

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chairman Banner
Vice Chairman Thompson
Mrs. Cafferata
Ms. Foley
Mr. Bennett
Mr. Jeffrey
Mr. Rackley
Mr. Rhoads

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Mr. Hickey

GUESTS PRESENT:

See guest list attached.

WITNESSES TESTIFYING:

Norman Anthonisen, Summa Corporation
William R. Gibbens, Gibbens Co., Inc.
Lawrence McCracken, Executive Director, Nevada Employment Security
Harold Dayton, Nevada Retail Association
John D. Taylor, MGM Grand Hotel, Las Vegas
Carole Vilardo, Citizens for Private Enterprise - South
Chuck King, Central Telephone
Fred Davis, Reno/Sparks Chamber of Commerce
Claude Evans, Executive Secretary-Treasurer Nevada AFL-CIO
Stan Jones, Northern Nevada Central Labor Council
Walt Henderson, Labor Management Laborers Local 169
John McGill, United Steel Workers, AFL-CIO
Roland Christensen, Plasterers & Cement Mason's Local 241
Frank Byrne, Northern Nevada Building Trades
Harold Knudson, Sheetmetal Workers, Northern Nevada
Robert Long, Insurance Administrator, Employment Security Department

Chairman Banner called the meeting to order at 5:05 P. M. and announced to the committee that this hearing is on AB-136.

AB-136: Places restrictions on payment of compensation for unemployment.

Chairman Banner opened the discussion by explaining that this bill is concerned with two parts. The primary part is encompassed in Senate Bill 240* and other bills will be following dealing with a one week waiting period when a claim is submitted for unemployment compensation. Another portion of the bill concerns benefits affecting pension or retirement allowance.

Norman Anthonisen, Summa Corporation addressed the one week waiting period and what is commonly referred to as double dipping. He explained this term applied to the practice of drawing retirement or unemployment type funds from two sources. Nevada is one of the few states without a one week waiting period before employees are entitled to draw unemployment compensation. Due to a recent law passed by the Federal Government, federal funds will be lost in the event Nevada does not institute a one week waiting period and goes into extended benefit period. This bill has been recommended by the Employment Security Advisory Council.

Concerning pensions, according to a recent law this becomes a conformity issue where the State of Nevada is out of conformity with federal requirements. This means that all the employers in the state would have to pay double premiums in the event this particular item concerning pensions was not passed. The third part of the bill, Worker's Compensation, employers are already paying for individuals to draw workman's compensation. There are situations where people draw this and unemployment compensation simultaneously. This is unfair to the employer who is required to fund both programs. The employee is drawing a double benefit.

Bill Gibbons, Gibbons Company, representing employers in unemployment compensation matter, said lines 32, 33, and 34 of page 2, AB-136 contain the current provision with respect to retirements and show clearly the problem. Those lines which read, "Any wages which are paid for employment immediately preceding retirement shall not be included as wages in determining the total wages paid during a claimants base period", should be removed from the law because they are too severe. Retirees, under this law, are totally disqualified because they lose their wage credits if they work for their last employer for $1\frac{1}{2}$ years. The amount that a person can qualify for in unemployment benefits is based upon wages within the last $1\frac{1}{2}$ years. Mr. Gibbons suggests that these three lines be removed because they totally disqualify every person that retires, when they have worked for more than $1\frac{1}{2}$ years.

In place of the three lines Mr. Gibbons recommends removing line 7, page 1, "the entire amount of any pension or retirement allowance should be used to reduce unemployment benefits." Too severe because it disqualifies totally or partially such persons as war veterans that are on disability pensions, etc. A veteran should not be disqualified simply because he was injured in World War II and is still receiving a pension.

In response to Mr. Jeffreys question, Mr. Gibbons said that if a person had worked for 20 or 30 years and received a pension based upon that work, that would be considered wages and would be deductible from unemployment compensation benefits. One law says a person is only entitled to benefits if they are not able to work. The other law says one is only entitled to benefits if able to work and that they both should not be paid at the same time.

Mr. Gibbons further explained in relation to job related injury claims, that if the awards were made on a continuing basis, it would be considered compensation because of inability to work. Unemployment benefits are supposed to be paid only to those able to work and seeking work. By making this change the bill will comply with the new federal law and also a recommendation of Nevada Employment Security Council, whose language is contained in BDR 53-167*, attached hereto as EXHIBIT A.

Mr. Gibbons said that on page 2 of BDR 53-167 the recommendation is that there be the provision that reads "If a claimant is entitled to receive in any week which begins after March 31, 1980, for which he is eligible for unemployment benefits: (a) if he receives a payment from an annuity, a governmental or private pension or other retirement program; or (b) any other similar periodic payment". That defined the language as to precisely what is intended.

Mr. Gibbons said he thinks this is a good bill providing the changes he has explained are made.

