**TO:** All Councilmembers

**FROM:** Councilmember Silverman

Chairperson, Committee on Labor and Workforce Development

**DATE:** November XX, 2018

**SUBJECT:** Draft Report on “District Government Employee Residency Amendment Act of 2017”

The Committee on Labor and Workforce Development, to which “District Government Employee Residency Amendment Act of 2017” was referred, reports favorably thereon with amendments, and recommends its approval by the Council.
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## Background And Need

On March 29, 2017, Bill 22-212, “District Government Employee Residency Amendment Act of 2017” was introduced by Chairman Mendelson at the request of the Mayor. On October 16, 2017, the Committee on Labor and Workforce Development held a public hearing on this bill as well as Bill 22-128, “Jobs for District of Columbia Public School and Public Charter Public School Graduates Amendment Act of 2017” and Bill 22-068, the “Deferred Compensation Program Enrollment Act of 2017.” This report addresses the portions of the hearing related to Bill 22-212.

The Executive and the Council share a goal of increasing the number of District government employees who are District residents. Bill 22-212 would strengthen and clarify existing law that requires certain government employees to establish District residency and improve verification and enforcement of residency requirements. As introduced, it also would establish a new hiring incentive and expedited processes for hiring into District government employment.

The introduced bill would amend existing laws governing District government employment; residency requirements, which apply to both job applicants claiming residency preference and certain job positions; and related matters. Specifically, the introduced bill created two new categories of employees that would need to establish and maintain District residency: first, highly compensated employees and second, those hired under another provision proposed in this legislation that would provide the Mayor authority to directly and non-competitively hire individuals into permanent Career Service and other positions. The bill also would transition verification of residency from paper-based records to a review of electronic files; establish a hardship waiver from residency requirements; establish student loan repayment assistance for newly-hired District government employees who claim the District resident hiring preference; clarify residency requirements of individuals in the District foster system who claimed District residency preference points in their job applications; streamline existing provisions, such as creating a single section of code to contain language regarding job positions that require District residency; and add conforming amendments to relevant sections of the D.C. Code regarding the residency requirements.

The Committee print maintains the policy proposals regarding electronic verification, with amendments to ensure that the verification is backed up by additional reviews because of deficiencies in these specific electronic files; strengthens, clarifies, and streamlines enforcement and reporting provisions; clarifies language and establishes a process for determining when residency requirements may be waived due to hardship circumstances; and conforms the language with other provisions in the Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act (CMPA) and other laws. However, the Committee Print does not include the student loan reimbursement or the authority to directly hire individuals non-competitively into permanent positions. Additionally, the Print strikes an obsolete provision of current law that would have established a universal lave program, but which was never enacted.

**Committee Print and Recommendations**

The Committee recommends the approval of the District Government Employee Residency Amendment Act of 2017, with amendments.

1. **Committee Print Makes Changes to Provisions Related to Verifying and Enforcing Residency Requirements**
2. **Keeps a Streamlined Residency Verification Process; Adds Additional Audit Requirements**

Under current law, several categories of employees must maintain District residency: those who claim preference points available to District residents when they apply for government employment, certain jobs such as agency heads, and certain services such as the Excepted Service. Each of these must be verified through an annual submission on paper of “8 bona fide proofs of residency.” The introduced bill streamlined the District residency verification process by removing the requirement for paper-based submission. Rather, the Department of Human Resources, which is responsible for enforcing residency requirements, would use Department of Motor Vehicle (DMV) electronic records and evidence of District withholding of state income tax as the basis for presumption of District residency.

