CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

of the

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR

----X

May 11, 2010 Start: 02:14pm Recess: 06:46pm

HELD AT: Council Chambers

City Hall

B E F O R E:

JAMES SANDERS, JR.

Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Gale Brewer Margaret Chin Daniel Dromm

James F. Gennaro

Daniel J. Halloran, III

Robert Jackson Letitia James Brad Lander

Jessica S. Lappin

Stephen Levin

Melissa Mark-Viverito

Michael C. Nelson

Domenic M. Recchia, Jr.

Ydanis A. Rodriguez

Deborah L. Rose

Larry B. Seabrook

Eric A. Ulrich

Jumaane D. Williams

Samira Rajan CEO Brooklyn Cooperative Federal Credit Union

Quenia Abreu President New York Women's Chamber of Commerce

Maximino Santos Representative Make The Road New York

Sherry Leiwant
Executive Director
A Better Balance

Carl Hum President Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce

Nancy Ploeger President Manhattan Chamber of Commerce

Linda Baran
President and CEO
Staten Island Chamber of Commerce

Jack Friedman
Executive Director
Queens Chamber of Commerce

Joseph Spinnato President Hotel Association of New York City

Shira Gans Representative Borough of Manhattan

Dr. Kevin Miller Representative Institute for Women's Policy Research

Andrea Doe Representative A Better Balance

Romulo favian Gavilanes Representative Restaurant Opportunities Center New York

Lourdes Espinosa Representative Make the Road New York

Thomas Ferrugia
Director of Government Relations
The Broadway League

Nora Nealis Representative National Cleaners Association

Patricia Brodhagen Vice President of Public Relations Food Industry Alliance New York State

Mitch Klein Vice President of Government Relations Krasdale Foods

Henry Kita Senior Vice President Building Trades Employers Assn.

Emily Sanders Representative Restaurant Opportunities Center New York

Donna Dolan

Chair

New York State Paid Family Leave Coalition

Carol Pittman
Representative
New York State Nurses Association

Dr. Victor Sidel Former President Public Health Association of New York

Scott Buchanan Owner Scott J Salons and Spas

Annamarie Gentile Partner Angiuli, Katkin & Gentile LLP

Debra Kravet Owner Apthorp Cleaners

Richard Aviles Co-owner Bridge Cleaners & Tailors

Danny Latham Owner Latham's Communications Brooklyn

Sharada Polavarapu Political Director Central Labor Council New York City

Sarah Johnson Representative Service Employees International Union Local 32BJ

Patrick Purcell
Assistant to President
United Food and Commercial Workers Union Local 1500

Robert Bookman Counsel New York State Restaurant Assn. & New York Nightlife Assn.

Anthony Juliano Chairperson Greenwich Village Chelsea Chamber of Commerce

Robert Sunshine Executive Director National Association of Theatre Owners

Kate Post Representative New York Staffing Association

Carmen Lee Shue Owner Lee Shue Realty

Charo Bourdier Unemployed Mother

Rachel Spector Staff attorney MFY Legal Services

Eric Brown Representative Restaurant Opportunities Center New York

Joseph Peters Representative Restaurant Opportunities Center New York

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

2	CHAIRPERSON	I SANDERS:	This	hearing
---	-------------	------------	------	---------

will now come to order. I want to start by thanking everyone for coming out here, you're certainly showing democracy in action. Good afternoon, I am Council Member James Sanders, Jr. and I am the Chair on the Committee on Civil Service and Labor. Today the Committee will hold a hearing on Intro #97, a local law to amend the administrative code of the City of New York in relation to the provision of paid sick leave, paid sick time, earned by employees. Thank you for attending today's hearing on this legislation. Intro #97 is sponsored by my friend, Council Member Gale Brewer, the public advocate, of course, Bill de Blasio, and many other members of the Council.

Legislators and policy makers are increasingly exploring the idea of providing paid sick leave for employees. We haven't gotten up to employers yet. The subject is currently being debated at the federal level and many jurisdictions at the state and local levels as well. Whether or not to make employers responsible for providing a minimum amount of paid

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

sick time to their employees has both pros and cons. The Committee expects to hear from individuals and organizations with a wide variety of viewpoints on this legislation. Some have asserted the need to have this benefit as a right that must be mandated so that those less able to negotiate or insist on this provision would be able to receive that which is taken for granted by those at other economic scales. On the other hand, some have asserted that it is not the role of government to regulate benefits that could impact how an employer does business, and that employer's ability to survive in these economic More and more, health professionals are times. encouraging those who are ill to stay out from work or away from school. This legislation, and other legislation similar to it in other jurisdictions, have been viewed by some as a means to better protect their jobs and well-being of their families. Today we have been joined by members of the Committee. We have Council Members and other members who are not members of the Committee, everybody is interested this one. We have of course Council Member Brewer, Council

2.0

Member Rodriguez, Council Member Chin, Council
Member Nelson and Council Member Lander. Now, I'm
going to perhaps ask the first questions after we
hear from speakers, and notice I'm going to only
ask two questions. Because I want my colleagues
to have a chance to get into this and to speak,
and I'm encouraging everyone else to be succinct,
to really make sure that we hear from every single
person who is here. And we'll never forget that
Council Member Dromm has joined us also,
especially since my friend, Gale Brewer, is kind
enough to make gure of that

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: I would also like to thank our Committee staff. We have our counsel, Matthew Carlin, Shauneequa Owusu, our policy analyst, Ksenia Koban, our financial analyst, Kim Tai, our press agent, and from my office, Marlene Tapper, who many of you have gotten to know and will know, and Cherise Vaughn, who the rest of you know. I would like to now stop and call upon the person who has perhaps best gotten us to this position, and that of course, Council Member Gale Brewer of Manhattan, and she

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

has the opportunity to say what brings us all together today. Thank you for doing all these things, Gale.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair, you and I have known each other for a long time. So it's a real honor to be here with you and my colleagues here today. have a lot of Ritz crackers for the long hearing, if anybody wants a Ritz cracker. This is first and foremost in my mind a bill regarding public Any of us who had our kids sick at school health. know that the worst call you can get is that your child is sick at school, and you have to come pick them up. And when you can't do that because you're afraid of losing your job, or losing pay, and you can't do that because you want to make the rent, that's a horrible call. And I think when we'll hear from pediatricians and nurses and some of our colleagues who are teachers in their previous employment, you'll understand that the most important aspect of this bill in my mind is that it would address the need for better public health in the City of New York.

Number two, the fact of the matter

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

is, is that this is not an expensive bill. Bureau of Labor Statistics, and we'll hear more about this from speakers, feels that it's eight cents an hour per service worker, or per employee. That is not a lot when you are thinking about the fact that many businesses, and this is my third point, already have paid sick leave. And we are working with the amazing staff writing this bill, both from the coalition that supports it, the coalition that doesn't, and also the amazing staff of the Speaker, to figure out a way of writing so that those businesses that already have paid sick or the equivalent would not be part of this legislation. I want to add though, that just to be clear, there are up to, if not over, a million low-wage New York City workers who do not have paid sick leave. It is 48% of working New Yorkers do not have paid sick leave, 54% of all public school parents do not receive paid sick leave, and 65% of low-income public school parents do not have paid sick leave. And many of them are obviously working families, one or two parents working, and many, many people of color.

My fourth point is that this is

part of a national effort. Obviously we have
heard about San Francisco at a previous hearing,
via audio-video, first time ever done in the City
Council. We actually heard and saw the people in
San Francisco who are implementing this law.
According to them, and San Francisco is a city,
some people say 'gala' doesn't count, it does
count, it is a city. And in that particular city
there has not been any exit of employees, exit of
business, and there has been growth in San
Francisco proper. So I feel strongly that you'll
hear also that there are some national leaders who
are trying to figure out a way that 40 million
private sector workers in America do not have paid
sick leave, and how could we work together, and
they urge that it start with municipalities.

Finally, I want to thank the

Chairman, and Laura Popa, Terzah Nasser, Matt

Carlin, Shauneequa Owusu, and certainly Shula

Warren and Kunal Malhotra from our office, and all

the people, pro and con, who have spent so much

time thinking about what's the best way to address

this challenge. Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: Thank you. I

that arguably Queens best Councilperson has shown up, Eric Ulrich. And I'm from Queens, to make matters worse. I will also say that I do want to thank everyone for coming out here, and taking your time to come to the people's house and put your position across. It's highly valued and I want to encourage everyone that we are going to have a good, healthy debate here. We're not going to boo and hiss and all kinds of other good stuff. We will let logic lead us on this one. And with that, sir, would you be kind enough to call the first panel?