Mr. Larry McCracken, Executive Director, Employment Security Department was the next witness. See Synopsis of impact of AB-136 on the issue of a "Pension Offset" for unemployment insurance, attached hereto as EXHIBIT B. See Synopsis of impact of AB-136 on the issue of a "Waiting Week" for unemployment insurance, attached hereto as EXHIBIT C.

Mr. McCracken explained that his chief concern was that the two major issues were required by national legislation to be looked into in the state. The state must take some position relative to pension offset and should consider the "waiting week" by virtue of the action the Federal Government has taken.

If a "waiting week" is not required the state will loose half a million dollars a year because the Federal Government will refuse to pay their share of the first week of extended benefits.

Chairman Banner asked the amount of maximum benefits and was informed it was \$123 per week. Mr. McCracken explained the current procedure as application for unemployment being on the first working day following the lay off, the following week the claim would be submitted for the first week and the first compensatory check would be received in about two weeks. The waiting week would be imposed only once during the benefit year, which is a year from the time the claim is filed. A person still gets 26 weeks of benefits. If he is unemployed for that length of time he would not lose any benefits as the waiting week requirement would be picked up at the end of the allowable compensatory period.

Chairman Banner noted that the only people who would lose a week of benefits were those who did not use the maximum amount of unemployment time available.

Mr. Jeffrey understood it will cost the fund about a half million per year if the waiting week is not instituted; what will it cost the claimant if they do institute a waiting week? Mr. McCracken answered \$3½ million with the current payout.

A discussion followed as to the impact of the MGM Grand, Las Vegas fire. The statistics were that 4,500 people were out of work as a result of the fire; 3,300 applied for unemployment benefits; the hotel maintained a work force of about 750 people; some of the people chose not to file for benefits; a total of 2,800 people have drawn some amount in benefit funds.

Mr. McCracken, continuing his testimony said he would prefer to have the total package heard by the Legislators before final action was taken on AB-136. Relative to pension and the recommendation that lines 32,33 and 34 be deleted, he concurs. As this bill now reads, if a person retires from a firm and yet not retires to the extent that he draws benefits from that employer, he would still have all the work history wiped out. There was an intent, but the final line is that the law is accomplishing other than what was intended. It is an inequitable situation.

Mr. Thompson outlined a situation where a person is on a partial disability from NIC and is drawing funds, people who through no fault of their own lose a job. They are subsequently reemployed and then laid off, the amount of money being received from NIC for the disability would be deducted from the unemployment benefits. That is not equitable.

Mr. Jeffrey asked what the federal law specified as to pension offsets.

Mr. Robert Long, Insurance Administrator, Employment Security Department said basically that federal law now requires a state, to avoid a conformity problem, to take at least half of an offset if an employee contributed up to half of the pension cost. That is the most common situation. The ESD decided to recommend a total offset which is acceptable to the Feds because it goes well beyond what they require. The federal requirement restricts this to base period employers. The Council recommendation is that it apply to any prior employers.

Mr. Jeffrey asked if a person worked for two different employers earning retirement benefits from both, how much are pension benefits required to be reduced.

Mr. Long said under federal law the person would have requalified and the prior benefits would not be required to be offset. A multiple employer pension fund (such as apply to the building trades) is considered as one base period employer.

In reply to Mr. Jeffrey's question as to whether this bill goes farther than federal law requirement, Mr. Long said the total

offset would reduce benefits by a million and a half dollars per year. If you go only as far as the federal law requires, the reduction would be closer to a million dollars.

Mr. Bennett asked how many states presently have the waiting week period and Mr. McCracken said all but 12 have a waiting week, including Nevada.

Ms. Foley asked when the waiting week was eliminated in Nevada. Mr. Long said in 1958, and that Nevada was the first state to eliminate it. At one time all states had a waiting period of one, two or three weeks.

Mr. McCracken added it was primarily for administrative purposes, to allow time to get the paper work processed, before the computer age. Now, it is philosophically imposed on the belief that an individual should be able to fund their first week of unemployment and it spurs incentive to find a job.

Mr. Thompson said he thought the idea of unemployment was to see that a person is able to get another job. He disagreed with this concept.

Mr. Long explained the general thrust of late has been to cut wherever cutting can take place and Congress has imposed a law that requires a look at the waiting week because there will be a loss to the state if something is not done. There is a loss to the claimant if something is done. It must be discussed.

Mr. Long stressed as an important point that this monetary penalty to the state would only be effective during times when we were paying extended benefits. If the state were not paying extended benefits there would not be a monetary penalty in any amount. Last year, it would have been a half million dollars, because we were paying extended benefits. As of January 20, 1981 we are no longer paying extended benefits if we don't trigger back on this year. If you never pay any extended benefits there is never any penalty. It is also important to understand that one of President Reagan's proposals is expected to eliminate the federal trigger. The monetary penalty can change radically if the federal trigger on extended benefits were eliminated, which now seems likely.

