

**ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE  
HOUSE STATE AFFAIRS STANDING COMMITTEE**

February 6, 2025

3:21 p.m.

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Representative Ashley Carrick, Chair  
Representative Andi Story, Vice Chair  
Representative Rebecca Himschoot  
Representative Ky Holland  
Representative Elexie Moore

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Representative Sarah Vance  
Representative Kevin McCabe

**COMMITTEE CALENDAR**

OVERVIEW: PAYROLL DIVISION

- HEARD

HOUSE BILL NO. 10

"An Act relating to the Board of Regents of the University of Alaska."

- HEARD & HELD

HOUSE BILL NO. 61

"An Act relating to employment; relating to voluntary flexible work hour plans; relating to the employment of minors; and relating to hours worked by minors employed in the state."

- HEARD & HELD

**PREVIOUS COMMITTEE ACTION**

BILL: HB 10

SHORT TITLE: ADD FACULTY MEMBER UNIV BOARD OF REGENTS

SPONSOR(S): REPRESENTATIVE(S) CARRICK

01/22/25	(H)	PREFILE RELEASED 1/10/25
01/22/25	(H)	READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
01/22/25	(H)	STA, FIN

02/06/25 (H) STA AT 3:15 PM GRUENBERG 120

BILL: HB 61

SHORT TITLE: EMPLOYMENT OF MINORS

SPONSOR(S): RULES BY REQUEST OF THE GOVERNOR

01/22/25 (H) READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS

01/22/25 (H) STA, L&C

02/06/25 (H) STA AT 3:15 PM GRUENBERG 120

**WITNESS REGISTER**

PAULA VRANA, Commissioner  
Department of Administration  
Juneau, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Co-offered the Department of Administration Payroll Division overview.

ERIC DEMOULIN, Administrative Services Director  
Division of Finance  
Department of Administration  
Juneau, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Co-offered the Department of Administration Payroll Division overview.

STUART RELAY, Chief of Staff  
Representative Ashley Carrick  
Alaska State Legislature

**POSITION STATEMENT:** On behalf of Representative Carrick, prime sponsor, presented HB 10.

Cathy Muñoz, Commissioner  
Department of Labor and Workforce Development  
Juneau, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** introduced HB 61 on behalf of the bill sponsor, House Rules by request of the governor.

Tanya Keith, Director  
Division of Labor Standards and Safety  
Department of Labor and Workforce Development

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Presented HB 61 on behalf of the bill sponsor, House Rules by request of the governor.

**ACTION NARRATIVE**

[3:21:18 PM](#)

**CHAIR ASHLEY CARRICK** called the House State Affairs Standing Committee meeting to order at 3:21 p.m. Representatives Story, Holland, Vance, McCabe, and Moore were present at the call to order. Representative Himschoot arrived as the meeting was in progress.

### Overview: Payroll Division

[3:22:55 PM](#)

CHAIR CARRICK announced that the first order of business would be an overview of the Payroll Division.

[3:23:40 PM](#)

PAULA VRANA, Commissioner, Department of Administration, began the Department of Administration Payroll Division overview. She began by noting that Payroll Services has faced challenges in the past several years. This includes difficulties with both recruitment and retention, and it has exasperated the complexities of an outdated payroll system. She remarked however, that the division has made significant progress since the presentation to the committee last year.

COMMISSIONER VRANA described some areas of improvement within the [Payroll Services]. First, it has fully digitalized timesheet submission and processing and has begun digitalizing past timesheet and payroll documents. Several thousand timesheets per pay period are processed automatically, which she noted is a new accomplishment that will save time and resources. Payroll Services has also relocated its office to the State Office Building. She said what really excites her is what lies ahead, and much work can still be done to improve the process. She said that this includes remote processing of payrolls.

[3:27:43 PM](#)

ERIC DEMOULIN, Administrative Services Director, Division of Finance, Department of Administration, as co-presenter, began a PowerPoint [hard copy included in the committee file]. He presented Slide 3 and discussed portal statistics. He noted that the division changed the way that it receives payroll inquiries and notices of pay problems. He noted that the data is grouped into two categories; inception to date and pay period. He remarked that average tickets per day and the inception to date is a way that the system recognizes how many tickets come to staff each day. He noted that the current time

to address the backlog, based off statistics is 308.68 days. He provided an elaboration of numbers pertaining to tickets completed per day and by time period.

