

; 05/09/17 3:09 AM
;
;;;BOSTON CITY COUNCIL 2:30-4:30PM
;;;5/9/2017

>> WE ARE HERE TODAY TO DISCUSS
DOCKET NUMBER 0135, A HEARING ON
AN ORDER APPROVING A PETITION
FOR A SPECIAL LAW REGARDING AN
ACT CONCERNING INSURANCE
BENEFITS FOR SURVIVING SPOUSES.
WE ARE JOINED BY MY
COLLEAGUES -- I DON'T KNOW WHO
GOT HERE FIRST.
TIM McCARTHY, MATT O'MALLEY,
ESSAIBI-GEORGE.
THIS MATTER WAS SPONSORED BY ME
AND.

THIS WOULD AYE AMEND MASS
GENERAL LAWS TO SURVIVING
SPOUSES DO NOT HAVE TO WAIT TO
REMARRY TO REF BENEFITS.
RICH PARIS FROM LOCAL 718 AND
BOB AND MARK JOIN HIM AND BY
DAVE SWEENY, CFO FOR THE CITY OF
BOSTON.

>> THANK YOU, MENTION.
COUNCILLORS.

THIS HAS BEEN A PETITION WE HAVE
BEEN WORKING ON FOR A WHILE.
PRIOR TO JULY 2000 NIRKS
SURVIVING SPOUSE WHO REMARRIED
LOST HIS OR HER PENSION.
FOR EXAMPLE THE FIREFIGHTERS
COULDN'T REMARRY OR THEY WOULD
HAVE LOST THEIR PENSION AND
HEALTHCARE.

AS J.J. WOULD SAY, HOW DO YOU
TELL YOUR KIDS TO LIVE IN SIN
WHEN A LOT OF THOSE
FIREFIGHTERS, TWO DIDN'T GET
REMARRIED, TWO OR THREE, BACK IN
BOO SHEA.

ANYBODY WHO GOT REMARRIED GOT
THEIR PENSION.

IT WAS A BIG WIN.

IF ANY OF THE GUYS DIES OF
CANCER, THEIR SPOUSE CAN GET
REMARRIED AND GOT TO KEEP THE
PENSION.

THE HEALTHCARE WASN'T INCLUDED.
THAT WAS BROUGHT UP BY SPOUSE
WHO CAME DOWN TO THE UNION HALL.

THEY WERE HAPPY ABOUT KEEPING THEIR PENSION, BUT THEIR HEALTHCARE.

A LOT OF THESE DAYS IF A YOUNG FIREFIGHTER DIES WITH CANCER, HE'S AN ACTIVE MEMBER, HIS WIFE AND KIDS STILL DON'T HAVE HEALTHCARE, IF SHE REMARRIES SHE KEEPS THE PENSION.

KRISTEN WALSH, SHE'S IN HER EARLY 40s, HAS THREE KIDS. FROM FIRST GRADE TO SEVENTH GRADE.

IF SHE REMARRIED, SHE WOULD KEEP HER PENSION BUT I BELIEVE SHE WOULDN'T BE ABLE TO KEEP HER HEALTHCARE.

I KNOW SHE WOULDN'T BE ABLE TO UNDER THIS LAW.

THAT'S WHY WE'RE HERE TODAY.

THERE ARE NOT MANY MEMBERS INVOLVED, AND I FEEL LIKE IT WOULD TAKE CARE OF THE SPOUSES AND KIDS AND THE FAMILY.

I'M TRYING TO THINK OF QUESTIONS COMING UP.

IF SHE REMARRIED AND HAS THREE KIDS AND REMARRIED SOMEONE THAT HAS HEALTH INSURANCE AND HE HAS -- LIKE THE BRADY BUNCH, THE BRADY BUNCH ISN'T COVERED, JUST SHE AND THE THREE KIDS WOULD BE COVERED.

>> SO THE BENEFIT DOESN'T FLOW TO THE NEW SPOUSE AND/OR TO THE THROUGH SPOUSE'S CHILDREN.

>> NO.

THAT DIDN'T COME FROM THE MARRIAGE.

>> NO, IT DOESN'T.

THE CHILDREN FROM THE MARRIAGE UNTIL AGE 18.

>> 18.

AND THE SURVIVING SPOUSE CONTINUES WITH THAT COVERAGE UNTIL HIS OR HER DEATH.

>> EXACTLY.

