## MONTANA SENATE <br> 5lst LEGISLATURE - REGULAR SESSION

## COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS

Call to Order: By Senator Gary C. Aklestad, Chairman, on January 31, 1989, at 1:00 P.M. at the state Capitol.

ROLL CALL
Members Present: All members were present. Senator Tom Keating, Vice-chairman, Senator Sam Hofman, Senator J.D. Lynch, Senator Gerry Devlin, Senator Bob Pipinich, Senator Dennis Nathe, Senator Richard Manning, Senator Chet Blaylock, and Senator Gary Aklestad, Chairman.

Members Excused: There were no members excused.
Members Absent: There were no members absent.
Staff Present: Tom Gomez, Legislative Council Analyst
Announcements/Discussion: There were no announcements or discussion.

HEARING ON SENATE BILL 218

## Presentation and Opening Statement by Sponsor:

Senator Gene Thayer, Senate District 19, sponsor of SB 218 , stated section 39-71-601 intended for Division of Workers' Compensation to initial jurisdiction of requests by injured workers, extending the time allowed to file a claim. Senator Thayer because of the Workers' Compensation Court and the Supreme Court have eroded the jurisdiction, the law needs to be clarified and put back where it belongs.
Currently, claimants have to go to both the Division and the Workers' Compensation Court to get an extension of claim filing time. This creates unnecessary delays. SB 218 clarifies the three areas where the Division has jurisdiction: 1) Cases where the claimant knew about the disability, but didn't know it would be disabling. 2) Cases were the claimant didn't know about a disability, but the disability was manifested later than the claim filing time. 3) Cases where the claimant was misled or not otherwise given due process by his employer or insurer, so the claimant failed to file a claim. Senator Thayer stated SB

218 eliminates the current confusion and puts jurisdiction back where it belongs--an administrative rather than a judicial first determination.

List of Testifying Proponents and What Group they Represent:
Bill Palmer, representing the Workers' Compensation Division
George Wood, representing the Montana Self Insurers Association.

Don Judge, representing the Montana State AFL-CIO.
Michael Sherwood, representing the Montana Trial Lawyers.
Bill Palmer stated SB 218 allows the division to better address claim filing waver requirements. The division has jurisdiction within twenty-four months after the claim filing time expires. The process was once clear, now the process has become confusing. The division and the court do the same procedure simultaneous, making the jurisdiction unclear. The claimant has significant delays in obtaining a routine decision. The issue affects claim filing only. It is still up to the insurer to rule on acceptance of claim liability. The department thinks SB 218 effectively addresses the court cases. The cases have gone to the courts instead of to the division.

George Wood, Executive Secretary of the Montana Self Insurers Association, stood in support of SB 218.

Don Judge, Montana State AFL-CIO, requested the committee to give SB 218 a DO PASS recommendation.

Michael Sherwood, Montana Trial Lawyers Association, stated the association supports SB 218.

## List of Testifying Opponents and What Group They Represent:

There were no testifying opponents.
Testimony:
There was no testimony.
Questions From Committee Members:
There were no questions from the committee members.
Closing by Sponsor:
Senator Thayer urged support of SB 218.

HEARING ON SENATE BILL 163
Presentation and Opening Statement by Sponsor:
Senator J.D. Lynch, Senate District 34, stated there are incidence in Montana where the severely handicapped, non ambulatory DD clients living in rural areas, are not given access to services available. Lynch gave the committee an example of a situation concerning a Rural Butte DD person. This individual could not participate in Sheltered Workshop because the specialized bus did not come to her area. The lift-ramp bus was contracted to serve an eight miles radius, and the client lived ten miles away, two miles beyond the radius. Lynch stated if the state of Montana can afford thousands of dollars to keep prisoners in Deer Lodge, the state should provide an opportunity for DD people to participate with their peers in group activities. The law should provide equal opportunity for DD individuals to participate in services. The Butte example is not isolated. People, throughout the state, are not able to get to their destinations because of transportation costs. Senator Lynch stated, in order to present the Legislature with a "reasonable ball park figure", the amount of money the state currently allows for milage was doubled. This is an fairness issue concerning the small handicapped, nonambulatory population of the society. Senator Lynch closed by urging the committee to provide services.

List of Testifying Proponents and What Group they Represent:
There were no testifying proponents.
List of Testifying Opponents and What Group They Represent:
There were no testifying opponents.
Testimony:
There was no testimony due to inclement weather. Helena's weather and surrounding road conditions were severe.

Questions From Committee Members:
Senator Nathe asked if the state is providing the services now, and will SB 163 increase the biennium costs by $\$ 746,000$. Senator Lynch stated he did not agree with the fiscal note. The state is currently providing some services. The people in question are the people who live beyond the designated areas and are not able to receive services that are currently available.

Senator Nathe asked if the $\$ 915,000$ amount was for clients in groups homes, but who are daytime residents of Sheltered Workshops. Dennis Taylor, stated the Department contracts with ten transportation providers across the state. The department also contracts in smaller communities, which do not have group homes. Approximately, a total of $\$ 12,00$ is appropriated. Each client is appropriated $\$ 800$. Senator Nathe asked if the department paid $\$ .45$ per mile for people who are living at home or at group homes and are needing to be transported. Dennis Taylor stated the department pays for transportation costs for individuals who reside within the transportation service area. There are approximately 150 individuals who would be eligible for new service should the Iegislation pass. The transportation service is available in thirty-one communities.

Senator Keating asked if a DD family would be reimbursed if they drove their DD child from Fort Benton to Great Falls in order for the child to participate. The family would be reimbursed for $\$ .45$ per miles under the new legislation. Senator Nathe asked if the reimbursement went for all DD clients, or only to the clients needing a lift. Dennis Taylor replied, currently, the department contract with only ten service providers.

Senator Keating asked if the department currently pays milage to some recipients, either directly or indirectly. Mr. Hunter stated the only case he is aware of is the Silver Bow County family. Senator Keating asked what is the current amount being spent on the development disabled program. Mr. Taylor replied approximately ten million dollars.

Senator Aklestad asked for a fiscal note estimation if each passenger was reimbursed at $\$ .45$ per mile. Senator Lynch replied the amount would be enormous is each client riding the bus was reimbursed at the $\$ .45$ per mile rate. The reimbursement amount would be considered a bargain if the milage was calculated according to how many miles the bus drove.

