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Thank you for the opportunity to submit written comments on SB-312, a critically important bill that will modernize Connecticut’s paid sick time law, provide needed support to workers across the State, minimize the costly and disruptive spread of illness in the workplace, and greatly improve public health.

A Better Balance is a national legal advocacy organization with four regional offices dedicated to promoting fairness in the workplace and helping workers meet the conflicting demands of work and family. Our organization provides legal and policy support to paid sick time campaigns throughout the nation, and we have worked on nearly all of the paid leave laws that are now or will soon be in effect. In addition to our legal research and drafting of paid sick leave laws, we have significant experience with paid sick leave implementation and enforcement.

Summary and Overview of the Need for SB-312

Over 10 years ago, the Connecticut Legislature became the first state in the country to pass a statewide paid sick leave law, a milestone that helped to pave the way for an incredible rise in paid sick time laws around the country. A decade later, 14 states and Washington D.C. now guarantee paid sick time to working individuals, two additional states guarantee general paid time off that can be used for any purpose, and nearly two dozen local governments have passed paid sick time laws. While Connecticut’s law was a landmark bill when passed in 2011, the law is now an extreme outlier as compared to other state programs and leaves far too many workers behind. Based on growing research confirming that comprehensive state and local paid sick time laws work well for employees, employers, and the larger community, Connecticut should take immediate steps to bring its paid sick leave law into line with other paid sick time laws around the country, covering all workers who lack this important protection.

Nationwide, nearly 28 million workers have no paid sick leave, and low-wage workers, workers with high public contact, Latinx workers, and Black workers are disproportionately less likely to have paid sick time.\textsuperscript{1} Connecticut’s current paid sick time law only addresses this need for paid sick time in a limited fashion, since the law only applies to certain hourly service workers who are working for employers with 50 or more employees. This narrow coverage renders Connecticut’s law barely protective of the workers who need it. All other state laws—all 14—that have been passed to address the lack of paid sick time for workers aim to cover the majority of state workers with far more limited carve outs. The carve-outs in the Connecticut law make it ineffective in reaching many of the workers who most need the protection. Research from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics show that workers at businesses with fewer than 50 employees are much less likely to receive any paid sick time than those who are employed by larger employers.\textsuperscript{2} Similarly, the federal data on access to sick leave shows that there are millions of workers—across industries and occupations beyond just hourly service workers—who lack paid sick time, which is why no other general paid sick time laws in the country restrict coverage to such a narrow
subset of workers. No workers should feel like they have to go to work when they or family members are ill, and the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic has put a spotlight on the tremendous public health risks when workers do not have access to a minimum of paid sick time for general health needs. The resulting economic crisis has also led to new financial pressures and fears for workers, especially low-wage workers who are living paycheck to paycheck and do not have access to paid sick leave. When workers go to work sick, they threaten their own health, their colleagues’ health, and the health of the community.

As detailed later in this written testimony, numerous studies have shown that workers without paid sick time are less likely to seek medical care, more likely to face workplace injuries, and more likely to go to work sick and spread illness to colleagues and community members. During the height of the H1N1 flu pandemic a decade ago, researchers showed that workers without paid sick leave were more likely to go to work sick, and as a result, the pandemic lasted longer as the virus spread; new research on paid sick leave and COVID-19 has confirmed that access to paid sick time also lowers the spread of COVID-19 in the workplace and throughout the community. Against the backdrop of the ongoing pandemic, Connecticut has the opportunity to take meaningful steps to modernize its paid sick time law and adopt a policy that reflects the dozens of other laws in effect around the country.

SB-312 builds on best practices for paid sick leave that have been studied and implemented across the country in the past decade, such as providing comprehensive coverage, a family definition that reflects the reality of families today, and adequate enforcement. Numerous studies, highlighted in this testimony, clearly show that paid sick time laws in the United States have improved worker and public health, while also leading to cost savings and positive effects for businesses. Rather than harming business, these laws have led to savings by successfully reducing worker turnover, boosting worker well-being and productivity, preventing the costly spread of illness, and leveling the playing field among businesses.

