a message to public employees that you have the same rights as everyone else that comes to us and we want you to come to us. I think it's also important that you remember that the leave policies that are referenced, that are in statute and in administrative code. Currently, today for agencies who are open and do not operate with fear and intimidation, an employee will go to their administrator and say I would like to take two hours of leave, when we had the pay bill for example, the room was packed with 200 people. Most of those, not on Martin Luther King Day, but on the day where they had to take leave, those people were on leave. Their employers granted it to them. Many of them probably knew that's where they were going and supported it. Others didn't know and didn't ask, it's not really their business and they don't ask. Agencies that operate in that open

environment, under the leave policy, currently employees could have that access today. So for those agencies, this bill will not prevent them from operating as they do today. It is the agencies who operate in a more closed fashion that this bill will open that door for those employees who do work in fear and intimidation and it will level the playing field, as you said, and put in rights that currently do exist for all of our citizens of our state. We strongly urge a Do Pass on this bill.

Rep. Charging: What will happen when the media becomes a player here. Is there another rule governing that individual from speaking in relation to a bill about the media. That's taking it to another level, I want to make certain that we don't. I was a state employee and it was an unwritten rule 10 years ago, that you just don't dare take an opposite stand to the agency.

Jodee Buhr: I think there are two main categories of this bill for you to think about. One is whether or not the policies are in place to protect both the employer and the employee, I have given you cites in statute and in administrative code. Those protections and boundaries exist. Other kinds of rights, i.e. Freedom of speech to be specific, exist today. So if an employee wanted to on their lunch hour, contact someone in the media and say, I feel passionate about this issue, this is how I feel about it, frankly they could. The leave policies are not going to prevent them from doing that. However, going back to what I said earlier, about the 20 people coming in to testify, likely an employee is not going to do that, unless a couple of things exist. One they have a relationship with their employer that they know even if they disagree, it's okay, you can openly speak your mind and I don't surround myself with yes people and complete like mindedness. It's okay if we disagree. We respect each other to do that. This bill will not open the floodgates, because you do still need to manage the business of the day and you can't have 50 employees leave, the work still needs to get done. So I think that this will send a message to those who maybe aren't really playing by the rules today.

Rep. Meyer: Do you see this weighing in an employee that comes forward, a state employee with their agency, with a contradictory position that their agency has and getting up and talking, and not making it clear that they are speaking on their own behalf personally and not about the agency's position. Are there checks and balances in place with that.

Jodee Buhr: Yes there are. A couple of things would come into play in that scenario. One is that, if an agency has made clear what their position is on an issue, say on abortion, if agency X says this is our position on it, and the employee stood up in complete opposition to whatever that was and the agency has made clear that is the basis of their organization or on their agency mission statement, in policy and every employee as an employee of that agency, is expected to carry out the mission of the agency. Potentially, that employee could be called on for insubordination under the performance rules of the state. At the same time, if the employee inadvertently didn't say that they were speaking in a personal capacity, but made it clear after the fact that they were, that is different. Also, if they made it clear that they were speaking in a personal capacity, and they were then retaliated against for doing that, likely those are the files that end up on my desk and I would be representing that employee in a grievance against the agency. Retaliating against them in a personal capacity, because that falls under the category of every person, including a public employee have rights.

Chairman DeKrey: Thank you. Further testimony in support. Testimony in opposition. We will close the hearing.

2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. SB 2193

House Judiciary Committee

☐ Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: 2/27/07

Recorder Job Number: 4003

Committee Clerk Signature DPenrose

Minutes:

Chairman DeKrey: We will take a look at SB 2193. What are the committee's wishes.

Rep. Delmore: I move that we amend the bill to add an emergency clause.

Rep. Kretschmar: Second.

Chairman DeKrey: Voice vote. Motion carried. We have the bill before us as amended. What are the committee's wishes.

Rep. Delmore: I move a Do Pass as amended.

Rep. Kretschmar: Second.

Chairman DeKrey: Frankly, I don't see why we needed it, but it sounds like we do.

Rep. Boehning: My only concern, I just think when we hear the agency speak on the bill that we don't get lots of employees coming and say they don't like it. I hope they don't use their titles and testify against what the agency said.

Rep. Delmore: If it is a problem, it tells us something about one of the departments that needs work.

Rep. Boehning: Sometimes it's hard to figure out what is going on.

Rep. Charging: As I shared in the testimony, having been a state employee, it really is an unwritten rule, there is a fear factor. You know the ones when you get your emails from a

Yahoo address or something that says please don't tell anyone that I talked to you, I think that's sad; that we have to go to this level to clear it up. I think it is our job and duty to wade through all the testimony, regardless of where it comes from.

Chairman DeKrey: The clerk will call the roll on a Do Pass as amended motion.

14 YES 0 NO 0 ABSENT **DO PASS AS AMENDED** **CARRIER: Rep. Charging**

Adopted by the Judiciary Committee
February 27, 2007

House Amendments to SB 2193 (70652.0101) - Judiciary Committee 02/27/2007

Page 1, line 3, remove "and" and after "penalty" insert "; and to declare an emergency"

Page 1, after line 8, insert:

"**SECTION 2. EMERGENCY.** This Act is declared to be an emergency measure."

