



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1097		DATE: 2/17/2021	
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Government Oversight			
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: ELIZABETH PETERSON		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: Buffypeterson@hotmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written		SUBMIT DATE: 2/16/2021 2:13 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			

Every state I have researched has given to wavier including in other regular circumstances even non pandemic related incidences there has always been a wavier program for non fraudulent overpayments. When it comes to federal funds or even FEMA funds for example with DUA Disaster unemployment assistance these sources are an attempt to inject the economy and to provide a way for people to support themselves during crisis times. The legal aid of Massachusetts even provided assistance to those in need of a wavier exceptions process if required by a state. The 2 rationales are both equally footed one based on hardship to pay the money back for the extremely low income individual and the other was based on equity and good conscience which holds to the credence that money given over for spending on things to use for survival in place of work is essential and would have been spend on needs based purchases things that cannot be liquidated once these essential purchases were made the individual would have not the ability whether low income or not to find or recoup the money that was utilized for standards costs of living during a crisis. Who ever gets unemployment whether later deemed ineligible in both cases these individuals some broke and desperate and others just trying to afford the norm of life that from the aspect that their not being able to work is the main point of the crux of the rationale as to why they needed the funds when they arrived. Once the ship has sailed every step of a persons life down to the minuet detail is forever changed. Have you ever heard the phrase a path trodden leaves no stone unturned. How do people go back and figure out how it would be possible to "un" turn all the stones they turned when the access to UI benefits was viable to them? My personal situation with reasonable assurance as a substitute teacher is daunting as each summer I get told that I will be toughing it out looking for work without any UI benefit cuz of a rule that is wrongfully stigmatized my line of work in the field of education. What I do remember was during the tornado of 2011 we had a real official from Springfield UI specialist available to us at Joplin Job service. That man worked his hardest to get out benefits he took my reasonable assurance and quickly got it to be deemed ineligible then he processed my DUA claim and it took almost 2 additional weeks for him calling supervisors above him in the durum to work out all the kinks. But, that claims specialist got my DUA to process and I was able to have a viable means to UI during a crisis that effected me. When the pandemic came I thought surely I would be eligible for PUA just like I was for DUA. But, instead I found that they kept processing my regular claim even when I called and said if it gets denied we just need to open the alternate to the PUA claim like I did back in the Tornado of 2011. But, the claims people kept saying not it's not necessary your claims are going in fine. So, why later would I get this notice of overpayment? What I do not understand is why those who never ever got unemployment like gig workers and self employed were deemed eligible for PUA but now even for the week that I was told I now owe I went in and asked to do those weeks for a PUA claim and now I got the notice that I was denied for the PUA claim too? Well, this is uncanny why in the middle of a crisis no different than the tornado of 2011 why would I not be seen as eligible for UI emergency help?

Furthermore, and moreover why is the dysfunctional outdated issue known as reasonable assurance even still allowed to be hung over my line of work. In Obama care we were told we could not any longer go over 30 hours per week by the educational employer so as to avoid them having to give us health insurances. Since, that time we were also told we could never get salary like real teachers even if we worked over 21 days straight for a teacher. They took all our rights and left all our responsibilities? There is no way to organize as we are not full time so we cannot get have unionization with someone to spokesperson for our rights. The more and more that reasonable assurance upsets me is that even bus drivers get furlough from what I am hearing. WE do not get furlough we get no contract and if we do not accept to keep our name on a list for the next fall then they force us to quit? Either way it's to the advantage of the educational employer's vantage. The right under this benefit is suppose to be based off our entitlement benefit's rights and yet the director of the Mo UI in the hearing a couple weeks ago stated this is not an entitlement program? I think she is explaining a 1/2 truth. The fact remains under the U.S. Constitution a citizen has a right to insurance for periods of time where they do not have employment. The eligibility of my beneficiary enforcement is the only basis of why this program was suppose to be designed in the first place. I know why this state trust is designed for it is designed by requirements state and federal so that the benefactor/Employer has to be there for the beneficiary rights. The beneficiary that is me as living in MO had to first request the assistance and then requires the access to it. The state agency is not a gate keeper as such the state agency is the fiduciary there to protect the purpose of the trust wasn't the purpose of the trust to be for the beneficiary in a time of need when the employer either fired them or puts the out to pasture for a lay off etc. What do people think is occurring in the off season of the academic year? We as subs are as needed at will employees we do not hold contracts we have no guarantee of work even when our name exists on a list for the fall. The tween time is not of our making and when I fought this rule in 2015 I even proved to the referees that I had aquired summer work with the school district but they went in and canceled every sinlge job i had accepted on the online system where specific teachers had requested me. So, I was available for work there was work to be had but the employer would not allow me to have it? What kind of program is it that is catered to the employer's vantage point? Well again, the program itself is useless in my opinion as it does not uphold my rights as the beneficiary for whom the purpose of the program was suppose to be designed as any trust is built on the basis of the beneficiary ability to inherit the rights constituted and it is the job the agency to use constitutional boundary in this program so tell me what about it is not an entitlement program? For one I do not even think most of the claims especially those with the majority which is reasonable assurance are correct in that the agency called us as now ineligible. It is really overdue time for regulatory reform at the federal and the state level with regards to this issue of reasonable assurance. But, at the very least I do not feel we owe this money and since the band aid approach is to fix it without fixing the underlying root cause. Then yes the agency should have to wave the non fraudulent claims. Every state is doing this and yet every state should also be addressing as should Mo why reasonable assurance is allowed to infringe upon my entitlement benefits rights.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1097		DATE: 2/17/2021	
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Government Oversight			
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: MARCI BRICENO		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: marcifranyer@gmail.com	ATTENDANCE: Written		SUBMIT DATE: 2/16/2021 11:51 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			

The current statute needs to be amended. The current statute is unjust and will cause great financial hardships for many Missourians, including my family. My husband was laid off due to COVID-19. The current statutes are outdated and extremely unfair to unemployed workers that were laid off due to COVID-19 and do not work for the same employer during the "base period", some 6 months prior to the employee's lay-off date and NOT during the pandemic. My husband's previous employer of that base period obviously appealed and won the appeal due to the current employer-favored, outdated statute. Please approve this bill and the other related bills that reiterate this huge need for Missourians. Unemployment benefits are just that, benefits to help survive and not a loan from the State to further burden Missouri residents. (Related HB 873, HB 1035, HS 1083, HB 1036 and HB 1050)



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1097		DATE: 2/17/2021	
COMMITTEE: Special Committee on Government Oversight			
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: ARNIE "HONEST-ABE" DIENOFF-STATE PUBLIC ADVOCATE		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: ArnieDienoff@Yahoo.Com	ATTENDANCE: Written		SUBMIT DATE: 2/17/2021 1:25 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			

I am Opposed to this Bill. These are wrong and improper Payments made in error to Missourians who did not earn these funds. It is NOT fair to all of the Missourians that have not been given that same benefit. This is NOT free money and needs to be paid back to the Unemployment Fund that is unstable and in need of funding.