

though I understand that Senator Chambers and Senator Crosby do not feel we've gone far enough in addressing their concerns, we feel it's a balancing act between the thrust and intent of the original bill in trying to recognize problems with that legislation and try to deal with those problems. First, one of the things that was of concern on General File was the question of what kind of jobs are we talking about. Senator Chambers, in particular, talked about, you know, we talk about jobs and everybody should get a job, but what kind of jobs are we talking about? Where are they available, what kind of wages and benefits? And although that was envisioned to be part of the studies that would be kicked off by this legislation, it wasn't made absolutely clear that what kind of information we wanted to see. So one of the elements of the amendment is to say the Labor Department shall develop an analysis of availability of jobs in terms of the number available, the location of where those are available, the types and pay and benefits of those jobs, so we have some sense of, for instance, particular areas of the state as to whether the jobs are even available for that area versus other areas of the state where maybe there are jobs available and how that might play into this whole effort. So that's one thing, doing more analysis on the issue of jobs and that would be done with the Department of Labor and then the round table would follow up. The second thing that came up was there are a myriad of definitions in this bill, as has been cited already by Senator Chambers as to what extreme hardship would be, what the self-sufficiency contract would look like, what kind of...how would you determine whether the recipient or the state had fulfilled their contract, what kind of family outcomes are we looking for, whether there are benchmarks to reach those family outcomes. There are any number of terms and concepts used in the legislation that really aren't very clear, the idea being that the Department of Social Services would go forward, develop a waiver and in developing the waiver clarify those terms. And we've, I guess, expected to have those terms defined and returned to us when we looked at this legislation again next year, which we'll have to do to reenact anything that we might decide to pursue next session. But we did not make it absolutely clear exactly what we wanted to see done, what kind of standards we would want to see and some of the questions that were raised on General File. So this amendment lists out a number of concerns and says, please, look at these and come back to us with your analysis of exactly the terminology you would be considering and the kind of rules and regs type of standards and criteria that you would use to implement this. Also included in