## Closing by Sponsor:

Senator Lynch stated he was open to amendments to make a better and less expensive bill. One hundred and fifty people will be effected. Suggestions are: l) The bill could be limited to nonambulatory clients who cannot go to services by normal automobile or taxicab. 2) The $\$ 800$ figure per client could be cut to a more reasonable figure. 3) The milage could be adjusted to a more reason figure, such as $\$ .221 / 2$ per mile. Senator Lynch stated the clients must not have to leave their homes and families and live in a
foster homes so they can participate in services. At home, the DD child has the family's love, and care. SB 218 can be made to work for these people, and Montana could be a "more kinder and gentler nation".

HEARING ON SENATE BILL 234

## Presentation and Opening Statement by Sponsor:

Senator Boylan, Senate District 39, chief sponsor of SB 234, stated the bill is an act defining "tipped employee" in the minimum wage laws. Food service people and restaurant owner have a problem with the Montana minimum wage law concerning the "tipped employee" issue.

List of Testifying Proponents and What Group they Represent:
Leon Stalcup, representing the Montana Restaurant Association.

Laurie Shadoan, Bozeman, MT, representing the Bacchus Pub and Rocky Mountain Pasta Company.

Tom Cott, Bozeman, MT, representing himself.
Peter Orrantic, Bozeman, MT, representing the Frontier Family Restaurants.

James Tutwiler, Helena, MT, representing the Montana Chamber of Commerce.

Testimony:
Leon Stalcup, Montana Restaurant Association, presented the committee with written testimony concerning SB 345. (ExhibitIA) Stalcup stated the association lost "tip crediting" in the 1987 Legislative Session. Currently, labor intensive type-businesses are at risk due the imposition of uncontrolled, mandated, increased labor costs. Many Montana restaurants operate on a two and three percent net profit on gross sales margin. The employee reports a one dollar tip, and the employer pays a twelve percent fee to the state and national government on the tip. The restaurant ends up making no profit on a $\$ 4.00$ meal.

Laurie Shadoan, owner of the Bacchus Pub and Rocky Mountain Pasta Company, Bozeman, Montana, submitted written testimony in support of SB 234. (Exhibitl⿸丆

Tom Cott, owner of a Bozeman restaurant, stated the average yearly rate of pay range from $\$ 6.95$ an hour to $\$ 8.46$ in "tipped income" based on eight percent guidelines. Mr. Cott
stated his employees earn 20 to $30 \%$ more than the eight percent claimed on a daily basis. Employers must pay payroll taxes on said tips. Cott stated he must pay $\$ 100,000$ worth of extra taxes on wages annually, which comes to $\$ 12,000$ per year in taxes. Since 1987, when the tip credit was disallowed, the average guest check has risen to 16.8\%, a substantial inflation in order to compensate the additional wage. Mr. Cott stated the business provides the building, pays taxes, hires unskilled people off the streets, pays wages, trains the employees, and covers mistakes. If the tipped credit is not passed, according to Cott, Montana's restaurant may disallow tips altogether in order to avoid paying the taxes.

Peter Orrantic, representing Frontier Family Restaurants of Bozeman, stated "tipped credit" is vital for the operation of businesses, such as Frontier Pies, and other independent businesses. Orrantic stated Frontier Restaurants is an aggressive, young company, based in Bozeman. The restaurant has been well received in Montana and would like to expand within Montana's boundaries to the major population centers, such as Great Falls and Billings. The company owns the franchise rights to seven western states. The other states look more attractive when expansion is considered. Orrantic stated it is sad a Montana company would have to go outside state boundaries in order to fill it's growth potential, especially when there are Montanans needing jobs.

James Tutwiler, Public Affairs Manager for Montana Chamber of Commerce, stated the Chamber is in full support of SB 234. Tutwiler stated the Chamber is concerned with Montana's competitive position. Labor costs are a subject of concern. Montana is rated sixth highest in the nation in terms of the cost of doing business. Montana's economy is not performing at the National economy level. Two basis statistic gives comparative information: The national hourly wage is $\$ 9.45$, while the Montana hourly wage is $\$ 8.76$. Based on November's Department of Labor statistics, the national per capita income is $\$ 15,041$. Montana's per capita income is $\$ 12,347$. SB 234 is a step in the right direction and should address the mandated raised labor cost issues. The data does not reflect the productivity increase.

List of Testifying Opponents, and What Group They Represent:
Senator J. D. Lynch, representing himself and his constituency.

Frank Sullivan, Butte, Montana. representing the Montana Restaurant and Bartender Union 457 and the Montana State Council of Hotel and Restaurants, etc.

Secily Fascione, Missoula, MT, representing the Hotel Restaurant Union.

Mary Balls, Great Falls, MT, representing herself.
Dennis Sullivan, Butte, MT, representing himself.
Elaine Bray, Great Falls, MT, representing herself.
Debbie Betterman, Butte, MT, representing herself.
Brenda Nordlund, Kalispell, MT, representing herself.
Virginia Jellison, Helena, MT, representing the Montana Low Income Coalition.

Gene Fenderson, Helena, MT, representing the Montana State Building and Construction Trade Council.

Nadine Jenson, Helena, MT, representing the Montana State AFL-CIO.

Testimony:
Senator J.D. Lynch stated he was appalled to hear testimony saying "the employees virtually do not mean better business for the business." When a business has good employees, there is more food selling, not because the restaurants has the nicest table cloth, the coldest water, or the hardiest lemon, it is because the employees help the employer make money. The word tip is defined " to incur promptness." Senator Lynch stated he goes to Jorgenson's restaurant and leaves a tip because the service is good. The idea that $\$ 3.35$ minimum wage is too high for the employers to pay and the employers should pay $\$ 1.34$ less because the customers are satisfied with the service is completely ludicrous. Do not misunderstand what has been said today. The employers are not paying $\$ 7.00$ an hour, the employers are paying taxes on $\$ 7.00$ an hour. They are paying $\$ 3.34$, which is minimum wage. Senator Lynch stated he called constituents employers asking if they want to cut their employees out of tips, so the employers don't have to pay the employees $\$ 3.35$. The employers laughed. The employers are paying above $\$ 3.35$ minimum wage scale in the sacred cities of Butte and Anaconda. Senator Lynch stated there are better ways to solve the economic problems and to encourage business than to gouge people from $\$ 3.35$ to $\$ 2.01$.

