# MINUTES OF THE MEETING <br> LABOR AND EMPLOYMFNT COMMITTEE <br> MONTANA STATE SENATE 

March 21, 1985
The twenty-third meeting of the Labor and Employment
Committee was called to order at 1:05 p.m. on March 21, 1985, by Chairman J. D. Lynch in Room 413/415 of the State Capitol.

ROLL CALL: All members were present.
FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE BILL 853:
John MacMaster explained the amendments to House Bill 853. (Exhibit No. 1)

The Statement of Intent was offered.
(Exhibit No. 2)
Senator Blaylock moved the Statement of Intent and the amendments. On a voice vote, with Senator Keating voting no and all others voting yes, the motion carried.

Senator Blaylock made a motion to reconsider House Bill 853. On a voice vote, with Senator Keating voting no and all others voting yes, the motion carried.

Senator Blaylock made a motion to attach the Statement of Intent and the amendments. On a voice vote, with Senator Keating voting no and all others voting yes, the motion carried.

Senator Blaylock made a motion that House Bill 853 Be Concurred In As Amended. On a voice vote, with senators Aklestad, Keating and Thayer voting no and senators Blaylock, Haffey, Lynch, Manning and Towe voting yes, House Bill 853 was CONCURRED IN AS AMENDED WITH THE STATEMENT OF INTENT ATTACHED.

CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE BILL 284:
Chairman Lynch called on Representative Hal Harper, sponsor of House Bill 284. House Bill 284 is a product of the Employment Security Advisory Council. This bill is a result of the compromise that the committee reached. Section 1 of the first page provides for a surtax to pay off the principle on the federal loans. Section 2 deals with the taxable wage base, the most important part of this issue. Sections 3 and 4 change the experience rating by which an employer is rated. Section 5 replaces the existing rate classed for each eligible employer. Section 6 provides for a waiting week for transitional claims. Section 7 changes
the weekly benefit amount from $50 \%$ to $49 \%$ of each claimant's average weekly wage. Section 8 , one of the most controversial parts of the bill, is the "good personal cause" section and provides that an employee will only be eligible for unemployment benefits if he has left his work with good cause attributable to his employment.

PROPONENTS OF HOUSE BILL 284:
Dave Wanzenried, Commissioner of Department of Labor and Employment, rose in support of House Bill 284 and submitted testimony.
(Exhibit No. 3)
George Allen, representing Montana Retail Association, submitted written testimony in support of House Bill 284. (Exhibit No. 4)

Jim Hughes, representing Mountain Bell, stated this bill is a good package.

Dave Goss, representing Billings area Chamber of Commerce, said the chamber is in support of this bill. He said of the approximately 23,000 employers in Montana, about 17,000, or 74\%, are non-retail employers. Of these non-retail employers about 14,000, or 85\%, are eligible employers, which means about $60 \%$ of all employers in Montana are eligible non-retail employers; about 10,000 , or $45 \%$, are non-retail service employers and of these about 8,400, or 81\%, are eligible employers. The 74\% of non-retail employers also employ $70 \%$ of the workers in the state.

Dave Bishop, representing Montana Homebuilders Association and the National Federation of Independent Business, rose in support of House Bill 284.

Irvin Dellinger, representing Montana Building Material Dealers Association, rose in support of House Bill 284.

Robert Pratt, Executive Director of Montana Restaurants Association, rose in support of House Bill 284.

Jim Murry, Executive Secretary of Montana AFL-CIO, said AFL-CIO supports House Bill 284 with some reservations; mainly, Senate Bill 81.

Forrest Boles, President, Montana Chamber of Commerce, stated there is no linkage between Senate Bill 81 and House Bill 284. He encouraged the committee's support of this bill.

OPPONENTS OF HOUSE BILL 284:
Anne Brodsky, representing Women's Lobbyist Fund, rose in opposition to House Bill 284 and submitted testimony. (Exhibit No. 5)

QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE:
Senator Manning asked Mr. Wanzenried if he is able to calculate what the "good cause" provision is worth. Dave Wanzenried referred Senator Manning to the last page of the handout he had distributed, line 6 , the saving to the trust fund. If that provision is enacted, it means two and a half million dollars for each of those two fiscal years.

Senator Haffey asked Mr. Wanzenried, at two and a half million dollars a year, does that mean people who become unemployed for "good personal cause" in Montana would receive two and a half million dollars in unemployment benefits a year. Dave Wanzenried replied that is correct. He said the largest number of "good personal cause" cases are "quit to follow."

Senator Haffey asked for an example of one other good personal cause. Mr. Wanzenried answered that other job prospects is the second most common reason. Senator Haffey asked whether "quit to follow" means that a spouse, male or female, quits his or her job and follows the spouse who is relocated to another job. Mr. Wanzenried answered that your spouse may be transferred to San Francisco, and rather than split the family up, you would ouit your job to move with her, and while you are unemployed you would be eligible to draw benefits.

Senator Haffey asked how long a person would be eligible. Mr. Wanzenried replied if you are working full time at the time you quit, you would be entitled to 26 weeks. The amount of your benefits would depend on how much you drew during the base period, in this case about $\$ 171.00$ per week.

Senator Towe asked Mr. Wanzenried, in regard to Exhibit No. 6 , if this is voluntary leaving for all reasons or does it just apply to those that have been granted "good cause" status. He asked how many cases there are of people from "quit to follow" as opposed to the entire number affected by section 8. Dave Wanzenried answered on Exhibit No. 6, A through $W$ is all the possible combinations of factors that might lead into voluntary leaving that would qualify a person to receive benefits. The second sheet with that is the indication of the number of claims that were awarded and
the total number of applications; in some cases some people were disqualified.

Senator Towe asked for an approximation of what the "quit to follow" provision would cost the State of Montana. Mr. Wanzenried answered 13.7\% of the total savings per year.

Senator Towe asked Mr. Wanzenried, in reference to the chart which is the last page of the handout (Exhibit No. 3), with this bill can we rely on the figures on line 12 , dealing with solvency? Mr. Wanzenried replied yes.

Senator Towe added that at the end of fiscal year 1986, based on a good economy, we will have the 21.3 million dollars, fund balance. Mr. Wanzenried replied that date is correct.

Senator Towe added, at 5.3 million dollars, fund balance, if it is a poor economy. Mr. Wanzenried replied yes.

Representative Harper closed on House Bill 284. He urged that this committee in some way pass this bill as a package.

The hearing was closed on House Bill 284.
ADJOURNMENT: The committee, having no further business, adjourned at the hour of 2:55 p.m.
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Amendment to HB 853, third reading, blue copy.

1. Page 1 , line 23.

Following: "provision"
Insert: ", in language approved by the commissioner of labor and industry,"
2. On Tue. 19 March, this bill was amended to add to section 1 of the bill the following subsection:
"(3) The commissioner of labor and industry shall enforce this section and investigate complaints of its violation."

