

**Responses to Questions for the Record from
REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT C. “BOBBY” SCOTT (D-VA)**

**Committee on Education and Workforce
Workforce Protections Subcommittee hearing titled: “Balancing Careers and Care:
Examining Innovative Approaches to Paid Leave”**

**Tuesday, February 24, 2026
10:15 A.M.**

**Responses to Question(s) for Julie Squire, Vice President and General Counsel,
National Association of State Workforce Agencies**

- 1. Ms. Squire, H.R. 3089, the More Paid Leave for More Americans Act authorizes funding for a three-year competitive grant program, administered by the U.S. Department of Labor, for states that enact their own paid family leave laws, subject to minimum requirements. Under this program, eligible states could receive between \$1.5 million and \$7 million in a grant, which may be used for a variety of purposes related to the state’s paid leave policy.**
 - a. What is the range of costs that a state would incur to set up a social insurance model paid leave program? Additionally, what is the range of benefits that a state paid leave program pays out over the course of a year?**

Response:

Title I of H.R. 3089 establishes a “State Paid Family Leave Public-Private Partnership Grant Program” and is available for states that have a partnership with a private entity “such as an insurance company or other private entity handling specific functions of the paid leave program, such as the benefit application process.” New Hampshire and Vermont currently partner with a private insurer, and it is our reading that states envisioning a public-private partnership like the programs currently operating in New Hampshire and Vermont would be eligible for the grants in Title I of H.R. 3089. As we currently understand the legislation, state social insurance model paid leave programs that do not partner with a private entity, like the programs in California, Colorado, Delaware, the District of Columbia, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Jersey, Oregon, Rhode Island, and Washington, would not be eligible for these Public-Private Partnership grants.

Responses from some of our members indicate initial start-up costs ranging from \$30 to \$90 million. These costs include information technology development, program administration, staffing, rulemaking, and public education. Based on responses from some of our members, 2025 total benefit payments ranged from \$300 million to \$2 billion in states with social insurance models.

b. Are the grants in H.R. 3089 sufficient to assist states to set up their paid leave program?

Response:

The “State Paid Family Leave Public-Private Partnership Grant Program” in H.R. 3089 would assist states seeking to involve a private entity with “handling specific functions of the paid leave program.” NASWA does not have sufficient information to respond to the question of whether the grants would be sufficient to operate this type of public-private partnership. Title 2 of H.R. 3089 proposes I-Plan “conforming grants” in section 204(a) and “implementation grants” in section 204(b). In [comments](#) to the I-Plan proposal in H.R. 3090, NASWA expressed support for the grant funding, and suggested that “increasing the amount of funding available to states would provide states with adequate resources to participate in I-PLAN and implement the results.”

c. What comments, if any, has the National Association of State Workforce Agencies (NASWA) received from your membership regarding the grant quantities under this legislation?

Response:

We have not received formal input from our members on the sufficiency of the “State Paid Family Leave Public-Private Partnership Grant Program” in Title I which are for programs partnering with a private entity, such as New Hampshire and Vermont. In [comments](#) to the I-Plan proposal in H.R. 3090, NASWA expressed support for the grant funding, and suggested that “increasing the amount of funding available to states would provide states with adequate resources to participate in I-Plan and implement the results.”

2. The second component of H.R. 3089 is the creation of a “Interstate Paid Leave Action Network (I-Plan)” to facilitate cooperation and coordination between states. Under this section, there are several policy standards and administrative standards for state paid leave program administrators to discuss when developing an interstate agreement. Ms. Squire, the subject of some of these standards are typically spelled out in a state’s paid leave statute, and others are generally part of the regulations issued by a state agency administering the paid

leave program. Can you outline which of these standards are likely to require state legislators to amend their statutes to implement an interstate agreement, and which standards under an interstate agreement are likely to be implemented by a state agency through rulemaking?

Response:

The policy and administrative standards listed in the I-Plan are extensive. Given that state paid family and medical leave programs differ significantly in their statutory frameworks, financing structures, administrative models, and political contexts, NASWA cannot at this time provide an answer as to which standards would require legislative or regulatory action. A review of which elements listed in H.R. 3089 section 202(b) might require legislative action would be a significant task, and NASWA has not conducted such a review. This work would be ideal for the I-Plan, should it be established. Some of the items listed in section 202(b)(1), such as the base period, definition of family members, employee eligibility and coverage, will likely require state legislation. For the administrative standards in section 202(b)(2), it is likely that legislation would be required in some states.

3. In October 2022, Oregon and Washington state issued joint guidance for employers who have employees that reside or work remotely in the other state regarding their paid leave programs. Ms. Squire, are there other examples of states cooperating or collaborating with regard to their respective paid leave programs? If so, please provide specific examples.

Response:

In late October 2025 Colorado, Washington, and Oregon sent a joint request for an extension to IRS Revenue Ruling 2025-4. This followed a [letter sent by NASWA](#) on behalf of our PFML Committee (13 states and DC) on April 15, 2025. Additionally, states in the process of building a new program learn from existing state programs. For example, in 2025 staff in Maryland participated in site visits to New Jersey and Colorado to learn from their paid leave programs.

NASWA's Paid Family and Medical Leave Committee is an example of cross-state collaboration. Our members meet monthly virtually and twice annually in-person. Our agendas cover best practices across critical issues like claims adjudication, program integrity, medical certifications, fund recovery, and more. State staff also participate in four key subcommittees: fraud prevention and program integrity; tax and contributions; onboarding and new state resource development; and shared definitions. Our shared definitions subcommittee meets monthly and allows states to share how they define

different key terms and processes (i.e. “family” or “When is a claim considered filed?”), where that definition originates, any changes that have been made to it through legislation or rulemaking, and if the definition challenges their operations in any way. NASWA continues to work with states to develop new resources and allow for cross-state conversation.

4. Ms. Squire, 13 states and the District of Columbia have established comprehensive paid leave programs for workers. Can you discuss how these states protect taxpayer dollars and minimize fraud in their programs?

Response:

Through NASWA’s Paid Family Medical Leave Committee, especially the Fraud Detection and Prevention Subcommittee, states share the latest fraud trends and promising practices to minimize fraud. States utilize a variety of measures to prevent fraud including, but not limited to:

- *Identity Verification:* Systems, such as in [Minnesota’s](#) program, employ two-level or three-level identity proofing, including "liveness checks" (photo verification) to stop identity theft and impersonation.
- *Medical Certification:* Individuals applying for benefits must submit documentation from a healthcare provider confirming the need for care, with medical professionals signing off on the duration of leave.
- *Data Analytics & Cross-Matching:* State agencies use various tools to identify potential fraud, such as multiple claims linked to one person or inconsistent data.
- *Employer Involvement:* Employers also certify that an employee is taking leave.
- *Fraud Deterrent:* Cases of fraud can lead to denial of benefits and potentially referral to law enforcement.

Thank you to Representative Scott for the questions and his work on these issues. If NASWA can provide further assistance, please do not hesitate to reach out.

Sincerely,

Julie Squire

Vice President, Policy and General Counsel
National Association of State Workforce Agencies
444 North Capitol St. NW | Suite 300 | Washington, DC 20001
P 202.935.3279 | E jsquire@naswa.org | W naswa.org