Frank Sullivan, Financial Secretary-treasurer of the Montana Restaurant and Bartender Union 457, Butte Montana; President of Montana State Council of Hotel and Restaurants; Montana Bartenders Council; President of the Silver Trades and Labor

Council for Butte Silver Bow; International Trustee for Local 746-Anaconda, 509-Anaconda, 806-Deer Lodge; and State Organizer of the State Restaurant Employees International Union, stated adamant opposition to SB 234. SB 234 would serve to rescind and set back the positive industrial gains of the 49 th and 50 th Legislative session. The Legislation would open the door and allow employers to use the hard earned employee tips and would subsidized employers' wage factors. In effect, the legislation creates a sub-wage for people who work for tips, who can least afford the wage decrease. The majority of these people are dependant on their hard earned tips in order to survive. According to studies, the average restaurant employee earns approximately $\$ 5,700$. The total amount earned leaves people living barely at the 1986 poverty level. "Tipped credit" would create further hardships, resulting in reduced purchasing power. The less money in workers' pockets means less money returning into the main stream economy. The downward financial spiral of financial stability would only serve to force these people, who are already clinging to the lowest economic bracket, to perhaps go on public assistance. We understand the employers may be motivated by the clamor for "tipped credit", but does this does not make the bill just. Especially, since many industry's employers are already reaping the financial rewards of government sponsored tax credits. Another financial reward is the usage of the employee trained fund, such as: on the job training, which subsidizes the employers up to six months.

The industry does not promise a 40 -hour work week. The idea cannot be considered as a basis for an income. The nature of the industry has proven any kind of tip is restricted and governed by factors produced by the employer The factors, such as time of day, shift assignment, hours, and physical handicaps and other uncontrolled circumstances. The tip proposal was overwhelmingly voted down by the 50 th Legislature. SB 234 will have a serious impact on the tipped employee's economic welfare. Many opponents were prevented from testifying due to inclement weather. Sullivan submitted approximately 10,000 signatures of people who petitioned against SB 234. Additional signatures are forthcoming. The legislation includes any employee who receives $\$ 30.00$ or more in tips each month. Beauticians and taxicab drivers will also be affected. The so-called "overpaid" employees are an asset to the business.

Secily Fascione, Missoula, Mt, Hotel Restaurant Union, stated petitions are forthcoming. The restaurant worker does not get a forty hour work week, a retirement pension plans, or a health insurance program. The hourly income and the tipped income is critical for all financial needs. Even as a advocated of the workers, a jump from $\$ 2.00$ to $\$ 3.35$ is
a significant labor cost. Fascione stated she tracked various restaurants who are still in business and found the menu prices have increased regardless of hourly wage. The union feels the businesses can carry on. In 1987 the average national annual wage for an restaurant worker is $\$ 5,700$. The amount was approximately the same as the national poverty level for a single person. Many people in the restaurant industry are not single people, but who are single, heads of households supporting their children on low wages.

Mary Balls submitted a signed petition from restaurants between Great Falls and Helena. Ms Balls stated these signatures represent small businesses that employ approximately two waitresses. Ms. Balls stated she works as a waitress. These people, according to Ms Balls, are \$3.35wage minimum people. Ms. Balls stated she could not raise her seven-year-old son on $\$ 2.01$ per hour. The customers are friends. They are given a personal touch because they are friends. The waitress is the hostess for the community. The waitresses do not receive health benefits or insurance programs. Waitresses work approximately 32 hour a week versus 40 hour weeks guaranteed at other kinds of employment. Ms. Balls stated she made $\$ 3,000$ in wages last year, and she worked for five and one half months.

Dennis Sullivan, Butte, Montana, stated, no doubt, the restaurant owners invest in the employee training. As a consumer, he returns to the restaurants where he is treated right. Being treated right is what tipping is all about. Mr. Sullivan urged the committee not to accept SB 234.

Elaine Bray, Great Falls, MT, stated definite support against SB 234. Ms. Bray stated she has worked in the restaurant business since she was a young girl. Later, she became secretary of the Local union and is now serving as president. Ms. Bray stated she has talked to hundreds of people in the last few day and has gathered 1,979 signatures from the Great Falls area. Ms. Bray submitted the signatures for the record.

Debbie Betterman, Butte, Montana, stated she works for a non-union restaurant and is a single parent raising two children on wages and tips. If the committee votes yes on SB 234, it will be impossible, according to Ms. Betterman, to raise the children as they should be raised.

Brenda Nordlund, Montana Women's Lobbyist, stated historically Woman's Lobbyists have opposed similar legislation, and the continue to do so at this time.

Virginia Jellison, Montana Low Income Coalition, stated opposition to SB 234. Ms Jellison stated if people's wages are reduced, these same people will end up on the welfare rolls. Ms. Jellison stated she finds it hard to believe the legislature is dealing with a bill such as SB 234 at the same time the legislature is dealing with welfare reform. Ms Jellison stated an increase in minimum wage is the answer to the problem, not a decrease.

Gene Fenderson, Montana State Building and Construction Trade Council, stated the Council is totally opposed to SB 234.

Nadine Jenson, Executive Directory of Montana State Council 9 and the American Federation of State Counties, stated opposition to SB 234. Ms Jenson stated she represents employees, she feels, who do not receive a fair wage. Ms Jenson stated, if tips help these people raise their standard of living, she is for the people and against SB 234.

Don Judge, Montana State AFL-CIO, Helena, MT, stated support opposition to SB 234. Mr. Judge submitted written testimony - (Exhibit 2)

There were no further opponents to SB 234.
Questions From Committee Members:
Senator Blaylock asked Sicily Fascione how many people in the restaurant industry work a forty hour week. Ms Fascione stated there are far more part time workers than full time employees. The number of employees changes according to the seasons. The senior employees may get forty hours a week during the summer months, but in the winter the senior employees share twenty-five to thirty-two hours a week. The additional part-time employees hired in the summer are terminated in the winter. Senator Blaylock asked if the forty hour per week senior employees are receiving health insurance and other benefits. Ms Fascione stated the benefits varies restaurant to restaurant. Very few restaurants provide health insurance benefits to their employees. Employees must work at least twenty-five hours a week year round to qualify for any employer contribution to health insurance policies. Ms. Fascione stated fewer than twenty-five percent of the people she represents have health insurance coverage.

Senator Pipinich asked how many signatures were presented to the committee. Ms Fascione stated she has over five thousands signatures. Senator Pipinich stated the complete
total is approximately ten thousands signatures against SB 234. The signatures are from restaurant patrons.

Senator Hofman asked Ms Fascione about the average wage per year. Ms Fascione stated the Montana Department of Labor's figures for 1987 list 22,000 employees in the restaurant and bar industry. The average income is $\$ 5,709$. The average number of hours worked is thirty-one hours. The \$5,709 figure, according to Fascione, does not reflect tips.

Senator Hofman asked if most people tip $5 \%$, $10 \%$, or $15 \%$ of the meal cost. Ms Fascione stated it is very rare to receive a $15 \%$ tip. Most people tip approximately $10 \%$ because it is easy to figure. Many people leave the change they receive after paying the bill. The federal government mandates the restaurants allocates $8 \%$ of the gross sales. The Internal Revenue declares the restaurant employees figure at eight percent. The Internal Revenue is considering a ten percent figure may be more accurate.