This amendment 2 will add the following to the end of that subsection (3): "and may adopt rules to implement this section:"

HOUSE BILL NO. 853

A statement of intent is required for this bill because section 1 grants rulemaking authority to the commissioner of labor and industry.

The rules should, at a minimum:
(1) provide the most practical method or methods for quantifying the requirement that at least $50 \%$ of the work on $a$ project must be performed by Montana residents so that the quantification method or methods can be applied to contracts and projects to ensure that the requirement is complied with;
(2) include a procedure by which the commissioner will determine whether or not $50 \%$ of the work by a contractor can be performed by Montana residents, and if it cannot, what percent can be so performed; and
(3) include procedures for investigating complaints and enforcing section 1 .

## UI Trust Fund Balance

## Trout Pund Balance in Millicere of Dollare



PROJECTED TRUST FUND BALANCE
(Actubl through une 84) (Actusl through June 84)

| MNE, 83 | (\$ 4.0n) | Projection with |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| JKY. 83 | (\$ 1.6H) | Pooz |
| mucust, 83 | \$ 0.94 | Economy |
| Septenber, 83 | (\$ 2.3n) |  |
| OCTOBER, 83 | (\$ 0.6M) |  |
| MOVEHDER, 83 | \$0.67 |  |
| DECEHBER. 83 | (\$3.m) |  |
| JAMUARY, 84 | (3 6.8H) |  |
| FEBRUARY, 84 | (\$ 9.34) |  |
| MARCH. 84 | (\$14.64) |  |
| April. 84 | (\$12.14) |  |
| HAY. 84 | (\$ 4.4.4) |  |
| JWE. 84 | (\$6.7n) |  |
| Mur, 84 | (\$ 4.3n) |  |
| AUCUST. 84 | (\$ 0.5H) |  |
| SEPTEMBER, 84 | (\$ 4.0n) | (\$4.8n) |
| CCPOBER. 84 | (\$ 2.5n) | (\$ 3.5n) |
| WOVENAER, 84 | \$0.11 | (\$1.2n) |
| DECENBER, 84 | (\$5.91) | (\$7.m) |
| JMUARY, 85 | (\$8.6n) | (810.86) |
| FEERUARY, 85 | (\$11.41) | (\$15.5n) |
| MARCH. 85 | (\$19.06) | (324.9n) |
| APRIL. 85 | (813.6H) | (321.0n) |
| MMT, 85 | (36.0.0. | ( 913.71 ) |
| June. 85 | (310.en) | (318.n) |


| $1-80$ | $1-81$ | $1-82$ | $1-83$ | $1-84$ | $1-85$ | $1-86$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

State Fiscal Year Qtrs.

|  | ACTUAL | ESTIMATED* |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Beginning Balance | $\frac{\text { SFY } 84}{(4.0)}$ | $\frac{\text { SFY } 85}{(6.7)}$ | $\frac{\text { SFY } 86}{(10.7)}$ | $\frac{\text { SFY } 87}{(15.5)}$ |
| Contributions | 57.2 | 59.0 | 62.2 | 65.1 |
| Benefits | 59.9 | 63.0 | 67.0 | 73.0 |
| Ending Balance | ( 6.7) | (10.7) | (15.5) | (23.4) |
| Minimum Annual Shortfall | 2.7 | 4.0 | 4.8 | 7.9 |
| Add for Variables Maximum Annual Shortfall | --- | $\frac{8.0}{12.0}{ }^{\text {a }}$ | $\frac{8.0}{12.8}$ | $\frac{8.0}{15.9}$ |

[^0]
## TAX TABLE RATIOS - TRUST FUND BALANCE

Under current law, the tax table ratio at Schedule $V$ requires a trust fund balance of $\$ 33.6 \mathrm{mill}$ ion (based on 1983 total wages). The median schedule is Schedule $X$.

House Bill 284 proposes to increase the ratio at Schedule $V$ to require a balance of $\$ 49.3$ million. The median schedule is Schedule VII, which requires a fund balance of $\$ 27.55$ million for calendar year 1985.

## TAX TABLE RATE CLASSES

Under current law, the tax table contains 7 rate classes for "eligible employers" and 6 rate classes for "deficit employers".

House Bill 284 proposes to increase the rate classes to 10 in each category.

## EXPERIENCE RATING PERIOD

Current law specifies a 3 year experience rating period.
House Bill 284 proposes to change the experience rating period to be continuous beginning 10-1-85.

SURTAX
House Bill 284 proposes a surtax to pay off outstanding federal loans. The tax would be set by the Department of Labor and Industry based on need to repay loans, but would be limited to a maximum of $.3 \%$ of total wages. The authority to impose the surtax, to be paid in total by employers, will remain in effect until June 30, 1987.

TAXABLE WAGE BASE (TWB)
Under current law, the TWB is $75 \%$ of the average annual wage with a maximum increase of $\$ 200$ per year. The TWB for 1985 is $\$ 8,600$.

House Bill 284 proposes to increase the TWB to $80 \%$ of the average annual wage. The TWB for 1985 would be $\$ 11,800$.

AVERAGE TAX RATE (ATR)
House Bill 284 proposes to increase the ATR at each schedule by . $2 \%$.

## MAXIMUM TAX RATE FOR DEFICIT EMPLOYERS

Under current law the maximum tax rate for deficit employers is 4.4\%.

House Bill 284 proposes to increase the maximum tax rate to $6.5 \%$.
NOTE: Under federal law, states must have a maximum tax rate of at least 5.4\%. Failure of the Legislature to amend current law to establish a maximum tax rate of at least $5.4 \%$ will put the state out of conformity with federal law and result in the loss of the state's employers' FUTA tax credit (estimated $\$ 77.5$ million) for calendar year 1985, loss of administrative funds to operate the unemployment insurance program ( $\$ 16$ million) and a discontinuation of the unemployment system until conforming legislation is enacted by the legislature.

DISQUALIFICATION - QUIT WITH GOOD CAUSE
State law currently provides benefits for employees who quit their job with good personal cause.

House Bill 284 requires that the cause of separation from employment be attributed to the claimant's employment in order to qualify for benefits.

## MAXIMUM WEEKLY BENEFIT AMOUNT

Under current law the maximum weekly benefit amount may not exceed $60 \%$ of the state's average weekly wage. The amount is calculated each July 1. Under current law the estimated maximum for SFY'86 would be $\$ 178$ and for SFY' $87 \$ 190$.

House Bill 284 imposes a "freeze" on the maximum for the period between July 1, 1985 and December 31, 1986. This change would freeze the maximum at $\$ 171$ per week during the period.