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Samira Rajan,
Brooklyn Cooperative Federal Credit Union; Quenia
Abreu, New York Women's Chamber of Commerce,
Maximino Santos, Make the Road New York, and
Sherry Leiwant, A Better Balance.

CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: If I could, even as you come up here, if I can encourage everybody that one true sign of intelligence is brevity, to express yourself in a fashion that is real clear, very quickly, because we want to make sure everyone hears everyone.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: And if anyone wants to testify and you haven't filled out one of these little white cards with the sergeant, please do so.

CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: In the order that you were called, if you would be kind enough to introduce yourself and to speak. And if you speak into the mic as I am doing, we'll all hear you. Let us begin. What order did you call them? Not a problem. That's fine, we'll make it work.

MS. LEIWANT: Okay. Good afternoon, I'm Sherry Leiwant, executive director of A Better Balance, the work and family legal center, and we've been working on paid sick days legislation all around the country. And I've been asked to outline the provisions of Intro 97, the proposed paid sick time law. I want to start by thanking the Chairman of the Committee, Council Member Sanders, the bill sponsor, Gale Brewer, and all the Council members who have signed on in support of this bill. As Gale, as Council Member Brewer said, the purpose of this bill is to insure the public health of the City of New York, to insure that when a worker is sick, that worker can

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

take time off without sacrificing a day's pay, or risking job loss, and insuring that no parent will ever have to choose between their job and caring for a sick child. I have a Powerpoint here to just outline the provisions of the bill, but there are two critical features that I really want to emphasize. One is that it has to cover, it does cover, and it has to cover, all workers, because all workers need paid sick days. In the Wall Street Journal this morning, there's a chart from the CSS Better Balance study of workers in the City of New York that shows that those without paid sick days are concentrated in smaller And it also shows that low income businesses. workers have been losing ground on this issue, and fewer and fewer of them every year have paid sick days.

The second thing I really want to emphasize is that businesses that already provide paid time off for their workers do not have to add additional time under this bill. No matter what they call it, if they call it vacation time or PTO or personal days, businesses don't need to add days if the time off they give their workers is

2 the same amount and can be used for sick time.

And they don't have to convert vacation days or personal days. They don't have to ... that time can be used for something else.

So this is the basic outline of the bill. It's an earned paid sick time bill, so it's based on the hours that employees work. It's one hour for each 30 worked. And there's a maximum in every year, 72 hours is the maximum that has to be given by bigger businesses, and 40 hours for smaller businesses. And smaller businesses are defined as those that employ less than 20 full time equivalent employees, and that's 88% of the businesses in New York.

Use of this is that days can be used for an employee's own physical or mental illness or for preventive care, or to take care of a close family member. And it also can be used if there's a public emergency. Notice of foreseeable leave can be required, documentation can be required after three days, and discrimination and retaliation is prohibited. In terms of who is covered, it covers all private employers and employees within the city boundaries, and that's

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

all that the City Council can do in fact. They're covering all the workers they legally can cover. And in terms of enforcement, there are posting requirements, and there will be an administrative remedy. Again, all leave counts and there's never, it's not up there, but I want people to understand that there's never a need to pay anyone for unused paid sick time, and there's never a need to give more than 72 hours or 40 hours in a year, so there is a limit. And there were a number of changes, as Council Member Brewer alluded to, from last year's bill, and those have been made in response to a lot of the people that we've talked to, a lot of the people that all the Council members here have talked to, who had objections or had concerns. And those are listed up there. We raised the number on small businesses, we've narrowed the number of relatives, we changed the rehire period, so that summer workers will not get to carry over their time from one year to another. And we've made it clear that businesses do not have to change their bookkeeping practices. So I thank you, I thank you again for taking up this bill, and if there

fair and affordable financial services, such as

19 savings accounts and small business loans. Today

20 Brooklyn Cooperative operates two branches,

21 manages over \$10 million in community assets. We

have 6,500 largely low-income working-class

24

23 members throughout central Brooklyn, and we employ

thirteen people. As a small business, we've seen

25 many ups and downs, including the current tough

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

economic times, plus we provide financing for many neighborhood small businesses and we know how hard it is to stay afloat. We definitely do not take lightly the need to be cost conscious. same time, there's no doubt in my mind that the single most important factor in our past and future success is our staff. No business, no company, whether for profit or not for profit, will thrive without a dedicated and competent workforce. This is why, though the credit union's budget is often tight, we have never compromised on fairness to our employees. Every employee, starting from their first week of employment is entitled to twelve sick days annually. Allowing staff to take time when they're sick is a basic right and expectation. A sick employee resents being at work, is not thinking, is not performing their job duties, and depresses overall staff morale. They may spread sickness to other employees and further decrease overall productivity. In addition, given that all credit union staff must interact with members of the public daily, there is a potential to spread sickness to the individuals coming in to do their

banking business. Finally, giving a sick staff	
member one or two days to rest will help them get	
better faster so they may more quickly return to	
full capacity. Forcing staff to work will only	
exacerbate their illness, perhaps prevent them	
from seeing a physician to obtain proper care, it	
creates unpredictability and a definite drag on	
productivity. A company's relationship with its	
workers ought to be built on mutual respect. The	
employee respects the company's policies and	
procedures and endeavors to do their job right,	
while the employer treats the employee with	
respect by providing a safe work place,	
transparent decision making and fair treatment.	
Everybody gets sick, it's unavoidable; to penalize	
the worker for a fact of life denigrates the work	
place. Many business owners do try to do right by	
their employees, but without a citywide standard	
that requires all businesses to provide sick days,	
they face being undercut by less scrupulous	
competitors. I wish to express support for this	
bill in front of you today, and thank you for the	
opportunity.	

CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: Thank you.

2 Next speaker.

3 MS. ABREU: Good afternoon, my name 4 is Quenia Abreu, I'm the president of the New York Women's Chamber of Commerce, and I want to thank 5 you for this opportunity to testify in front of 6 7 you today. I'm here to testify in favor of paid 8 sick time act #97. We are, as I mentioned to you, the New York Women's Chamber of Commerce, with 9 more than fifteen hundred members, the majority of them women-owned businesses. As small business 11 12 owners, we know how important it is for our 13 workers to be able to take time off when they or a family member is sick, with the peace of mind of 14 15 knowing they won't lose a day's pay or their jobs. 16 Paid sick days is a matter of basic fairness. 17 one should have to come to work when they are sick, and no one should risk losing their job or 18 19 their pay check they need just because they come 20 down with a cold or their sick child needs care. 21 As women business owners, we know it's often the 22 women in the family who are responsible for caring 23 for sick children or parents, but who also have jobs they want to keep. Giving our employees paid 24 25 sick days means a happier, healthier, more

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

productive workforce. That's why we are proud to stand here today in support of the paid sick days bill. As small business owners who care about our workers, it is also important that we know that all businesses will be doing the right thing. That levels the playing field for all of us, so we can provide what we know is right for our workers without putting ourselves at a disadvantage. This bill has a special provision for small businesses that will balance our needs with the need to make sure everyone's health is protected by including smaller businesses in the bill, but requiring small businesses to provide a few less days than big businesses. As everyone knows, the economy has not been great, and all businesses, especially small businesses, are struggling. But providing paid sick time for our workers is not going to cost us very much. Having a worker stay out when they are sick is better for any business owner than having sick workers come in and make other workers and customers sick. And the small cost of paid sick days is not a problem for small businesses. The problem for us is the price of commercial rents, the property taxes, and the red

tape of regulations that government ... or unnecessary regulations, unfair taxes by large corporations and unfair city rules. We have banded together to support the small business survivor act. There are a lot of ways the City Council can help small businesses, but failing to pass a law that will help so many people by guaranteeing a small amount of paid sick time is not one of them. Paid sick days is a good policy for everyone, workers and businesses alike, and I hope the Council will pass this law. Thank you.

FEMALE VOICE: Maximino is going to speak in Spanish, and then I'll translate his testimony into English.