Senator Hofman asked Lauri Shadoan about her statement when she said she paid a high wage. Lauri said she paid her employees up to $\$ 8.00$, and the her waitresses could make more than $\$ 8.00$ per hour. Ms. Shadoan stated the committee must understand how the percent is effected. Ms Shadoan explained the procedure. The total of the tip figure and the $8 \%$ of total gross sales is considered the total tip amount. The $\$ 6.60$ a hour comes from the federal allocated tip figure. The federal government says the employee makes $\$ 6.60$ per hour, and unless the employee can prove differently, the employee has to pay taxes on the $\$ 6.60$ amount. The restaurant can handle the allocated tip figure in two ways. It is handled on an hourly basis or it is handled by the actual dollar income made per person. The employer is caught in between federal and state wage regulations.

Senator Manning asked what were the average hours a restaurant employee worked per week in the Butte area. The average is 30 hours per week. The Great Falls employee works approximately 25 hours. Based on $\$ 2.01$ an hour, the weekly rate is approximately $\$ 240.00$ per week. The average tip is approximately $\$ 10.00$ per week.

Senator Lynch asked Ms Shadoan what she pays her employees per hour without tips. Ms Shadoan replied the wage is between $\$ 3.35$ and $\$ 4.50$, depending on seniority.

Senator Keating asked Ms Shadoan if SB 234 is passed, will she also reduce the employee's wages by $\$ 2.00$ per hour or by $\$ 1.34$ per hour. Ms Shadoan said no. The reason why the issue is coming up is because $H B 28$ is on the floor of the

House. HB 28 will increase the minimum wage. HB 28 says the minimum wage is set to come in at $\$ 4.35$ per hour or at $\$ 4.25$ per hour. Without tipped credit, it is difficult to pay the $\$ 4.35$ or the $\$ 4.25$ wage. Ms Shadoan stated she does not have a problem with a bill that says an attached wage will remain at $\$ 3.35$. Ms. Shadoan said she is concerned where the state will go with the minimum wage, but without tipped credit.

Senator Keating stated he is concerned about the $\$ .12$ amount taken out of the tipped dollar. Senator Keating asked if that is the tax against employers. The waiter gets the dollar, and the employer pays $\$ .12$ for social security, unemployment compensation, and workers' compensation premiums. The only thing exempt from the tipped income is the state income tax. The businesses pay federal unemployment compensation and federal social security. Senator Keating stated the Legislature could exempt the tax on Workers Comp premium in regards to the tip. Senator Keating wondered what kind of impact this action would cause.

Senator Nathe asked what determines the hourly tip. The tip is determined by the wage on a bi-monthly pay period. The more the employee claims, the more the employer claims. The amount is an arbitrary figure, and it should work for both the employee and the employer. Sometimes it is hard for the employee to come up with the $\$ 400$ at the end of the year.

Senator Keating asked Debbie Betterman what she made an hour. Ms Betterman stated she makes $\$ 4.26--m i n i m u m$ wage for 24 years of service. Ms. Betterman said she works 19 hours a week. Yesterday, Ms Betterman stated she worked 11:00 to 3:00 p.m. and made $\$ 8.40$ in tips. On Sunday, Ms Betterman worked 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. and cleared \$27.00 in tips. The amount of the tips are different each day for various reasons.

Senator Keating asked if the employer paid Ms Betterman $\$ 4.26$ per hour because of her seniority or because of the amount of tips she received. Ms Betterman stated the reason is seniority. Ms Betterman stated she makes approximately $\$ 6.00$ per hour, and if SB 234 passes, she will make approximately $\$ 4.00$ per hour.

## Closing by Sponsor:

Senator Boylan stated the employers know they have to have good employee in order to stay in business. SB 234 is not out to hit the wage earners. Labor and management has to get together so they don't "break the sled" that is providing the employment. Both sides must protect the
another. People are eating out more and more. The fast food people are going to take over the market because of the size, business savvy, and tax understanding. The basic issue is: Taxes have to be paid on the estimated employee wage.

## EXECUTIVE ACTION

## DISPOSITION ON SENATE BILL 70

## Amendments and Votes:

Senator Aklestad stated SB 70 has a Statement of Intent.
Tom Gomez explained the section 13 of the bill provides the Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services authority to adopt rules and implement the Job Search and Training Program for recipients of the AFDC Program. The intent of the legislation is to establish the program consistent with the provisions of the federal law. This will help insure AFDC recipients education for employment and prevent long term welfare participation. The statement of intent indicates the program will be mandatory. In the 1990 Biennium beginning July l, 1990, the program should include enrollment of at least $7 \%$ of all recipients of aid to families with dependent children who are not exempt from participation under section six. The statement of intent outlines the area the department should consider in adopting rules. Rules will include policy for determining participation in the program, services, the delivery of the services, and the fair hearing. The Legislature expressly intends the department will comply with federal requirements and adopt such methods of administration necessary to obtain the maximum amount of federal funds possible.

Senator Devlin moved the statement of intent. The motion passed unanimously.

Tom Gomez explained the SRS amendment. The amendment makes clear the department will provide the necessary child care assistance in line with the federal format to any persons who loses AFDC eligibility as a result of the federal earned income disregards. The amendment provides for a specific effective date of April 1, 1990 to correspond to the mandatory requirement. The department will provide necessary child care to the people who need transitional child care assistance.

The motion carried.
Tom Gomez explained the Aklestad Amendment. The governor will guarantee the program's activities are coordinated with programs administered under the Federal Job Training

Partnership Act, or any other relevant employment, training, education, or work program in Montana. The governor may consolidate the program established in section 3 with other programs to maximize program activity coordination as required in subsection one.

Senator Sam Hofman moved the amendment. The motion passed unanimously.

Senator Lynch explained the Lynch Amendment. Section six will add: "If child care is not available, the parent or other relative who is personally providing care of a child under six year of age is exempt from participation in the program." In some areas, child care is simply not available.

Lee Tickell stated the federal mandate addresses a concern where the state is required to guarantee child care. If the child care is not guaranteed, the client cannot be held accountable for not find a job. Previously, the federal mandate indicated a person could be exempt if they had children under six years of age. The federal statute says the only people who could be exempt are mothers with children under three years of age. The age requirement may go down to one year old.

Tickell said the federal mandates says that any person who has a child under three may be exempt from going to work. But if the child is between three and six years of age, the client is not exempt from going to work.