## WAITING WEEK BETWEEN TRANSITIONAL YEARS

Currently, state law does not require a waiting week between transitional years.

House Bill 284 requires a waiting week between transitional years. During any year in which "extended benefits" trigger on for the normal 13 week period, the estimated savings to the trust fund is $\$ .5$ million.

## WEEKLY BENEFIT AMOUNT

Current state law provides for benefits equal to $50 \%$ of the claimant's average weekly wage during his/her base period (with a minimum and maximum provision).

House Bill 284 reduces the weekly benefit amount to $49 \%$.

```
TRUSTGUNDNORKSHEET
```

(IN MILLIONS OF DOLLARS)


HOUSE BILL 284

## AN ACT MAKING THE UNEMPLOYMENT TRUST FUND SOLVENT

Section 1. This section authorizes a surtax to pay off principal on loans from the federal government. The rate of the surtax may not exceed . $3 \%$. This surtax will enable the Department of Labor and Industry to pay off all monies owed the federal government by January 1986. The authority for the surtax expires on June 30, 1987.

Section 2. Section 2 changes the taxable wage base from $75 \%$ to $80 \%$ of the annual wage and eliminates the $\$ 200$ per year ceiling on tax increases.

Sections 3 and 4. An employer's "experience factor" determines the rate at which unemployment insurance taxes will be paid. The factor is computed based on benefits drawn from and contributions paid into the employer's account. Currently, only figures for the last three years are used to calculate the experience factor. Sections 3 and 4 make benefit charges and contributions payments accumulative in the experience factor calculation throughout the life of the business. This will cause the rates to drop for stable employers that have had a small amount of benefits charged against their accounts.

Section 5. Section 5 modifies the unemployment insurance tax rate structure. It provides for 10 rate classes replacing the 7 existing rate classes. Rate classes for deficit employers would be increased from 6 to 10 classes. The maximum average tax rate is increased from $3.0 \%$ to $3.2 \%$. See Attachment 1. (The Job Service assessment (39-51$404(4))$ of $.1 \%$ is in addition to the actual tax paid.) The reserve ratio has been changed to require a greater balance before triggering to a lower rate schedule.

Section 6. Section 6 requires a claimant with a transitional claim (claim spanning two benefit years) to wait a week between benefit years. Benefits would not be paid during the waiting week. See Attachment 2. Montana is the only state in the country which does not provide for a waiting week between benefit years.

Section 7. Section 7 reduces the maximum of an individual's weekly benefit amount from $50 \%$ to $49 \%$ of his/her average weekly wage. This change would reduce benefit expenditures by approximately $\$ 1.3$ million in fiscal year 1986. In addition, the maximum weekly benefit amount is proposed to be frozen at the 1984 level through January 3, 1987.

Section 8. An employee may currently receive unemployment insurance benefits if he/she can show "good personal cause" for leaving his/her employment. Section 8 would require a claimant to demonstrate that the cause of separation from employment is attributable to employment in order to qualify for benefits. This change would reduce benefit expenditures by approximately $\$ 2.5$ million in fiscal year 1986.

Section 9. This section permits the department to make rules for this act like it does for other laws it implements.

Section 10. This section puts this act in the law which applies to the rest of unemployment insurance.

Section 11. This section would make the temporary surtax and the new contribution rate schedules effective this calendar year.

Section 12. Because the year for determining benefit rates begins July l of every year, this section makes the benefit changes proposed by this act effective July 1, 1985. This section also provides for the termination of the surtax on June 30, 1987 and makes the tax sections effective upon passage.

| SCHEDULE Of CONTRIBUTIOid RATES* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minimun Ratio of Fund to Total Wages <br> Average Tax Rate | $\begin{gathered} \text { Sched. } \\ I \end{gathered}$ | Sched. II | $\begin{gathered} \text { Sched. } \\ \text { III } \end{gathered}$ | Sched. IV | $\begin{gathered} \text { Sched. } \\ V \end{gathered}$ | Sched. VI | $\begin{gathered} \text { Sched. } \\ \text { VII } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sched. } \\ & \text { VIII } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sched. } \\ & \text { IX } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Sched. } \\ \mathrm{X} \end{gathered}$ |
|  | $(.0150$ 1.3 | $(.0145$ 1.5 | $(.0140)$ 1.7 | $(.0130)$ 1.9 | $(.0120)$ 2.1 | $(.0110)$ 2.3 | $(.0095)$ 2.5 | $\begin{gathered} (.0075) \\ 2.7 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $(.005)$ 2.9 | $\begin{gathered} (\ldots . .) \\ 3.1 \end{gathered}$ |
| Rate Class | CONTRIBUTIAN RATES FOR ELIGIBLE ESPLOYERS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 0.27 | 0.31 | 0.5\% | 0.75 | 0.93 | 1.14 | 1.31 | 1.58 | 1.75 | 1.98 |
| 2 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 1.6 | :1.8 | 2.0 | 2.2 |
| 3 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 2.5 |
| 4 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 1.8 | 2.0 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 2.8 |
| 5 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 3.1 |
| 6 | 1.6 | 1.8 | 2.0 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 3.4 |
| 7 | 1.9 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 3.7 |
| CONTRIDUTION RATES POR UNRATED EMPLOYERS: | 2.14 | 2.38 | 2.54 | 2.71 | 2.9: | 3.14 | 3.38 | 3.53 | 3.74 | 3.98 |
| Rate Class | CONTRIBUTION RATES FOR DEFICIT EMPLOYERS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 2.21 | 2.48 | 2.68 | 2.88 | 3.08 | 3.24 | 3.41 | 3.64 | $3.8 \%$ | 4.08 |
| 2 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 4.2 |
| 3 | 2.6 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 4.2 | 4.4 |
| 4 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 4.2 | 4.4 | 4.4 |
| 5 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 4.2 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 4.4 |
| 6 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 4.2 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 4.4 |
| SB95 seeks to clarify. that $.1 \%$ of the above rates collected from employers is set aside for the Job Service Administrative Fund. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



## TRANSITIONAL CLAIMS

Claimant files a claim effective 1-8-84.


| January |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S | M | T | W | T | $F$ | $S$ |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
| 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |
| 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 |
| 29 | 30 | 31 |  |  |  |  |

The week ending 1-14-84 is claimant's waiting week.

Claimant receives benefits through March when he returns to work. He is laid off, reopens his claim effective 12-9-84, and continues to receive benefits through the week ending 1-5-85 when his benefit year expires.


He files a new claim effective 1-6-85.


This claim is termed a "transitional claim". The claimant is in a compensable status, that is, being paid benefits, at the end of his prior benefit year and may continue to receive benefits without interruption to serve a waiting week at the beginning of his second benefit year.