The Committee agrees with the intent of streamlining residency verification and moving from a paper-based to electronic system. As in the introduced bill, the Committee Print removes the requirement for the submission of 8 paper proofs. However, the Committee learned that the DMV may not be informed, and thus records may not be updated, when an individual moves out of the District. Also, when an individual applies for identification in another state, often their old, physical identification is either retained by the new state or the physical card is marked to reflect that it is no longer valid. The Committee is aware that residency fraud exists and that extra steps must be taken to verify residency. As such, the print clarifies that *new hires* who claimed preference points or otherwise have a residency requirement present a physical District license or identification and proof of District tax withholdings. For annual audits of *existing* employees, the Committee Print keeps the automated process of checking DMV records and that the District withholds income taxes, but the Committee Print also requires the Mayor to conduct additional audits on at least an annual basis of at least 20 percent of employees in subordinate agencies, and of all employees with residency requirements in at least three randomly selected independent agencies. The Executive expressed openness to additional checks if they could utilize a variety of tools. The Print thus does not specify the exact nature of these audits, but notes that they may include presentation of physical documents or checking other electronic records.

The introduced bill also tightened and moved into one section the language outlining which positions and services currently have residency requirements. The Committee print maintains most revisions and adds others in order to have a single, streamlined section of Code outlining the requirements, hardship waivers, verification, enforcement, and annual reporting by agencies to the Council of related information.

Additionally, in the Committee Print, “District government” is defined as “the government of the District of Columbia, including any department, agency or instrumentality of the government of the District of Columbia; any independent agency of the District of Columbia established under part F of title IV of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act or any other agency, board, or commission established by the Mayor or the Council; the Council of the District of Columbia; and any other agency, public authority, or public benefit corporation which has the authority to receive monies directly or indirectly from the District of Columbia (other than monies received from the sale of goods, the provision of services, or the loaning of funds to the District of Columbia).” The Committee intends to apply this definition of “District government” broadly to apply to all District government employees regardless of the entity that employs them.

1. **Changes to Enforcement of Residency Requirements**

As in the introduced bill, the Committee Print requires the Mayor to remove from employment subordinate agency employees who are found not in compliance with the residency requirement. For employees in other agencies within District government, such as independent agencies and instrumentalities, the Mayor must forward their findings to that agency and the agency must review the case and remove the employee if the agency finds that the employee is not in compliance.The Committee Print adds a requirement for the Mayor to create a notice and appeal procedure to give employees an opportunity to rebut findings before they are released from District government employment for non-compliance. Under the Committee Print, the Council must establish its own rules to enforce residency requirements applicable to its employees.

1. **Defines Highly Compensated**

The introduced bill added an additional residency requirement for highly compensated employees within the Career, Education and Management Supervisory Services. However, the term “highly compensated” was not defined.

The Committee Print of Bill 22-212 defines “highly-compensated” to include positions with an annual salary of $150,000 or more, based on a recommendation from the Department of Human Resources. According to employment data reviewed by the Committee, this threshold represents 3 percent of Career Service, 21 percent of Management Supervisory Service, and 1 percent of Education Service employees. However, this new residency requirement will only apply to new hires and not to existing employees.

The Committee is interested in increasing the portion of District employees who are District residents; thus, the Committee print sets a maximum threshold salary amount of “highly compensated” employees to include a larger percentage of the District government workforce, which the Mayor may decrease. Furthermore, as inflation will change the real value of the nominal salary, the Committee Print includes a provision allowing the Mayor to increase the salary threshold in line with raises to pay schedules for non-union employees. An adjustment to this threshold must be published in the D.C. Register within 45 days.

1. **Tightens Hardship Waiver Provision**

In the introduced bill, a waiver provision was added to allow an employee subject to a District residency requirement to receive a waiver of this requirement for one year if that employee had an extraordinary hardship because of circumstances beyond his or her control. This waiver could be extended beyond one year for good cause shown.

The Committee Print preserves this waiver but tightens the language and increases the requirements in order to ensure that this provision is implemented as intended and will not be overused or used as a way to avoid the District residency requirement altogether. The Committee Print requires the Mayor to review all waiver requests to verify whether the hardship exists and that the hardship necessitates the District government employee to reside outside of the District. The waiver may only be used for one year and, unlike the introduced bill, the Committee Print does not allow for an extension.