3:31:20 PM

MR. DEMOULIN responded to a couple questions from committee members. First, he noted that he would be addressing the backlog later in the presentation. Second, he said that he can provide committee members a different set of data not pertaining to holidays following the committee meeting.

3:32:19 PM

MR. DEMOULIN presented the next few slides and discussed current projects associated with Payroll Services. He elaborated on the time and attendance system. He discussed how many timesheets are processed and how they are processed. He remarked that in the future the division is looking at integrating those processes and building efficiencies. Additionally, he noted that the division is looking at improving electronic timesheets as well. He said that having an efficient way to receive timesheets will allow Payroll Services to build efficient processes and the lack of standardization between submissions is an area of improvement. He mentioned that mass approvals apply to about half of the current payrolls. He discussed payroll optimization, pay roll actions, retroactive payments, and current processes. He added that integration processes that are in current formulation are to reduce manual labor and redeploy resources.

3:37:35 PM

MR. DEMOULIN gave an example of a retro pay adjustment. He said that if an agency is behind on evaluation requirements for pay increments, then the division needs to receive and process it with regards to backpay. He mentioned that the division is looking at implementing systems that can reduce manual calculations for staff and increase evaluation turnover. He mentioned the use of Officers' Activity Reporting System (OARS) interface and its utilization by the Department of Public Safety. He remarked that across the state a few agencies use a time and attendance program that helps with their business needs. He said that internal programming allows them to process information. He remarked that a question amongst the division is how they can work with the pre-existing programs and focus work efforts.

[3:39:35 PM](#)

MR. DEMOULIN responded to a couple of questions from committee members. He said that OARS is a proprietary system developed for specific department use in Alaska. He said that payroll systems on hold pertain to funding decisions and a request for proposal (RFP), that would require legislative authority.

[3:41:19 PM](#)

MR. DEMOULIN remarked that one of the biggest items heard from agencies is the need to support 24-hour facilities and accurate reporting times. He said that when looking at an RFP for a payroll system it would require looking at what businesses need. On Slide 5, he discussed reporting projects and current feedback from other stakeholders. He then discussed inefficiencies and cited health trusts cutting off insurance as an example. He noted that lapses and delayed pay are something the division takes seriously.

[3:43:51 PM](#)

MR. DEMOULIN responded to Chair Carrick that insurance lapses can happen for various reasons and provided some examples and elaboration.

[3:45:11 PM](#)

MR. DEMOULIN discussed Item 2, staff metrics and reporting. He remarked that reporting can come a couple of different ways, and the division is trying to get a handle on how many timesheets are received, processed and what the adequate staffing levels to meet goals are. He said that timekeepers exist across the state and sign off for staff. He said that double checking is a redundant activity by the time it gets to payroll.

[3:47:29 PM](#)

MR. DEMOULIN discussed Slide 6 and current projects pertaining to training and communications. He discussed the cultural changes since COVID-19 and readjustments to the current job market. He noted that the division hopes to expand recruitment pools by allowing more flexibility regarding work from home options. He then discussed timekeeper training and certification and how to identify areas of improvement to make these timekeepers more effective. How noted that with a 50

percent vacancy, timekeeper improvements have not been given the attention they need. He then discussed communications, and that one area of opportunity is communication transparency with other stakeholders across the state. He discussed recent meetings with union members and the work to allow more communication on what is currently being worked on. He noted that a newsletter is currently in formulation to help address this.

[3:51:16 PM](#)

MR. DEMOULIN proceeded to Slide 7 and discussed payroll statistics broken down by pay period. He provided an explanation for various notes and numbers found on the slide. He mentioned that auto approvals or low-risk items are processed with a high degree of confidence and are given processing rules. He provided elaboration on what constitutes an employee as low-risk and how it relates to auto-approvals. He provided a description of payroll runs and supplemental runs and how they are part of the business process. He also provided an explanation of timesheets not paid on time and how this can occur. He noted that even with a 50 percent vacancy, 99.8 percent of timesheets are paid on time. He remarked that the staff has worked extremely hard to do this.

[3:56:48 PM](#)

MR. DEMOULIN, on the next slide presented data representations. He recognized that if the division is not operating at 100 percent, then there is room for improvement. The next slide provided information on auto approvals and provided a visual summary. He said that a division focus has been on building efficiencies in other areas in addition to auto-approvals. He mentioned that this includes building a portal to facilitate actions. He also mentioned that implementing a module for form creation and auto-interfacing for a system of record will remove manual processes. On Slide 10, he presented a graph representation of auto-approvals and described the rules system that governs it. On Slide 11, he described vacancies by component, he mentioned that the section of payroll currently had a 32 percent vacancy, and these numbers are run every week. He noted that currently hiring incentives are used for payroll services. He expressed that flexible telework options should help thin applicant pools, and the division hopes to finalize these options in the next 30 days.

