

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
HOUSE LABOR AND COMMERCE STANDING COMMITTEE

January 30, 2023

3:15 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Representative Jesse Sumner, Chair
Representative Justin Ruffridge, Vice Chair
Representative Mike Prax
Representative Dan Saddler
Representative Stanley Wright
Representative Ashley Carrick
Representative Zack Fields

MEMBERS ABSENT

All members present

OTHER LEGISLATORS PRESENT

Representative Josephson

COMMITTEE CALENDAR

HOUSE BILL NO. 13

"An Act relating to the definition of 'employer' for the purposes of the State Commission for Human Rights."

- HEARD & HELD

HOUSE BILL NO. 46

"An Act allowing child care providers that receive state aid to organize and collectively bargain with the Department of Health; and establishing the child care provider fund."

- HEARD & HELD

PREVIOUS COMMITTEE ACTION

BILL: HB 13

SHORT TITLE: APPLICABILITY OF HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

SPONSOR(S): REPRESENTATIVE(S) JOSEPHSON

01/19/23	(H)	PREFILE RELEASED 1/9/23
01/19/23	(H)	READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
01/19/23	(H)	L&C, JUD

01/30/23 (H) L&C AT 3:15 PM BARNES 124

BILL: HB 46

SHORT TITLE: CHILD CARE PROVIDER COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

SPONSOR(S): REPRESENTATIVE(S) FIELDS

01/25/23 (H) READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS

01/25/23 (H) L&C, STA, FIN

01/30/23 (H) L&C AT 3:15 PM BARNES 124

WITNESS REGISTER

REPRESENTATIVE ANDY JOSEPHSON

Alaska State Legislature

Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Presented HB 13, as the prime sponsor.

ALEXANDER SCHROEDER, Staff

Representative Andy Josephson

Alaska State Legislature

Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Provided a PowerPoint presentation, titled "HB 13: Applicability of Human Rights Commission," on behalf of Representative Josephson, prime sponsor.

ROBERT CORBISIER, Executive Director

Alaska State Commission for Human Rights

Anchorage, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Provided invited testimony during the hearing on HB 13.

REPRESENTATIVE ZACK FIELDS

Alaska State Legislature

Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: As the prime sponsor, introduced HB 46 via a PowerPoint presentation, titled "Raising Wages and Benefits for Child Care Workers (HB 46)."

BLUE SHIBLER, Executive Director

Southeast Alaska Association for the Education of Young Children

Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Provided invited testimony during the hearing on HB 46.

PEARL BROWER, PhD, CEO

Ukpeagvik Inupiat Corporation

Anchorage, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Provided invited testimony during the hearing on HB 46.

CHRISTINA EUBANKS, Executive Director
Hillcrest Children's Center
Anchorage, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Provided invited testimony during the hearing on HB 46.

EVAN ANDERSON, Staff
Representative Zack Fields
Alaska State Legislature
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Presented a sectional analysis of HB 46, on behalf of Representative Fields, prime sponsor.

ACTION NARRATIVE

[3:15:09 PM](#)

CHAIR JESSE SUMNER called the House Labor and Commerce Standing Committee meeting to order at 3:15 p.m. Representatives Wright, Fields, Prax, Saddler, Ruffridge, and Sumner were present at the call to order. Representative Carrick arrived as the meeting was in progress.

CHAIR SUMNER appointed Representative Ruffridge as vice chair of the House Labor and Commerce Standing Committee.

HB 13-APPLICABILITY OF HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

[3:16:05 PM](#)

CHAIR SUMNER announced that the first order of business would be HOUSE BILL NO. 13, "An Act relating to the definition of 'employer' for the purposes of the State Commission for Human Rights."

[3:16:15 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE ANDY JOSEPHSON, Alaska State Legislature, as prime sponsor, presented HB 13. He stated that Alaska has had a State Commission for Human Rights (ASCHR) since 1963; however, it does not have jurisdiction over nonprofit organizations. He said that according to Legislative Research Services, it is unclear why this is the case.

REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHSON stated that ASCHR was created to eliminate discrimination based on factors such as race and ethnicity, and the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) acts as a "parent organization" and generally covers larger employers. He stated that EEOC will pay a fee to ASCHR to handle some cases EEOC would normally handle. He reiterated that HB 13 would give ASCHR jurisdiction over nonprofit organizations. He reinforced that the Alaska Human Rights Commission operates by investigating meritorious claims of discrimination, working to conciliate both sides to keep the cases from going to court; however, the agency can take cases to court if a reconciliation agreement cannot be reached.

REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHSON stated that the ASCHR commissioners appointed in 2018 by Governor Bill Walker had supported the change HB 13 proposes. He highlighted that the commissioners now, appointed by Governor Mike Dunleavy, agree with the previous commissioners.

[3:21:55 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHSON expressed the belief that the proposed legislation is necessary to address a gap in jurisdiction. He explained that if a person is discriminated against for housing or employment, this individual is able to take the claim to the Anchorage Equal Rights Commission (AERC); however, residents who work for a nonprofit in other parts of the state do not have this opportunity. He pointed out that because ASCHR lacks jurisdiction, a gap is created. He noted that only nine states lack protections for nonprofit employees. He pointed out that approximately 50 cases statewide were not "screened in" by ASCHR because of this lack of jurisdiction.

[3:24:23 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SADDLER asked how many cases ASCHR deals with per year.

REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHSON expressed uncertainty and deferred the question to Robert Corbisier, the Executive Director at the commission.

[3:25:24 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE RUFFRIDGE reported a potential conflict, as his wife serves as a commissioner for ASCHR.

CHAIR SUMNER did not recuse Representative Ruffridge.

[3:25:47 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHSON stated that in the 2021 report from ASCHR, there was a peak of 1,733 cases in the highest year, 405 of which were found to have a basis. In 2021, he stated that the number dropped to 674, and he expressed the belief that this could be related to the COVID-19 pandemic.

[3:27:00 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SADDLER asked for clarification on the number of cases for 2021.

REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHSON answered that there were 674 inquiries in 2021. Of these, 139 cases were found to have a basis, while 119 cases were taken in. Out of these cases 106 complaints were filed.

[3:27:43 PM](#)

ALEXANDER SCHROEDER, Staff, Representative Andy Josephson, Alaska State Legislature, on behalf of Representative Josephson, prime sponsor, provided a PowerPoint presentation titled "HB 13: Applicability of Human Rights Commission" [hard copy included in the committee packet]. He explained that the proposed legislation would amend the definition of "employer" in AS 18.80.300, to include nonprofit organizations, and this would give ASCHR jurisdiction on discrimination cases.

[3:29:19 PM](#)

MR. SCHROEDER moved to slide 2 and stated that the federal equivalent to ASCHR is EEOC, which was created by Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to deal with employment-related discrimination. He noted that EEOC covers employers with 15 or more employees, while ASCHR covers any employer with at least one employee. He continued to slide 3 and said that ASCHR was created in 1963, adding that Alaska is one of only nine states not including nonprofit organizations under the jurisdiction of its human rights commission. He said that municipal level human rights commissions, such as the Anchorage Equal Rights Commission and the Juneau Human Rights Commission (JHRC) have nonprofit organizations included under their jurisdictions.

MR. SCHROEDER argued that, while there are other commissions covering nonprofit organizations in relation to employment discrimination, it is still important for ASCHR to gain jurisdiction over these types of cases. He explained that the location of the nonprofit organization matters, and residents of an area should be able to go to the human rights commission within their municipality, even if the nonprofit organization is in another area. He said that there are areas in Alaska with significant numbers of nonprofit employees who do not have a municipal commission.

[3:34:08 PM](#)

MR. SCHROEDER returned to slide 3 and said that ASCHR has had a legislative goal to gain jurisdiction over employment related discrimination cases for four consecutive years. On slide 4, he gave a brief overview of what the proposed legislation would do, reiterating that the definition of "employer" would be changed in statute to include nonprofit organizations. He added that the exceptions would be for religious, fraternal, and social nonprofit organizations.