Senator Lynch asked if a mother can be exempt if the child is three years old, plus one day. Tickell stated the state has to guarantee the child care. No, the three years old and one day old child cannot be exempt, unless the availability of the child care is virtually impossible. The concern is already taken care of in current statute.

Senator Lynch asked Ms Jellison to respond. Ms Jellison stated she asked Senator Lynch to submit the amendment to clarify what the Legislature's intent is concerning the child care issue. The current law allows the administrative branch to change the ruling from three to one years of age. Ms Jellison stated the coalition would prefer the age to be three, rather then one. Families with young families should not be forced into work training unless child care is provided.

Lee Tickell stated the best way to address long term poverty is to intercede early and preventing a pattern of staying at home for six years.

Senator Keating asked who determines the administrative rules adopted by the department. Tickell replied the determination will be up to the department, as it goes through the formal rule making process. The department will follow the direction of the legislation.

Senator Nathe asked what happens if the rules are adopted, but there is opposition. Tickell stated the rules would be adopted, unless the Administrative Code Committee intercedes.
Senator Lynch stated the intent is the three years and under age group is provided an exemption, while the three to six age group will be provided child care.

Senator Aklestad stated the amendments will stay attached.

## ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment At: The meeting was adjourned at 2:58 P.M.
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## ROLL CALL

## LABOR COMMITTEE

51st LEGISLATIVE SESSION

DATE:


| N | PRESENT | ABSENT | EXCUSED |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SENATOR TOM SEATING | $X$ |  |  |
| SENATOR SAM HOFMAN | $X$ |  |  |
| SENATOR J.D. LYNCH | $X$ |  |  |
| SENATOR GERRY DEVIN | $x$ |  |  |
| SENATOR BOB PIPIMICH | $x$ |  |  |
| SENATOR DENNIS NATHE | $x$ |  |  |
| SENATOR RICHARD MANNING | $x$ |  |  |
| SENATOR GARY AKLESTAD | $X$ |  |  |

MR. PRESIDENT:
We, your commitee on Labor and Fmploynent Helations, baving tad under considesation $S B 70$ (first reading copy -- white), respectfully report that $S B 70$ be amended and as so amended do paes:

1. Title, line 12.

Following: "EMPLOYHENT;"
Insert: "TO REgUIRE NECESSARY CHILD CARE ASSJSTANCE;"
2. Páge 1, line 16.

Following: line 15
Ingert, "

## sTATEHENT OP INTENT

A statement of intent is requised for the bjll becaure [eection 14 ] grants the department of social and rehabiljtation services authority to adopt rules neceseary to inplement the provisions of this bill.

It is the intent of the legielature that the department establish a program, conejstent with the provisiong of the federal Fanily Eupport Act of 1988 , to assure that recipiente of add to fanilies with dependent children obtaln the education, training, and employment nefded to avoid long-teru dependency on velfare. The progran should be a mandatory program and, in the biemmiun beginnirg July 1,1990 , should include enrollment of at least 7 s of all recipjents of aid to faniliee with dependent children who are mot exempt fromparticipation under [eection 6].

In establishing theprogram, the departmebt shogld adopt rules. tor:
(1) deterifining participation in the program;
(2) roviding servjes ant activities to jugsth participants;
(3) determining eligibility for child care assistance under Isection 9];
(4) selecting providers of services and activities under the program;
(5) evaluating the performance and effectiveness of the program;
(6) imposing sanctions as provided in [section 10]; and
(7) resolving disputes involving an individuale partictpation in the program,

The legislature expressly intends that the department comply with federal requirements and adopt such methods of administration as may be necessary to obtadn federal funds for the program 1 h the mazimum anourt possible."
3. Fage 7, line 1.

Following: "assistance."
Strike: "The"
Insert: "In accordance with sections 301 and 302 of the federal Family support Act of 1988 [42 U.S.C. $602(\mathrm{~g})]$, the"
4. Page 7, lines 2 through 4.

Following: "assistance" on line 2
Staike: remainder of lines 2 through "for" on line a
Insert: "to: (a)"
5. Page 7, Jine 5.

Following: "Isection 3)"
Infert: "; and
(b) any individual whose fanily has ceased to recesve aid to familes with dependent children as result of increaied houre ox income from employment or because of loss of federally frescribed earned income disregards"
6. Page 7, line 11.

Following: line 10
Insert: "NEW SECTION. Section 11. Coordination sequinement: .. consolidation of lrograne authorized. (1) The governor shall assure that program activities under [this act] are coordinated with programs adminiftexed under the federal gob Trabntrag Iartrenshif het and any ofhes relevant meloyment, tiajning, education, or work progras in this state.
(2) The governor may consolidate the program estallished in [section 3] with other programs in order to maximize coordination of program activities as required in subsection (1) and to fievent. overlapping and duplication of services." Renumber: subsequent sections
7. Page 10, line 16.

Following: "through"
Insert: "8, 10,"

```
8. Page 10, lime 17.
Fol10wIng: "12,"
Insert: "13."
Strike: "14"
Insert: "15"
Strike: *15*
Inser"t: "16"
```

9. Fage 10, 1ine 18.

Following: line 17
Insert: " (2) [Section 9) is effective April 1. 1990."
Renumber: cubsequent eubsection
10. Page 10, Jine 18.

Strike: "Section 13"
Ineert: "Sections 11, 14,"

AND AS AMBNDED DO PASS
Signed: $\qquad$
Statement of Intent adopted.

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY!

waws: Leer Stackup Date: tan 311985 adDress: 1735 went Missoula Mt
pHoNe: 7212.895
representing whom:Moutana Restancent Association appearing on which proposal: $5 B 234$ DO YOU: SUPPORT? $\qquad$ X AMEND? $\qquad$ OPPOSE? $\qquad$
comments: See exhibit / A
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$


What is the tip credit?

When Congress brought the food service industry under the Fair Labor Standards Act in 1967, it recognized that restaurant employees often receive a substantial portion of their income in tips. It created what is known as the tip credit, which allows an employer to apply a portion of an employee's tip income against the employer's obligation to pay the minimum wage.

Existing national law allows an employer to take a tip credit up to 40 percent of the minimum wage. This means that employers may pay their tipped employees $\$ 2.01$ an hour in cash wages and take a tip credit of $\$ 1.34$ an hour ( 40 percent of \$3.35).

Safeguards in the law insure that tipped employees earn at least the minimum wage. To protect tipped employees, the law provides that a tip credit cannot reduce an employee's wages below the required minimum wage. In other words, a tip credit can never exceed tips actually received by an employee. In addition, the credit must be clearly shown on payroll records, and it cannot be used at all unless its application and limitations are first explained to the employee.