[4:03:06 PM](#)

MR. DEMOULIN answered a series of questions from committee members. He credited Commissioner Vrana for empowering the division to make these changes and allowing some free reign with regards to improving pre-existing processes. He credited good staff and other affiliated members who helped these changes go into effect, including his data manager Will Muldoon. He said that some work regarding an ROI strategic plan had been done for payroll; however, publishing an ROI number is difficult until other data points are met. He said that much of the payroll improvement focus has been on finite tasks but that doesn't mean there are no other tasks that can be worked on. He said that changing processes will create more opportunities in other areas and that it is difficult to pin down an ROI in a shifting organization. He remarked that he does think there are going to be more opportunities, but he could not point to where they are. He noted that business development consultation is an idea, and that group would have opportunities to improve operations. He said that there is a lot of work to do internally as a starting point. He clarified that the 308.68 days to address the backlog is based off statistics and turnarounds. He noted that one of the biggest retractors is data storage. He said that an internal program was built to help address this and once it goes live, it will help address this problem. He said that he would let committee members know once it launches. He also clarified those timesheets belonging to the supplemental run group. He clarified that supplemental timesheets are not more complicated but different. He said he could communicate with system staff to determine how long on average the paperwork is processed and follow-up with committee members.

[4:20:38 PM](#)

The committee took an at-ease from 4:20 p.m. to 4:23. p.m.  
[During the at-ease, Chair Carrick handed the gavel to Vice Chair Story.]

**HB 10-ADD FACULTY MEMBER UNIV BOARD OF REGENTS**

[4:23:53 PM](#)

VICE CHAIR STORY announced that the next order of business would be HOUSE BILL NO. 10 "An Act relating to the Board of Regents of the University of Alaska."

[4:24:13 PM](#)

CHAIR CARRICK, as prime sponsor, introduced HB 10 and described some of the bill's details.

4:24:40 PM

STUART RELAY, Chief of Staff, Representative Ashley Carrick, Alaska State Legislature, on behalf of Representative Carrick, prime sponsor, presented HB 10. He began by introducing the University Board of Regents and its role. He noted that HB 10 would add one faculty member to the Board of Regents for a two-year term. He stated that six other states include faculty member(s) on their respective universities board of regents. He said that adding one faculty member would provide better representation and allow universities to have the same parity and respect granted to students who have an elected student regent.

4:26:39 PM

MR. RELAY read the sectional analysis for HB 10 [included in the committee file], which read as follows [original punctuation provided]:

Section 1. Short title: "The University of Alaska Faculty Representation Act."

Section 2. Amends AS 14.40.120 to increase the size of the UA Board of Regents from 11 members to 12 members.

Section 3. Adds subsection (f) to AS 14.40.130 establishing the requirements for the faculty regent.

- One of the 12 regents must be a current, full-time, tenured faculty member within the University of Alaska system.

- If the faculty regent is no longer tenured, no longer employed full-time, or no longer employed in the UA system during their term they shall forfeit the position.

- The Governor is required to appoint a faculty regent from a list of nominees within 60 days of the forfeiture or vacancy of the seat.

Section 4. Amends AS 14.40.140 to establish the term length of a faculty regent as two-years.

Section 5. Adds subsection (c) to AS 14.40.150 establishing the appointment process for the faculty regent.

- Requires at least one member of the Board of Regents to be a faculty member.

- The faculty regent will be appointed by the Governor from a list of six nominees within 60 days after the list is submitted to the Governor.
- The list of nominees consists of names of two faculty members selected by each of the three faculty senates of the UA system after an election is held by each faculty senate.
- The elections process for faculty regent elections conducted by the faculty senates shall be conducted under rules established by the Governor's office.
- The term length of a faculty regent is two years and begins on June 1 of the year in which appointment is made.

Section 6. Changes the quorum requirements for Board of Regents Meetings from six to seven members present.

Section 7. Requires the University of Alaska to hold elections for faculty regent nominees on or before Feb 1, 2026.