1. **Streamlines and clarifies annual reporting requirements**

The introduced legislation maintained current requirements for reporting annually to the Council certain information, including about new hires’ state of residency. Current law sets these requirements in several different places in the District’s Official Code, often in sections of Code establishing the different employment services. Current language is not always clear. Moreover, such reports have not been provided to the Council in recent years, and the Committee is unaware if they have ever been submitted.

The Committee Print creates a single section of law outlining annual reporting requirements. The Mayor will be responsible for submitting by December 1 of each year an annual report containing information on each subordinate agency, including new hires’ state of residency, the portion of new hires who are District residents, any waivers granted, and any individuals found to have not been in compliance with residency requirements. The print requires independent agencies to submit such reports to the Mayor by November 1 of each year and for the Mayor to include those reports in its annual submission to the Council.

1. **Committee Print Omits Provisions Creating a Tuition Repayment Benefit and Expanding the Mayor’s Direct-Hire Authority.**
2. **Tuition Repayment**

The introduced bill would have established a student loan repayment assistance for newly-hired District government employees who claim the District resident hiring preference, allowing up to $10,000 per year per employee. The bill would have required employees taking the benefit to agree, in writing, to remain District residents for 7 years and to repay any benefit received if the benefit recipient ended their employment with District government before the end of the 7-years.

The Committee Print of Bill 22-212 does not include this provision. The Committee agrees with the intent of incentivizing employment in District government, but the Committee believes that limiting such a large benefit to newly hired employees would be unfair to the current District government workforce. It would also be expensive. The Committee encourages the Executive to consider other, more equitable and cost effective ways to incentivize employment in District government employment and to introduce new legislation for the Committee’s consideration.

1. **Direct Hire Authority**

The introduced bill would have permitted the Mayor to directly hire individuals into permanent positions within the Career, Education, and Management Supervisory Services, without competition. These individuals would have been required to reside in the District of Columbia within 180 days of appointment and maintain residency in the District while employed in the non-competitive position. These non-competitive positions would be limited to positions where there existed a severe shortage of candidates or there is a critical hiring need.

While District government employment is largely based on merit-based hiring requirements, the Mayor already has expansive authority to hire non-competitively, such as through term appointment hiring in positions Grade 12 and below, as well as through Excepted Service positions. The Committee has previously expressed concerns about the abuse and misuse of existing non-competitive hiring authorities particularly term hiring and “name select” as means to bypass merit hiring. Also, the Committee submitted multiple requests for data on the specific positions and information to justify the extreme difficulty in hiring those positions that would necessitate hiring without competition into permanent, merit-based positions. The Executive did not provide adequate justification or proof of need for this provision, that is, that there are truly hard-to-fill positions. One reason given was the need to hire quickly; however, DCHR could evaluate its hiring process to streamline it where possible. The Executive provided an example of the need to hire cyber security experts through direct hiring authority; however, the Executive did not provide proof of lengthy job openings, unsuccessful recruitment, or supporting data related to cybersecurity jobs. Indeed, there is already a special provision to hire science and technology jobs within the Excepted Service that could be utilized for hiring these kinds of positions, but to the Committee’s knowledge, this provision is not utilized. Finally, stakeholders with whom the Committee consulted numerous times strongly opposed the provision, even when provided with Committee-developed language that would have set several additional requirements and parameters in order for an agency to receive authority to hire directly (non-competitively), and in more limited circumstances.

The Committee understands that this authority is a priority for the Executive. However, the Committee does not believe that the Executive has provided sufficient justification for it, nor does it have the external support necessary to warrant its inclusion in this legislation. The Committee suggests that if this remains a priority, the Executive should introduce new legislation for the Committee to consider. The Committee recommends revising the provision to include tighter requirements, such a process by which the Executive would review objective data demonstrating the existence of a bona fide hard-to-fill position, and to submit such legislation with accompanying data and other information justifying the need for such hiring authority.