In addition to ensuring that Connecticut’s paid sick time law protects the workers who need it, SB-312 would bring the state’s paid sick time law into line with other state minimum labor standards. For example, the Connecticut Legislature passed a strong paid family and medical leave insurance program that will provide 12 weeks of leave and benefits (with an additional 2 weeks for certain pregnancy-related health needs) to bond with a new child, to recover from a serious health condition, or care for a seriously ill loved one. Compared to the narrower protections of Connecticut’s current sick time law, the new paid family and medical leave program is comprehensive, universal, and inclusive. SB-312 would establish similar standards for the state sick time law’s more modest 40 hours of paid sick time, ensuring that all workers can access this modest, basic right. Similarly, SB-312 would adopt the same family definition for use of 40 hours of sick time that the Legislature adopted for 12 weeks of paid family and medical leave. Beyond Connecticut, the proposed family definition in SB-312 has become a standard in paid sick time laws around the country, as discussed in more detail below. Like the paid family and medical leave program, SB-312 would make paid sick leave a labor standard for all workers, regardless of business size or profession, and adopt the same inclusive family definition as the paid family and medical leave program.

Based on our work on paid leave laws around the country, the overwhelmingly positive outcome in the many jurisdictions that have passed workplace leave laws, and the urgent need for paid sick time among workers regardless of employer size or profession, we urge you to advance SB-312 without delay. This legislation will
ensure that Connecticut’s paid sick leave law is no longer a restrictive outlier, improve the health and well-being of workers and their loved ones, lead to cost savings for employers, and help to disrupt the spread of illnesses like COVID-19—both now and in the future—in Connecticut.

**Modifications to the Connecticut Sick Time Law Included in SB-312 Will Protect Connecticut Workers and Bring Connecticut into Line With Other States and Localities**

- **Coverage of all workers without a business size carve out.** Currently NO other state or local paid sick time law contains a business size carve out for employers with less than 50 workers (except Michigan where a law with no carve out was amended in lame duck under questionable maneuvering under the law), and the vast majority have no business size carve out all. Thirty-one of the 34 paid sick time laws enacted have no business size carve out and the remaining law (other than Connecticut and Michigan) has a far smaller carve out.5

- **Coverage regardless of sector of economy worker is employed in.** NO other paid sick time laws are limited to service workers or provide broad exemptions to sectors of employment like Connecticut's law has done. The Connecticut law should not leave out workers in designated sectors.

- **40 hours is a modest amount of leave.** SB-312 does not propose to expand the amount of sick leave workers can earn in a year from the current ceiling of 40 hours. This proposal is modest as compared to some paid sick time laws that provide an even greater amount of time regardless of business size, such as 48 hours of paid sick time for all workers in Colorado, 56 hours of paid sick time in some California cities, and 56 hours for federal contractors.

- **Sick leave to care for all family members.** Currently, Connecticut’s sick time law defines family members for whom sick time may be taken as only minor children and spouses. All of the sick time laws in the U.S. recognize that family in America means more than that and define family much more broadly. Nearly every other paid sick time law in the United States defines family to include children (including adult children), parents and parents-in-law, grandparents, and grandchildren, and with only a couple of exceptions, nearly every paid sick time law includes siblings as well.6 Moreover, Connecticut’s sick time law fails to recognize that some workers provide care to other loved ones—such as a significant other, a close loved one who is like a sister, or an aunt who helped to raise the worker. Arizona, Colorado, New Jersey, New Mexico, and Rhode Island have all adopted family definitions that recognize loved ones with whom the worker has a close relationship and/or caregiving responsibility, as has New York City, Los Angeles, Chicago and Cook County (Illinois), and Saint Paul and Duluth (Minnesota); moreover, the federal government has used a similar version of this language for its own workforce for over 50 years.7 Connecticut has already recognized the critical importance of these family relationships in the definition for the State’s paid family and medical leave insurance program; SB-312 would adopt the same family definition for the State’s paid family and medical leave law and bring Connecticut into line with other sick leave laws around the country.