MR. SANTOS: Good afternoon, my
name is Maximino Santos and I am a member of Make
the Road New York. Thank you to the members of
this committee for the opportunity to testify. I
worked for five years as a chef at a restaurant
called Viennese Gourmet Deli at 475 Lexington
Avenue in Manhattan. While I was working there, I
got sick many times, but I went to work anyway
because I was afraid of losing my job. First it
was just a cold, but it got worse and worse over

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

time because I kept going to work while I was My boss would not let me take any time off, so I would just take some Tylenol or some Advil and go to work sick, often with a fever. I wanted to see a doctor, but my boss told me that he could not run the business by himself, so I had to go to work. My boss was never concerned about me being contagious. I bought face masks with my own money because I did not want anyone else to get sick, but my boss never bought anything like that. Finally I was so sick that I went to a clinic. The doctor there told me that I was very ill, and that I could not go back to work. He told me that my lungs were inflamed, and that if I went back to work, I was risking my life. I asked him for a letter to show my boss, and I have the doctor's letter. I am a 45 year old man now, but two months ago my lungs were functioning like those of an 84 year old. In February I went to the clinic, they did a test and I have the documentation that shows this. This is the documentation. went to the hospital, and they told me that I had to take very good care of myself, because my lungs were very weak. They told me that I had

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

bronchitis, which had then developed into pneumonia. The doctor told me that it would not have gotten so serious if I had been able to see a doctor earlier. I called my boss and he told me that I had to come back to work if I wanted to keep my job. For three weeks I was seriously ill and had a high fever. After two weeks I was still sick, but I bundled up and went back to work because I was afraid of losing my job. When I got there, my boss told me that he had already hired somebody else, and that I did not have a job any This happened about two months ago, I have been unemployed since then because I'm still sick and have not been able to go back to work. the City Council to please pass this legislation as soon as possible, for the health of all workers like me, and for the well being of all New Yorkers. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: I'm very sorry of your illness, your health problems, [Spanish phrase]. Let's see, let's start. Oh, glad you looked over here. We've also been joined by Council Members Mark-Viverito, Rose, Jackson, Levin, Williams, and James, and I think I ... and

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Halloran, for balance. That one person will balance all these points, no doubt. Having said those things, I'm going to see if my colleague, Gale Brewer, wants to raise a point.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: First of all, thank you all very for being here. Samira Rajan I have a question. You run a business, and you obviously work with other businesses and individuals. One of the issues we hear is that if we provide paid sick leave, and I think, again, many businesses already do it and don't know it, and we're trying to work with them, so that they're not part of this bill, as we stated earlier. But do business, do workers take advantage of your twelve days? Do they take every Monday off, every Friday off? Is this something that you have to deal with, or do people understand that they have a job, they want to do it, and they want to be part of the team?

MS. RAJAN: Thanks for your question. In my experience, I've been running ...

I've been at the credit union for almost ten years. In my experience we've never had a staff person take advantage of sick leave in the way

anything that's going to change that, as long as it's the same amount of leave, and their workers can use it for the purposes that we described.

23

24

And there are some changes from last year's bill to make it clearer about the bookkeeping, as I said. And as clear as that can be, we would want that to be made clear. I think it is clear in this bill, but if there are ways to do it better, sure.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Thank you very much. Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: Thank you. I have, in order of speaking, I have Council Members Lander, Jackson, Williams and James. And I just want to draw your attention that Chair Brewer has also shown us the way. She put two questions on the floor, and she stopped, so that everyone can get out of the way, and I encourage everyone else to do the same, and that way, after you get your two and everyone spoke, and if you want to speak again, not a problem. But at least everybody gets in here. And to show the way, Council Member Lander.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman, for the good guidance. Let me first
say to Ms. Rajan that I appreciate your testimony,
you make me very proud to be a member of the

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Brooklyn Cooperative Federal Credit Union.

MS. RAJAN: Oh, get out, man.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: And I think that shows not only that, you know, it works well from a worker's point of view, but from a community point of view, and a customer point of view as well. You want to do business at a place where people are taken care of. Council Member Brewer talked about obviously the obvious public health issues, but I think the broader issues and 12 what it means that we're doing as a city are profound, and I think you for helping me feel that 14 way today, and for leading us as a city.

> Thank you for your kind MS. RAJAN: words.

> COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Ms. Abreu, I wanted to ask whether you had a chance to look yet at the fourteen recommendations that came out of the Small Business Regulatory Review Commission that Speaker Quinn has taken real leadership on and worked with the Mayor, and that, you know, hopefully will be passing the first piece up tomorrow, the Small Business Bill of Rights, but that really represents significant steps forward,

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

in my opinion, in making life easier and easing some of the regulatory burden in helping small businesses in the city thrive. I think this is an ideal time to be considering both paid sick time, which was great to hear you say you think is not a significant additional burden, while we're also looking to do things that really help small businesses move forward at the same time.

MS. ABREU: Yes, I have and I really appreciate that, but as I mentioned in my speech, one of the major problems that our small businesses have is with their lease, it really is, and with the real estate taxes. We have our beauty salons that are paying thirty, forty thousand dollars a year in real estate taxes. When you think about paying a couple of sick days to, you know, versus, you know, the \$40,000 that they pay just in real estate taxes on a property that doesn't ... that they don't really own, and it's a beauty salon, a woman-owned business providing also employment to other women, the paid sick days is really not a lot, and we really need to take a look at other things, to really help the small businesses. At least the businesses that we

represent, which are really the immigrant business
owners and especially women-owned businesses, and
I just want to add to the first question that Gale
asked about sick days, we are the women's chamber,
we are a small organization, we only have five
employees, and we provide five paid sick days, and
no one has ever abused that. As a matter of fact,
we have one employee that never, ever takes a sick
day, that I have to force him to at least go to
the doctor and, you know, for prevention, because
he doesn't, he never takes a sick day. So I don't
really see the issue here. I'm actually, and I
said this before, I am embarrassed that we have to
said this before, I am embarrassed that we have to come here to even bring this forward, when this
come here to even bring this forward, when this
come here to even bring this forward, when this should have been done a long time ago. And when
come here to even bring this forward, when this should have been done a long time ago. And when we talk to our small business owners, a lot of
come here to even bring this forward, when this should have been done a long time ago. And when we talk to our small business owners, a lot of them, they don't even know that there is not a

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: Thank you, sir, and you certainly have led the way. Council

1	COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR 32
2	Member Jackson will follow up in the same good
3	order.
4	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Well, if I
5	follow the order that's taken place, Council
6	Member Brewer asked two questions, Council Member
7	Lander asked one, so that means I should ask none.
8	CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: No, actually
9	Council Member Lander did a commercial first.
10	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Yes,
11	right.
12	CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: And then
13	spoke.
14	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Well,
15	thank you, Mr. Chair, good afternoon to the panel.
16	Let me just ask, with respect to the impact of
17	passing this particular bill into law, do you
18	have, any one of you have, any idea of how many
19	more people this would impact, and what, from a
20	practical point of view, would it have on changing
21	their lives or their families' lives? That's
22	what my question is, and if you all can respond,
23	more than one, but very quickly so that the Chair
24	won't get on my back.
25	MS. LEIWANT: Okay, we have done,

MS. RAJAN:

Yes.

So do you

COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON:

24

MS. LEIWANT: Yes, I just wanted to

Τ	COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR 34	
2	mention, Gale alluded to this, but the Bureau of	
3	Labor Statistics study that says that paid sick	
4	days will cost approximately eight cents an hour	
5	for service sector workers, and twenty three cents	
6	an hour for other workers. It's not an expensive	
7	bill.	
8	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Anyone	
9	else?	
10	MS. RAJAN: I have a small	
11	business. We currently have thirteen employees.	
12	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: What kind	
13	of business, please?	
14	MS. RAJAN: It's a small credit	
15	union in Brooklyn.	
16	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Okay. Non	
17	profit?	
18	MS. RAJAN: Yes.	
19	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Go ahead.	
20	So are you willing to pay the cost?	
21	MS. RAJAN: We already provide up	
22	to twelve sick days per person per year.	
23	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Okay. And	
24	you are a worker, is that correct, sir?	
25	Unemployed worker? Right now you're unemployed.	

1	COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR 35
2	is that correct?
3	CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: Translate for
4	brother Jackson.
5	MS. SANTOS: Yes.
6	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: But right
7	now you're an unemployed worker, but if you owned
8	a business, would you be willing to pay the cost
9	in order to provide sick leave for workers, pay
10	the cost?
11	CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: Speculation,
12	sir.
13	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: I'm asking
14	the question.
15	CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: Your
16	question, sir.
17	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Now, you
18	know, Mr. Chair, when you translate from one
19	language to the other, it takes twice as much
20	time, so I'm entitled to four questions.
21	CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: Yes, but no
22	speculations.
23	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Okay.
24	CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: Please let
25	him answer that question, and then let's go on.