1. **Committee Print Makes Technical Changes.**
2. **Residency Requirement Provisions**

The Committee Print of Bill 22-212 would amend the District of Columbia Government Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act of 1978 (CMPA) to ensure consistency with the new provisions added to D.C. Code 1-515.01 *et seq*. The Committee Print ensures this consistency across employment services. In each part of law establishing the employment services, the Print adds references to the sections of Code with the residency requirements and enforcement provisions. This includes adding additional conforming amendments to other laws to ensure that the bill’s residency requirement provisions apply to all agencies within District government, including independent agencies and instrumentalities. However, the Print does not change existing requirements beyond adding the category of highly-compensated employees; where language is amended, it is for the sake of clarification and does not make additional substantive changes to policy or establish any other new residency requirements.

1. **Unenacted provision for universal leave**

Additionally, the Committee Print of Bill 22-212 strikes an obsolete, never-enacted universal leave provision located within the CMPA. In 1998, the CMPA was amended in anticipation of a universal leave program that would have been established for District government employees in Career and Excepted Services. However, this program was never implemented. In 2018, the Executive introduced B22-0818, the Leave Harmonization Amendment Act of 2018. The bill would make technical amendments to the CMPA so that it will conform with current practices related to District government employee leave. Because the Bill 22-212 aims to streamline the Code, the Committee has included the technical amendments of Bill 22-0818 within the Committee Print of Bill 22-212.

1. **Committee Print Establishes a Deadline for Finalization of Regulations to Implement this Legislation**

The Committee Print requires the Executive to finalize regulations within 180 days of the effective date.

## Legislative Chronology

March 29, 2017 Introduction of Bill 22-212, by Chairman Mendelson at the request of the Mayor

April 4, 2017 Referral of Bill 22-212 to the Committee on Labor and Workforce Development

April 7, 2017 Notice of Intent to Act on Bill 22-212 is published in the *District of Columbia Register*

September 29, 2017 Notice of Public Hearing on Bill 22-212 is published in the *District of Columbia Register*

October 16, 2017 Public Hearing on Bill 22-212 held by the Committee on Labor and Workforce Development

November 26, 2018 Consideration and vote on Bill 22-212 by the Committee on Labor and Workforce Development

## Position Of The Executive

B22-212 was introduced by the Executive. Director Ventris Gibson of the Department of Human Resources testified on behalf of the Executive regarding Bill 22-212. Her testimony is summarized below.

## Comments Of Advisory Neighborhood Commissions

The Committee received no testimony or comments from any Advisory Neighborhood Commission.

## Summary Of Testimony

The Committee on Labor and Workforce Development held a public hearing on Bill 22-068 on Monday, October 16, 2017, at 10:00 a.m. in room 123 of the John A. Wilson Building. Committee Chair Elissa Silverman made an opening statement. The portion of the opening statement relevant to B22-212 is as follows:

“The District’s government workers are key to the functioning of the District. We rely on them for everything from patching potholes to managing our health insurance marketplace to processing business licenses and so much more. They are the reason that the District is one of the best places to live and work. It’s important that we are able to attract and retain good employees in our government, as well as to provide appropriate salaries and benefits. The executive’s bills aim to do just that.”

*Public Witnesses*

***Barry Carey, President, AFSCME District Council 20*** testified regarding residency requirements stating that many District government worker salaries are too low to establish residency within the District, because the District is too costly to live in. He also mentioned that although the District has offered housing voucher programs to District government workers, these vouchers are insufficient if workers’ salaries are not enough to sustain home ownership and account for the high cost of living in the District.

***Andre Lee, Chapter Chair of DPW/SWEEP*** testified regarding District government worker salaries and expressed concerns about the affordability of living in the District.