Changes to tax law in the 98 th and 100 th Congresses reversed a long-standing policy that employee tips (in excess of the tip credit) are not remuneration for employer payroll tax purposes.

Until enactment of the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984 , tips had not been considered wages for FUTA (unemployment compensation) tax purposes. The 1984 tax act defined all tips wage "wages" for FUTA purposes, thus subjecting employers, for first time, to FUTA liability on income their employees had received not from them, but from customers.

The Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1987 extended this same rationale--that tips should be considered wages for payroll tax purposes--to FICA (Social Security) taxes. With enactment of the 1987 act, employers were required to pay FICA taxes on all reported tips, although before then they had only paid FICA on tips "deemed as wages" (tip credit).

As a result of these changes, the Internal Revenue Code now treats tips as if they were wages paid by the employer, while tips are not counted as wages under Montana law.


Employers contribute significantly to the production of tip income. Tips are earned on the premises of the employer, using the employer's equipment and serving food bought and prepared under their supervision. The employer determines the general atmosphere, price of meals and the quality and presentation of food; factors that contribute directly to the level of tip income received by employees. Employers should be given "credit" for their part in providing an environment conducive to tipping. Tips are part of the employee's total compensation and are so recognized by the national government.

The tax acts of 1984 and 1987 requires employers to pay unemployment and the employer share of Social Security payroll taxes on tip income, making tips wages for the purposes of FUTA and FICA payroll taxes. In addition the employer pays workers' compensation payment on tips.

The Fair Labor Standards Act, under Federal law, allows tip crediting. At this time only 8 other states do not allow tip crediting. Fairness would dictate Montana restaurants should be treated similarly to businesses in other states.

## LABOR AND EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMITTEE SENATOR GARY AKLESTAD, CHAIRMAN

Chairman Aklestad and members of the Labor and Employment Relations Committee;

Thank you for giving me this opportunity to testify in favor of SB 234, defining tipped employees. My name is Laurie Shadoan. I am owner of two restaurants in Bozeman, the Bacchus Pub and Rocky Mountain Pasta Co. I employ 74 people, of which $50 \%$ are tipped employees.

I feel compelled to explain in detail what a tip credit is. When Congress brought the foodservice industry under the Fair Labor Standards Act in 1967, it recognized that restaurant employees often receive a substantial portion of their income in tips. It created what is known as an employee's tip credit. This credit allows an employer to apply a portion of an employee's tip income against the employer's obligation to pay the minimum wage. The existing Federal Law allows an employer to take a tip credit up to $40 \%$ of the minimum wage. This means that the Federal Law allows employers to pay their tipped employees $\$ 2.01$ per hour in cash wages and take a tip credit of $\$ 1.34$ per hour ( $40 \%$ of $\$ 3.35$ ). Federal Law has safeguards insuring that all tipped employees earn at least minimum wage.

Federal Law also passed in 1987 a law declaring that all tipped employees must claim $8 \%$ of their employer's gross income. With this addition it requires employees and employers to pay taxes on these tips. In my two restaurants the tipped employees claim for tax purposes $\$ 5.10$ and $\$ 6.60$ per hour, cash wage plus tip allocation. This figure does not represent the total income for tipped employees. I have tried several times to promote into management a tipped employee. My starting rate for floor supervisors is $\$ 8.00$ per hour. These tipped employees are clearing well above the $\$ 8.00$ per hour. I can not compete with the tipped employee.

Statistics indicate that there are currently 40 states with a tip credit (either state or federal). Montana currently has the sixth (6th) highest minimum wage for tipped employees. With the current legislation in the House (HB28) , Montana would move into fifth (Fth) highest state. With the proposed increase to $\$ 4.00$ per hour in 1990, Montana would become the second (and) highest state in the nation, only behind California! You can not change the way the industry operates by ignoring that tipped employees exist.

I believe that Senate Bill 234 is written with the safeguards that should be in a bill of this nature. The definition of a "tipped employee" means any person who regularly and continuously receives $\$ 30.00$ or more a month in tips, is a financial safeguard. Federal law currently defines a "tipped employee" as a person who regularly and continuously receives $\$ 20.00$ or more a month in tips.

I have copies for each one of you in regard to the Federal and State Wage and Hour laws, and the statistics which I quoted. I urge your committee to give SB234 a "DO PASS" report.


RANKING BY STATE OF MINIMUM CASH WAGE PLUS TIP CREDIT (BEGINNING WITH THE HIGHEST STATES)
CALIFORNIA ..... 4.25ALASKAMINNESOTAWASHINGTONMONTANA3.853.853.85
HAWAII ..... 3.65
NEVADA ..... 3.353.35
OREGON
CONNECTICUT ..... 3.27
GEORGIA ..... 3.25
N. DAKOTA ..... 2.80
W. VIRGINIA ..... 2.68
VIRGINIA ..... 2.65*
RHODE ISLAND ..... 2.60
MICHIGAN ..... 2.51
MASSACHUSETTS ..... 2.50
S. DAKOTA ..... 2.34
IDAHO ..... 2.30
NEW YORK ..... 2.30
VERMONT ..... 2.25
DELAWARE ..... 2.23
PENNSYLVANIA ..... 2.22
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ..... 2.15
UTAH ..... 2.06
ALABAMA ..... 2.01
ARIZONA ..... 2.01
FLORIDA ..... 2.01
ILLINOIS ..... 2.01
IOWA ..... 2.01
LOUISIANNA ..... 2.01
MAINE ..... 2.01


States that have tip credit and the amount of the tip credit.

Arkansas
Colorado
Connecticut
Delaware
District of Columbia
Hawaii
Illinois
Kansas
Kentucky
Maine
Maryland
Massachusets
Michigan
Nebraska
New Hampshire
New Jersey
New Mexico
New York
N. Carolina

Ohio
Oklahoma
Pennsylvania
Rhode Island
S. Dakota

Texas
Utah
Vermont
Virginia
W. Virginia

Wisconsin
Wyoming
$50 \%$ credit
$40 \%$ credit
$23 \%$ credit
$331 / 3 \%$ credit
2.60 per hour
.20 per hour
$40 \%$ credit
$40 \%$ credit
$50 \%$ credit
1.74 per hour

40\% credit
$40 \%$ credit
$25 \%$ credit
1.34 per hour
$50 \%$ credit
1.34 per hour
1.34 per hour
1.05 per hour
$50 \%$ credit
$50 \%$ credit
$50 \%$ credit
45\% credit
$35 \%$ credit
$30 \%$ credit
$50 \%$ credit
$25 \%$ credit
$40 \%$ credit
Amount to be determined by employer $20 \%$ credit
1.74 per hour
$50 \%$ credit