SO IT SORT OF IS A PUNITIVE MECHANISM BY WHICH A SPOUSE CHOSE TO REMARRY OR FIND A LIFE PARTNER AND/OR A FATHER OR MOTHER FOR EXISTING CHILDREN, THEY'D CHOOSE NOT TO MARRY FOR FEAR OF LOSING THE BENEFIT WHICH

WAS THE HEALTH BENEFIT FOR THEM
OR THEIR KIDS.

>> RIGHT.

IT WAS THE FEAR OF LOSING THE
PENSION BEFORE, BUT NOW, STILL,
IT'S LOSING THE HEALTHCARE,
WHICH IS VERY IMPORTANT TODAY.

>> GOTCHA.

AND WE'RE GOING TO SHIFT OVER TO
DAVE SWEENEY, THE CFO, WHO HAS
DONE MATH BEHIND THIS AND
WHETHER OR NOT IT WOULD APPLY
DEAL WITH SPOUSES OR
FIREFIGHTERS WHO HAVE -- SPOUSES
OF FIREFIGHTERS WHO HAVE DIED
AROUND HEART AND LUNG CANCER.
IF THIS APPLIES TO OTHER
EMPLOYEES IS ANOTHER QUESTION.
IF YOU COULD GIVE US YOUR
THOUGHTS ON THIS PARTICULAR
LEGISLATION.

>> SURE.

THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN.
AS YOU MENTIONED, IVE DAVE
SWEENEY, CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER
FOR THE CITY HERE TO TESTIFY ON
BEHALF OF THE WALSH
ADMINISTRATION WHICH IS
SUPPORTIVE OF PROVIDING
COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH INSURANCE
BENEFITS FOR OUR EMPLOYEES,
RETIRES AND FAMILIES.
AS MANY OF YOU KNOW, WE HAVE
BEEN VERY SUCCESSFUL IN MANAGING
HIGH-QUALITY HEALTH BENEFITS IN
THE CITY TYPICALLY THROUGH
NEGOTIATIONS OF BENEFITS WITH
OUR PUBLIC EMPLOYEE COMMITTEE
WHICH IS COMPRISED OF ALL THE
CITY'S UNIONS INCLUDING LOCAL
718.

THE CITY IS SUPPORTIVE OF THE
INTENT, AS WE UNDERSTAND, OF THE
HOME RULE PETITION BEFORE YOU.
WE REVIEWING THIS AND BELIEVE
THAT THERE MAY NEED TO BE A
COUPLE OF TWEAKS TO MODIFY
THE -- TO CLARIFY THE INTENT,
BUT I WILL GO INTO A LITTLE MORE
DETAIL ABOUT OUR GENERAL
THOUGHTS ON THE PROPOSAL AS WE
UNDERSTAND IT.

SO THE SPECIFIC DOCKET BEFORE
US, AS WRITTEN, COULD BE

INTERPRETED TO COVER SPOUSES OF FIREFIGHTERS POTENTIALLY BUT NOT POLICE OFFICERS BUT COULD ALSO COVER -- WOULD ALSO AMEND SECTION 9B WHICH COVERS ALL EMPLOYEES, SO THAT'S THE PART THAT IS CAUSING ME SOME CONFUSION BUT, AGAIN, I BELIEVE THAT'S SOMETHING WE COULD WORK OUT WITH CORPORATION COUNSEL AND THE ATTORNEYS FOR THE UNION. IN TERMS OF IMPACT, WE DON'T HAVE PERFECT INFORMATION ABOUT THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE WHO WOULD BE MADE ELIGIBLE FOR HEALTH INSURANCE UNDER THIS BILL BECAUSE WE DO NOT KNOW THE EXACT NUMBER OF SURVIVING SPOUSES WHO WOULD RETURN TO CITY HEALTH INSURANCE.

AS WAS MENTIONED, THERE ARE ALSO SCENARIOS IN WHICH SURVIVING SPOUSES REMARRY AND UTILIZE THEIR OWN HEALTH INSURANCE OR THEIR NEW SPOUSAL'S HEALTH INSURANCE OR GOVERNMENT HEALTH INSURANCE BECAUSE THEY ARE RETIRED OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT. SO IT'S VERY DIFFICULT TO PREDICT THE BEHAVIOR THAT THIS WOULD INDUCE, BUT WE KNOW THAT, AT A MINIMUM, FROM WHAT WE HAVE BEEN TOLD BY LOCAL 718, THAT AT LEAST A HANDFUL AFFECTED -- OF AFFECTED WIDOWS WHO ARE CURRENTLY IN THIS SITUATION BASED ON THEM HAVING HAD THEIR PENSION ELIGIBILITY RESTORED IN 2000 WHO REMAIN IN THE CITY'S PENSION SYSTEM.