*Government Witness*

***Ventris Gibson, Director, Department of Human Services***, testified on behalf of the Executive regarding Bill 22-212. The Director’s written testimony included a discussion of the bill’s creation of a student loan repayment assistance program for newly hired District government workers, the bill’s addition of highly-compensated employees of District government to the residency requirement, and the bill’s changes to the District government’s residency verification system. Chairperson Elissa Silverman asked Director Gibson several questions related to these topics in addition to other provisions in the Executive’s bill, including provisions expanding the Mayor’s authority to hire non-competitively for direct-hire positions.

The Director first explained the Executive’s proposal to create a student loan repayment assistance program. She noted that the District is one of the most educated cities in the United States, with 55 percent of residents holding a bachelor’s degree. But this comes at the cost of increased student loan debt. To improve District government employee recruitment efforts and retention, the Director explained that the District should improve the employee benefits offered to District government workers.

Chairperson Silverman asked the Director why this benefit would be limited to new hires instead of being made available to current employees. The Director explained that this would be too costly and that the program could be expanded to include more employees in the future. However, the Director explained that she believed that starting with the newly-hired population would improve recruitment efforts and make District government more competitive with other employers in the region.

Regarding the addition of highly-compensated employees of District government to the residency requirement, the Director explained that, although “highly compensated” was not defined in the bill, it would be defined through regulations. These regulations would define “highly compensated” to capture individuals hired into leadership and highly-skilled roles within District government. The goal of this provision would be to keep more tax revenue within the District and ensure that the District’s leaders have a stake in the District’s success. Chairperson Silverman asked what the definition should be if it were to be included in the bill. Director Gibson suggested a salary threshold of $150,000 and over.

The Director then spoke in detail about changes that the bill would make to the District government’s residency verification system for employees. These changes would expedite and modernize the current system—which requires 8 proofs of residency. Instead, the bill would link DMV records to the District government’s online employee portal (i.e., PeopleSoft). Related to the residency verification system, Director Gibson discussed the Executive’s intention to expand DCHR’s complains unit and improve its capability to perform audits throughout District government. She outlined plans of expanding the compliance and explained that having a more automated process for verification (through an electronic database of DMV records) would allow the compliance staff to have more time and resources dedicated to improving their auditing capabilities.

Regarding the provisions creating direct hire and appointment authority within the Career, Education, and Management Supervisory Services, Director Gibson explained that this would only apply to positions chosen by DCHR. She further explained that these provisions would allow DCHR to recruit candidates in a timelier manner and prevent potential candidates from pursuing other opportunities due to a relatively slower hiring process within District government. She listed positions in cyber security as one area that would require this more expedited hiring process in order to obtain a qualified employee. Chairperson Silverman discussed concerns that that Committee has received regarding the abuse of current non-competitive hiring practices related to Term and Temporary appointments. Director Gibson noted that she wants to investigate the term hiring process more and that these concerns can be addressed through their plans to expand the compliance unit and the compliance unit’s auditing capabilities.

Chairperson Silverman informed the Director that, if the Committee decides to mark-up the bill, the Committee may not include all the bill’s provisions and that the provisions that she would work with the Executive to identify which portions of the bill would continue through the legislative process. She asked the Director to state which provisions of the bill were the Executive’s highest priorities if a compromise was necessary to move the bill further. The Director listed the following priorities in this order: (1) Direct appointment of hard to fill positions without competition; (2) Automating the residency verification process through DMV records; (3) Adding highly compensated employees to the residency requirement; and (4) Creating a new student loan reimbursement benefit.