Should he be required to serve a waiting week at the beginning of his second benefit year, the week ending 1-12-85 would become his waiting week. This requirement would not reduce the maximum number of weeks to which he is entitled in the new benefit year, but would only delay the receipt of benefits for one week as was the case in his 1984 benefit year.

PFESENT screale
LNEPROMENT INSURACE CONTRIEITIGI AATES


I II III IV V VI VII VIII IX X

| mantare fucio nida to rotal mope | (.0150) | (.0145) | (.0440) | (.0130) | (.0120) | (.0110) | (.0085) | (.0075) | (.005) | (.....) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| merces Tex Rate | 1.2 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 1.8 | 2 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 2.8 | 3 |
| nute cress |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | . 1 | . 2 | . ${ }^{4}$ | . 6 | . ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 1 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 1.8 |
| 2 | . 3 | . 5 | . 7 | - 9 | 1.1 | 2.3 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 2.1 |
| 3 | . 6 | . ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 1 | 1.2 | 2.4 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 2 | 2.2 | 2.4 |
| 4 | . 9 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 2.7 |
| 5 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 2.6 | 3.6 | 2 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 2.8 | 3 |
| 6 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 3.3 |
| 7 | 1.8 | 2 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 2.8 | 3 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 3.6 |
| mutat for Unrevea Erployers | 2 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 2.0 | 3 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 3.8 |


| 1 |
| ---: |
| 1 |
| 2 |
| 3 |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

hb 284, As Amended
PEB. 5, 2008

| trieution pates fur deicit geploners |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2.1 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 3.9 |
| 2.3 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 3.9 | 4.1 |
| 2.5 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 3.9 | 4.1 | 4.3 |
| 2.7 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 3.9 | 4.1 | 4.3 | 4.3 |
| 2.9 | 3.1 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 3.9 | 4.1 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 4.3 |
| 3.1 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 3.9 | 4.1 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 4.3 |

SOED. SOED. SOED. SOED. SOED. SOED. SOED. SOHED. SOED. SOED.

| 1 | II | III | IV | $v$ | $v 1$ | VII | vIII | IX |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nun Retio fund to Total (.0260) | (.0025) | (.025) | (.0200) | (.0170) | (.015) | (.0095) | (.0075) | (.005) |  |
| werrege Tex fate 1.4 | 1.6 | 1.8 | 2 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2. | 2. | 3 | 3.2 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0 | 1 | . 3 | . 5 | . 7 | . 9 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 1.7 |
| 2 | . 1 | . 3 | . 5 | . 7 | . 9 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.9 |
| 3 | . 3 | . 5 | . 7 | . 9 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 2.1 |
| 4 | . 5 | . 7 | . 9 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 2.1 | 2.3 |
| 5 | . 7 | . 9 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 2.5 |
| 6 | . 9 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 2.9 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 2.7 |
| 7 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 2.9 |
| 8 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 3.1 |
| - 9 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 3.3 |
| 10 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 3.3 | 3.5 |
| Receen for urratio employers | 2 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 2.8 | 3 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 3.8 |
| CONTREATION ARTES FOR DEFICIT EPLOVEPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 4 | 4.2 | 4.4 | 4.6 | 4.8 | 5 |
| 2 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 4 | 4.2 | 4.4 | 4.6 | 4.6 | 5 | 5.2 |
| 3 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 4 | 4.2 | 4.4 | 4.6 | 4.8 | 5 | 5.2 | 5.4 |
| 4 | 3.4 | 4 | 4.2 | 4.4 | 4.6 | 4.6 | 5 | 5.2 | 5.4 | 5.6 |
| 5 | 4 | 4.2 | 4.4 | 4.6 | 4.8 | 5 | 5.2 | 5.4 | 5.6 | 5.6 |
| 6 | 4.2 . | 4.4 | 4.6 | 4.6 | 5 | 5.2 | 5.4 | 5.6 | 5.8 | 6 |
| 7 | 4.4 : | 4.6 | 4.6 | 5 | 5.2 | 5.4 | 5.6 | 5.8 | 6 | 6.2 |
| 8 | 4.6 | 4.8 | 5 | 5.2 | 5.4 | 5.6 | 5.8 | 6 | 6.2 | 6.4 |
| 9 | 4.6 | 5 | 5.2 | 5.4 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 6 | 6.2 | 6.4 | 6.4 |
| 10 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 6.4 |
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| Hor cra |  |

HB 284 AS AMENDED

SOEDLE VII:




Significant Provisions of State Unemployment Insurance Laws, January 6, 1985

| State | BENEFITS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | coverage <br> Size of <br> firm (l <br> worker in specified time and/ or size of payrol1) ${ }^{15}$ | taxes <br> 1985 <br> Taxable wage base |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Qualifying wage or employment (number $X$ wba or as indicated) ${ }^{1}$ | Waiting week $^{2}$ | Computation of wba (fraction of hqw or as indicated) 1/3/ | Wba for total unemployment ${ }^{4}$ |  | Earnings disregarded ${ }^{5}$ | Duration in 52-week period |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ```Proportion of base- period wages}\mp@subsup{}{}{6``` | ```Benefit for total un- employment}\mp@subsup{}{}{7``` |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Min. | Max. |  | Min. ${ }^{8}$ | Max. |  |  |
| Ala | $\begin{aligned} & 1-1 / 2 \times \\ & \text { hqw; not } \\ & \text { less than } \\ & \$ 774.01 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 1/24 | \$22 | \$120 | \$15 | 1/3 | $11+$ | 26 | 20 wks. | \$8,000 |
| Alaska | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 1,000 \text {; } \\ & \text { wages in } \\ & 2 \text { qtes. } \end{aligned}$ | 1 | 3.8-0.95\% of annual <br> wages, $+\$ 24$ <br> per dep. up to $\$ 72$ | 38-62 | $\begin{aligned} & 188- \\ & 260 \end{aligned}$ | 3/4 <br> wages <br> over $\$ 50$ | Weighted schedule of bpw in relation to hgw | ${ }^{7} 16$ | 726 | Any time | 21,800 |
| Ariz. | $1-1 / 2 x$ <br> hqw; <br> $\$ 1,000$ in HQ. | 1 | 1/25 | 40 | 115 | \$15 | 1/3 | $12+$ | 26 | 20 wks | 7,000 |
| Ark. | $35 \times \mathrm{wba}$; wages in 2 qtrs. | 1 | $1 / 52$ of 2 highest qtrs Lip to 66-2/3\% of state aww ${ }^{17}$ | 40 | 154 | 2/5 | 1/3 | 12 | 26 | 10 days | 7,500 |
| Calif | 8 wks. employment at $\$ 20$ s BP wages of $\$ 900$ or total BP wages of $\$ 1,200$ | 1 | 1/24-1/33 | 30 | 166 | Lesser <br> of $\$ 25$ <br> and 25\% <br> of wages | 1/2 | ${ }^{7} 12+$ | ${ }^{7} 26$ | Over $\$ 100$ in any qtr. | 7,000 |
| Colo. | 40 | 1 | 608 of $1 / 26$ of claimant's 2 highest qtrs up to $50 \%$ of State aww | 25 | 206 | 1/4 wba | 1/3 | $7+-13$ | 26 | 13 wks or $\$ 5.00$ in CQ | 8,000 |
| Conn. | 40 | 0 | 1/26, up to 60\% of State aww + \$10 per dep. up to $1 / 2$ wba or 5 deps. | 15-22 | $\begin{aligned} & 180- \\ & 230 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 / 3 \\ & \text { wages } \end{aligned}$ | Uniform | $7_{26}$ | 726 | 20 wks . | 7.100 |
| Del. | 36 | 0 | 1/78 of 3 highest $q \pm r s$ of BP , up to 66-2/38 of State aww13,17 | 20 | 165 | Greater <br> of $\$ 10$ <br> or 308 <br> of wba | 1/2 | 18 | 26 | 20 wks . | 8,000 |
| D.C. | $\begin{aligned} & 1-1 / 2 \times \\ & \text { hgw; not } \\ & \text { less than } \\ & \$ 900 ; \$ 300 \\ & \text { in } 1 \text { qtr. } \end{aligned}$ | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & 1 / 23+\$ 5 \\ & \text { per dep; up } \\ & \text { to } \$ 2017 \end{aligned}$ | 26 | 2064 | $\begin{aligned} & 1 / 5 \\ & \text { wages } \end{aligned}$ | 1/2 | 17 | 26 | Any time | 8,000 |
| fla. | 20 wks. employment at average of $\$ 20$ or more | 1 | 1/2 claimant's aww | 10 | 150 | \$5 | 1/2 wks. employment | 10 | 26 | 20 wks. | 7,000 |