The next witness was Harold Dayton, co-owner of Dayton's Furniture at Zephyr Cove, Nevada. He was speaking on behalf of the Nevada Retail Association. They support AB-136. Prepared testimony attached hereto as EXHIBIT D. He spoke particularly to that portion of the bill requiring the one week waiting period and urged the committee to vote favorably on the bill.

Mr. John D. Taylor, MGM Grand, Las Vegas spoke in support of the bill. He talked about the prohibition of the double dipping opportunity for unemployment compensation as well as workman's compensation in the temporary conditions

Self insured employers were in a position to make these temporary total disability payments and should be included in that section; NIC as well as self insurers.

Mr. Banner asked him his concept of the pension and unemployment benefits. He replied they have no specific position with respect to the pension or retirement allowance.

One week waiting period was supported by Mr. Taylor generally but catastrophic situations with no foreseeable planning should not be included. Planned layoffs should be prepared for by the employees.

Mr. Jeffrey said he had never experienced layoffs predicted in the construction business. Mr. Thompson agreed. When Mr. Bennett asked how much notice Mr. Taylor's MGM Grand employees were given before a layoff he replied about two weeks.

As to trust funds savings, \$1½ million savings is a federal subsidy savings, in addition to that, a \$3 million savings because those additional benefits are not being paid out. In reality, the trust fund saves a total of \$4 million.

The hearing was recessed for a five minute break and resumed at 6:05 P. M.

Carole Vilardo, Citizens for Private Enterprise, supports the one week waiting period. She thinks it would present no particular difference from the present system because of the computer system of ESD. She said there would be a savings to the employer but it should not penalize the worker to the point where he has to wait a full additional week without getting that money.

Ms. Foley asked if you go on and off the system is an employee penalized only once during the benefit year. Vilardo said that was her understanding of the bill.

Chuck King, Central Telephone Company, agreed with the employers that testified before him and support the one week waiting period.

Fred Davis, Greater Reno/Sparks Chamber of Commerce supports the one week waiting period with the provision that the language that Mr. Gibbons explained earlier should be cleaned up to accommodate the thrust of what was recommended by the Labor Management Advisory Committee. He stressed that employers are not looking to impose a hardship on anybody in labor.

Ms. Foley asked Mr. McCracken why with the computers does it take two to three weeks to get the checks out.

Mr. McCracken showed the committee a calendar and pointed out that right now if we have a waiting week an individual would come in on the 2nd, a Monday, they would file their new claim on that date. The following Monday they would file a claim for that first week but it is not payable with the waiting week.

The following Monday they would file a claim for the prior week, that would be the first week that would be compensable. The paper work would go to Carson City and the check would be in the mail and received anywhere from the 18th to the 21st. It might come a couple days earlier than that but 3 weeks is something that you could count on.

Ms. Foley asked if you have computers why it isn't plugged in in Las Vegas instead of sending it to Carson City; why isn't check sent from Las Vegas directly to claimant. Mr. McCracken said that is essentially what happens but there is still two days in the mail. This would apply even if the checks were mailed from Las Vegas as opposed to Carson City.

Mr. Claude Evans, Executive Secretary-Treasurer, Nevada AFL-CIO Prepared written remarks attached hereto as EXHIBIT E. Mr. Evans opposes the entire bill. He said that the \$3½ million proposed to be saved by one week waiting period actually comes from the workers. The recently unemployed workers as a result of the MGM Grand and Hilton fires and other layoffs cannot pay their bills on the present unemployment benefits and this bill would reduce the amount even further. Laborers in particular cannot afford the one week waiting period.

Mr. Evans said that as to the pension portion of the bill he referred to line 5, page 1 that the benefit week will be reduced by any amount he may receive for pension or retirement allowance and the entire amount of any allowance by the NIC. This bill would reduce the permanent partial disability allowances people are now receiving by the same amount. He opposes the entire bill and thinks it is wrong and regressive legislation.

Mr. Stan Jones, Northern Nevada Central Labor Council, opposed to AB-136. Prepared testimony attached hereto as EXHIBIT F. His organization is opposed to AB-136 from the standpoint of simple humanitarianism.

Walt Henderson, Business Manager for Local 169, Reno. He presented a petition from about 150 people in opposition of this bill. The petition is attached hereto as EXHIBIT G. The citizens signing are opposed to AB-136. He stated that his people do not abuse this system. The system is there so that they can survive. He thinks the bill penalizes the people up front and that it is bad legislation.

John McGill, United Steel Workers. He is working with the AFL-CIO during this session and represents people in Henderson, Nevada, Titanium Plant; U. S. Line Pacific Engineers and the Stafford Chemical Co. These people are subject to layoffs quite frequently due to the economy or whatever. He said this legislation would be an additional hardship on these people and opposes the bill.