[3:35:51 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE WRIGHT asked for a specific example of an instance when this would be needed.

REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHSON expressed the inability to provide a case, explaining that this is because ASCHR currently lacks jurisdiction. He deferred to Mr. Corbisier.

[3:37:12 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SADDLER questioned whether the minutes from the bill which created ASCHR had been reviewed. He indicated that these minutes may help understand why the makers of that bill did not include nonprofits.

REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHSON answered that Legislative Research Services has related that because of the age of the legislation, the records are limited, and no minutes are available to provide context. He continued that the records prior to 1990 are difficult to find, if at all. In response to a follow-up question, he offered to contact his father on the matter, as he had been a legislator at the time.

REPRESENTATIVE SADDLER asked if the same definition of "employer" is used at the municipal and federal level, but not the state level.

MR. SCHRODER answered that the definitions vary, as well as the exceptions to these definitions. He deferred to Mr. Corbisier.

[3:40:46 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE CARRICK questioned the rationale for excluding religious and fraternal organizations, and he questioned the definition of a "fraternal organization."

REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHSON answered that HB 13 would cover an "evolving" area of law, and this is an example. He expressed the opinion that a church should not be required to ordain female clergy if this is against its beliefs. He offered that the Boy Scouts of America are an example of a social or fraternal organization, and although its position has been reversed, there was a case concerning a Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer (LGBTQ) scout leader. He said that the bill ultimately reflects language the commissioners have requested.

[3:45:37 PM](#)

ROBERT CORBISIER, Executive Director, Alaska State Commission on Human Rights, stated that ASCHR enforces Article 1, Section 3 of the Constitution of the State of Alaska, and this is the section that provides for civil rights. He said ASCHR is the legislature's implementation of this constitutional provision. He continued that ASCHR has jurisdiction over employment, public accommodations, the sale and rental of real property, credit and financing, and government practices cases, as well as retaliation cases, which often stem from one of the previous types of cases. He noted that the Fairbanks Diversity Council and JHRC are advisory councils without the ability or resources to enforce decisions. He noted AERC is the only other entity in Alaska with the ability and authorization to implement and enforce decisions. He explained that this gap means that small nonprofit organizations of fewer than 15 employees would not face accountability for discrimination.

[3:49:02 PM](#)

MR. CORBISIER stated that ASCHR receives reimbursement from the EEOC for taking co-jurisdictional cases; however, EEOC does not

track the "screened-out" cases. He said that ASCHR is not a punitive agency, and its goal is to make victims "whole" and work with the respondents to create an enforceable nondiscrimination policy which complies with state and federal laws. He informed the committee that in 2022, ASCHR received 814 cases, of which 184 had basis, 164 were formally taken, with 134 of these investigated.

[3:53:32 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PRAX reported a potential conflict of interest, as his sister-in-law serves on the ASCHR board.

CHAIR SUMNER did not recuse Representative Prax.

REPRESENTATIVE PRAX asked whether EEOC would take cases dealing with a nonprofit organization if the organization had 15 or more employees.

MR. CORBISIER answered that it would; however, if the employer is in Anchorage, EEOC would refer all of these cases to ASCHR or AERC. He explained that if the employer is a nonprofit EEOC would be informed that ASCHR cannot take the case. In response to a follow up question, he expressed uncertainty concerning the 15-employee threshold. He speculated that it is related to the size of cases the federal government will address.

[3:55:53 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SADDLER asked for an explanation on the jurisdictional gap present in employment discrimination cases.

MR. CORBISIER answered that the jurisdiction of AERC and ASCHR are similar; however, AERC has explicit jurisdiction over cases involving LGBTQ discrimination as a protected class. He said AERC also has jurisdiction over nonprofit organizations within the Municipality of Anchorage, while EEOC has jurisdiction over employers with 15 or more employees, including nonprofit organizations. He added that both organizations would have jurisdiction over cases involving government employers. In response to a follow-up question, he said that ASCHR covers employers with any number of employees, excluding nonprofit organizations. In response to a follow-up question, he answered that ASCHR has a budget of just over \$2 million. He added that this is roughly what it costs to repave a mile of road.