| State | BENEFITS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | coverage <br> Size of firm (1 worker in specified time and/ or size of payrol11 ${ }^{15}$ | TAXES <br> 1985 <br> Taxable <br> wage <br> base |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Qualifying wage or employment number X wba or as indicated) ${ }^{1}$ | waiting week ${ }^{2}$ | Computation of wba (ffaction of hqw or as indicated) 1/3/ | Wba for total unemployment 4 |  | Earnings disregarded ${ }^{5}$ | Duration in 52-week period |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Proportion of baseperiod wages ${ }^{6}$ | Benefit weeks for total unemployment ${ }^{7}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Min. | Max. |  | Min. ${ }^{8}$ | Max. |  |  |
| Md. | $1-1 / 2 x$ <br> hqw; <br> $\$ 576.01$ in 1 qtr ; wages in 2 qtrs. | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 1 / 24+\$ 3 \\ & \text { per dep. up } \\ & \text { to } \$ 12 \end{aligned}$ | 25-28 | ${ }^{4} 175$ | \$35 | Uniform | 26 | 26 | Any time | \$ 7,000 |
| Mass. | $\begin{aligned} & 30 \text {; not } \\ & \text { less than } \\ & \$ 1,200 \end{aligned}$ | 1 | 1/21-1/26 up to $57.5 \%$ of state aww, $+\$ 6$ per dep. up to $1 / 2 \mathrm{wba}^{3}$ | 14-21 | $\begin{aligned} & 196- \\ & 294 \end{aligned}$ | 40\% not <br> less <br> than $\$ 10$ <br> nor more <br> than $\$ 30$ | 368 | $9+-30$ | 30 | 13 wks. | 7,000 |
| Mich. | 20 wks . employment at $30 \times$ State min. hourly wage ${ }^{10}$ | 0 | 658 of claimant's after tax earnings (ATE) up to a maximum of $58 \%$ of State aww. 17 | 54 | 197 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Up to } \\ & 1 / 2 \\ & \text { wba } \end{aligned}$ | 3/4 wks. employment | 15 | 26 | 20 wks. or $\$ 1,000$ in CY | 9,000 |
| Minn. | 15 wks. employment: at 308 of State aww | ${ }^{9} 1$ | 12/ | 52 | 198 | \$25 | 7/10 wks. employment | 11 | 26 | 20 wks. | 10,300 |
| Miss. | $\begin{aligned} & 40 ; \$ 780 \\ & \text { in } 1 \text { qtr. } \\ & \text { wages in } 2 \\ & \text { gtrs. } \end{aligned}$ | 1 | 1/26 | 30 | 115 | \$5 | 1/3 | $13+$ | 26 | 20 wks. | 7,000 |
| Mo. | $\begin{aligned} & 1-1 / 2 \mathrm{x} \\ & \text { hqw; } \$ 300 \\ & \text { in } 1 \text { qtr; } \\ & \text { wages in } \\ & 2 \text { qtrs. } \end{aligned}$ | 91 | 4.5\% | 14 | 120 | \$10 | 1/3 | 10 | 26 | 20 wks. | 8,000 |
| Mont. | 20 wks. employment at $\$ 50$ or more | 1 | $1 / 2$ claimant's aww up to 608 of State aww | 42 | 171 | $1 / 2$ <br> wages in excess of $1 / 4$ wba | Weighted schedule of bpw in relation to hqw | 8 | 26 | Over $\$ 500$ in current or preceding year | 8,600 |
| Neb. | \$600; \$200 in each of 2 gtrs. | 1 | 1/17-1/24 | 12 | 120 | 1/2 wba | 1/3 | 17 | 26 | 20 wks. | 7,000 |
| Nev. | $1-1 / 2 x$ <br> hqw | 0 | 1/25, up to $50 \%$ of State aww | 16 | 162 | $\begin{aligned} & 1 / 4 \\ & \text { wages } \end{aligned}$ | 1/3 | $12+$ | 26 | \$225 in any qtr. | 11,100 |
| N.H. | \$1,700; <br> $\$ 830$ in <br> each of 2 qtis. | 0 | 1.8-1.28 of annual wages | 26 | 141 | 1/5 wba | Uniform | 26 | 26 | 20 wks. | 7,000 |
| N.J. | 20 wks. employment at 15 of aww; or 12 x aww | ${ }^{9} 1$ | 608 of claimant's aww + d.a. up to 56-2/38 of State aww | 20 | ${ }^{4} 203$ | Greater of $\$ 5$ or $1 / 5$ wba | 3/4 wks. employment | 15 | 26 | \$1,000 in any year | 10,100 |