Roland Christenson, Business Representative for the Plasterers and Masons in the Reno area, opposed to this bill.

Frank Byrne, Northern Nevada Building Crafts Council. He stated that what is happening in regards to this legislation is no different than previous sessions and is opposed to this bill. He said it would work a serious hardship on the fellow that is temporarily unemployed because he is going to miss out on one weeks unemployment compensation. It does nothing to the guy that takes advantage of this system. The fellow that is off work for two or three weeks will not get compensated for one of those weeks. The habitual offender of this system that stays on it for 26 weeks will get his money on the other end.

Harold Knudson, Sheetmetal Workers, Northern Nevada. They are opposed to this legislation.

Ms. Foley moved this meeting adjourn. Mrs. Cafferata seconded the motion and the meeting adjourned at 6:45 P. M.

Respectfully submitted,

Janice Fondi
Committee Secretary

Date: Feb 17, 1981

GUEST LIST

PLEASE PRINT YOUR NAME	PLEASE PRINT WHO YOU REPRESENT	I WISH TO SPEAK		
		FOR	AGAINST	BILL NO
ART BOECHER	RENO/SPARKS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE			136
FRED DAVIS	" " " "	X		
VERN PARIS	RENO NEWSPAPERS INC.			
Harold Dayton	D. ... & Nevada ...	X		1-6
N.C. ANTHONY	SUNNIA CORP	X		136
Wm R Gibbons	The Gibbons Co. Inc.	X		1-6
JOHN D. TAYLOR	WASH GRAND - LAS VEGAS	X		136
BILL CHAMBERLAIN	" " " "			
R. E. ...	NEVADA ...			
G. R. TACKETT	NEVADA BELL			
Harold Knudson	STEEL METAL WORKERS			
X HAL G. CURTIS	IRON WORKERS LOCAL 439			136
X DON H. ...	LABORERS LOCAL 169			136
X WALT HENDERSON	LABORERS LOCAL 169		X	136
Richard ...	FLORIDA ...			136
X Jack Evans	I.U.O.E LOCAL 1139		X	
X ...	AFL CIO		X	136

EXHIBIT A

SUMMARY--Revises certain conditions of eligibility for unemployment compensation. (EDR 53-167)

Fiscal Note: Effect on Local Government: No.
Effect on the State or on Industrial Insurance: No.

AN ACT relating to unemployment compensation; revising certain conditions of eligibility for benefits; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, REPRESENTED IN SENATE AND ASSEMBLY, DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

6 Section 1. NRS 612.375 is hereby amended to read as follows:

612.375 An unemployed person is eligible to receive benefits with respect to any week only if the executive director finds that:

1. He has registered for work at, and thereafter has continued to report at, an office of the employment security department in such manner as the executive director may prescribe, except that the executive director may by regulation waive or alter either or both of the requirements of this subsection for persons attached to regular jobs and (as to such) in other types of cases or situations with respect to which he finds that compliance with (such) those requirements would be oppressive or inconsistent with the purposes of this chapter.

2. He has made a claim for benefits in accordance with the provisions of NRS 612.450 and 612.455.

3. He is able to work, and is available for work ; but no claimant shall be considered ineligible with respect to any week of unemployment for failure to comply with the provisions of this subsection if such failure is due to an illness or disability which occurs during an uninterrupted period of unemployment with respect to which benefits are claimed and no work has been offered the claimant which would have been suitable prior to the beginning

of such illness and disability.) No otherwise eligible person [shall] may be denied benefits for any week in which he is engaged in training approved by the executive director by reason of any provisions of this chapter relating to availability for work or failure to apply for, or a refusal to accept, suitable work.

4. [Except as provided in subsection 5, he] He has within his base period been paid wages from employers equal to or exceeding [one and one-half] 1 1/2 times his total wages for employment by employers during the quarter of his base period in which [such] his total wages were highest; but if a person fails to qualify for a weekly benefit amount of one twenty-fifth of his high-quarter wages but can qualify for a weekly benefit amount of \$1 less than one twenty-fifth of his high-quarter wages, his weekly benefit amount [shall] must be \$1 less than one twenty-fifth of his high-quarter wages; but no person may receive benefits in a benefit year unless, subsequent to the beginning of the next-preceding benefit year during which he received benefits, he performed service, whether or not in "employment" as defined in this chapter and earned remuneration for [such] that service in an amount equal to not less than [three] 3 times his basic weekly benefit amount as determined for [such] the next-preceding benefit year.

7 5. [Any wages which are paid for employment immediately preceding retirement shall not be included as wages in determining the total wages paid during a claimant's base period.] If a claimant is entitled to receive in any week which begins after March 31, 1980, for which he is eligible for benefits:

(a) A payment from an annuity, a governmental or private pension or other retirement program; or

(b) Any other similar periodic payment,

based on previous work which is reasonably attributable to that week, the amount of benefits payable to the claimant for that week must be reduced, but not below zero, by the amount of the payment.