## Impact On Existing Law

Bill 22-212 amends the Jobs for D.C. Residents Amendment Act of 2007, to create one section of Code with the requirements that an agency head, Executive Service employee, Excepted Service employee, Senior Executive Attorney Service employee, and attorneys employed by the Council reside in the District of Columbia within 180 days of appointment and maintain residency in the District during their incumbency; to newly require that highly compensated employees establish and maintain residency in the District; to establish a hardship waiver from residency requirements; to implement an electronic residency verification process for applicants and appointees; to require District residency within 180 days of leaving the foster care system in order to receive the foster care hiring preference; to add new sections on enforcement, waivers, and rules that apply across employment services; to amend the District of Columbia Government Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act of 1978 to make conforming amendments and repeal an outdated provision regarding universal leave for certain District of Columbia government employees; and to amend the Office of Administrative Hearings Establishment Act of 2001 to conform the existing residency requirement for Administrative Law Judges in the Office of Administrative Hearings with the language of this Act.

## Fiscal Impact

The attached [DATE] fiscal impact statement from the District’s Chief Financial Officer states that funds are sufficient in the FY 2018 through FY 2022 budget and financial plan to implement the bill.

## Section-By-Section Analysis

Title I District Residency Preferences and Requirements.

Section 1 Short title.

Section 2 Amends Title I of the Jobs for D.C. Residents Amendment Act of 2007, effective February 6, 2008 (D.C. Law 17-108; D.C. Official Code § 1-515.01).

Defines terms; Streamlines language for District residency requirement; Compiles into one section of Code that an agency head, Executive Service employee, Excepted Service employee, Senior Executive Attorney Service employee, attorneys employed by the Council reside in the District of Columbia within 180 days of appointment and maintain residency in the District during their incumbency; adds a new requirement that highly compensated employees reside in the District of Columbia; Implements an electronic residency verification process for applicants and appointees; Establishes a hardship waiver; Adds new sections related to enforcing District residency requirements, granting waivers of the residency requirement, and issuing rules implementing the residency requirement.

Section 3 Amends the District of Columbia Government Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act of 1978, effective March 3, 1979 (D.C. Law 2-139; D.C. Official Code § 601.01 et seq.).

1. Amends the definition of “exceptional circumstances.”
2. Makes technical changes; amends the foster care preference requiring District residency within 180 days of leaving the foster care system in order to receive the foster care hiring preference;
3. Makes technical changes.
4. Makes technical changes.
5. Makes technical changes.
6. Makes technical changes.
7. Makes technical changes.
8. Makes technical changes to confirm with the repeal of D.C. Code § 1-612.03a.
9. Repeals D.C. Code § 1-612.03a, reflecting current practices and the unimplemented universal leave program.

Section 4 Amends Section 11(d) of the Office of Administrative Hearings Establishment Act of 2001, effective March 6, 2002 (D.C. Law 14-76; D.C. Official Code § 2-1831.08(d)).

1. Makes technical changes.
2. Makes technical changes.

Title II Conforming Amendments.

Section 5 Amends the District of Columbia Government Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act of 1978, effective March 3, 1979 (D.C. Law 2-139; D.C. Official Code § 1-601.01 *et seq*.).

Makes technical changes to conform with amendments by B22-212 to the Jobs for D.C. Residents Amendment Act of 2007 regarding residency requirements for the D.C. Board of Education and the Board of Trustees of the University of the District of Columbia.

Section 6 Amends section 121(g)(2)(B) of the District of Columbia Retirement Reform Act, approved November 17, 1979 (93 Stat. 866; D.C. Official Code § 1-711(g)(2)(B).

Makes technical changes to conform with amendments by B22-212 to the Jobs for D.C. Residents Amendment Act of 2007 regarding residency requirements for the D.C. Retirement Board.

Section 7 Amends section 5(e)(1)(C) of the District of Columbia Election Act, approved August 12, 1955 (69 Stat. 700; D.C. Official Code § 1-1001.05(e)(1)(C)).

Makes technical changes to conform with amendments by B22-212 to the Jobs for D.C. Residents Amendment Act of 2007 regarding residency requirements for the Board of Elections.

Section 8 Amends section 16(f) of the District of Columbia Housing Authority Act of 1999, effective March 9, 2000 (D.C. Law 13-105; D.C. Official Code § 6-215(f)).