Rose, said outside, we gave the horses a couple of

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

weeks vacation a couple of weeks ago, I think we can give some sick days to the human beings. So from what I've seen for all the changes that were made, I think we've addressed all the concerns that were brought up, any reasonable concerns, and I really don't see any rational reason why people would now be opposed. Because we've addressed the size of the businesses, we've addressed if you already have time off. We've addressed all of these issues already. So I'm trying to think of any rational reason why you may think someone could oppose. And I was thinking perhaps maybe the administrative part of putting this into place. Can you talk about administratively what would have to change, if you had to implement sick leave if you didn't have it, which you should have had already? Because this should have been in place a long, long time ago.

MS. LEIWANT: Do you mean for individual businesses to put it into place? think it's not ... again, I mean, the one city that has had a lot of experience with it is San Francisco, and the businesses there that didn't have it before and put it into place, it wasn't a

problem. And that's been, you know, the Golden

Gate Restaurant Association said it wasn't a

problem, the small business association there said

it wasn't a problem. They just had their payroll,

their payroll company assess the paid sick time

and then they paid the paid sick time. It was not

a big deal, and I don't think it would be a big

deal here either.

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: So, and we've shown that it doesn't cost that much money. So is there any other reason that you could think of? Is it just irrational fear of change? Like what is it? What is the reason that we can't get this done?

MS. ABREU: I think it's just irrational fear. I mean, I remember the Mayor talking about the no smoking in businesses, and the businesses thought that that was going to put them out of business, and it didn't. So why not just, you know, why not just give it a try? Why not just do it? This is talking about health and as Council Member Brewer said, it's talking about public health. And we really just need to do it. And for instance, working with our small

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

businesses and helping them put together a
personnel manual that would also help them in
terms of implementing the sick days, and it's just
simple. I mean, especially if you're a small
business, how hard can that be? You know, you put
it in place, it's a policy, it goes into your
personnel manual, and whoever is handling your
payroll is in charge of just keeping, you know,
paying the sick days, or keeping count of the time
off, and that's it.

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: All right, well I want to say thank you again. Like I said before, I think there are two people who should be opposed to this, those who have never gotten sick, and those who won't get sick in the future.

> MS. ABREU: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: Thank you very much, sir. We'll hear from Brooklyn's fighting Council Member, Council Member James.

COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: First to Ms. Rajan, I believe the Brooklyn Cooperative Federal Credit Union is in my district, so it's an honor and a privilege to meet you. I look forward to

MS. LEIWANT: Okay, you know, New

City of New York. Could you speak to that a

23

24

little bit?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

York obviously is the best city in the whole world, and we all know that. But having said that, San Francisco is a city that has more restaurants per capita than any other city in the United States, and their restaurants were not providing paid sick days before this bill was passed. They have done it now, and it has not been a problem. And speaking to one of the other questions of Council Member Williams, I think people are afraid of change. There was a lot of opposition before it went into effect in D.C. and in San Francisco, and it's not ... it hasn't happened now. So I would say, you know, we are a great city, we are a large city, but these cities are very large and have a lot of the same kinds of industries and the same kinds of service sector jobs that we have here. So I don't really see why it would be a so much bigger problem here in New York.

COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: Thank you.

The other argument that I hear, particularly from the chambers of commerce in all five boroughs, is that this is going to kill jobs, it's going to destroy the economy. Is that a myth?

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 MS. LEIWANT: It's a myth, and 3 again, that's the kind of thing that business and, 4 well, the chambers, in any event, have said when we've had minimum wage legislation, and any kind 5 of basic labor benefit legislation. Again, you 6 7 know, and I alluded to San Francisco so much 8 because they have had the experience now for several years, whereas the others are newer. 9 And 10 even in the recession, their loss of jobs was ... 11 they did much better than the surrounding 12 counties, where there was no such law. So I think 13 that's a powerful argument that this law is not going to make the sky fall or jobs go away. 14 15 COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: So let me

COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: So let me give you this fact pattern. I'm a business in Brooklyn, I already provide vacation and time off and sick leave. Would this law apply to my business?

MS. LEIWANT: Well, every ... it applies to everybody, because everybody needs paid sick days, but if you have, if you already provide the same amount of time, and again, no matter what you call it, if it's vacation or PTO or personal days, or sick leave, you don't have to do any

MS. LEIWANT:

I think it's fair to

wondering if you happen to know what,

When you said we're a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

1213

14

15

16

17

18

1920

21

22

23

24

25

margin of small, 80% of the small businesses in

New York City is? What the percentage margin of
operation is for those businesses? Do you know?

MS. RAJAN:

statistically speaking, the margin, the operating

non-profit, it's true that we're non-profit. But we still have to rely on our employees to do the So in there it really doesn't make a work. difference. We still have to raise, we still have to get our money to come in, and that's also part of their job. So it really doesn't make a difference there. I have owned a business before as well, and I can tell you this is just a basic principle. And also one other thing, because I've got to tell you, when you don't provide paid sick time to your employees, what ends up happening is that a lot of times they're going to have to take paid sick days anyway. Or if they come in, they make other people sick, and then they're sick and other people are sick. So they still ... you're going to lose those employees for that time, and what ends up happening too, is that there's a high turnover. When you don't provide benefits to your employees, it's a high turnover. And that's

immigrant community wants in this. And their

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

chamber of commerce came out against this. So it's interesting that you say that. But my question was, do you know what the percentage of margin of operation is for small businesses in the City of New York? Do you know what it is? You know what, let me tell you. It's 5%. Okay? So the average business is not gouging people making huge The average business, 80% of them, of profits. the small businesses, small business is defined as under 25 employees. The average one operates on a 5% margin. Has anybody here done a study to see with businesses operating on a 5% margin if we give the sick leave you're talking about, how that will impact the bottom line? Because you're not only going to pay someone to sit home, in those small businesses, you're going to pay somebody to take their place. So I'd just like to know if any of you studied that before you made your tremendous pronouncements about how this is not going to have an effect on small businesses.

MS. LEIWANT: You know, nobody has said that there is no cost involved here, and I think there will be people testifying later on who have more ... you know, have actually done the

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

research. But the Bureau of Labor Statistics, again, which is a reputable, it's not a partisan organization, has said eight cents an hour in the service sector, twenty three cents an hour, and I understand that's not nothing. But on the other hand, it's not a lot.

COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: And that is spread out across the entire spectrum of those businesses and range. We're talking about, and to address specific objections that have been raised include exempting businesses under a certain number of employees. I think that people can understand why that might be an issue. definition of a family, taking leave for a family person, without a tight definition, we could wind up with, well, that's Joe, I kind of call him my uncle, and I'm taking care of him. Which is not what the intention is. And language is a very funny thing in the law, you try to be as precise as possible, so that when it winds up in a courtroom, you're able to negotiate. And speaking of courtrooms, it's interesting that this bill does not include fees for counsel for the business owner, when they prevail and somebody makes a

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: Thank you,

Mr. Chair. I've heard a lot of talk about the number of sick days granted a larger business that employs twenty or more staff members, and a smaller one. And I was wondering if in fact you have done any research into, you know, if there would be any significant financial gain for businesses which currently employ twenty staff members to reduce their staff to under twenty for financial gain, and if in fact you feel that that might be a trend that we might see that would have an impact on the number of people who were employed.

MS. ABREU: I don't think that would become a trend. As I mentioned to you before, there are already businesses that provide sick days. We at the Women's Chamber, the majority of our businesses are small businesses, really, but they already provide sick days, paid sick days. And I don't see how that would really become a trend, that they would have to reduce their staff, because they need a certain amount of employees to produce a certain amount of goods or services, they're still going to need them. So that reducing the labor force is going to affect the

1	COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR 52
2	productivity, so I don't foresee that becoming a
3	trend.
4	COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: So you don't
5	feel that they would have that would give them
6	incentive to downsize?
7	MS. ABREU: No.
8	COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: And so I want
9	to thank you for, you know, for your testimony.
10	And I have no other questions.
11	MS. ABREU: Okay, thank you.
12	CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: Thank you,
13	ma'am. May I hear now from back to Queens. Let's
14	speak to Council Member Levin. Brooklyn,
15	Brooklyn, of course, the second part of Queens.
16	COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: It's King's
17	County.
18	CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: I stand
19	corrected.
20	COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: Thank you,
21	Mr. Chairman. And thank you all for your
22	testimony. I just have a question regarding the
23	required documentation for folks that are out.
24	Currently in your businesses, do you require that
25	there be documentation for folks that are out for

documentation?

