

SENATOR VRTISKA: When it say at no cost to the individual, I was just curious who is the cost then assigned to?

SENATOR HALL: The cost in this case, Senator Vrtiska, I believe is going to be borne by the department. If you go down to the bottom of line 4, excuse me, the bottom of...the new language on page 4, it would be lines 19 through 20. Actually go up a little farther, you're on the green copy, go up to line 17. And it says the Federal Social Security Act, in other words, it talks about the Section 301-J1 of the federal Social Security Act and says, unless the commissioner determines that, and then you've got the colon and you've got sub(a) and it says, the individual has completed such services, semicolon, or sub(b), it reads, there is justifiable cause for the claimant's failure to participate in such services. That catchall phrase there would be the out, if you will. It would be the ability for the commissioner to say, you don't have to go through these services. In other words, we don't have the funds to provide the service or they're not available at the local level possibly through one of the voc tech schools, I guess they're community colleges now, excuse me. But that's where I see the ability for the department to keep from having to provide these services. As I understand it, I don't mean to be using up your time, and I was trying to respond as best I can to your question, there won't be as many people that will be required to go through this type of a reemployment service as I thought, depending on how those profiles are established. So it probably will be limited at best. The intent is to not have the individual who is receiving the unemployment have to then pay out of their pocket in order to receive it for employment services. I would not see this as being a cost that should be borne by the former employer. You have to understand that this individual is without employment at the time that they've applied and been approved. So it should not be a cost to the employee, the individual who is applying or to anyone else. If this is something that is being dictated to us by the federal government that we have to abide by, then it ought to be a cost that the state bears or finds some subdivision or some group or party who is willing to provide that service. I don't want it to be borne by either the individual who is the claimant or the employer and I don't see any way at all that the department could push it back onto the former employer.

SENATOR VRTISKA: Okay, thank you. I appreciate your