Makes technical changes to conform with amendments by B22-212 to the Jobs for D.C. Residents Amendment Act of 2007 regarding residency requirements for the D.C. Housing Authority.

Section 9 Amends section 3(c) of the Office of Zoning Independence Act of 1990, effective September 20, 1990 (D.C. Law 8-163; D.C. Official Code § 6-623.02).

Makes technical changes to conform with amendments by B22-212 to the Jobs for D.C. Residents Amendment Act of 2007 regarding residency requirements for the Office of Zoning.

Section 10 Amends section 216(2) of the Washington Convention Center Authority Act of 1994, effective September 28, 1994 (D.C. Law 10-188; D.C. Official Code § 10-1202.16(2).

Makes technical changes to conform with amendments by B22-212 to the Jobs for D.C. Residents Amendment Act of 2007 regarding residency requirements for the Washington Convention Center Authority.

Section 11 Amends section 1506(b-1) of the Fiscal Year 2002 Budget Support Act of 2001, effective October 3, 2001 (D.C. Law 14-28; D.C. Official Code § 22-4235).

Makes technical changes to conform with amendments by B22-212 to the Jobs for D.C. Residents Amendment Act of 2007 regarding residency requirements for the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council.

Section 12 Amends section 8(c-1) of An Act Making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and fourteen and for other purposes, approved March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. 993; scattered sections of the D.C. Official Code).

Makes technical changes to conform with amendments by B22-212 to the Jobs for D.C. Residents Amendment Act of 2007 regarding residency requirements for the People’s Counsel.

Section 13 Amends the District of Columbia School Reform Act of 1995, approved April 26, 1996 (110 Stat. 1321 [226]; D.C. Official Code § 38-1802. 01 *et seq*.).

Makes technical changes to conform with amendments by B22-212 to the Jobs for D.C. Residents Amendment Act of 2007 regarding residency requirements for D.C. Public Charter Schools.

Section 14 Amends section 203(b)(2) of the District of Columbia Housing Finance Agency Act, effective March 3, 1979 (D.C. Law 2-135; D.C. Official Code § 42-2702.03(b)(2).

Makes technical changes to conform with amendments by B22-212 to the Jobs for D.C. Residents Amendment Act of 2007 regarding residency requirements for the Housing Finance Agency.

Title III Applicability; Fiscal Impact Statement; Effective Date.

Section 15 States that the Council adopts the Fiscal Impact Statement of Bill 22-212.

Section 16 Establishes the effective date.

## Committee Action

On [DATE], the Committee met to consider Bill 22-212, the “District Government Employee Residency Amendment Act of 2017.” The meeting was called to order at \_\_:\_\_ a. m./p.m., and Bill 22-212 was item XX-I on the agenda. After ascertaining a quorum (Chairperson Silverman and Councilmembers Cheh, McDuffie, R. White, and T. White present; Councilmember \_\_\_\_\_\_ absent), Chairperson Silverman moved the print with leave for staff to make technical and conforming changes. After an opportunity for discussion, the vote on the print was unanimous (Chairperson Silverman and Councilmembers \_\_\_ present; Councilmember \_\_\_\_\_\_ absent).

The Chairperson then moved the report with leave for staff to make technical, conforming, and editorial changes. After an opportunity for discussion, the vote on the report was unanimous (Chairperson Silverman and Councilmembers Cheh, McDuffie, R. White, and T. White present; Councilmember \_\_\_\_\_\_ absent). The meeting adjourned at \_\_:\_\_ a.m./p. m.

## Attachments

1. Bill 22-212 as introduced.
2. Notice of hearing September 29, 2017.
3. Witness list and agenda for hearing October 16, 2017.
4. Written Testimony from hearing on October 16, 2017.
5. Fiscal Impact Statement for Bill 22-212.
6. Legal Sufficiency Determination for Bill 22-212.
7. Comparative Print for Bill 22-212.
8. Committee Print for Bill 22-212.