| State | BENEPITS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | coverage <br> size of firm (1 worker in specified time and/ or size of payroll) ${ }^{15}$ | taxES <br> 1985 <br> Taxable <br> wage <br> base |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Qualifying wage or employment number $X$ wba or as indicated) ${ }^{1}$ | Waiting week ${ }^{2}$ | Computation of wba (fraction of hqw or as indicated) 1/3/ | Wba for total unemployment ${ }^{4}$ |  | Earnings disregarded ${ }^{5}$ | Duration in <br> 52-week period |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Proportion of baseperiod wages ${ }^{6}$ | Benefit weeks for total unemployment ${ }^{7}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Min. | Max. |  | Min. ${ }^{8}$ | Max. |  |  |
| N.Mex | $\begin{aligned} & 1-1 / 4 x \\ & h q w \end{aligned}$ | 1 | 1/26; not less than 108 nor more than 50\% of state aww | \$30 | \$150 | 1/5 wba | 3/5 | 19 | 26 | 20 wks. or $\$ 450$ in any qtr. | \$10,000 |
| N.Y. | 20 wks. employment at minimum average of $\$ 80$ or more 10 | $111_{1}$ | 67-508 of claimant's aww | 40 | 180 | 11/ | Uniform | 26 | 26 | \$300 in any qtr. | 7,000 |
| N.C. | 1-1/2 $x$ hqw not less than $6 \times$ State aww | 1 | 1/52 of 2 highest qtrs up to 66-2/38 of State aww 12 | 15 | 167 | 108 aww in 2 highest qtrs. | Weighted schedule of bpw in relation to hqw | 13-26 | 26 | 20 wks. | 8,700 |
| n. Dak | $\begin{aligned} & 1-1 / 2 \times \\ & \mathrm{hqw} \end{aligned}$ | 1 | $1 / 52$ of the 2 highest qtrs; up to $65 \%$ of the State aww | 60 | 185 | 1/2 wba | Weighted schedule of bpw in relation to hqw | 12 | 26 | 20 wks. | 10,700 |
| Ohio | 20 wks. employment. at 37 x min. hourly wage | ${ }^{9} 1$ | $1 / 2$ claimant's aww + d.a. of \$1$\$ 86$ based on claimant's awn and number of dep. $3,16,17$ | 10 | $\begin{aligned} & 147- \\ & 233 \end{aligned}$ | 1/5 wba | 20 x wba: <br> wba for <br> each <br> credit wk. <br> in excess <br> of 20 | 20 | 26 | 20 whs. | 8,000 |
| Okla. | $1-1 / 2 x$ <br> hqw: not less than $\$ 3,000$ in BP; \$7,000 | 1 | $1 / 25$ up to 66-2/38 of state aww 18/ | 16 | $\begin{aligned} & 197 \\ & 18 / \end{aligned}$ | \$7 | 508 of taxable wage | $20+14$ | $26^{14}$ | 20 wks. | 7,000 |
| rreg. | 18 wks; not less than $\$ 1,000$ in BP | 1 | 1.258 of bpw up to 648 of State aww | 47 | 204 | 1/3 wba | 1/3 | $7+7$ | 267 | 18 wks, or $\$ 225$ in any qtr. | 13,000 |
| Pa. | $37+$ - 40; <br> $\$ 800$ in HQ <br> and \$1,320 <br> in BP; at <br> least 20: <br> of bpw <br> outside $\mathrm{H} Q$ | 1 | 1/23-1/25 up to 66-2/3\% of state aww $+\$ 5$ for 1 dep; \$3 for 2d | $\begin{gathered} \$ 35- \\ 40 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 224- \\ & 232 \\ & 18 / \end{aligned}$ | Greater of $\$ 6$ or 40: wba | At least 16 credit wks. for min., 18 for max. | 16 | 26 | Any time | 8,000 |
| P.R. | $40 \times$ wba not less than \$280; $\$ 75$ in 1 qtr.; wages in 2 qtrs. | 1 | 1/11-1/26; up to 50 of state aww | 7 | 95 | wba | Uniform | $7_{20}$ | 720 | any time | All Wages |


| state | BENEFITS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | COVERAGE <br> Size of <br> firm (l <br> worker in <br> specified <br> time and/ <br> or size of <br> payroll1) ${ }^{15}$ | TAXES <br> 1985 <br> Taxable wage base |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Qualifying wage or employment number $X$ wba or as indicated) ${ }^{1}$ | waiting week ${ }^{2}$ | Computation of wba (fraction of hqw or as indicated) 1/3/ | Wba for total unemployment ${ }^{4}$ |  | Earnings disregarded ${ }^{5}$ | Durdtion in 52-week period |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Proportion of baseperiod wages ${ }^{6}$ | Benefit weeks for total unemployment ${ }^{7}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Min. | Max. |  | Min. ${ }^{8}$ | Max. |  |  |
| R.I. | 20 wks. employment at $\$ 67$ or more; or \$4,020 | 1 | $55 \%$ of claimant's aww up to 608 of State aww, + \$5 per dep. up to \$20 | 37-42 | $\begin{gathered} \$ 174- \\ 194 \end{gathered}$ | \$5 | 3/5 wks. employment | 12 | 26 | Any time | \$10,600 |
| s.c. | $\begin{aligned} & 1-1 / 2 \times \\ & \text { hqw; not } \\ & \text { less than } \\ & \$ 900: \$ 540 \\ & \text { in } 1 \text { qtr. } \end{aligned}$ | 1 | 1/26 up to 66-2/3\% of state aww | 21 | 125 | 1/4 wba | 1/3 | 14 | 26 | 20 wks. | 7,000 |
| S.Dak. | $\$ 728$ in <br> HQ ; 30 x <br> wba out- <br> side hQ | 1 | $1 / 26$ up to 628 of State aww 17 | 28 | 129 | $\begin{aligned} & 1 / 4 \\ & \text { wages up } \\ & \text { to wba } \end{aligned}$ | 1/3 | $18+$ | 26 | 20 wks. | 7,000 |
| Tenn. | 40; <br> $\$ 754.01$ in <br> highest 2 qtes. | 1 | $1 / 25-1 / 31$ of average 2 highest qtrs | 30 | 120 | \$30 | 1/4 | 12 | 26 | 20 wks. | 7,000 |
|  | 1-1/2 $x$ hqw not less than $\$ 500$ or $2 / 3$ PICA tax base | ${ }^{9} 1$ | 1/25 16 | 29 | 189 | Greater of $\$ 5$ or 1/4 wba | 27\% | $12+$ | 26 | 20 wks. | 7,000 |
| Utah | $\begin{aligned} & 1-1 / 2 \times \\ & \text { hqw; bpw } \\ & \text { of } 8 \times \\ & \text { State } \\ & \text { aaw } \end{aligned}$ | 1 | 1/26 up to 608 of Staさe aww | 46 | 186 | 3/10 wba | 27\% | 10 | 26 | $\$ 140$ in CQ in current or preceding CY | 12,100 |
| V.I. | 26+-30; <br> not less <br> than \$99 <br> in 1 qtr. <br> and wages <br> in 2 gtrs. | 1 | 1/23-1/25 ${ }^{13}$ | 15 | 130 | 1/4 <br> wages in excess of $\$ 5$ | Uniform | 26 | 26 | Any time | 8,000 |
| vt. | 20 wks. employment at $\$ 35$ or more | 1 | $1 / 2$ claimant's aww for highest 20 wks up to 608 of state awwl7 | 18 | 146 | $\$ 15+\$ 3$ <br> for each <br> dep. up to 5 | Uniform | 26 | 26 | 20 wks. | 8,000 |
| va. | 50; wages in 2 qurs. | 0 | $1 / 50$ of the 2 highest qtes. | 54 | 150 | \$25 | 1/3 | 12 | 26 | 20 wks. | 7,000 |


