

From: Robert McCarthy <pffm1@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 25 Jun 2007 13:27:10 -0400
To: Jay R Kaufman <Rep.JayKaufman@Hou.State.MA.US>
Cc: Rachel Kaprielian <Rep.RachelKaprielian@Hou.State.MA.US>
Subject: House 4110, "An Act To Reduce The Reliance On Property Taxes Through Municipal Health Care"

Dear Mr. Chairman,

In regards to our phone conversation this morning. Please find my concerns in reference to the Legislation voted on by the House of Representatives on Thursday to reduce the reliance on property taxes through Municipal employees, Municipal retirees and municipal survivors of municipal employees Health Care Plans.

I commend you for changing the title to what it really is; because it is certainly not An Act to promote quality and affordable Health Insurance through the Group insurance commission.

As I have stated in numerous communications to you and other legislators and also have stated at meetings with the Special Commission "The firefighters do not oppose the concept of municipalities purchasing health insurance plans through the GIC. Our final concern was to add an amendment to establish a safety net and safeguard to protect the future quality of proposed health insurance plans. I am disappointed that you, the Speaker, The Joint Public Service Committee and all but two house members did not agree with my proposed amendment. I did not think it was asking for too much.

I was out of the Commonwealth attending to union business on Thursday June 21, 2007 when the House voted on this proposal and I apologize for not being there to articulate my concerns better and in person.

The Firefighters worked with the Commission for over two years to reach consensus and other than my final safeguard amendment we did not oppose the concept.

After reading HB 4110 that was voted on by the House on Thursday, I see there are many pro management additions to what I believed was consensus and I am concerned about the process.

* page two, 1108-5201, one million dollars to GIC from administrative fees, is this in addition to the 1% ?

* Section 4, page 4 deleted and a new member added to GIC Commission, The new addition from the Massachusetts Municipal Association. I do not see any

appointments from the Professional Firefighters of Mass.

* I also see where the bill added the MMA's Insurance co and subsidiary and subdivision MIA the opportunity to purchase health insurance through GIC.

* page 14, deleted" "shall not be a subject of collective bargaining".

* page 16, An agreement executed pursuant to this section shall be binding on all active and retired employees for whom health coverage is being purchased and SHALL SUPERCEDE ANY CONFLICTING PROVISIONS OF ALL COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS AND SHALL ITSELF NOT BE SUBJECT TO SUPERSEDEANCE IN ANY IMPASSE PROCEEDING PURSUANT TO CHAPTER 150E.

*Page 18 Deleted Contributions rates of subscribers pursuant to this section shall be determined pursuant to collective bargaining agreements and incorporated in the written agreement between the appropriate public authority and the public employee committee."

And inserted in place of above" "Contribution ratios of subscribers pursuant to this section shall be determined pursuant to the written agreement between the appropriate public authority and the public employee committee."

* page 18 same section holds GIC harmless "And shall not be subject to collective bargaining, the written agreement or to arbitration pursuant to said agreement" GIC can do whatever they want to do.

* page 21 deleted (F) provision to revoke deleted, and also provision that public authority establishing a health and welfare trust fund pursuant to s.15.

The above are changes I found after a quick perusal and I believe are different than the so called consensus.

I hope for all effected this legislation be reconsidered.

Please call me if you have any questions, 1.617.803.5222

Sincerely,

Bob McCarthy, President
Professional Firefighters of Ma.
130 Bowdoin St., Suite 710
Boston, Ma., 02108