SYNOPSIS OF IMPACT OF A.B. 136 ON THE
ISSUE OF A "PENSION OFFSET" FOR UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

A.B. 136 provides for a reduction in unemployment insurance benefits of the entire dollar amount of any pension or retirement allowance payable to the claimant for the applicable benefit week. Such pension offset provision would result in a decrease in annual unemployment insurance payout in an estimated amount of \$1,500,000.00.

The enactment of a pension offset provision in Chapter 612, NRS, would bring Nevada into conformity with the Federal pension reduction requirements of Section 3304 (a) (15), FUTA, which provides that States are required to adopt pension reduction standards for Federal Certification of State laws effective April 1, 1980 and for subsequent years.

Present Nevada Law does not provide for a pension offset, but rather provides that any wages which are paid for employment immediately preceding retirement shall not be included as wages in determining the total wages paid during a claimant's base period. Under the current provisions of Chapter 612, NRS, 612.375 (5) any intervening work after retirement, but prior to filing a claim for unemployment benefits, permits a person to escape disqualification. The provisions of A.B. 136 for an offset on a dollar-for-dollar basis would be more equitable in that all individuals would be treated the same, and would also be in Federal conformity.

A.B. 136, as written, does not remove the present provision for deleting wages earned immediately prior to retirement from base period wages. Such language would seem to be somewhat superfluous considering the pension offset provision.

Administratively, inclusion of a total pension offset provision in the law would have some effect on the work-load in local offices in taking and processing claims, since many retirees or pensioners would probably not file benefit claims.

SYNOPSIS OF IMPACT OF A.B. 136 ON THE
ISSUE OF A "WAITING WEEK" FOR UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Based upon past history of first pay orders on initial unemployment insurance claims, the waiting week provision contained in A.B. 136 would decrease annual payout of benefits by an estimated \$3,500,000.00 at the current rate of payout. The effect of reducing benefits paid because of a waiting week would not be felt by all U.I. claimants, since historically twenty-two percent exhaust their benefits during a benefit year. These claimants in effect, draw the benefits in their final week which would otherwise have been paid during the first or "waiting week."

The Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1980 (P.L. 96-499), effective December 5, 1980, provides that the Federal share (50%) of the cost of the first week of extended benefits is eliminated in any state which does not have a "waiting week" for regular benefits, and in those which pay the waiting week retroactively or under any circumstances. Thus, the enactment of a waiting week for regular benefits in the Nevada Law would avoid the loss of this Federal sharable amount in future periods of extended benefits payments. The Federal sharable amount of first weekly payments of extended benefits would have been one-half million dollars if this law had been in effect in 1980.

Administratively, if an individual were separated from employment under non-disqualifying circumstances at the end of his/her shift on a Friday, having worked during the entire week, and having earned in excess of his/her weekly benefit amount, that person would normally file an initial claim for benefits during the following week. With a waiting week in effect, that individual would not be paid benefits for that week in which he filed his initial claim. His first compensable week would be the next following week if he were still unemployed. Without a

"Waiting Week"
Page Two

waiting week, a claimant received his first benefit check in approximately eleven to fourteen calendar days after filing his initial claim. With a waiting week, a claimant would receive his first benefit check approximately eighteen to twenty-one calendar days after filing his initial claim. (See sample calendars attached.)

WITHOUT WAITING WEEK

SUNDAY	MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY	SATURDAY
1	2	3	4	5	6 L A I D O F F	7
8	9 F I L E S I C	10	11	12	13	14
15	16 F I L E S F I R S T W E E K	17	18	19 F I R S T C H E C K P A I D	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28

WITH WAITING WEEK

SUNDAY	MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY	SATURDAY
1	2	3	4	5	6 L A I D O F F	7
8	9 F I L E S I C	10	11	12	13	14
15	16 F I L E S W A I T I N G W E E K	17	18	19	20	21
22	23 F I L E S F I R S T W E E K	24	25	26 F I R S T C H E C K P A I D	27	28



NEVADA RETAIL ASSOCIATION

POST OFFICE BOX 722, CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89701 • 882-1943

Statement by Harold Dayton on AB 136

MY NAME IS HAROLD DAYTON. I AM CO-OWNER OF DAYTON'S FLOORS, ZEPHYR COVE LAKE TAHOE. I AM SPEAKING ON BEHALF OF THE NEVADA RETAIL ASSOCIATION AND, SPECIFICALLY, FOR MY BROTHER JACK, WHO IS PRESIDENT OF THE NEVADA RETAIL ASSOCIATION, BUT WHO WAS UNABLE TO BE HERE TODAY.

I APPRECIATE THIS OPPORTUNITY TO APPEAR BEFORE THIS COMMITTEE TODAY.