[3:58:32 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SADDLER inquired about the reimbursement per case from EEOC. He also questioned the associated costs with taking on those cases.

MR. CORBISIER answered that ASCHR has the capacity to accept more cases without additional cost to the state. He added that most of the rejected cases are "obviously" not jurisdictional. He voiced that ASCHR moves away from giving "false hope" for these complaints. He continued that the COVID-19 pandemic caused the number of cases to decline because of remote work. He stated that since normalcy is returning, the number of cases has increased. In response to a follow-up question, he said that the amount of reimbursement could be up to \$800 per case, and that 45,000 employees could be affected by the change in jurisdiction. He confirmed that it would not cause an increase in cost to the state's general fund.

[4:03:19 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHSON asked Mr. Corbisier about the difference between the original version of the bill and the commission's adopted resolution language.

MR. CORBISIER answered that the commission's resolution relies on the religious exemption language provided in regulation. He confirmed that the bill's draft did not change the religious exemption language but removed the word "club."

[4:05:38 PM](#)

CHAIR SUMNER announced that HB 13 was held over.

[4:05:51 PM](#)

The committee took an at-ease from 4:05 p.m. to 4:08 p.m.

HB 46-CHILD CARE PROVIDER COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

[4:08:22 PM](#)

CHAIR SUMNER announced that the final order of business would be HOUSE BILL NO. 46, "An Act allowing child care providers that receive state aid to organize and collectively bargain with the Department of Health; and establishing the child care provider fund."

[4:08:32 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE FIELDS, as prime sponsor, gave a PowerPoint presentation, titled "Raising Wages and Benefits for Child Care Workers (HB 46)" [hard copy included in the committee packet]. He provided a brief history of HB 46. Moving to slide 2, he stated that the problem is that the child care sector has low wages and few benefits, and this has resulted in a shortage of workers. He added that the COVID-19 pandemic has increased the shortage of adequate child care.

REPRESENTATIVE FIELDS directed attention to slide 3, which showed a report which related that employment in the child care sector has decreased by 7 percent. On slide 4, he highlighted a report which shows that 2 more child care centers have closed in Juneau, while there are none in Valdez.

[4:12:12 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE FIELDS advanced to slide 5, expressing the belief that the inadequate amount of child care in Alaska is playing a part in the outmigration from the state. He added that the greatest number of people leaving the state are young people of working age. He turned to slide 6, stating that 11 other states have implemented some form of collective bargaining for child care employees.

REPRESENTATIVE FIELDS directed attention to slide 7, stating that the goals of HB 46 are to give these workers a "living wage" in order to increase the supply of child care. He advised that many families cannot afford to pay more for child care, so this should be done without increasing prices. He added that public policy on child care should remain "flexible" to allow the sector to continue to work with the state government on the best possible solutions.

[4:14:36 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE FIELDS continued to slide 8, pointing out that major Alaska employers are raising concerns about the lack of adequate child care in Alaska, and child care is one of the top three issues for the Alaska Chamber of Commerce.

REPRESENTATIVE FIELDS concluded by explaining how the proposed legislation would work. He explained that the Alaska Department of Labor and Workforce Development would conduct an election which would ask whether child care workers would engage in

sectoral bargaining with the state. If it is voted affirmatively, a union would be created to negotiate with the state for wages and benefits. He added that the bill would also establish a child care trust fund.

[4:17:37 PM](#)

BLUE SHIBLER, Executive Director, Southeast Alaska Association for the Education of Young Children, provided invited testimony on HB 46. She expressed the opinion that there have always been issues with child care shortages. She explained that this is because child care centers do not have "a very good business model." These centers have a single source of revenue, with the charge being limited to what families can pay. She suggested that, prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, it was possible to find employees who would do the work because they enjoyed it; however, rising costs of living have forced a choice between having an enjoyable job or a higher-paying job. She pointed out that Juneau's child care centers have the capacity to care for more children, but there are not enough employees to increase enrollment. She described the current business model for child care as a "market failure," and she described child care as a "public good." She asserted that the solution would be investment by the state into the child care sector.