[4:29:11 PM](#)

CHAIR CARRICK gave a PowerPoint pertaining to HB 10 [hard copy included in the committee packet]. She mentioned that this bill and its intent have been in consideration for years. She provided a background on the University of Alaska's Board of Regents and its duties. She mentioned that appointed student regents have full voting power amongst the board and two students from a campus can be selected for nomination and are subject to nomination by the governor. She said that the faculty members at the board can act as advisors but do not have any speaking rights. When comparing to other states, there are 24 state university systems that have student regents and 6 university systems that have a faculty regent. She noted that there is not one way to govern a university system and provided differences amongst various state university systems. On Slides 4 and 5, she provided an illustration of differences among these university systems.

[4:33:06 PM](#)

CHAIR CARRICK outlined how HB 10 would work in practice. She remarked that because the bill would increase the number of regents from an odd to an even number, there is language that specifies that a quorum would be increased by one member, as would the number of votes needed for a motion to carry. She noted that most votes on the Board of Regents are unanimous. The faculty regent, if appointed, would be selected from a list

of six names given by the three faculty senates, and this includes two nominees per university system. The governor would select a single appointee, and it would be subject to confirmation by the legislature. Much like the student regent, she reiterated, faculty regents would have full board power. She clarified that of the three main campuses, there are faculty members affiliated with branch campuses around the state, and they could be prospective nominees as well. She discussed Slide 8 and presented a chart that shows the way that current individuals interact with the Board of Regents.

[4:36:28 PM](#)

CHAIR CARRICK, in closing, noted that over many years of working on this bill's concept, what has become clear is that many faculty members feel they don't have a seat at the table. She remarked that most regents come from professional backgrounds, and this was a positive thing. She explained that this would not create a majority dynamic but provide a voice that is in parity with the university.

[4:38:20 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT asked about guarantees with regards to smaller universities having the opportunity to have candidacy for seats on the board.

REPRESENTATIVE CARRICK responded that when looking at the student regent process, it may be an appropriate comparison with prospective faculty regents. She noted that the University of Alaska Southeast (UAS) has had some years without submissions for student regents. She noted that past governors have done a decent job trying to achieve parity between campuses by selecting student regents across the different universities. She acknowledged that UAS hasn't had parity in student regent representation but expressed optimism that this is changing.

[4:39:47 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HOLLAND said he was in support of this effort and had previous experience working for universities in different capacities. He asked if being tenured faculty was a requirement for faculty regents and if this could be left to the Faculty Senate. Additionally, he asked for clarification for a backstop if a nominee isn't appointed by the governor and whether the term length is appropriate.

CHAIR CARRICK noted that previous discussions with university affiliates had made it clear that there is a preference for tenured faculty. She said adjunct faculty could be considered with Faculty Senate approval and this may serve the branch universities or UAS. She said the current bill is drafted from previous feedback and explained that the previous iteration of the bill had the University of Alaska president weighing in as a tiebreaker. She said that previous discussions with university affiliates made it clear that the executives and the board of regents should be separated. She said that if a governor failed to appoint somebody for the position, then it would remain vacant. She noted that faculty time on the board was another talking point amongst affiliates and the term seemed appropriate and would foster positive turnover.

REPRESENTATIVE HOLLAND clarified that his inquiry into non-tenured faculty was with specific consideration to termed but non-tenured faculty.

[4:46:57 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE MOORE asked for clarification on the fiscal note and if concerns had been addressed.

CHAIR CARRICK responded that the university administration likes the way things are, and that the fiscal note speaks to a question regarding conflict of interest. She said HB 10 is trying to achieve parity with a student regent and support faculty. She noted that students can be employees of the university while serving as regent and will recuse themselves from votes with conflicts of interest. She noted that these same standards can be applied to faculty regents. She said that she could get back to Representative Moore regarding fiscal note details.

REPRESENTATIVE MOORE asked about faculty members on each campus and if discussions were made about rotating faculty regent appointments amongst the different universities.

CHAIR CARRICK responded that it has been discussed in the past and she was not opposed to specifying rotations in statute. She raised concerns that it could create an inequity because of the higher proportions of tenured faculty at University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF) and University of Alaska Anchorage (UAA). She noted that the intent is not to have a single university system monopolize this position.

4:51:21 PM

VICE CHAIR STORY, regarding the twelve-member proposed under HB 10, asked if a thirteen-member Board of Regents would be considered.

CHAIR CARRICK responded that she would be open to adding an alumni member on the board. She said that bringing this legislation forward was to see better representation and informed decision making, and the bill seeks to alleviate a current issue. She said alumni associations haven't been asking for this representation, but the faculty have been.

VICE CHAIR STORY asked about being open to thirteen regent members regardless of designation. She raised concern about split votes from an even number of board members.