Renumber accordingly

Date: 2/27/07
Roll Call Vote #: 1

2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES
BILL/RESOLUTION NO. 2193

House JUDICIARY Committee

☐ Check here for Conference Committee

Legislative Council Amendment Number

Action Taken Do Pass as Amended

Motion Made By Rep. Delmore Seconded By Rep. Kretschmar

Representatives	Yes	No	Representatives	Yes	No
Chairman DeKrey	✓		Rep. Delmore	✓	
Rep. Klemin	✓		Rep. Griffin	✓	
Rep. Boehning	✓		Rep. Meyer	✓	
Rep. Charging	✓		Rep. Onstad	✓	
Rep. Dahl	✓		Rep. Wolf	✓	
Rep. Heller	✓				
Rep. Kingsbury	✓				
Rep. Koppelman	✓				
Rep. Kretschmar	✓				

Total (Yes) 14 No 0

Absent 0

Floor Assignment Rep. Charging

If the vote is on an amendment, briefly indicate intent:

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

SB 2193: Judiciary Committee (Rep. DeKrey, Chairman) recommends **AMENDMENTS AS FOLLOWS** and when so amended, recommends **DO PASS** (14 YEAS, 0 NAYS, 0 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). SB 2193 was placed on the Sixth order on the calendar.

Page 1, line 3, remove "and" and after "penalty" insert "; and to declare an emergency"

Page 1, after line 8, insert:

"**SECTION 2. EMERGENCY.** This Act is declared to be an emergency measure."

Renumber accordingly

2007 TESTIMONY

SB 2193

Att # 1
1-30-07

NDPEA NORTH DAKOTA PUBLIC EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS LOCAL 4660 AFL-CIO

3333 EAST BROADWAY AVE, SUITE 1220
BISMARCK, NORTH DAKOTA 58501-3396

701-223-1964
1-800-472-2698

EMAIL: comments@ndpea.org
WEBSITE: www.ndpea.org

TESTIMONY OF JODEE BUHR
ON SB 2193
BEFORE SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
JANUARY 30, 2007

Good morning Chairman Nething and members of the Judiciary Committee. My name is Jodee Buhr, Executive Director of the North Dakota Public Employees Association, AFT Local #4660. I would like to thank the sponsors of Senate Bill 2193 – Senators Holmberg, Hacker, Nething, Triplett and Representatives Owens and Schneider. NDPEA supports SB 2193 and we strongly believe that this change to the Public Employee Relations Act is necessary.

Although there are many agencies working to create an environment of openness, the reality is that there are also agencies where intimidation and suppression exist. As recent news reports have revealed, when these types of environments go unchecked, fear and intimidation can run rampant. Public employees are one of the greatest assets of our state and they deserve to be treated with respect and dignity, not to mention that they should have the right to expect their agency heads to follow the rules. It might be hard to believe that there are in fact agency heads who try to restrict their employees from contacting

you, their Legislators; however, based on 21 years of service as a state employee and my current experience, I can tell you unequivocally that this does happen.

The agencies that currently have an open environment or are working toward this, will welcome the change being proposed in SB 2193. More importantly, the agencies that are not currently following the rules need to hear the message set out in SB 2193: That you, as Legislators, are elected by the people and for the people; that you want and need to hear from the employees who are working hard to provide quality services for our great state; and that you want employees to contact you because their input is valuable! SB 2193 also sends a clear message to employees that you want them to contact you and that you are making sure they are allowed to do so! Thank you for your support of SB 2193. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

NDPEA NORTH DAKOTA PUBLIC EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION
AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS LOCAL 4660 AFL-CIO
3333 EAST BROADWAY AVE, SUITE 1220
BISMARCK, NORTH DAKOTA 58501-3396
701-223-1964
1-800-472-2698
EMAIL: comments@ndpea.org
WEBSITE: www.ndpea.org

TESTIMONY OF JODEE BUHR
ON SB 2193
BEFORE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 27, 2007

Good morning Chairman DeKrey and members of the Judiciary Committee. My name is Jodee Buhr, Executive Director of the North Dakota Public Employees Association, AFT Local #4660. I would like to thank the sponsors of Senate Bill 2193 – Senators Holmberg, Hacker, Nething, Triplett and Representatives Owens and Schneider. NDPEA supports SB 2193 and we strongly believe that this change to the Public Employee Relations Act is necessary.

Although there are many agencies working to create an environment of openness, the reality is that there are also agencies where intimidation and suppression exist. As recent news reports have revealed, when these types of environments go unchecked, fear and intimidation can run rampant. Public employees are one of the greatest assets of our state and they deserve to be treated with respect and dignity, not to mention that they should have the right to expect their agency heads to follow the rules. It might be hard to believe that there are in fact agency heads who try to restrict their employees from contacting

you, their Legislators; however, based on 21 years of service as a state employee and my current experience, I can tell you unequivocally that this does happen.

The agencies that currently have an open environment or are working toward this, will welcome the change being proposed in SB 2193. More importantly, the agencies that are not currently following the rules need to hear the message set out in SB 2193: That you, as Legislators, are elected by the people and for the people; that you want and need to hear from the employees who are working hard to provide quality services for our great state; and that you want employees to contact you because their input is valuable! SB 2193 also sends a clear message to employees that you want them to contact you and that you are making sure they are allowed to do so! Thank you for your support of SB 2193. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.