



## **Statements on Submission of Caregiver Petition to Gov. Inslee Urging Veto of SB 6199**

“For family and other live-in care providers, this bill piles many additional complications and external agendas on an already overly complex care situation. We are being asked to provide 24/7 care and to ‘dance to the tunes’ of nearly a dozen administrative players - all at the same time. On top of that, this bill paves the way for the first ever labor strike that would leave vulnerable citizens alone in their homes with no personal care. Rather than piling on endless complications, we should be the recipients of gratitude. My household provides 24/7 care to an extremely vulnerable young adult - a citizen who would cost the state around \$220,000 per year in a state institution. Instead, we have been blacklisted by the SEIU for calling on the union to begin representing the true interests of live-in caregivers. For the low level of service our household receives from SEIU, we are called upon to pay about \$1,300 per year in union dues. Maintaining SEIU’s ability to force us to pay dues is one of the underlying agendas behind this bill. SB 6199 does not serve the citizens of Washington well; it does not serve well the most vulnerable among us; but it serves a few special interests extremely well.”

- *Loren Michael Freeman, Olympia, WA*

“I provide 24-hour care for my son in our home. As a parent, I know this is the best place for him. SB 6199 will force me, as a parent provider, to be employed by a private entity. I don’t need to be managed by some private company to care for my own son. This bill will also take away my constitutional right, as recognized in *Harris vs. Quinn*, to choose whether to support SEIU 775 with 3.2 percent of my pay. This doesn’t make any sense to me. Losing those funds will put more stress on our single income home. I do not see how SB 6199 will benefit our son or me as a parent provider. I see it as just another spoke in the wheel, more confusion, added stress, money taken from my home, and a legal right taken from me.”

- *Tammy Shipler, Lacey, WA*

“I am the parent and guardian of my 27-year-old developmentally disabled daughter who requires 24-hour care. I provide for all of her long-term care needs as her individual provider (IP). We believe she will receive the best possible care and support living at home with her family. Seventy percent of IPs care for a family member. Before 2009, IPs who wished to avoid associating with SEIU could work through one of the privately-owned, non-union home care agencies. But in 2009 Rep. Eileen Cody sponsored a bill that prohibited family caregivers to work through an agency and forced them to contract with

the state as IPs. Part of that involved requiring us to become dues-paying SEIU members. I was told if I did not want to be a union member, I could quit providing care for my own daughter. Eventually, the U.S. Supreme Court's *Harris v. Quinn* decision allowed us to opt-out of supporting SEIU, which I did. Now, with the support of legislators including Rep. Cody, the state is seeking to force IPs back into the private-sector with SB 6199, since that will allow SEIU to force us to pay union dues again. I strongly resent being forced to pay close to \$1,000 a year to a union that doesn't represent my values and political views. My hope is that Governor Inslee will do what is right for the people over favoring the union and veto this bill."

- Sally Coomer, Duvall, WA