States with NO tip credit.
Alaska3.85
California ..... 4.25
Georgia ..... 3.25
Idaho ..... 2.30
Indiana ..... 2.00
Minnesota ..... 3.85
Montana ..... 3.35
Nevada ..... 3.35
N. Dakota ..... 2.80
Oregon ..... 3.35
Washington ..... 3.85

States with no state minimum wage.
Alabama
Arizona
Florida
Iowa
Louisiana
Mississippi
Missouri
S. Carolina

Tennessee
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| \％ |  |  | BILL NO． | $\square \quad \frac{\mathrm{S}}{\square}$ | \％ | 緉 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| （equ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 空 |
|  |  |  |  | 管 |  |  |
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10. Also exempts persons under 18 who are not high school or vocational all employees must be pard the full minimum wage. In Ohio, this notice nee
not appear on menus in restaurants covered by the FLSA. bulletin board or sign. It patrons are nol furnished with the required notice. printed on a separate card that is limmy attached io
restaurant does not use individual menus, the notice must be posted on the
of the same on a sepparate card that is turmly attached to the menu. Where the tips." This notice must be printed in a separate box on the menu in lettering

 All restaurants and other foodservice operations which pay tipped employees
less than the minimum wage, that is, they take a lip credit, must furnish to

Titte Vill of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.
chalienged, such laws are usually found invalid Decause they contlict with by a dishonest or willful act or by an employee's negligence. 7. Deductions are allowed only when it can be shown that the loss was caused
 maintain such unitorms. 4. Tips may not be included in computing wages - no crednl allowed. The law allows a credit tor the reasonable cost to the employer of meals
furnished to employees. The credil may not niclude a profil. least/more than $\$ 20$ a month in tips.
2. A tipped employee is detined as customarily and regularly receiving at


## addendum to wage and hour chart



## California

As of October 31, 1988, there is no longer a separate minimum wage for tipped employees in the state of California. Tipped employees, like other employees in the state, must now be paid $\$ 4.25$ per hour. The California Supreme Court has ruled unconstitutional a July 1988 Industrial Wage Commission decision to allow a two-tiered minimum wage based on the amount of an employee's tips. The court's ruling is retroactive to July 1 , 1988, and all employees must be paid back wages by January 1 , 1989. Interest and penalties accrue beyond that date.

## Maine

On January 1,1989 , the minimum wage in Maine rose from $\$ 3.65$ per hour to $\$ 3.75$. The tip credit increased by a like amount, from $\$ 1.64$ to $\$ 1.74$.

## Pennsylvania

Effective February 1, 1989, the minimum wage in Pennsylvania increased from $\$ 3.35$ to $\$ 3.70$ per hour for all employers. The tip credit rose from $40 \%$ to $45 \%$.

## Vermont

Effective January 1, 1989, the Vermont minimum wage increased from its 1988 level of $\$ 3.65$ per hour to $\$ 3.75$. The wage will continue to increase by no less than 10 cents a year, until it reaches $\$ 3.95$. Additionally, increases in the wage are tied to the federal minimum wage, so that the Vermont minimum wage will rise by the same amount as any future rises in the federal wage. Vermont's tip credit remains at 40 percent.

## Washington

On January 1, 1989, the state of Washington raised its minimum wage from $\$ 2.30$ per hour to $\$ 3.85$. On January 1,1990 , the wage will go to $\$ 4.25$. There are no provisions for a tip credit.

JAMES W. MURRY
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

110 WEST 13TH STREET
P.O. BOX 1176

HELENA, MONTANA 59624

Testimony of Don Judge on Senate Bill 234 before the Senate Labor and Employment Relations Committee, January 31, 1989

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, for the record my name is Don Judge and I'm representing the Montana State AFL-CIO in strong opposition to Senate Bill 234.

As has already been made very clear here today, SB 234 would allow employers to withhold paying up to 40 percent of our state's minimum wage to those employees who receive tips, or gratuities, from their customers. This change would establish a new basic minimum wage of $\$ 2.01$ per hour for such workers based on a 40 percent reduction of our current minimum wage of $\$ 3.35$ per hour. The caveat, of course, is that the employees must receive at least enough tips to raise the new basic back to the $\$ 3.35$ per hour.

Think about the effects of Senate Bill 234 for just a minute: Should this bill pass, a worker who earns up to $\$ 4.69$ per hour with the wages and tips combined could suffer a wage cut of up to 28.6 percent, or a loss of as much as $\$ 1.34$ per hour! We've heard and read extensively about how the incomes of so many Montanans rank at or near the bottom of national scales. And yet we are here discussing a bill that would take the lowest of the low paid and push them down even further -- and not by just a few points, but by as much as 28.6 percent.

Look at what that means for the employee. With a 1987 average annual wage of $\$ 5,709$ for employees of eating and drinking establishments, a 28.6 percent pay cut equals about $\$ 1,632$. That pushes their annual wage down to about 42 percent of the poverty level for a standard family of three ( $\$ 9,690$ for 1987).

With an approximate 29,000 potential tipped employees in the state, the total wage loss related to this bill could reach $\$ 38,860$ per hour. Think about the effects of that multiplied annually in lost consumer spending. With an average workweek of approximately 31 hours for workers in the affected industries, the potential annual loss could equal as much as $\$ 62.6$ million! That's money taken from workers' paychecks and off of Main Street.

And think about another potential impact: untold millions of dollars more in requests for general assistance from people who have been pushed so deep into poverty that they can work full time and still qualify for welfare. This proposal comes at a time when the Legislature is trying to find ways to move people onto the job rolls and off of the welfare rolls.

Testimony of Don Judge
Senate Bill 234
Page Two
January 31, 1989

People who work for minimum wage plus tips don't plan their futures based on tips; they plan based on their real wages. Tips can fluctuate with the season, with the weather, with the day, with the menu. Planning for college, for home-buying, for car-buying, all depends on the base wages paid. And I submit to you that people paid a wage of $\$ 2.01$ an hour don't plan to buy new cars, don't build new houses and don't send their children off to college. And, they don't pay taxes.

This is a terribly punitive bill that cuts the very heart out of the already meager income of some of the lowest paid workers in our state. A bill in the last session of the Legislature to officially declare that tips are not wages passed the House and the Senate unanimously. We hope that the same unanimity can be applied to votes against this terribly punitive measure. We urge you to give SB 234 a resounding "do not pass" recommendation.

Thank you.