THE NEVADA RETAIL ASSOCIATION IS IN SUPPORT OF AB 136 AND PARTICULARLY THAT PORTION OF THE BILL REQUIRING A ONE-WEEK WAITING PERIOD BEFORE AN UNEMPLOYED PERSON IS ENTITLED TO RECEIVE BENEFITS.

THESE ARE MY REASONS:

1. THE ONE-WEEK WAITING CONCEPT IS NOTHING NEW OR DRASTIC IN THIS COUNTRY. ALL BUT 12 STATES NOW REQUIRE SUCH A PROVISION.
2. BY NOT HAVING A WAITING WEEK, THE COST FOR NEVADA IN 1979 TO ITS UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FUND WAS APPROXIMATELY \$ 3,500,000; OR OVER NINE PER CENT OF TOTAL BENEFITS PAID DURING THE 1979 CALENDAR YEAR. THIS IS A VERY SIGNIFICANT DRAIN ON THE RESERVES WHICH SHOULD BE USED TO MEET NEEDS OF QUALIFIED AND DESERVING CLAIMANTS.
3. THE PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A ONE-WEEK WAITING PERIOD IN NEVADA HAS BEEN ENDORSED BY THE STATE'S EMPLOYMENT SECURITY COUNCIL WHICH, AS YOU KNOW, IS COMPRISED OF REPRESENTATIVES OF BUSINESS, LABOR AND THE GENERAL PUBLIC.



NEVADA RETAIL ASSOCIATION

POST OFFICE BOX 722, CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89701 • 882-1943

Page 2

4. IT IS MY UNDERSTANDING THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT NOW REFUSES TO PAY IT'S 50 PER CENT SHARE OF THE FIRST WEEK OF EXTENDED BENEFITS IF A STATE DOES NOT HAVE A NON-COMPENSABLE WAITING WEEK. THE COST TO THE STATE OF NEVADA BY THE FEDS WITHDRAWING THEIR SUPPORT ON THE FIRST WEEK OF EXTENDED BENEFITS AMOUNTS TO ABOUT \$500,000. IF WE DON'T IMPOSE THE ONE-WEEK WAITING CONCEPT, IT WILL COST NEVADA ██████████ \$500,000 MORE ANNUALLY THAN WE PAY NOW.

5. THE ONE-WEEK WAITING PERIOD DOES NOT TAKE AWAY REMUNERATION FROM AN UNEMPLOYED WORKER, BECAUSE THIS AMOUNT IS ADDED ON THE END OF HIS COMPENSATION PERIOD. THIS MEANS THEN, THAT THIS IS REALLY A DEFERRAL OF BENEFITS, NOT A DISQUALIFICATION.

FOR THESE REASONS, I URGE THE COMMITTEE TO VOTE FAVORABLY ON ASSEMBLY BILL 136.

IN THESE DAYS OF INFLATION AND HIGH COST OF GOVERNMENT, THIS BILL OFFERS THIS COMMITTEE THE OPPORTUNITY TO SAVE THE STATE SOME MONEY AND TO COMPLY WITH FEDERAL REGULATIONS WHICH SPEAK STRONGLY AND PRACTICALLY IN THIS REGARD.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION.

February 17, 1981

Testimony of Claude Evans, Executive Secretary-Treasurer of the Nevada State AFL-CIO, before the Assembly Committee on Labor and Management on February 17, 1981 regarding Assembly Bill 136.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

The Nevada State AFL-CIO strongly opposes this legislation. We have heard a great deal this evening about the employment security fund but it seems to me we have failed to discuss how this affects individual Nevada workers.

For example, during the shutdown of the Aladdin Hotel, the MCM fire and now the Hilton tragedy, a great many Nevada employees have been laid off through no fault of their own. And, a great deal of publicity was generated of how they were unable to pay their bills on the present unemployment benefits. This bill would reduce those benefits even further.

The people who were laid off at the respective hotels would have been penalized one week of unemployment benefits, and we have to keep in mind that the maximum benefit for a laid off employee now is \$123.00 per week or approximately \$17.57 per day. On this amount of money it is difficult to feed even one individual let alone people who have families.

I refer you to line 5 page 1 which states, in effect, that the benefit week will be reduced by any amount he may receive for pension or retirement allowance, and the entire amount of any allowance by the Nevada Industrial Insurance Commission.

There are a great many Nevada workers who presently receive a permanent partial disability of \$40.00 or \$50.00 per month from the Nevada Industrial Commission and this amount would be deducted from their weekly benefit check.

We think this is wrong and regressive legislation which affects legitimate laid off employees of Nevada. We urge your defeat of this legislation.

NORTHERN NEVADA CENTRAL LABOR COUNCIL

AFFILIATED WITH
 THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR
 CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

AND
 THE NEVADA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR

1150 TERMINAL WAY • RENO, NEVADA 89502



2/17/81

THE N. NEVADA CENTRAL LABOR COUNCIL IS OPPOSED TO A.B. 136 FROM A STANDPOINT OF SIMPLE HUMANITARIANISM.