| State | BENEFITS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | coverage <br> Size of firm (l worker in specified time and/ or size of payroll) ${ }^{15}$ | TAXES <br> 1985 <br> Taxable <br> wage <br> base |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Qualifying wage or employment number x wba or as indicated) ${ }^{1}$ | waiting week ${ }^{2}$ | Computation of wba (fraction of hqw or as indicated) 1/3/ | Wba for total unemployment ${ }^{4}$ |  | Earnings disregarded ${ }^{5}$ | Duration in 52-week period |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Proportion of baseperiod wages ${ }^{6}$ | Benefit <br> weeks <br> total <br> employn |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Min. | Max. |  |  | Min. ${ }^{8}$ | Max. |  |  |
| Wash. | 680 hours | 1 | $1 / 25$ of average of 2 highest qtrs. wages up to 55\% of State aww 17 | \$51 | \$185 |  | 1/4 <br> wages in excess of $\$ 5$ | 1/3 | $\begin{aligned} & 16+- \\ & 30 \end{aligned}$ | 30 | Any time | \$10,000 |
| w.va. | \$1,150 and wages in 2 qtrs. | 1 | 1.5-1.08 of annual wages up to 708 of state aww | 18 | 225 | \$25 | Uniform | 28 | 28 | 20 wks. | 8,000 |
| Wisc. | 18 weeks employment at $30 \%$ of state aww | 0 | $50 \%$ of claimant's aww up to 66-2/38 of State aww ${ }^{17}$ | 37 | 196 | 678 <br> wages over $\$ 20^{5}$ | 8/10 wks. employment | 1-14+ | 26 | 20 wks. | 9,500 |
| Wyo. | $5 \%$ of State aaw in HQ and 88 of State aaw in BP | 1 | $4 \%$ of hqw up to $55 \%$ of State aww 18/ | 34 | 183 | Greater <br> of $\$ 15$ <br> or $1 / 2$ <br> wba | 3/10 | 12-26 | 26 | $\$ 500$ in cursent or preceding CY | 9,500 |

$1_{\text {Weekly }}$ benefit amount abbreviated in columns and footnotes as wba; base period, BP; base-period wages, bpw; high quarter, $H Q$; high-quarter wages, hqw; average annual wage, aaw; average weekly wage, aww; benefit year, BY; calendar quarter, $C Q$; calendar year, $C Y$; dependent, dep.; dependents allowances, da.; minimum, min.; maximum, max.; quarter, qtr.; week, wk.

2Inless otherwise noted, waiting period same for total or partial unemployment. In Ga. no waiting week if claimant unemployed not through own fault.
$3_{\text {When }}$ States use weighted high-quarter, annual-wage, or average weekly-wage formula, approximate fractions or precentages figured at midpoint of lowest and highest normal wage brackets. When da provided, fraction applies to basic wba. In States noted variable amounts above max. basic benefits limited to claimants with specified number of dep. and earnings in excess of amounts applicable to max. basic wba.. In Ind. da, paid only to claimants with earnings in excess of that needed to qualify for basic wba and who have 1-4 deps.. In Iowa, and ohio claimants may be eligible for augmented amount at all benefit levels but benefit amounts above basic max. available only to claimants in dependency classes whose hqw or aww are higher than that required for max. basic benefit. In Mass. for claimant with aww in excess of $\$ 66$ wha computed at $1 / 52$ of 2 highest quarters of earnings or $1 / 26$ of highest quarter if claimant has no more than 2 quarters work.
${ }^{4}$ When 2 amounts given, higher includes da.. Higher for min. wba includes max. allowance for one dep.. In D.C., Md., and N.J., same max. with or without dep.
${ }^{5}$ In computing wba for partial unemployment, in States noted full wba paid if earnings are less than $1 / 2$ wba; $1 / 2$ wba if earnings are $1 / 2$ wba but less than wba.
${ }^{6}$ States noted have weighted schedule with percent of benefits based on bottom of lowest and highest wage brackets.
${ }^{7}$ Benefits extended under State program when unemployment in state reaches specified levels; Alaska, Calif., by 50\%; Conn. by 13 weeks. Oreg. (until June 29, 1985), by 25 . In Hawaii benefits extended by 13 weeks when a manmade or disaster causes damage to either the State as a whole or any of its counties and creates an unemployment problem involving a substantial number of persons and families. In P.R. benefits extended by 32 weeks in certain industries, occupations or establishments when special unemployment situation exists. Benefits also may be extended during periods of high unemployment by 508, up to 13 weeks, under Federal-State Extended Compensation Program.
$8_{\text {For }}$ claimants with min. qualifying wages and min. wba. When two amounts shown, range of duration applies to claimants wi=h min. qualifying wages in BP; longer duration applies with min. wba; shorter duration applies with max. possible concentration of wages in $H Q$; therefore highest wba possible for such BP earnings. Wisc. determines entitlement separately for each employer. Lower end of range applies to claimants with only 1 week of work at qualifying wage; upper end to claimants with 18 weeks or more of such wages.
${ }^{9}$ Waiting period compensable if claimant unemployed after 9 consecutive weeks, MO.; when benefits are payable for third week following waiting period, N.J.; after benefits paid equaling 3 x wba, Tex.; after any 4 weeks in BY, Minn.: after 3d week of total unemployment, (for CY's 1984 and 1985 no benefits will be paid for the waiting week) ohio.

10 or 15 weeks in last year and 40 weeks in last 2 years of aww of $\$ 80$ or more, N.Y.; 14 weeks of employment and $B P$ wages equal to 20 x the State aww, Mich.
$11_{\text {For }}$ N.Y., waiting period is 4 effective days accumulated in 1-4 weeks; partial benefits $1 / 4$ wha for each 1 to 3 effective days. Effective days: fourth and each subsequent day of total unemployment in week for which not more than $\$ 180$ is paid.