## HOTEL and RESTAURANT EMPLOYEES and BARTENDERS

LOCAL NO. 312
AfL \& Clo
(im
PHONE (406) 755-5279
BOX 144
KALISPELL, MONTANA 59901
February 6, 1989

Senator Gary Aklestad
Capitol Station
Helena, Mt. 59620

DEar Senator Aklestad:
Enclosed are more petitions concerning the Tip Credit bill.
We ask for your support in defeating this bill. We are already at the poverty level. Thanking you in advance, $I$ remain


We, the undersigned, as employees in Great Falls, oppose efforts by the Montana Restaurant Association to pressure the State Legislature to adopt Tip Credit provision. We oppose a tip credit law because it would legally allow Montana Businesses to fix their Tipped Employees as little as $\$ 2.00$ hourly. We live on our tips and wages and believe any attempts to decrease our hourly wage through tip credit are invalid.

DiNe hundred three pages of signed petitions here subuitied frow the great falls areal. the originals are stored at the historical society.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { SB } 284 \\
& 1-31-89
\end{aligned}
$$

We, the undersigned, as friends and $1: 1: 1$ hers of tipped employees, as restaurant patrons, and as individuals concerned about the Montana economy, oppose efforts by the Montana Restaurant Association to pressure the state legislature to adopt a tip credit petition. We oppose the tip credtt proposal because it would legally allow Montana businesses to pay their tipped employees as little as $\$ 2.00$ hourly. We believe tipped employees deserve a decent wage and we view a tip credit provision as unfair to Missoula's wage earners working for tips.


ADDRESS
PHONE
WORIPPLACE
tueity-orfe pages uf sigined petitions were subimited froh the kalispell area. the originals are stored at the historical society.
$\qquad$ BILL $\qquad$

A statement of intent is required for this bill because [section 13] grants the department of social and rehabilitation services authority to adopt rules necessary to implement the provisions of this bill.

It is the intent of the legislature that the department establish a program, consistent with the provisions of the federal Family Support Act of 1988, to assure that recipients of aid to families with dependent children obtain the education, training, and employment needed to avoid long-term dependency on welfare. The program should be a mandatory program and, in the biennium beginning July 1,1990 , should include enrollment of at least $7 \%$ of all recipients of aid to families with dependent children who are not exempt from participation under [section 6].

In establishing the program, the department should adopt rules for:
(1) determining participation in the program;
(2) providing services and activities to program participants;
(3) determining eligibility for child care assistance under [section 9];
(4) selecting providers of services and activities under the program;
> (5) evaluating the performance and effectiveness of the program
(6) imposing sanctions as provided in [section 10]; and
(7) resolving disputes involving an individual's participation in the program.

## $5 B 70$ <br> 1-31-89

The legislature expressly intends that the department comply with federal requirements and adopt such methods of administration as may be necessary to obtain federal funds for the program in the maximum amount possible.
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SB 70
Amendments to Senate Bill No. 70 First Reading Copy
Requested by Senator Gary Aklestad For the Senate Committee on Labor and Employment Relations
Prepared by Tom Gomez, Staff Researcher January 24, 1989

1. Page 7, line ll. Following: line 10
Insert: "Section ll. Coordination requirements -- consolidation of programs authorized. (l) The governor shall assure that program activities under [this act] are coordinated with programs administered under the federal Job Training Partnership Act and any other relevant employment, training, education, or work program in this state.
(2) The governor may consolidate the program established in [section 3] with other programs in order to maximize coordination of program activities as required in subsection (1) and to prevent overlapping and duplication of services."
Renumber: subsequent sections
2. Page 10 , line 17.
Strike: "12"
Insert: "10, 13"
Strike: "lu"
Insert: "15"
Strike: "15"
Insert: "16"
3. Page 10, line 18.
Strike: "Section 13"
Insert: "Sections 11 and 14"


AMENDMENT TO S.B. 70
SECTION 6. Exemptions. lines 19-22, (l) (c)
Replace comma after "...3 years of age..." with a period and delete "...except as otherwise provided in administrative rules adopted by the department."

Add: "If child care is not available, the parent or other relative who is personally providing care of a child under 6 years of age is exempt from participation in the program."

Amendments to Senate Bill No. 70 First Reading Copy

Requested by the Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services For the Senate Committee on Labor and Employment Relations

## Prepared by Tom Gomez, Staff Researcher January 31, 1989

1. Title, line 12.

Following: "EMPLOYMENT;"
Insert: "TO REQUIRE NECESSARY CHILD CARE ASSISTANCE;"
2. Page 7, line 1.

Following: "."
Strike: "The"
Insert: "In accordance with sections 301 and 302 of the federal
Family Support Act of 1988 [42 U.S.C. 602(g)], the"
3. Page 7, lines 2 through 4.

Following: "assistance" on line 2
Strike: remainder of lines 2 through "for" on line 4
Insert: to: (a)
4. Page 7, line 5.

Following: "[section 3]"
Insert: "; and
(b) any individual whose family has ceased to receive aid to families with dependent children as a result of increased hours or income from employment or because of loss of federally prescribed earned income disregards"
5. Page 10 , line 16.

Following: "through"
Insert: "8, 10 through"
6. Page 10, line 18.

Following: line 17
Insert: "(2) [Section 9] is effective April 1, 1990."
Renumber: subsequent subsection

Requested by Representative John Cobb
For the Senate Committee on Labor and Employment Relations
Prepared by Tom Gomez, Staff Researcher
February l, 1989

1. Page 7, line ll.

Following: line 10
Insert: "NEW SECTION. Section ll. Performance standards -monitoring and evaluation of program. (l) In addition to standards of performance established pursuant to section 487 of the federal Family Support Act of 1988 [42 U.S.C. 687], the department shall provide standards to further measure the performance and effectiveness of the program. Such standards must consist of an objective, quantifiable measure of the extent to which participation in the program increases the employment and earnings of participants and decreases their dependency on public assistance.
(2) In order to determine whether performance standards are met, the department shall monitor and evaluate the program on the basis of appropriate factors that must include the following:
(a) placement of participants in unsubsidized employment;
(b) retention of participants in unsubsidized employment;
(c) the increase in earnings, including hourly wages, of participants due to placement in unsubsidized employment;
(d) reduction in the number of individuals and families receiving aid to families with dependent children; and
(e) the amount of reductions in payments for aid to families with dependent children.
(3) In monitoring and evaluating the performance of the program, the department shall determine the reasons for high and low levels of performance, administrative efficiencies, and program coordination."
Renumber: subsequent sections
2. Page 10 , line 10.

Following: line 9
Insert: "NEW SECTION. Section 16. Audit required. The legislative auditor shall conduct a performance audit of the program established in [section 3] and report the results of the audit to the 5 2nd legislature."
Renumber: subsequent sections
3. Page ìp, line 17.
4. Page 10, line 18 .

Strike: $13^{\prime \prime}$
Insert: "14"
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