BUT JUST TO GIVE A GENERAL SENSE, IT COSTS ABOUT \$6,500 TO \$6,600 ON AVERAGE FOR SURVIVING SPOUSES AND THEIR FAMILIES FOR HEALTH INSURANCE.

THIS UNIVERSE, EVEN UNDER THE BROADEST INTERPRETATION OF THE LANGUAGE IN FRONT OF YOU, THE MAXIMUM UNIVERSE WOULD PROBABLY BE ABOUT 100 PEOPLE, AND IF WE WERE TO CLARIFY THAT THIS WERE IN THE LINE OF DUTY ELIGIBLE EMPLOYEE SPOUSES ONLY, THAT NUMBER WOULD PROBABLY SHRINK

SIGNIFICANTLY.

SO JUST TO CLARIFY, IN A NUTSHELL, THE ADMINISTRATION IS VERY SUPPORTIVE OF WHAT WE BELIEVE THE INTENT TO BE. WE WANT TO WORK THROUGH OUR CORPORATION COUNSEL'S OFFICE WITH CITY COUNCIL AND LOCAL 718 TO ENSURE THE LANGUAGE IS PERFECTED TO CARRY OUT THE INTENDED PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION.

>> THAT WOULD BE GREAT.

IF I ASK CHRISTINE O'DONNELL COUNSEL FOR CITY COUNCIL, SHE COULD BE INCLUDED.

>> OF COURSE.

AND SHIFTING, SOME OF THE PETITION WE'RE DEALING WITH NATIONAL LAWS 32B WHICH IS 9C AND 9B, SO TO DAVE SWEENEY'S POINT, C DEALS WITH FIREFIGHTERS.

B IS THE SECTION THAT DEALS WITH THE OTHER SECTION -- ONE DEALS WITH POLICE, ONE FIREFIGHTERS AND ONE REGULAR EMPLOYEES.

9G BOSTON POLICE OFFICERS, 9C BOSTON FIREFIGHTERS.

IS EMS WITH B OR C OR D OR --

>> I KNOW THEY COULD BE COVERED UNDER 9G.

BUT I KNOW THEY'RE COVERED UNDER GROUP 4.

>> I TAKE CLARITY FROM YOU, DAVE.

>> WE CAN FIGURE IT OUT.

SO WE CAN INCLUDE E.M.S., SO THE PUBLIC SAFETY PIECE OF THIS, PARTICULARLY IN THE LINE OF DUTY STUFF, AND THEN DEALING WITH 9B, SEE WHAT THAT AMOUNTS TO.

SO ANY OTHER ADDITIONAL THOUGHTS, DAVE, BEFORE WE PUT IT OUT TO QUESTIONS?

ANYTHING ADDITIONAL?

>> I JUST -- YOU KNOW, WE'RE JUST LOOKING OUT FOR OUR SPOUSES AND THE KIDS FOR THEIR HEALTH BENEFITS, YOU KNOW.

WE WANT TO FIGHT FOR THE PENSION AND WE GOT THAT, AND, YOU KNOW, I SEE SOME NAMES HERE, THEY DON'T HAVE HEALTH INSURANCE NOW.

>> FOR MY COLLEAGUES AND THOSE VIEWING AT HOME, IMPORTANT TO NOTE PRIOR TO JULY 1, 2000, IF THERE WAS A SURVIVING SPOUSE WHOSE HUSBAND OR WIFE WAS KILLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY, IF THEY DIED FROM INJURIES SUSTAINED IN THE LINE OF DUTY, THEY'D LOSE THEIR PENSION AND HEALTHCARE IF HE OR SHE DECIDED TO MARRY. SO THEY REPEALED WHAT THEY CALLED THE REMARRIAGE PENALTY AND DID SO BY REINSTATING A PENSION BENEFIT FIFTH PORTION OF IT BUT NOT THE HEALTHCARE PORTION, SO WE'RE HEAR TODAY TO ADDRESS THE HEALTH BENEFIT PORTION OF IT ALLOWING SPOUSES, PARTICULARLY THOSE THAT CONTINUE TO HAVE ACCESS -- DON'T HAVE ACCESS TO EITHER PURCHASING THEIR OWN OR OWNOR REMARRIED SOMEONE WHO DOESN'T HAVE INSURANCE.