[4:21:22 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PRAX inquired about the organizations that Southeast Alaska Association for the Education of Young Children represents.

MS. SHIBLER explained that the association provides support mechanisms rather than representation. In response to a follow-up question, she said that the majority of the money child care centers receive is from the parents' tuition. She added that there are subsidies available for families with lower incomes.

[4:23:39 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE RUFFRIDGE requested an explanation of the label "market failure" concerning child care centers.

MS. SHIBLER responded that, as a business, no profit is being made and a worthy wage is not provided. She contrasted this with a traditional business where goods or service costs could be raised to close the gap; however, child care businesses cannot do this because parents would not be able to pay.

[4:25:55 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE RUFFRIDGE questioned whether a state subsidy would be the only way for these businesses to survive. He questioned where the state would receive an "injection of cash" for this purpose.

MS. SHIBLER answered that child care centers are unable to pay high wages or make a profit. In other businesses, it is possible to raise the prices to reflect a rise in business costs, whereas child care centers are unable to do this because it becomes unaffordable for families. She concluded that the lack of ability to make a profit means fewer people attempt to start this business. In response to a follow-up question, she expressed the belief that the child care sector needs subsidies to remain operational. She observed that the issue is being acknowledged in other states and at the national level.

[4:27:31 PM](#)

MS. SHIBLER, in response to a series of questions from Representative Saddler, answered that, in her 20 years of experience, the issue of low profits and wages has been an ongoing problem, and the increase in the cost of living has exacerbated the problem. In response to a follow-up question, she said that child care prices are generally similar across the sector and largely paid for by the parents. She answered that the Department of Health (DOH) receives block grants from the federal government and is responsible for deciding on the best usage of this money in regard to child care. She continued that the federal money used in the Childcare Assistance Subsidy Program pays providers on behalf of parents who qualify for assistance. Other money is used for training purposes; however, federal money does not cover increasing wages or benefits for workers. She expressed uncertainty concerning the amount of federal money going towards wages.

[4:32:29 PM](#)

PEARL BROWER, PhD, CEO, Ukpeagvik Inupiat Corporation (UIC), provided invited testimony on HB 46. She stated that workplaces across the state are facing shortages, and this has made it more difficult for parents to return to work. She said that one of the reasons her family moved from Utqiagvik to Anchorage was because of the difficulty finding child care. She continued that the lack of available child care causes economic

instability for families, leaves children at a higher risk of neglect, and makes it difficult for employers to fill available positions.

[4:36:28 PM](#)

DR. BROWER, in response to Representative Prax, stated that UIC is a for-profit organization. In response to a follow-up question, she said that even if the corporation were to provide child care benefits to employees, there would not be enough child care providers to care for every child.

REPRESENTATIVE PRAX suggested that the solution may require an increase in the cost of child care, either paid for by the state or by private employers.

[4:39:03 PM](#)

CHRISTINA EUBANKS, Executive Director, Hillcrest Children's Center, provided invited testimony on HB 46. She stated that finding employees has been a continuous issue in her 20 years of working in child care. She suggested that this is one of the lowest paying professions in the state, which causes a high level of turnover. She expressed the belief that the industry should have a voice in how federal grants for child care are being spent. She argued this because of the direct impact on the operations and cost of child care centers.

[4:41:49 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PRAX questioned why prices have not increased.

MS. EUBANKS responded that nothing is preventing price increases and explained that prices have already increased. She stated that there is an expected price increase of 6 percent to 10 percent this year, and this has the consequences of child care only being affordable for parents with high incomes.

[4:42:47 PM](#)

MS. EUBANKS, in response to Representative Saddler, reiterated that raising prices would make child care unaffordable for many families.

[4:44:44 PM](#)

EVAN ANDERSON, Staff, Representative Zack Fields, Alaska State Legislature, on behalf of Representative Fields, prime sponsor, provided a sectional analysis of HB 46 [included in the committee packet], which read as follows [original punctuation provided]:

Section 1: This section amends AS 23.05.360(t) to allow the Alaska Labor Relations Agency board in the Department of Labor & Workforce Development the authority to include workers in the child care sector for the purpose of holding hearings. This is a conforming change to language added in Sec 4.

