

Chairman Rulli, Vice Chair Lang, Ranking Member Sykes and members of the Senate Small Business and Economic Opportunity Committee. My name is Jack Kahaian. I would say I am a proponent for SB 133, without detailed knowledge of the intricacies of the bill.

I have been a licensed cosmetologist since 1993. I have been a active owner an employee based salon since 1997. I work in the cosmetology schools from 1989 thru 1996 as a financial aid administrator.

I can appreciate and understand both the proponent's and opponent's points of view on this proposed bill, but I believe the time to reduce the requirements is now.

I believe we are experiencing what is happening across the our national post-secondary education institutions. The problem is **Title IV Financial aid**. Our educational institutions have become slaves to the federal funds to operate their schools, without which they are likely to shrink and some fail. Our cosmetology training school have inflated their costs of education, as well as our colleges and universities. ALL students (Colleges and trade schools) are coming out with more debt than ever entering a jobs with salaries that have not come up with the costs.

I would say most students feel like the hours are excessive and are not helping them better their skills to prepare for the work force. The schools do a great job at setting the basic skills needed to start and more importantly pass their licensing exams, but most every graduate has a great deal more to learn once out in the industry,

Our Cosmetology schools will suffer greatly with lower hour requirements, yes. Lower clock hour requirements will reduce the amount of Title IV funds they will be eligible for, thus limiting the amount of students they can attain. The archaic contracts that many schools impose on students also restrict the number graduates that can enter the work force.

Salon owners are stuck in a predicament also. A restrictive supply of employable workers is at epidemic levels across the nation, it is even harder for salon owners because we are vying for an even smaller group of eligible skilled labor.

I do not want our licensing to be abolished, as fear-mongering opponents may use to motivate the licensed stylists to oppose this bill. I would venture to say, if we can be assured that the licensing we all worked hard at achieving was to be safe, everyone would likely say 1500 hours is more than what is needed. I would be happy to employee a 1,000 hour graduate. I do not see the value from an employer's perspective in the extra training hours, I am sure many of the students would feel the same.

I could go on, but I do have a business to run. I wish I had the time and resources to testify in person, but this is the best I can do on short notice.

Chairman Rulli and members of the committee, thank you for allowing me to submit proponent testimony on SB 133.