SO THAT'S IN A NUTSHELL.
ANY QUESTIONS?

>> WHAT WOULD BE CONSIDERED PENSIONED OUT, TEN YEARS? IS THAT THE END OF THE SYSTEM OR --

>> NOT IN YOUR CASE, BUT GENERALLY, SO IT WOULD BE 9B EMPLOYEES.

>> IF THIS WERE TO BE APPLIED TO 9B EMPLOYEES, THAT'S A GOOD QUESTION.

I'LL HAVE TO GET BACK TO YOU. GENERALLY THE WAY WE INTERPRET PENSION ELIGIBILITY IS 20 YEARS, BUT I'M NOT SURE IF FOR THESE PURPOSES DRAWING A SMALL PENSION WOULD TRIGGER ELIGIBILITY FOR HEALTH INSURANCE.

>> OKAY.

COUNCILLOR O'MALLEY.

>> MR. CHAIRMAN, THANK YOU FOR YOUR LEADERSHIP.

I SUPPORT IT WHOLEHEARTEDLY. I THANK DAVE AND YOU ALL FOR YOUR EXCELLENT TESTIMONY. IT'S A NO BRAINER TO SUPPORT THE REMAINING SURVIVING SPOUSES OF THOSE KILLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY.

IF I HAVE THIS RIGHT,

MR. CHAIRMAN, THE STATE PARTIALLY REPEALED THE PENSION PART OF THE STATE HEALTH PORTION.

IS ANYONE ELSE AWARE OF THE STATE LOOKING TO FINISH THE JOB THEY STARTED AND ADDRESSING THE HEALTHCARE AND INSURANCE?

>> I FEEL THAT WE'RE THE BIG DOGS IN THE FIGHT, SO WE'RE BASICALLY LOOKING FOR THIS, AND THEN IT COULD GO UP TO THE STATE LEVEL DOWN THE ROAD ONCE THEY FIND OUT THAT, YOU KNOW, IT'S COVERED HERE.

THERE ARE A LOT OF SPOUSES OUT THERE.

JOE TUSCANO -- AND I HATE BRINGING NAMES UP, BUT IT'S THE TRUTH -- JOE'S WIFE IS YOUNG AND SHE'S GOT FIVE KIDS.

SO SHE WOULD KEEP THE PENSION BUT LOSE THE MEDICAL IF SHE REMARRIES.

>> ABSOLUTELY.

SO SHOULD WE PASS THIS AND IT GET TO THE STATEHOUSE AND LIKELY PASS THERE H, DO YOU THINK IT WILL START -- MAYBE IT WILL BE THE SPARK THAT CAN GET THE STATE TO DO THE RIGHT THING?

>> YEAH, I THINK SO.

AND, DAVE, YOU SAID IT'S ABOUT 65 TO \$6,600 IS THE ANNUAL COST FOR HEALTH INSURANCE FOR SURVIVING SPOUSES IN THE UNIVERSE WOULD BE LESS THAN 100 PEOPLE.

>> I THINK THAT'S THE BROADEST. I THINK WE'RE TRYING TO CLARIFY THE INTENT OF WHO'S COVERED. IT'S LIKELY A LOT FEWER THAN 100 IF IT'S ONLY IN THE LINE OF DUTY RELATED DEATHS FAMILIES.

>> IT'S PART OF YOUR INTENT AS THE ADMINISTRATION TO EXTEND THIS NOT ONLY TO FIREFIGHTERS BUT EVERY OTHER CITY EMPLOYEE, BE IT PUBLIC SAFETY OR OTHERWISE?

>> I THINK THAT'S WHAT WE WANT TO CLARIFY IN TERMS OF INTENT. WE DID MAKE THE CALCULATION OF WHAT IT WOULD COST IN THE

INTERPRETATION OF THE BROADEST POSSIBLE UNIVERSE, WHICH I THINK WE -- AND AGAIN, THIS IS IMPERFECT -- BUT WE FOUND ABOUT 106 POTENTIAL SURVIVING SPOUSES WHICH WOULD BE ABOUT \$650,000 IN ADDITIONAL ANNUAL COSTS. OBVIOUSLY, IF YOU SEGMENTED OUT THE POPULATION SO IT ONLY APPLIED TO POLICE OR FIRE OR POLICE AND FIRE, THAT WOULD BE MUCH SMALLER.