12 To 558 state aww if claimant has nonworking spouse; 62.48 if he has dep. child, Ill.; 1/19-1/23 up to $65 \%$ of State aww for claimants With dep., Iowa; 608 of first $\$ 85,40 \%$ of next $\$ 85,50 \%$ of balance of individual's aww; max. set at $66-2 / 38$, Minn. $60 \%$ of aww if fund ratio is less than 5.5 ; however, the max. wba may not be less than the max. in effect for the previous year, N.C.
13 Ijp to $66-2 / 38$ of state aww, La.; up to 508 of State aww, V.I.; 63\% until July 1985, Del..

14 puration can be as low as 10 wks . for individuals with only one BP ER, Okla..
$15 \$ 1,500$ in any $C Q$ in current or preceding CY unless otherwise specified.
${ }^{16}$ max. amount adjusted annually: by same percentage increase as occurs in state aww (Ohio) by $\$ 7$ for each $\$ 10$ increase in average weekly wage of manufacturing production workers (Texas).
$17_{\text {Beginning }}$ July 1 , 1985, the max. will be computed at 60 percent of the 1984 State aww; beginning January $1,1986,66-2 / 3$ percent of the 1984 State aww and begilining July 1,1986 , 66-2/3. percent of the state aww for the preceding cy, Ark.. The min, and max. wba's are frozen indefinitely, La. and Wisc. The max. wba is frozen until July 1985, Del., and wash; until January 1986, D.C. and ohio; until June 1986, Vt.; until January 1987, Mich.; and indefinitely, S.Dak..

18 The wba may be reduced by $5 \%$ depending on the solvency of the fund, Pa.; wba's over $\$ 90$ will be reduced to $85 \%$ of the computed amount when revenues in the fund are inadequate to pay benefits, Wyo.; the greater of $\$ 197$ or 608 , $57.5 \%, 55 \%, 52.5 \%$ or $50 \%$ of state aww of the second preceding cy depending on the condition of the fund, okla.


Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:
For the record, my name is George Allen and I am a lobbyist for the Montana Retail Association. I am here with strong support of HB 284.

As you know our present trust fund balance is in trouble, and the present law that we have is very unfair and inequitable and inadequate. I'd like to call your attention to the attached document in which you can see the unfairness of the present contribution schedule.

During the past several months the Governor's Advisory Council on Unemployment Insurance has had many meetings, spent hundreds of hours, and some of us have traveled thousands of miles across the state holding meetings, getting in-put on Unemployment Insurance.

HB 284 is the result of the unanimous recommendation from the advisory ouncil. This recommendation went to the Governor, and came back with his blessings.

HB 284 is the result of a lot of compromises from big businesses, small businesses, labor, and from the legislators who served on the committee.

I guess you could disect any portion of HB 284 and make a pretty good argument either for or against that particular issue. But when you look at the total package it's a delicately balanced compromise. One that we strongly recommend that it be passed as a package.

Respectfully,


Executive Vice President
Montana Retail Association


Analysis of Contributions Apr. '79-Mar. 82

| Manufacturing | 14.3\% |
| :---: | :---: |
| Construction | 12.6\% |
| Mining | 9.4\% |
|  | 36.3\% |



Analysis of Benefits Paid Apr. '79-Mar. '82
Construction ................... $26.6 \%$
Manufacturing . . . . . . . . . . ..... 25.7\%
Mining
$14.0 \%$
$66.3 \%$

FlGURES SUPPIIID BY TIHE STATE OF MONTANA, DEPT. OF LABOR \& INDUSTRY. KEPRINIEI) H' OH REPORT PREPARED BY MONTANA RETAIL ASSOCIATION.

# WOMEN'S LOBBYIST FUND <br> Евох" 9099 <br> Hellena. MT 59624 <br> $449-7917$ 

March 21, 1985
Mr. Chairman and Members of the Senate Labor and Employment Relations Committee:

My name is Anne Brodsky and I am here today to speak on behalf of the Women's Lobbyist Fund (WLF) in opposition to HB 284 . Our opposition to the bill is based on our opposition to one section, that is, section 8 of the bill, which adversely affects women. We realize that many groups have worked hard at reaching a compromise on this bill, and we respect the hard work that required. However, the WLF was not a party to the compromise, and, in order to express our views on section 8 , we can do so meaningfully only by opposing the bill.

Section 8 disqualifies for benefits a person who has left work for good cause not attributable to his or her employment. Most benefits received under the present law that are not attributable to the individual's employment are received under a "quit to follow" circumstance. For calendar year 1984, 1268 individuals who qualified for u.i. benefits qualified under the category of "quit to follow." . I point out that the fiscal note for this section of the bill estimates that the number of individuals who will no longer qualify for u.i. benefits will be 1440 in FY. 86 and 1350 in FY 87... Clearly, most of these will be individuals who "quit to follow." Although I do not have any hard and fast statistics on the breakdown by men and women, it is widely known that "quit to follow" situations are most often ones in which a woman quits to follow her spouse if he is relocated.

The ability to collect unemployment insurance in quit to follow circumstances is important for a number of reasons. In Montana, in 1980, women on average earned $50.5 \phi$ for every dollar earned by men. Unfortunately, economic realities most often favor the husband's occupation and income in family relocation decisions. An alternative to a quit to follow choice is to divide the family, i.e., one spouse moves and the other does not follow. Section 8 of the bill might provide such an incentive.

Working wives are the major reason why many families can stay above the poverty line. In husband-wife families in 1979, $14.8 \%$ were poor when the wife did not work outside the home; $3.8 \%$ were poor when she was in the labor force.*

Women in the workforce should not be penalized by having to bear such a large burden in the goal of eliminating the deficit in the unemployment insurance trust fund. We understand that everyone must sacrifice a littie in reaching a fair compromise. However, section 8 of the bill places the brunt carried by workers on primarily women workers.

For these reasons, the WLF urges you to strike section 8 of the bill.

[^1]
## 2-- VOLUNTARY LEAVING

A. Personal Health
B. Job Dissatisfaction
C. Move to Another Area or Return Home
D. Not Enough Money or Hours
E. Disagreement with Supervisor
F. Working Conditions
G. Other Job Prospects
H. Pregnancy (After Childbirth)
I. Attend School
J. Illness or Death of Relative
K. Not Reporting for Work
L. Distance or No Transportation
M. To Take Time Off
N. Family Problems
0. Disagreement with Workers
P. To Stay Home
Q. Child Care Problems
R. Other
S. Leaving in Anticipation of Discharge
T. Job for Which Hired Not Available
U. Change in Condition of Hire
v. Quit to Follow
W. Quit to Marry

$$
1-28-80
$$

Count of Voluntary Quento for C.4. 1984 by NDA and DISQ.



[^0]:    Average Annual Shortfall '85-'87:
    Minumum $=5.6$
    Maximum $=13.6$

[^1]:    *These statistics are from the Women's Bureau of the U.S. Department of labor.