Section 2: This section amends AS 23.05.370(a) to direct the Alaska Labor Relations Agency to serve as labor relations agency for workers in the child care sector covered by the new language added in Sec. 4.

Section 3: This section amends AS 23.05.380 to give Department of Labor & Workforce Development the authority to update regulations pertaining to collective bargaining rights for workers in the child care sector. This is a confonning [sic] change to language added in Sec 4.

Section 4: This section amends AS 23.40 to give child care providers the right to self-organize, join, or assist an organization to bargain collectively and engage in concerted activities for the purposes of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection. This section prohibits the Department of Health from engaging in unfair labor practices, and it provides a process for investigation and conciliation of complaints. This section also provides definitions.

Section 5: This section establishes a child care provider fund as a separate fund in the state treasury. This section also establishes a child care stakeholder group to recommend disbursements from the fund.

[4:47:07 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE FIELDS, addressing earlier questions, added that not investing in child care would create an environment where only high-income families would be able to afford it. He deduced that this results in a decrease in economic capacity because families are pushed out of the workforce. He reiterated that the proposed bill would create a child care trust fund to

allow the state to invest more in child care, similar to other places in the world.

[4:49:06 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SADDLER questioned the role DOH would play in collective bargaining. He questioned who would provide the funding.

REPRESENTATIVE FIELDS said the model would be similar to the Alaska Higher Education Investment Fund. He continued that subsidized slots do not cover the entire cost of tuition at a child care center; therefore, child care centers pass the cost to the parents who can pay.

REPRESENTATIVE SADDLER asked for a breakdown of the costs of child care paid for by families and the grants from the federal government.

REPRESENTATIVE FIELDS, referencing the child care center his family uses, stated that subsidized slots are available, meaning the state pays for the child care of children whose parents qualify. He added that some states have expanded the level for eligibility for subsidies, and this helps provide child care for a wider range of families; therefore, the number of people able to work increases.

[4:52:42 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PRAX expressed concern that the proposed bill would result in a continuously expanding eligibility for the subsidy. He compared it to the current issues facing Medicare.

[4:54:16 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE CARRICK questioned whether home-based child care providers would be covered by the proposed bill.

REPRESENTATIVE FIELDS answered that all licensed providers would be covered, including home-based providers.

REPRESENTATIVE CARRICK commented that the bill could be useful in the effort to retain child care workers.

[4:55:59 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE RUFFRIDGE questioned whether HB 46 could cause prices to increase for some parents if the subsidy is not expanded.

REPRESENTATIVE FIELDS answered that the goal is to keep prices down for parents. He expressed the belief that child care providers should be a greater part of the discussion because they have the best idea of how to serve families. He stated that the bill would create a framework giving providers a greater voice, as it would not be a mandate on a certain wage for child care employees. In response to a follow-up question, he stated that currently there is not a specific amount to be placed into the child care trust fund that HB 46 would create.

[4:59:06 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SADDLER questioned the amount of childcare paid for privately versus the amount paid for by the government.

REPRESENTATIVE FIELDS recapped that the vast majority is paid for privately by parents, with some slots subsidized with government funds. In response to a follow-up question, he stated that the idea behind the trust fund would be to give child care providers a greater say in how the federal grants would be used. He reiterated the opinion that providers have a better idea what would be most effective.

[5:01:07 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE WRIGHT questioned the amount of money received from the federal grants per year.

REPRESENTATIVE FIELDS expressed uncertainty and offered to follow up with the committee at a later time.

REPRESENTATIVE WRIGHT explained the Worthy Wage Campaign and asked whether the bill was related to this.

REPRESENTATIVE FIELDS answered that he is unfamiliar with the campaign.

[HB 46 was held over.]

[5:02:23 PM](#)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the committee, the House Labor and Commerce Standing Committee meeting was adjourned at 5:02 p.m.