1	COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR 54
2	MS. LEIWANT: Can I, I just want to
3	clarify, what the bill says is that the employer
4	may require it.
5	COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: May, right.
6	MS. LEIWANT: It's not a
7	requirement, the businesses don't have to require
8	it.
9	COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: Right, do
10	you believe that it should be like up to the
11	business owner, and do you think it should be
12	required within the bill, or do you think that it
13	should be at their discretion?
14	MS. LEIWANT: I think that it
15	should be at the discretion of the business owner
16	after three days, yes.
17	COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: Okay, thank
18	you very much.
19	MS. ABREU: Yes, I believe that
20	should be the case as well, because I think that
21	the bill should be in place, but also the business
22	owner should have, you know, some freedom to enact
23	their own policy with their own business policies,
24	their own employees policy within their business.
25	COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: Thank you

1	COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR 55
2	very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
3	CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: Thank you. I
4	will now see if there is any Council Member who
5	wants to speak again on this issue, since you were
6	kind enough to accommodate. Would you care, sir?
7	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Yes.
8	CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: Absolutely.
9	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: You know,
LO	iPhones are a wonderful thing. I just pulled up
11	the civil rights act, and this question is
12	directed here. In fact, under section 1983 in
13	real property discrimination acts, counsel's fees
L4	are awarded both ways. So the prevailing party,
L5	whether it's plaintiff or defendant is in fact
L6	so your statement before is inaccurate, isn't it?
L7	MS. LEIWANT: Yes it is.
L8	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: It is,
L9	thanks.
20	MS. LEIWANT: It is.
21	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: I just
22	wanted to check on it.
23	MS. LEIWANT: Right, the prevailing
24	party.
25	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Yes, it's

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

prevailing party, which could be the bad guys or the good guys, right? As your way of looking at it. Another question for you. Several, well in fact, I think all of the chambers of commerce have come out against this bill, but they raised six different objections, the chambers of commerce, some of which were addressed. And I commend the Committee for looking at this and making modifications to the law to attempt to address some of them. Significant questions they had regarding carryover provisions, allowing you to bulk the time and carry it over to another year. Blackout periods, where especially during, for example, if you're in the retail business, taking holiday leave in the middle of the heavy shopping season, things like that. And I would imagine, you know, depending on the nature of the work, you know, maybe the summer, if you're a lifeguard and it's lifeguard stuff. You know, so insert business time here. Those are questions which have been raised by these small businesses. any of these concerns of these small businesses at all impact your saying maybe we still need to tweak this a little bit more? Or should we just

it, and that's all.

20

21

22

23

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN:

MS. LEIWANT: I mean, I can't ... that's all I have to say about that. But, having said that, we have ... I know that the Council members here have worked and met and the staff has

1	COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR 59
2	MS. ABREU: Uh huh, yes.
3	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN:
4	Congratulations.
5	MS. ABREU: Thank you.
6	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: That's an
7	impressive number. Just one other question, with
8	regards to
9	CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: (Interposing)
LO	Just for the sake of the record, that side is out
11	of order also. That ought to balance it.
12	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Thank
L3	you, Mr. Chair, I appreciate it.
L4	CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: You're
15	welcome.
L6	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Let it
L7	not be said you don't have an even hand.
18	CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: At least one.
19	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Just one
20	question with regards to the health of workers as
21	it relates to restaurants. Clearly there is
22	concern, and much concern has been addressed with
23	regards to food service providers being sick, and
24	that is one of the areas that this bill, you know,
25	would obviously have a positive effect on. Would

you not agree that any health concern in that		
regard falls more squarely in the Health		
Department's venue, in the sense that if a		
business is licensed to handle food, there's a		
certain set of food handling regulations that are		
in place, and it's incumbent on the owner and the		
employee to follow those as they exist right now?		
So theoretically the straw man argument that has		
been made that food service workers are sick and		
therefore could potentially get others sick means		
they're actually operating in violation of law		
right now. So you do realize that the Department		
of Health already has regulations prohibiting food		
handlers from working while they're sick? And		
that to use that as an argument here is simply		
saying, "Well, they're not following the law there		
anyway, so we're going to hope they're going to		
follow the law here"? Do you guys you have		
banking here, and hair salons there, and nobody's		
in the food industry, right? Were you in the food		
industry, by any chance?		

MR. SANTOS: Yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Yes?

MR. SANTOS: 105th.

1	COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR 61
2	CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: Give time for
3	the translation.
4	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Yes.
5	FEMALE VOICE: Do you have a
6	(inaudible)?
7	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Have you
8	ever worked in the food handling industry?
9	Restaurants, things like that?
10	CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: He stated he
11	is a chef.
12	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Yes, has
13	an employer ever told you to go home because
14	you're sick while you're preparing food?
15	MR. SANTOS: No.
16	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: No. Have
17	you ever been sick while you've been preparing
18	food?
19	MR. SANTOS: Yes, many times.
20	COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Okay. So
21	has anyone ever made you aware of the fact that
22	preparing food while you're sick is actually a
23	violation of the Department of Health's
24	regulations for opening and operating a business
25	that's licensed to handle food?

CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: We heard you

1	COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR 64
2	all.
3	MS. RAJAN: Thank you.
4	CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: Yes.
5	COMMITTEE COUNSEL: The next panel
6	we have the Five Boro Chamber of Commerce
7	Alliance, although I only have cards for four of
8	them. Carl Hum, Brooklyn, Nancy Ploeger,
9	Manhattan, Linda Baran, Staten Island, and Jack
10	Friedman, Queens. Do we have is Lenny Caro
11	here?
12	CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: No, you got
13	them all. I see that many of you have carried
14	posters in, this is a moment you can put them up,
15	I will allow that, if you wanted to show what your
16	organization. All right, I'll take that, good,
17	good.
18	MALE VOICE: It said four or five,
19	good.
20	CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: Thank you,
21	thank you very much. You can put them down now.
22	Yes, we're adding one more person.
23	COMMITTEE COUNSEL: We're just
24	going to add one other person, Joseph Spinatto
25	from the Hotel Association of New York City.

CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: Even as he steps up, if you could speak clearly into the microphone, it would be a shame if I have to tell you that, Jack or Carl. If you speak clearly into the microphone, I'd appreciate it, and just as I'm going to have my colleagues do the same thing, to only ask two questions, and we're going to take the list of who wants to speak even before we start. He was here first. In the order that you choose, I'll let you guys speak.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Good afternoon everybody, Councilman Sanders, members of the Committee, other Council members who are here, thank you very much. My name is Jack Friedman, I'm the executive director of the Queens Chamber of Commerce, and I'm representing today the Five Boro Chamber Alliance, which as has been mentioned, represents each of borough's chamber of commerce, and over 5,000 dues-paying members across New York City. Since the introduction of paid sick leave legislation in the City Council last summer, we have banded together with over 25 other business organizations representing a wide range of industries and small businesses, some of

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

which you'll be hearing from later on today, in strident opposition to first Intro 1059 and now Intro 97. Our fundamental argument remains the same as when we testified before the Committee in November. Our business coalition opposes government deprivation of our ability to determine the appropriate benefit package for our employees. Any business person knows that a successful, profitable organization begins with motivated and In fact, our coalition healthy employees. wholeheartedly, and I repeat, wholeheartedly, supports and agrees with the supporters of Intro 97 that no worker should ever fear retaliation from his or her employer, or worse, termination, if they take a sick day. That being said, it is the government's mandate that these sick days be compensated solely on the backs of the business community that we object to. As we reported last November, two out of three of our collective chamber members already offer some form of paid sick leave, and for those businesses that do not offer paid sick days, it's probably because they cannot afford it, like Mayor Bloomberg recently said. If the Council considers paid sick days as

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

a moral imperative, on a par with unemployment insurance or social security, where everyone pays into the system, then help our business community pay for it. Similar legislation in other states, like New Jersey, have created mechanisms to share the cost of these socially-motivated initiatives to ease the burden on the business community, particularly small businesses. During the past few weeks our coalition followed this vein and drafted our own language that could achieve this. We've even shared it with some Council members in hopes of creating a basis for a new bill that we could all support. Unfortunately, Intro 97 is not that bill. Intro 97 in fact falls miserably short of addressing many of the concerns that were voiced in November, and at a time when the Council is making great strides in addressing small business concerns through the Regulatory Review Panel and the Access to Credit summit, Intro 97 will only undo all the good that's been done thus Let me go through just three examples of many of the bill's shortcomings. The new definition of small businesses as 20 or less employees does not comport with any of the