**A Successful Track Record: Paid Sick Time Laws Benefit Workers, Employers, and Public Health**

In recent years, voters and policymakers have increasingly addressed the fact that large segments of the American workforce lack paid sick time. Based on research that underscores the success of paid sick time laws, sick leave
laws around the country are increasingly comprehensive, universal, and inclusive. For example, New Mexico recently became the fourteenth state to pass a paid sick time law, and the program covers all employees regardless of business size, guarantees 64 hours of paid sick time, includes robust enforcement, and allows workers to care for all of their loved ones. After passing the country’s first statewide program, Connecticut now has the opportunity to raise the law’s protections to reflect current sick leave standards, research, and best practices around the country.

I. Research clearly shows that comprehensive paid sick time laws have not caused problems for employers or the economy and, indeed, have a positive business effect.

San Francisco’s paid sick time law is the oldest in the country, passed by ballot initiative in 2006, and its impacts have been well researched and documented. All evidence examined since the law took effect shows that there have been no adverse effects on San Francisco business and that job growth has been as substantial or better than in adjoining counties. After the law’s first anniversary, Kevin Westlye, Director of the Golden Gate Restaurant Association, told the *San Francisco Chronicle* that, “[s]ick leave is one issue where people just looked at adjusting their policies and moved on. It hasn’t been a big issue.”

Studies of New York City’s paid sick time law showed steady job growth in the year after the law went into effect. On the law’s first anniversary, the city released a report touting its successful implementation and noting that since the law went into effect, “the city has had steady job growth and the lowest unemployment in six years.” The city further reported that “New York City’s economy has thrived since the enactment of PSL [paid sick leave],” and that in the period covering the law’s implementation “economic indicators were a cause for celebration, not concern as many had predicted. . . .”

A 2016 report surveying employers showed that New York City’s paid sick time law has worked well for business. An overwhelming 98% of employers reported no known cases of abuse of paid sick leave. One employer, Tony Juliano, has stated that before the city’s paid sick leave law passed, “there were concerns that I and other small businesses had. But as it turns out, it hasn’t had the kind of impact that I worried about. Not even close. And in fact, the impact that I saw in my business was a much stronger bond between ourselves and our employees, higher productivity, and a more successful business, not a less successful business.”

Most employers were able to cover absences with cost-free measures, such as temporarily reassigning duties to other employees or putting some work on hold. Given these results, employers in New York City have a positive view of the paid sick leave law; 86% of employers surveyed now described themselves as supportive of the law, with more than half saying they were “very supportive.”

Studies in Washington, D.C. and Seattle also saw no negative economic effects following implementation of their paid sick time laws in either job loss or movement of businesses out of the city. A report from the Washington D.C. Auditor, issued five years after passage of the District’s sick time law, found that the law “did not have the economic impact of encouraging business owners to move a business from the District nor did the [law] have the economic impact of discouraging business owners to locate a business in the District of Columbia.” Likewise, a study of the economic impact of Seattle’s sick leave law found that a “preliminary look at available data shows no widespread negative economic impact as some opponents of the ordinance feared.” In fact, King County, which
includes Seattle, continued to outpace the state in job growth following implementation of the law. Seattle maintained its share of King County’s businesses and revenues, with no evident business flight, including in the retail and food services sectors.19

There are also many ways in which providing paid sick time has proven to be good for businesses and for the economy. Indeed, significant benefits for business have been found in several studies of paid sick time, and these cost savings should be considered by the Connecticut Legislature as part of any deliberations.20 Paid sick time has been shown to reduce worker turnover, which leads to reduced business costs incurred from recruiting, interviewing, and training new hires.21 Paid sick time also reduces the risk of “presenteeism”—workers coming to work with illnesses and health conditions that reduce their productivity—a problem that costs the national economy $160 billion annually ($207.6 billion after adjusting for inflation).22 With greater paid sick time access among larger employers and for higher-wage positions,23 SB-312 will also help to level the playing field across all covered employers and employees and establish paid sick time as a basic workplace right.