>> WELL, AGAIN, AGAIN, MR. CHAIRMAN, THANK YOU FOR YOUR LEADERSHIP ON THIS.

I THINK IF THERE IS AN OPPORTUNITY TO FIX IT, MIGHT AS WELL FIX IT FOR EVERYBODY, RECOGNIZING IT'S A RARE THING, BUT NEVERTHELESS TRAGIC AND WE WANT TO SHOW OUR SUPPORT.

THANK YOU.

THANK YOU ALL, GENTLEMEN.

>> THANK YOU.

COUNCILLOR ESSAIBI-GEORGE.

>> THANK YOU.

I WANT TO LEND MY VOICE TO THE ROUND OF SUPPORT FOR THIS.

I THINK AS A PARENT AND I THINK, IN MOST CASES, WE'RE TALKING ABOUT A SURVIVING MOTHER OR FEMALE SPOUSE, IN THOSE CASES, OF COURSE, AND, OF COURSE, HEALTH INSURANCE IS THE REASON SO MANY PEOPLE SIMPLY GO TO WORK.

SO IF WE CAN PROVIDE THAT DID FOR OUR SURVIVING SPOUSES, I THINK THAT'S AN INCREDIBLE GIFT, YOU KNOW, CONSIDERING THE LOSS THAT THEY WOULD HAVE FACED IN ORDER TO QUALIFY FOR THIS BENEFIT.

>> THANK YOU.

WE WOULD COUNT THAT THERE'S NO RETRO PART OF THIS. EVERYTHING IS PROSPECTIVE.

>> EXACTLY.

THERE WAS NO RETRO IN THE PENSION EITHER.

>> NO, THERE WASN'T.

SOME OF THEM REMARRIED IN 69, IN '81.

MRS. CLARITY, HER HUSBAND GOT

KILLED ON TRUMBULL STREET, AND SHE WAS TO THANKFUL.
HOW OLD WAS SHE?
SHE WAS IN HER --
>> SHE JUST COULDN'T AFFORD TO KEEP UP WITH THE PAYMENT.
>> SHE SAID TO MIKE, I JUST HIT THE NUMBER.
I JUST HIT THE LOTTERY.
IMAGINE ALL THOSE YEARS, YOU KNOW.
AND, YOU KNOW, I KNOW --
>> SO HE WAS DECEASED IN '64. SHE REMARRIED, I THINK, IN '69, CORRECT?
>> YEAH.
YOU KNOW, I MEAN, IT'S THE BEST TERMINOLOGY WAS A REMARRIAGE PENALTY.
>> THAT'S A HOME RUN.
THAT WAS REALLY BIG TO THEM, YOU KNOW.
>> I KNEW A FAMILY WHO LOST THEIR DAD IN A FIRE AND THE MOTHER DIDN'T REMARRY BECAUSE SHE HAD SMALL CHILDREN BUT SHE ENDED UP FINDING A LIFE PARTNER BUT STILL DIDN'T MARRY BECAUSE SHE WOULD HAVE LOST HER PENSION OR BENEFIT PART OF IT.
IT'S A STIGMA AND INAPPROPRIATE. I KNOW THEM WELL, I AGREE UP WITH THEM.
SO THIS IS AN OPPORTUNITY TO MAKE IT RIGHT WITH RESPECT TO THE HEALTHCARE PORTION OF IT, IT WAS OBVIOUSLY MADE RIGHT 17 YEARS AGO TO THE STATE HOUSE FOR THE PENSION PART OF IT AND IT MAKES THE MOST SENSE.
FOR COUNCILLOR O'MALLEY'S POINT, WE'LL SPEAK TO IT IN TERMS OF MAKING SURE WE'RE VALUING ALL OUR EMPLOYEES.
WE LOVE AND RESPECT OUR FIREFIGHTERS BUT LOVE AND RESPECT ALL OUR CITY EMPLOYEES IF ANY TRAGEDY HAPPENS TO ANY OTHER PUBLIC EMPLOYEE THAT THE CITY STANDS BY THEM.
>> ANY OTHER THOUGHTS, COUNCILLOR?
>> THERE WILL BE A LOT MORE TO THIS AS WE EXPAND THE UNIVERSE