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

legislative definitions of small business. FMLA and the recently-passed federal health insurance reform bill define small business as 50 employees or less. This discrepancy could affect the bottom lines of thousands of small businesses. The bill still allocates five sick days per employee for small businesses and nine sick days for large Is there any public policy basis to businesses. require more paid sick days at larger businesses? Do people who work at larger businesses get sick more often? Or is this just government aiming at what is perceived to be deeper pockets? The bill is still silent as to what regulatory authorities would be responsible for the enforcement, and most importantly, the adjudication of any damages and disputes. The absence of such specifics could lead to frivolous private actions which would further add to the court system's backlog. might add, also tremendous amount of cost administratively, which has not been taken into consideration by this Council. Once again, Intro 97, like it's forebear, Intro 1059, is a wellintentioned but overly broad bill that fails to recognize the diversity of our business community,

represents 249 of the finest hotels in New York

City, with more than 70,000 hotel rooms and over 2 3 32,000 employees. A vast majority of the 4 industry's employees are represented by the New York Hotel Trades Council, and their terms and 5 6 conditions of employment are covered by a New York City-wide collective bargaining agreement, 7 8 commonly referred to as the Industry-wide Agreement, or IWA. The IWA is a product of over 9 10 70 years of collective bargaining with the New 11 York Hotel Trades Council. It is not hyperbole to 12 state that the IWA makes our employees the highest paid in the United States. In addition to their 13 wages, our association member hotels provide our 14 15 employees with, excuse me: family major medical 16 and hospitalization at no cost to the employee; 17 family dental care at no cost to the employee; 18 pension benefits up to fifteen hundred dollars per 19 month for eligible employees; family 20 pharmaceutical benefits at no cost to the 21 employee; optical; life insurance; up to five 22 weeks of paid vacation; nine paid holidays; three 23 paid personal days; three paid bereavement days; and as of July 1, 2010, just coming up in a couple 24 25 of months, eight paid sick days, which may be

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

carried over for up to fifteen days from year to year. So as you can see, we provide as much as 49 paid days off per year, almost ten weeks per year. In the true spirit of collective bargaining, these benefits have been negotiated between the association and the union, and they establish and reflect an extraordinarily comprehensive wage and benefit package. In fact, all our employees will receive a 3.5% wage increase on July 1st, at a time when our industry is still only able to charge rates we were getting ten years ago. We urge the City Council to recognize, as has the Supreme Court of the United States, that a central purpose of federal labor laws is to protect and encourage the practice and procedure of collective bargaining between employers and unions, so that they themselves may determine the terms and conditions of the employment of hotel employees. Our association objects to the section of Intro 97 that contravenes the law governing collective bargaining by usurping the parties' bargaining rights and interfering with the bargaining process. Intro 97 would negate the guid pro guo which the association received in return for the

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

comprehensive wage and benefit package it negotiated with the union. We strongly believe that those employers who provide paid sick leave and other employee benefits under a bona fide collective bargaining agreement should simply be exempt from this legislation. I notice that the buzzer went off. I will terminate my testimony at this time in respect to that requirement. Thank you for the opportunity to testify on this matter.

CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: Thank you. It's been a very respectful group, and in that spirit we're going to hear from Council Members Brewer, Ulrich, Halloran, Lander, Jackson and Gennaro, who will take it from here. Council Member Brewer.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. First, for the Five Boros, I think one of the issues that we've been trying to work out with all of you, and you know that we've met many times, and I have great respect for you and the small businesses and larger businesses whom you represent. But what I want to know is, do you as associations already offer paid sick time, or the equivalent, to your employees? And do you, how

That's right, because

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

2	many of the businesses that you represent do you
3	think already offer it? Because my guess is,
4	quite a few. I knew that the guy from Brooklyn

would answer this question, how did I quess?

Brooklyn gets out in front all the time. 7

MR. HUM:

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER:

MR. HUM: Council Member Brewer, probably the Brooklyn Chamber runs the largest chamber in terms of staff size. We have approximately 31 staff members, and our personal leave policy is, yes, we do offer paid sick time. At this point right now we offer five days sick and five personal days, and then vacation on top of that. And then with regards to our membership, which we are counting at twelve hundred strong, as Jack Friedman had referred to in his testimony earlier, between our collective membership, which is over 5,000 businesses, two out of three of the businesses are already offering some form of paid sick leave.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Thank you, so do you think that the ones that are not would be able to accommodate some of these issues in the

bill? Because what we're trying to say is, we're working hard to carve out those that do provide, and to figure out ways of those that don't to be part of the same group that you just described. That's the goal of this bill.

MR. HUM: Well, you know, it goes back to what Jack had said, to our collective statement. And, you know, let us be clear, you know, the business community that we represent today, it's not only the five chambers, it is also other organizations, 25 other business organizations that we have come together because of this bill. We are all in basic agreement that no worker should fear for his or her job for taking a sick day. I mean, we are all equally aghast at the testimony given earlier today by the young gentleman.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Mr. Santos.

MR. HUM: Mr. Santos. That's a horrible, horrible story. And there is a horrible, horrible employer. And we made this point before, in our last testimony, was that what is the intent that the Council is going after here? Is it to address a health problem, or is it

no way that we're going to agree with that.

Well, and also just to MR. HUM: answer your question in regards to the remainder of our membership that does not offer sick days, it's for a combination of factors. I mean, some of them, it's because their employees may be

20

21

22

23

24

25

Central Labor Council is supporting this

25

2.0

Mr. Chairman, and I want to thank my colleague,		
Council Member Gale Brewer for her leadership on		
this issue. My question is for Mr. Friedman. You		
said in your testimony that you have you and		
your coalition, rather, has followed this vein and		
drafted bill language that could achieve this,		
meaning, you know, address the issue of paid sick		
time. You even shared it with some Council		
members in the hope of creating a basis for a new		
bill that we could all support. Unfortunately		
Intro 97 is not that bill. Could you talk about		
your alternative bill?		

MR. FRIEDMAN: Sure.

COUNCIL MEMBER ULRICH: Could you talk about some of the provisions, some of the ways that, you know, you think that this issue could be addressed differently?

MR. FRIEDMAN: Absolutely. The language that we drafted and shared with Council Member Brewer and Speaker Quinn and a few others is a shared-cost paid sick leave. It addresses that same issue that all workers should never have to face the decision of going to work sick, or face retaliation or retribution. We looked at

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

other models besides San Francisco. A lot's been said about San Francisco today, and frankly a lot of inaccurate information was said about San The time it took to implement this in Francisco. San Francisco, the results are far from proven to be positive, but we've looked at other places. We've looked at Milwaukee, we've looked at New Jersey, we've looked at Washington, D.C., and part of our bill, for example, in terms of shared sick time and shared pay for this, we looked at things like workers' compensation, disability insurance, unemployment insurance, all benefits that are moral obligations, public health issues and other issues, where the employee as well as the government, as well as the employer, all contribute into it. So it's not something that's solely on the backs of one entity. We don't have specific numbers yet because frankly, the numbers that we are hearing today are completely out of gibe with the numbers that we have. And rather than us espouse our numbers and get into a hesaid/she-said, we've asked for, and we've spoken to Council Member Brewer and Speaker Quinn about getting more time to do our own study, an

2.0

independent study, to see just how prevalent a
problem this is, and just what the costs are.
Because, I'll tell you, the numbers of eight cents
an hour, twenty three cents an hour, are just way
off base. So our bill focuses on things, you
know, an example, like New Jersey, where their
paid sick leave bill includes an employee
contribution, there's an employer contribution,
and we've mimicked that within our own
legislation. We've also thrown in a component for
New York City to offer an incentive.

COUNCIL MEMBER ULRICH: Is it a tax credit?