It is not surprising that such a small amount of sick leave as that required under the Connecticut law would have no negative impact on business. As the Legislature considers SB-312’s impact, it is important to recognize that workers on average do not use all of the paid sick days available to them. For example, when the federal government required contractors to provide 56 hours of paid sick time (more than SB-312 would guarantee in Connecticut), the U.S. Department of Labor’s cost estimates accounted for the fact that average paid sick time usage is lower than the overall leave available:

“Although the [Federal Contractor] Executive Order will allow employees to accrue up to 56 hours of paid sick leave annually, many employees will not use all paid sick leave that they accrue (and many others will not work a sufficient number of hours on covered contracts to accrue 56 hours of paid sick leave in an accrual year). . . . Case studies demonstrate that not all paid sick days will be taken. In a comment by the Institute for Women's Policy Research, the organization cited the 2011 IWPR report on San Francisco’s Paid Sick Leave Ordinance that found that the average worker used only three paid sick days per year and 25 percent used no paid sick days at all.”24

The cited paid sick time usage under San Francisco’s law—an average of three days—is especially notable given that San Francisco’s law allows workers in businesses with more than 10 employees to earn up to 72 hours (or nine days) of paid sick and safe time, which is much higher than proposed in Connecticut. Research on New York City’s paid sick time law has also found that workers are cautious in their use of sick time; as one employer stated, “[p]eople ration it. People want to save it up in case something serious happens.”25 The Connecticut Legislature should, like the federal government, consider such usage data when estimating the effects of SB-312, in addition to public health benefits and the savings that businesses see when they provide the benefit.

Even when average usage of paid sick time is lower than what may be available, a higher threshold of available paid sick time is still necessary. In a given year, many workers may ration their leave and not face as strong a need for time off, while they may face an unexpected emergency the following year; each year, some workers will face health or safety needs that necessitate the full amount of time. The availability of 40 hours of paid sick time to workers across Connecticut establishes an adequate safety net for covered workers—even if average usage will be lower each year.
Recognizing these benefits and the lack of negative consequences for business, San Francisco, Washington, D.C., and New York City—all among the earliest adopters of paid sick time laws—later went back and expanded their paid sick leave laws, underscoring how well these laws are working for workers, employers, and communities. New York City’s paid sick leave law has been so successful that the City Council has thrice expanded it to include broader coverage—most recently to allow workers to use paid sick leave immediately as it’s earned, ensure that domestic workers receive paid sick time, and to increase the annual paid sick time cap for workers with large employers. Connecticut should follow the example of these early paid sick time adopters and also modernize the State’s paid sick time law.

II. SB-312 will improve the public health and well-being of all Connecticut residents.

In addition to the positive effect on business, paid sick time laws improve both employee health and the larger public health of the community. It is especially relevant during the current pandemic that access to paid sick time reduces the spread of contagion. Workers in jobs with high levels of public contact, such as restaurant and child care workers, are very unlikely to have paid sick time. As a result, these workers may have no choice but to go to work when they are ill, thereby increasing the risk of passing illnesses on to co-workers and customers while also jeopardizing their own health. A peer-reviewed epidemiological study found that nearly one in five food service workers had come to work vomiting or with diarrhea in the past year, creating dangerous health conditions. The largest national survey of U.S. restaurant workers found that two-thirds of restaurant waitstaff and cooks have come to work sick.

Overall, people without paid sick time are 1.5 times more likely than people with paid sick time to go to work with a contagious illness like the flu, a fact that is costly and disruptive on an annual basis and catastrophic during a pandemic. During the H1N1 pandemic a decade ago, research showed that workers with lower rates of access to paid sick time were more likely than those with higher rates of access to paid sick time to go to work sick, and as a result, the pandemic lasted longer in their workplaces as the virus spread from co-worker to co-worker and throughout the community. As we enter the third year of the COVID-19 pandemic, researchers are already demonstrating that access to paid sick leave similarly reduces transmission and cases of the coronavirus. One study found that temporary access to paid sick leave led to a decrease in 400 COVID-19 cases per day per state without existing paid sick leave requirements during the height of the pandemic. Even during a regular flu season, let alone a pandemic, state and federal government officials strongly advise that sick workers stay home to prevent the spread of illness. However, because many workers lack paid sick time, they may be unable to comply, risking transmission to colleagues and the larger public. In addition, parents who don’t have paid sick time are more than twice as likely to send a sick child to school or daycare, which spreads illness.