BECAUSE PUBLIC WORKS DIE OR
BTD -- YOU KNOW, A TRAFFIC
ENFORCEMENT OFFICER IS AS
IMPORTANT AS ANYTHING ELSE AND
THEIR LIVES ARE WORTH IT AS
WELL, BUT I KNOW THAT, BECAUSE
OF THE ISSUES FIREMEN HAVE,
CERTAINLY THE CANCER BILL,
THAT'S GOING TO GIVE A BIGGER,
BROADER SCOPE FOR YOU.
WE'LL HAVE TO HAVE THIS
DISCUSSION DURING OUR -- WHAT AM
I TRYING TO SAY HERE, MIKELE?
THE WORKING SESSION.
WE'LL HAVE TO HAVE THOSE
DISCUSSIONS BECAUSE, CLEARLY, IF
YOU ARE A TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT
OFFICER AND YOU HAVE CANCER AND
YOU PASS AWAY, THEN THIS MAY NOT
TRIGGER THAT.
BUT IF YOU GET RUN OVER BY A COW
WHILE ON NEWBURY STREET, THAT'S
A DIFFERENT STORY.
>> FOR A HUSBAND WHO'S GOING TO
REMARRY, YOU KNOW --
>> YEAH.
SO THERE WILL BE AN INTERESTING
DISCUSSION WITH ALL THE LEGAL
TERMS, BUT I THINK CERTAINLY
WITH C.F.O. SWEENEY'S SHOP AND
YOUR SHOP AND US, I THINK WE CAN
GET SOMETHING DONE.
>> DAVE AND I HAVE BEEN TALKING
AND WORKING TOGETHER ON IT.
WE'RE GOING TO GET OUR NUMBERS
AND WILL WORK TOGETHER ON THIS
TO MAKE SURE THAT IT WORKS, YOU
KNOW.
>> GREAT.
IF THERE'S ANYONE HERE WISHING
TO OFFER PUBLIC TESTIMONY MAY DO
SO OR HOLD YOUR PEACE.
SEEING OR HEARING NO DESIRE,
THAT WILL CONCLUDE THE PUBLIC
TESTIMONY OF IT.
I WOULD LIKE TO THANK MY
COLLEAGUES FOR TAKING TIME TO
WEIGH IN ON THIS.
IT'S STRAIGHTFORWARD AS PERTAINS
TO THE 9C PORTION OF IT AND
OPENS THE DOOR TO HAVE A BROADER
DISCUSSION ABOUT 89B AND 9G, SO
MAY WANT TO REACH OUT TO OUR
RESPECTIVE UNIONS OF THOSE CITY

EMPLOYEES.

THEN THE COMMITMENT WILL BE TO DAVE AND HIS COUNSEL TO WORK WITH YOU AND YOUR COUNSEL AND THE COUNCIL'S COUNSEL TO EITHER COME UP WITH SOME LANGUAGE HERE WHEREBY WE COULD PASS SOMETHING IN A NEW DRAFT AND/OR THROUGH A WORKING SESSION OR COMMITTEE REPORT TO GET SOMETHING ON THE BOOKS THAT ELIMINATES THE REMARRIAGE PENALTY, THAT'S THE IMPORTANT PIECE WE'RE TRYING TO SOLVE AN INJUSTICE HERE AND ELIMINATE THE REMARRIAGE PENALTY FOR SPOUSALS WHOSE HUSBANDS OR WIVES HAVE DIED IN THE LINE OF DUTY OR HAVE HAD A DEATH IN THE COURSE OF THEIR ACTION. AND IN YOUR INSTANCE, IT'S DIFFERENT BECAUSE YOU HAVE SECTION 100.

SECTION 100 PERTAINS TO YOU WHICH IS THE HEART, LUNG AND CANCER PORTION OF YOUR BENEFITS, BUT THAT DOES NOT PERTAIN TO EVERYBODY ELSE.

THIS IS JUST A SITUATION WHERE THERE'S A SPOUSE HANDLING -- DEALING WITH A PENSION BECAUSE OF A LINE OF DUTY OR ANOTHER SERVICE TYPE OF INCIDENT WHERE THERE IS PROBABLY NOT AS MANY PEOPLE AS WE THINK BUT WILL BENEFIT AND DO AWAY WITH THE REMARRIAGE PENALTY.

WITH THAT SAID, LOOK FORWARD TO RECONVENING AT SOME PORTION AND THAT WILL CONCLUDE THIS HEARING ON DOCKET NUMBER 0135, A HEARING AND ORDER APPROVING A SPECIAL LAW REGARDING AN ACT CONCERNING INSURANCE BENEFITS FOR SURVIVING SPOUSES.

AGAIN, THE CMOMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS IS ADJOURNED.

THANK YOU.

(GAVEL POUNDING)