TO THE INDIVIDUAL WHO SUFFERS THE HUMILIATION OF LOSS OF EMPLOYMENT THROUGH NO FAULT OF THEIR OWN..... THE FIRST WEEK PRESENTS THE SAME FINANCIAL HARDSHIP AS THE SECOND, THIRD, OR SUBSEQUENT WEEKS OF DEPRIVATION.

IT'S EASY ENOUGH FOR THE "FAT-CATS" WHO AREN'T FACED WITH THEIR EMPLOYER TELLING HIM..... "SORRY CHARLIE, WE JUST DON'T HAVE ANY MORE WORK FOR YOU. TAKE THAT MESSAGE HOME TO A WIFE AND KIDS WHO LIVE FROM DAY TO DAY, AND TELL THEM THEY'LL NOT HAVE ANY INCOME AT ALL FOR ^{three} WEEKS AND ONE OF THOSE ^{three} WILL BE DISQUALIFIED.

THE MAJORITY OF UNEMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS COME FROM THE LOW-INCOME MINIMUM WAGE EARNER WHO HAVE NO OPPORTUNITY OF BUILDING EVEN A ONE WEEK CUSHION AGAINST THE DAY CERTAIN..... WHEN THEY'RE TOLD THEIR EMPLOYMENT IS TERMINATED.

TO FURTHER HUMILIATE THEM BY DENYING THEM UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR ONE WEEK IS THE ABRIDGEMENT OF CONCERN FOR OUR FELLOW worker REMEMBER..... THESE PEOPLE ARE JOBLESS NOT BY CHOICE, BUT BY THE FICKLE-FINGER-OF-FATE.

THE AFFILIATES OF THE N. NEVADA CENTRAL LABOR COUNCIL BEG OF YOU TO DEFEAT THE SENSELESS A.B. 136. IMAGINE.... IF YOU WILL, THE HEARTACHE A LAYOFF BRINGS. DON'T COMPOUND THAT HEARTACHE WITH THE BURDEN OF AN EMPTY TABLE. THEY'VE PAID THEIR DUES, OR THEY WOULDN'T BE ELIGIBLE IN THE FIRST PLACE.

BE UNION — BUY LABEL

PETITION

The undersigned citizens of the Great State of Nevada do hereby request the Nevada Legislature, convened in the sixty-first session, resist any effort to pass AB 136. This proposes a one (1) week waiting period for unemployment benefits and we feel this legislation is detrimental to and penalizes unjustly the working men and women of the State of Nevada:

Name

Address

City

Name	Address	City
Anna P. Buck	4025 Inverness Dr.	Reno
Alfred Brown	1019 Washington St.	Reno 94503
Glenn A. Kenney	3139 Champton S.	Carson City Nev
Willie Tollett	328 Westbank	RENO
Ron Judd	1842 A ST	SPARKS
Michael Boston	1810 F St	Sparks
James R. Booth	187 BUCKLAND DR.	RENO
Carl Brantley	3430 Mountain Tr	Sparks
Rick Cook	1752 York way	SPARKS
Stan Jones	108 W 550	Reno
Ronald E. Crowder	106 B ST	Sparks
Robert Perry	1351 E 10th	RENO
Frank Foster	747 WILLOW ST	RENO
REYNOLDS	2525 E 4th ST	Reno
L & B Burgameyer	520 Montgomery Road	
Wynnette L. Hall	1400 E. 4th St. #10	Reno
Ron Dunsford	12015 Stoner, Brook Drive	Reno
Killie Williams	1948 1/2 Pittman	Sparks Nev
David A. Murchie	557 Bell St.	Reno Nev.
Thom. Carl Frost	925 East 8th St.	Reno 89512 Nevada
Paul C. Conroy	2238 Prater way	Sparks Nev. 89431
JERRY OROSCO	852 E. 2nd	RENO NEV.
John [unclear]	440 E. 7th St.	RENO NV
W. J. [unclear]	4145 NE 14th Rd.	RENO. NEV.
James D. Ogden	1130 GA AENO	RENO NEV
John Quincy	6150 Sun Dr	Sun Valley Nev
Walter Unscheld	5675 Pilla	Sparks Nev
Earl Buff	715 E. 4th av.	SPARKS NV.
Oliver DeLozier	2835 Cannon St	Reno
Alvin R. Cheppelis	6000 Rangeland Rd.	Reno
Paul A. [unclear]	1973 Rio Lindo	SPARKS

PETITION

The undersigned citizens of the Great State of Nevada do hereby request the Nevada Legislature, convened in the sixty-first session, resist any effort to pass AB 136. This proposes a one (1) week waiting period for unemployment benefits and we feel this legislation is detrimental to and penalizes unjustly the working men and women of the State of Nevada:

Name	Address	City
Leonard Owen	1016 B Wildem Av.	RENO
Karl Larson	4500 Mia Loma	RENO
Lotis Kilmore	445 Sullivan	Sparks
Sid Gregory	465 Lindville Ct	Sun Valley
Robert Tolbren	1960 Hillboro Ave.	RENO
William A. Rae	4055 So. VIRGINIA ST.	RENO
Wade Henderson	5730 Sun Valley Dr	Sun Valley
John D. Olsen	940 Beech Hill Dr	RENO
Billie E. Kudd	1775 Castle way	RENO NEVADA
Micki King	457 Camoet	Simons Valley, Nev.
Greg L. King	457 Camoet	Simons Valley, Nev.
K. W. Kalinapi	2480 E 9 TH	RENO NEV
Walter Henderson	2475 TRIDENT	RENO NEV
Cheri Hill	1315 N. Main Av.	RENO NEV
Bob Johnson	570 SPRUCE DR	Fernley NV
Dona L. Hill	P.O. Box 20481	RENO, NEV.
Robert Summers	PO Box 21	Wadsworth, Nev.
Sam Bond	1987 Plume	RENO
Emil Petersen	1845 Frazer	RENO
Bob J. Jell	4719 Whorensia	Sparks
K. W. D. Dickson	PO Box 555	FERNLEY
Ray Griffith	PO Box	Fernley
Walter Henderson	2475 Trident	RENO
Carol Wyatt	421 S. Pratt	Carson City
Donald E. Ender	1150 Terminal way	RENO
Mersey G. G. G.	1110 Hwy St	Sparks
Edward Christensen	1750 Wendover Way	RENO
HAROLD G. CURTIS	401 APPLEGATEWAY	C. C. NEV.
Jack Evans	3323-4 TH ST.	Sparks, Nev.
John G. Madell	205 Beech Hill Dr.	Henderson NEV
Blackie Cross	777 E. Williams	RENO C. C.

PETITION

The undersigned citizens of the Great State of Nevada do hereby request the Nevada Legislature, convened in the sixty-first session, resist any effort to pass AB 136. This proposes a one (1) week waiting period for unemployment benefits and we feel this legislation is detrimental to and penalizes unjustly the working men and women of the State of Nevada:

Name	Address	City
Jae Baker	1978 FRAZER	SPARKS
SHIRLEY BAKER	1978 FRAZER	SPARKS
Betty J. Johnson		RENO
Betty Selph	2301 LADLE	RENO
Douglas Smith	542 Hill	RENO
HELEN PRICE	1160 CASTLE	RENO
Maretha Alderson	4190 Baker Ln	RENO
Therese Smith	11560 SITKA	RENO
Shirley Seckins	11560 SITKA	RENO
Ken H. Brown	7450 So. Virginia	RENO
Daniel Anderson	106 B ST Sparks	SPARKS
Sam G. Baker	106 B ST Sparks	SPARKS
Dave Smith	1119 1/2 F ST	SPARKS
Mike Bussick	1355 Parkview	SPARKS
Bonnie Orr	1115 F ST	SPARKS
Michael Arington	280 Mt. Union Dr	SPARKS
Clint Watkins	50 Barrill Place	RENO
Gary C. Holt	437 E 5 TH ST.	RENO
HAROLD SECKINS	1120 19 TH ST	SPARKS
Michael J. Tarrant	10086 BAXITE	RENO
Joe Williams	5120 5200 COLDA ST 27	RENO
JEFF WING	5200 COLDA ST #28	RENO
Christina Lopez	2424 Sutter 4 th	RENO
Bud. aderson	2424 Sutter	RENO
John N. Nader	mgm motel	RENO
Edith Vinkler -	145 E 7 th ave	S.V. NV.
Jay Johnson	2301 LADLE	RENO

PETITION

The undersigned citizens of the Great State of Nevada do hereby request the Nevada Legislature, convened in the sixty-first session, resist any effort to pass AB 136. This proposes a one (1) week waiting period for unemployment benefits and we feel this legislation is detrimental to and penalizes unjustly the working men and women of the State of Nevada:

Name

Address

City

Cecil Hoffman	2581 Poolway	Carson City
Virginia Hoffman	2581 Poolway	Carson City
Paul Epps	2780 E. NYE LN	CARSON CITY
Jon O Bagley	2535 Peacock	Reno, Nev.
Mr Osborne	5060 Rampion	Sparks
James E Kallen	3355 Elaine way	SPARKS
Miss Spumway	3295 Everett Dr.	Reno
Kelnes D. ...	290 MAINE ST	FERRELL
James A Busch	592 - 1 st St	Sparks
Thomas L. Wagner	34 Long Spruce	Dayton Nev
William Luster	1900 W 6 ST.	RENO
Jim Peterson	1101 Prospect Ave.	Sparks, Nev.