MR. FRIEDMAN: A tax credit incentive against New York City taxes for both the employee and the employer contribution, a portion of that. We just feel, again, we are not opposed to the concept of paid sick leave, we're just opposed to the fact that there's been a lot of talk that the business community is anti this, we're not. We're anti paying for it on our backs alone, and that's totally different than other types of insurances and benefits. And even when we talk about numbers of businesses, numbers in

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

business, when we look at 50 in FMLA, 50 in new insurance act, you've got to remember, under 50, those businesses are exempt entirely. We're not sure that any number is really the right number. There was a question before about incentives and disincentives when you reach that 20 mark, wherever you put that mark, that becomes a disincentive for a business to go from one to the other. So we address that in our bill, we address the need not to have necessarily two different tiers, that people get sick and if you get sick four days a year, we determine together that we require five days a year. It shouldn't matter whether you work for a company with a million employees or two employees. Just because there's deeper pockets doesn't mean you need a different provision for days off. I'm sorry.

COUNCIL MEMBER ULRICH: So while I'm a supporter of the bill, and a supporter of the idea, because I believe in workers' rights, I do think you made some very compelling arguments, particularly with respect to the size of the business. And I know that I've shared this with my colleague, Council Member Brewer and others, in

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

terms of not being semantical, in that who's to say that if I have a business that has 21 employees today, but tomorrow, because of the economy, I have to lay off three or four, do I now offer my employees five days or nine days. And if we're going to offer it, then it has to be one number and it has to be across the board, in That's your perspective and your principle. opinion, and that happens to be mine. I'm not speaking for my colleagues, and I believe in paid sick time. I do, I take exception, though, to the fact when you talk about earned, you know, benefits for instance, and I know, Mr. Spinnato, you brought up many of the benefits that hotel workers enjoy, and that's terrific, because they also have a collective bargaining agreement, to many of the employees that this bill would provide relief to are not members of unions, that work in very low-wage jobs with no prevailing wage and no benefits, you know, of these sorts. So I mean, we really can't, while we're on the topic of ambiguities and semantics, let's be fair and not compare apples to oranges. And- -

MR. SPINNATO: (Interposing) That's

why we feel we should be exempt, sir.

3 COUNCIL MEMBER ULRICH: Right, I 4 understand. And you are exempt, actually. Because you actually offer more than the required 5 days under the bill. On the days that we will 6 debate, and I'm sure that that discussion will 7 8 take place, hopefully with much of your input. And there was one other point that I had with 9 10 respect to your testimony. When you brought up 11 about moral imperative and the Council considers 12 paid sick days as a moral imperative on par with 13 unemployment insurance and social security, where everybody pays into the system, then help our 14 15 business community pay for it. I think that's a 16 very good point. However, I do want to make the 17 point that, you know, this is not something for nothing. It's not as if that, you know, if I own 18 19 a small business, I hire somebody and I've got 25 20 employees, that they could take off for the next 21 nine days. They actually have to accrue, they 22 have to earn it through showing up and actually 23 working. And if they do abuse that system, then 24 they can be terminated at any point, because 25 obviously if they are not showing up to work ...

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

well, you know, we can get into that at a later point. The last thing that I want to say, and then I'll thank the Chairman for his indulgence, is that this is a very contentious issue, with people with very strong feelings and passions on both sides. However, I think going forward we should really remember that this is not a battle between good and evil, or the haves and the havenots, that many people have very serious concerns about people who are employed right now, who do not have adequate coverage or benefits and do get sick. Certainly I don't think you want people to come to work and infect everybody else, and I think that it's safe to say that the people who are in favor of paid sick leave don't want small businesses to close down. So if we can remove ourselves from the far extremes of both sides of the argument and work on compromising, come to the middle, if I can be helpful in that way, I offer myself and my faculties. Thank you.

MR. FRIEDMAN: I would like to say in particular to Council Member Ulrich, I know this is a deeply moral issue for you, and I really, really appreciate your consideration of

2 our issues.

CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: Well put. I

do want to draw your attention, right in back of
you is a gentleman who's been standing up all day,
and this is the first time that the City Council,
to my knowledge, and I've been told, is
translating everything into Spanish. And a great
step forward for democracy, and I congratulate the
City Council. Although I have to rule both sides
out of order for clapping. Now we will hear from
Council Member Lander.

Mr. Chairman. I first want to thank Council
Member Ulrich for his extraordinarily reasonable,
thoughtful, bipartisan and depolarizing questions.
Perhaps we could set a better national tone really
to the debate. I want to thank you all for being
here, and for the work you do on behalf of small
businesses, and I was particularly encouraged to
see Mr. Friedman praise the work of the regulatory
review panel. As you know, the Council tomorrow
will be taking up Item #1 on that fourteen point
list, and I know that under the Speaker's
leadership, and working with the Mayor, we're

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

making some real good steps there. I think this just goes to Council Member Ulrich's point that the Council, including those of us that are supporters of this legislation, are very eager to be working with you and your organizations and small businesses across the city to strengthen small businesses in challenging economic times. know you said that you wanted to take some time to do your own research, so I'm not going to refer to the study that was just released recently. some of the numbers we've been talking about here are now six or even twelve months old. So on the basic issue of how many workers in the city lack paid sick days, right, we've heard the sort of numbers of, you know, I think the estimate in the Better Balance CSS study was 1.3 million. There's estimates as high as 1.6 to 1.8 million. lowest number I've heard anyone say is 1 million, and I guess my first question for you is do you dispute that there are somewhere north of a million workers in our city who don't have a paid sick day?

I don't think that we're MR. HUM: equipped to give you an answer in regards to

3

5

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

From my understanding of these findings, in regard to 1.3 to 1.8 million workers who don't have paid sick leave, basically it is based on an

either yes or no, north of one million or not.

extrapolation of a survey of less than 2,000
workers. Then basically extrapolated for the rest

8 of the entire workforce of New York City. Keep in

9 the mind that the entire workforce in New York

10 City is four million people. So if you're saying

11 that 1.8 million people are out, who don't have

12 paid sick leave, you're saying that nearly half of

the workforce doesn't have paid sick leave.

Somewhere that boggles the mind.

boggle the mind, which is exactly why we're sitting here. I mean, I've looked at the Community Service Society and heard surveys in the past, that sampling model is sound, they've been doing it for more than a decade. I've never heard anyone question the sampling model or the rational use. No, it's not the census, but it is the approach that we reasonably use to try to understand the conditions, and I mean, its results are really troubling to know the number more than

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

one million, the fact that 72% of low income Latinos don't have paid sick days, the fact that 68% of people in hospitality and retail and some service industries don't have paid sick days. And while it's fine to say, you know, that seems strange, you know, I think we've heard from an awful lot of people and an awful lot of examples, and it is a profound and compelling problem. It's not just a problem of retaliation, it's a problem of having a basic right. And it doesn't sound to me ... you know, I hear you offering opportunities to address the issue of retaliation, but I don't hear you offering anything that would address the more fundamental issue that we really have a crisis of more than a million workers in our city, and just extraordinarily high percentages in some critical industries lacking something that I think we all absolutely count and rely on.

MR. HUM: Well, again, I think that the coalition that we formed are somewhat skeptical of those numbers, and we would invite you, Councilman Brad Lander, with your vast resources, that perhaps we should study this problem together and figure out what that number

is.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: I have a study that I think adequately reflects what the number is.

MR. FRIEDMAN: I think there's also some ambiguity, when the questions were asked of the businesses, do you offer paid sick leave, they weren't asked whether they offer other types of PTO which might be compensated as paid sick leaves. So I think there was some question about how the question was asked, whether it's a sick leave, paid sick leave, or whether it's the overall bucket of personal time off. So that's one of our questions. The other question gets back to cost. So we agree that there is an issue, we just don't know if it's as large as some of the other people are saying. That's why we really, really need time to do our own study.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: But let me just pick up on the issue of cost then. My colleague, Council Member Halloran, had some questions of the Women's Chamber of Commerce on the earlier panel about margin, and I guess, you know, one of the businesses, one of the sets of

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

employee's birthday was on a Friday. And Saturday that employee had a birthday party celebration. And Monday the employee didn't come to work. As an employer, and if anyone is an employer here, what do you think when I said that? Too much what? You're right, that's what you're thinking when you're an employer, right? Or a director. Had a stomach situation. So Tuesday I'm expecting my employee to be in to work. Tuesday, calls in sick. And you know I'm not happy. You know I'm not happy, right? Okay, Wednesday, you expect the employee. Wednesday, the employee is out sick again. I'm steaming, let me tell you that. I'm not happy at all. I call up my chief of staff, find out what the deal is. They call him up, what's going on. You know, the boss is steaming. Do you need any help? Yes, he says, yes. They go to his house, they take him to the doctor, upstairs past our office. The doctor says, take him to the emergency room immediately. For three days his stomach is killing him, his appendix had burst, and was bleeding poison into his body. in this situation, I'm glad that that employee had sick leave, because he was hospitalized for about

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

two weeks, and they cut out part of his small intestine as a result of that. Now, you know when employees don't have sick leave, you know, and if you're struggling, struggling to make ends meet, you're going to try to go to work, even if your stomach is hurting, if you're coughing, it doesn't matter. If you have a slight fever, especially when you don't have sick leave, you're going to go to work. Because even as a parent, when my kid said to me, Dad, my stomach is hurting, you know, I don't want to go to school today, you go to the bathroom and sit on the toilet for five minutes, and then you're going to school. And if the kid didn't have a fever, and I don't care if they were coughing, they're going to school. The bottom line is this, I know all of you care about the workers that you represent. But I know you agree that everyone should be entitled to sick leave. Do you agree with that?