In jurisdictions around the country, paid sick time has been shown to reduce recovery time, increase primary and preventive care, and lower health care expenditures by promoting the use of regular medical providers rather than hospital emergency departments. Nationally, providing all workers with paid sick time would result in $1.1 billion in annual savings in hospital emergency department costs, including more than $500 million in savings to publicly funded health insurance programs such as Medicare, Medicaid, and SCHIP. During the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, it is more critical than ever to reduce the burden on our already-strained healthcare system and avoid unnecessary strain on hospital emergency rooms, while also ensuring workers are able to get vaccinated and obtain boosters—and take time off for side effects—for themselves and loved ones. A study by Centers for
Disease Control and Prevention researchers also found that workers who have access to paid sick time are significantly more likely to undergo routine cancer screenings—including mammograms, Pap tests, and colonoscopies—and to visit a doctor or obtain other medical care.\textsuperscript{39}

Paid sick time has also been shown to prevent employee accidents, which in turn helps to prevent disruptions for employers and makes safer and more efficient performance of county contractors. A study by researchers from the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention found that workers with access to paid sick time were 28\% less likely than workers without access to paid sick time to be injured on the job.\textsuperscript{40} The strongest connection between access to paid sick time and a lower incidence of occupational injuries occurs in high-risk sectors and occupations.\textsuperscript{41}

SB-312 would also extend the current law’s time off for victims of sexual and domestic violence to workers across professions and regardless of business size. More than one in four American women report having experienced a negative impact from sexual violence, physical violence, and/or stalking by an intimate partner at some point in their lives.\textsuperscript{42} Many workers need time away from their jobs to care for their health after these incidents or to find solutions, such as a restraining order or new housing, to avoid or prevent physical or sexual abuse. Each year, victims of domestic violence are forced to miss nearly eight million days of paid work, costing more than $700 million annually due to victims’ lost productivity in employment.\textsuperscript{43} Furthermore, many survivors report job loss, due at least in part to the domestic violence.\textsuperscript{44} Loss of employment can be particularly devastating for survivors of domestic violence, who often need economic security to ensure their and their children’s safety.

IV. Based on an Understanding of the Clear Need and Benefits, Voters Across Party Lines Support Paid Sick Time as a Basic Labor Standard

Residents of Connecticut also recognize the need for basic, universal paid sick time provisions. Regardless of political party, large majorities of voters in the United States recognize the need for paid sick time and support paid leave laws. In one recent poll, 87\% of voters said they supported paid sick days and paid family leave for all workers impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic, including 91\% of Democrats, 86\% of Republicans and 71\% of Independents.\textsuperscript{45} Across party lines, voters also overwhelmingly say they are more likely to support elected officials who support general paid sick days legislation.\textsuperscript{46} Numerous polls show similarly high public support for paid sick leave requirements.\textsuperscript{47}

Conclusion

SB-312 provides an important opportunity for Connecticut to modernize its first-in-the-country statewide sick time law and better reflect best practices and research on paid sick time. Comprehensive, inclusive paid sick leave laws come with a track record of success and lead to benefits and savings for business, as demonstrated by research and the experience of other jurisdictions. The COVID-19 pandemic has put a spotlight on the critical need and public health implications of paid sick time, both during and beyond public health crises. Paid sick time laws improve worker health and safety, reduce the spread of illnesses, and improve public health throughout the larger community.
For the reasons outlined in this testimony, we urge members of the Labor and Public Employees Committee to support and advance SB-312. Thank you again for your consideration and the opportunity to submit this comment.
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