CHAIR CARRICK responded that a previous iteration of the bill had an odd number of regents, and it was not as popular as the current version. She noted that when adding regents beyond what is in the legislation, role clarity is important. She remarked that adding members could water down pre-existing board members voices and votes.

VICE CHAIR STORY asked about whether other university systems had been studied on how they handle conflicts of interest with board members.

CHAIR CARRICK replied that it has been some time since she made calls regarding this topic. She recalled that some university systems found the idea of a faculty regent as outlandish but those with faculty members as regents simply recused themselves from voting. She noted that regents are held to a high professional standard. She responded in short that no, considerable research hadn't been conducted.

VICE CHAIR STORY asked about instances in which faculty recuse themselves from voting.

CHAIR CARRICK said she could not speak to that since there wasn't a faculty regent currently in place, but Faculty Senate members may have these experiences as would student appointed regents.

4:57:22 PM

VICE CHAIR STORY announced that HB 10 was held over.

[4:57:23 PM](#)

The committee took an at-ease from 4:57 p.m. to 4:58 p.m.  
[During the at-ease. Vice Chair Story handed the gavel back to Chair Carrick.]

**HB 61-EMPLOYMENT OF MINORS**

[4:58:36 PM](#)

CHAIR CARRICK announced that the final order of business would be HOUSE BILL NO. 61 "An Act relating to employment; relating to voluntary flexible work hour plans; relating to the employment of minors; and relating to hours worked by minors employed in the state."

[4:59:25 PM](#)

Cathy Muñoz, Commissioner, Department of Labor and Workforce Development (DLWD), introduced HB 61 on behalf of the bill sponsor, House Rules by request of the governor. She said that HB 61 has two primary components. One component is to streamline the permitting process for youth employment. She explained that youth aged fourteen to sixteen are required to get a work permit for employment and the legislation would remove this requirement for sixteen-year-olds. The second component of the legislation is to provide flexible scheduling options for Alaska Workers. She remarked that the bill provides an exemption to the daily overtime requirement for flex work scheduling. If the bill is approved, this schedule could not be mandated and would still require prior employee approval. She said that in current law, hospital nurses are provided a flex schedule option but not other workplaces. She said that flexible scheduling is a way that can help address labor gaps. She stated that younger workers are very interested in flexible scheduling and a work life balance. She said that HB 61 also provides provisions around youth employment and that the department currently processes approximately 2,500 work permits for sixteen-year-olds each year and it is an unnecessary paper push.

MS. Muñoz paraphrased the sectional analysis [included in the committee file] and remarked that Section 3 extends the exemption for youth workers in family-owned businesses and boats. The current law provides an exemption only for parental businesses. She noted that Section 4 would change total allowable work hours for sixteen-year-olds. Lastly, Section 5

would remove the requirement for individual work permits and gives employers the option to receive blanket approval for hiring multiple youth in the same capacity.

[5:04:04 PM](#)

TANYA KEITH, Director, Division of Labor and Standards Safety, Department of Labor and Workforce Development, presented HB 61 on behalf of the bill sponsor, House Rules by request of the governor. She stated that the proposed changes would make it better for DLWD to meet the needs of the public and focus resources on efforts that protect Alaska's workers. She remarked that the purpose of HB 61 is to allow for work up to 12 hours a day under a voluntary work hour plan for all employees that are currently capped at 10 hours a day. The bill would also make changes to the youth employment law to allow businesses to employ fourteen- and fifteen-year-olds with written approval from DLWD and remove the need for individual work permits. The bill would also exempt sixteen- and seventeen-year-olds in family-owned businesses from written approval requirements. She noted that sixteen-year-olds have the same restrictions under child labor laws as seventeen-year-olds, prohibition from hazardous occupation jobs. She stated that the restrictions for younger employees are much stricter and only certain jobs under the law are permitted. She noted that it makes sense to remove these requirements and focus on younger age groups with stronger limitations. She noted that HB 61 would also increase daily allowable work hours for fourteen- and fifteen-year-olds from 9 to 10 hours; she clarified that school hours are counted as work hours. She remarked that this would allow work full-time while school is not in session and currently labor laws do not allow this.

[5:06:47 PM](#)

MS. KEITH stated that the first change would be flexible work hours and allowing employees to work twelve hours a day under a voluntary flexible work hour plan. The plan would require that overtime be paid for any work over eight hours a day that is not in the approved plan. It would remain voluntary on behalf of the employer, who could not require the employee to work this plan and not pay overtime. She noted that HB 61 would make this plan available for all industries across Alaska.

MS. KEITH discussed current overtime laws. She remarked that Alaska is a dual overtime state, which means that employees are owed overtime for anything over eight hours a day or forty hours

a week. The voluntary flexible work hour plan allows employees a partial exemption from daily overtime when it is made in agreement with the employee. She remarked that this must be a voluntary agreement between the employee and the employer and require approval by DWLD. She reiterated that time worked over the agreement must be paid.

MS. KEITH discussed flex plans and remarked that DLWD has received flex plans from 1,348 employers in the last four years. She said that once received, the department approves the schedule, the employer gets back the schedule and can employ as many on that this plan as needed. The department estimates that there are between 5,300 and 13,500 employees that are working alternate work schedules on this plan, and this could even be a low estimate. She noted that the department has received 563 wage claims, and of these claims, only one of them involved a flexible work hour plan. She stated that it is one of the most successful initiatives with DLWD and remarked that complaints and compliance issues have been minimal, and the department is confident in a change to a twelve-hour plan.

[5:10:19 PM](#)

MS. KEITH discussed the benefits of a twelve-hour work plan. For employers, flexible staffing options and consistent scheduling for 24-hour facilities have been important. In the healthcare industry, being able to offer the same salary that hospitals offer has helped with recruitment. Benefits for employees include a schedule that has a better work-life balance, reduced commuting costs, eliminating childcare needs, and students could also see benefits while in school. She noted the approximate childcare costs for an average family of three.

[5:11:29 PM](#)

MS. KEITH talked about changes in youth employment. She remarked that HB 61 would exempt sixteen-year-olds working in family-owned businesses from the approval requirements. She reiterated that sixteen- and seventeen-year-olds are subject to the same labor limitations and that the employment of fourteen-year-olds is much more restrictive. She stated that focusing approval processes on these younger groups is warranted. She noted that the proposed legislation would move the requirement for employers to send individual approval inquiries to a registration system for approval. It would increase the total number of workable hours and add an exemption to the weekly work limitations to allow full-time work.

5:13:00 PM

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT asked about Slide 6. She asked about limitations regarding twelve hour shifts and if an employer builds a schedule on 12-hour shifts, whether applicants that want 8-hour shifts should refrain from applying.

MS. KEITH responded that 12-hour shifts cannot be an employer requirement. Any employer that issues twelve-hour shifts must also offer eight-hour shift arrangements.

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT asked about Slide 7 and youth employment. She asked if a student works two different part-time jobs, who tracks the total hours and how accountability is held.

MS. KEITH responded that youth are allowed by law to work only nine hours between both school and work. She noted that she hasn't heard of a fourteen-year-old having more than one part-time job. She remarked that nobody would track the work hours in this instance.

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT asked that if a child is working too many hours, whether it is up to the family to work with the employer.

MS. KEITH responded that this is a reason for the proposed legislation. She offered that currently the parents sign the work permit, and it gets turned in for processing and it is taken back to the employer. She remarked that there is never any assertion of the requirements outside of the work permit. Allowing this new registration process would ensure parents are informed of work limitations and other employment regulations. She stated that it will allow the department to ensure that employers can understand the regulations and allow for more oversight.

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT asked if this was not possible to do in regulation.

MS. KEITH responded that the statute requires that individual work permits be submitted for every child. She stated that the amount of work permits received is overwhelming. In May, June, and July, it takes four investigators just to process work permits. She remarked that some of the oversight is not happening because of paperwork processing. She explained that

the department wants to eliminate this backlog and ensure safe working environments for children.

[5:17:46 PM](#)

CHAIR CARRICK thanked presenters.

[5:18:15 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE STORY asked for clarification for written permits. She asked whether this is an online process and if efforts underway to do so.

MS. KEITH recapped the process where the employer must fill out the permit, receive signatures from parents. She explained the change of hands regarding work permits.

REPRESENTATIVE STORY asked how the department keeps track of permits.

MS. KEITH remarked that it is a process, and a database is used to store the permits. She stated that some applications get sent back to fix errors. She mentioned that the department processes over 600 child labor applications for McDonalds that are all the same type of employment. She stated that some applications received from them are filled out incorrectly.

[5:20:20 PM](#)

CHAIR CARRICK said that additional questions can be sent to her office.

[HB 61 was held over]

[5:21:03 PM](#)

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business before the committee, the House State Affairs Standing Committee meeting was adjourned at 5:21.