Absolutely. MR. FRIEDMAN:

COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: The only solution is that where do we come to find an agreement that's workable for everyone, is that correct?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HUM: That's correct.

COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: So I sav this to you, think of yourself not as an employer, not as a director. Think of yourself as that employee that testified earlier, the one that you say, that my Chair says, allegedly a bad employer. And if you were in that employee's position, as I said to him, if you were an employer, would you be willing to pay for it. And the answer is yes. And I think my only message is that we, collectively, must find a way to insure that employees are covered, and no one wants anyone to abuse sick leave. And the example that I gave to you was real, and I was steaming, let me tell you Because I thought that he was like ... but he was dying and needed help.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Councilman Jackson, you know I love you, I've known you for a long time, that was a great story. I'm just glad you're not my boss, because me being a boss, I would have been concerned about my employee from day one. And if I found out on Wednesday that my employee was sick, I wouldn't have been seething, I would have been upset and concerned, and I think

the president of the local chamber of commerce in
a small town outside the city. And he served in
that capacity for many, many years, and so I come
from a small business family. And so we have that
common ground. And people are, you know, starting
to wax a little bit, which is fine. And although,
you know, I'm certainly very sensitive to the
crisis as it has been characterized, of people who
don't have paid sick days, but certainly the
larger crisis is of people who don't have a job.
And so that is because we're not even talking
about paid sick days if people don't have jobs.
And I don't know what the numbers are, 10% of the
city doesn't have jobs, or something like that?
Maybe that's under, you know, and maybe it's more
than that. And I'm happy that you put together a
coalition of how many business groups?
MR. FRIEDMAN: Over twenty five.
COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: You've got

COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: You've got to speak right at the microphone jack, you know that. After having been working for the Council for so long.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Over twenty five different business organizations.

COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: And I

really believe that it is the business	
organizations that have, you know, really tried to	
put forward in a very forthright way the positions	
of the people who were in the business of, you	
know, making jobs in this city. So you have to	
continue to do that, because people who are not in	
the business of creating jobs, they don't fully	
understand everything that goes into that. And	
one of my colleagues just said that the more and	
more he speaks to the business community, the more	
the details come out, the more he has an	
appreciation of, you know, what is on the table	
and the harm that we may be doing to certain types	
of businesses by moving forward with the bill as	
it is. And I just want to state to the business	
community, having come from a small business	
family, I'm certainly going to be in your corner	
to make sure that, you know, your good point of	
view is balanced with the other very good and very	
legitimate point of view that speaks to the need	
for paid sick days. And I wish to thank the	
sponsor of the legislation and the Chairman for	
the great job that he is doing. And Jack, I'm	

still, you know, giving very serious consideration		
to the package of ideas that you folks have put		
together and we'll be talking more about that.		
And I'm not going to take my time to get into		
details and this number and that number, is it		
eight cents, is it twenty three cents, is it this,		
is it that. I think that those kinds of details		
can come out in meetings, but I would urge you to		
go forward and, you know, do your study and put		
together numbers that we can bring to the table,		
and I'm confident that in working with the		
Chairman and working with the sponsor and working		
with the leadership of the Council, we can do		
something which is fair for everyone. But I just		
wanted to, you know, state on the record, you		
know, coming from a small business background,		
I'll do everything in my power to make sure that		
the position and the needs of people who are		
making jobs in this city are brought to the table.		
So thank you very much for being here and onward		
we go.		

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you very much.

COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman.

2	CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: I want to
3	thank this panel for putting your positions out
4	there, and making sure that everyone understands
5	where you stand. It's been well put. Never
6	before have 25 business communities come together,
7	so it must be something that we need to look at.
8	With that being said, please submit all
9	information to my office also, please keep us in
10	the loop, and I look forward to working with you.
11	It sounds like we have a winner within reach, and
12	we just need to reach for it, however. If
13	everyone is saying that the idea is a good idea,
14	then we will either find God or the devil in the
15	details. Thank you very much for coming out here.
16	Please call the next panel.
17	COMMITTEE COUNSEL: We have Shira
18	Gans on behalf of the Manhattan Borough President,
19	Scott Stringer.
20	CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: As soon as
21	you sit down, if you identify yourself and you can
22	start speaking.
23	MS. GANS: Hello, my name is Shira
24	Gans and I'm here on behalf of the Manhattan
25	Borough President, Scott Stringer. Good

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

afternoon, I'd like to thank you, members of the City Council's Committee on Civil Service and Labor, for holding this hearing on the important matter of paid sick leave. I would also like to thank Council Member Gale Brewer for sponsoring this vital piece of legislation. I'm here today to reiterate my support for this measure, because working New Yorkers should not be put in the position of having to choose between a pay check and their health. A long-term study by the Community Service Society determined that approximately 1.7 million workers in New York City receive no paid sick leave. Not surprisingly, the burden of balancing home and work without paid leave does not equally across the workforce. take just one example, 72% of low income Latino workers in our city make do without a paid sick day. I want to commend the drafters of this legislation who listened to members of the business community, took their concerns to heart, and adjusted the language in the bill. current version of the bill reflects an understanding of the unique challenges facing small businesses. As such a small business is now

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

defined as having twenty rather than ten employees. With this change, nine out of ten New York City businesses will fall under the lower requirement of offering five rather than nine sick days per year. We have heard, and we will hear again today, some passionate opponents of this legislation who say that it imposes too large a burden on business. Concerns from small and large businesses about government mandates must always be seriously weighed when a new program is being launched, especially during difficult economic times like the one we are living through. York City's economy must keep growing and diversifying, yet the cost of this paid sick leave legislation on business are small relative to the sizeable benefits the new law would provide for New York City workers, and yes, for employers as My office has explored ways in which our city and state can make paid leave and paid family leave an affordable option for workers, their families, and employers. We hosted focus groups on the need for this benefit and the obstacles that prevent employers from offering it. Our report, called "The Working Balance", found that

paid sick leave provides real benefits to business
owners of all sizes. Employers providing paid
sick leave acknowledge that it reduces turnover by
creating a more loyal and stable workforce. That
translates directly into a more profitable bottom
line. For New York City to maintain the nation's
best workforce in a competitive economy, we must
never lag behind the standards set by our
competing cities. If we fail, New York City risks
losing the working people who have built this city
and continue to make it run. Paid sick leave is
an economic issue, one that affects the future and
the vitality of our great city. But more
importantly, it is a human issue. For 1.7 million
people who come to work in New York City, but
cannot take a paid sick day, this is landmark
legislation. Rejecting this bill would, in
effect, be telling them that their health and the
health of their families are unaffordable
luxuries. Let's pass this bill. Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: Thank you,
and please give our thanks to the Manhattan
Borough President.

MS. GANS: I will.

situation as we can, while protecting everyone's job and wellbeing. Let's see. In the order that you called, we will speak. And if I can remind you to pull the mic as close to you as we can. may begin.

(testifies in MS. ESPINOZA: Spanish).

20

21

22

23

24

25

2	FEMALE VOICE: I'll be translating
3	for Lourdes Espinoza. My name is Lourdes Espinoza
4	and for five years I worked in a restaurant, both
5	as a waitress and as a cook to support myself and
6	my family. I have never had paid sick days at any
7	of my jobs. At my most recent job, a few times
8	when I was really sick, they let me go home, but
9	they always took the money out of my paycheck. I
10	am a single mother, supporting four children. I
11	was working thirteen hours a day, six days a week,
12	at that restaurant. There were many times that I
13	went to work anyway, even though I was really ill,
14	with a fever, with a runny nose, cough and
15	headache, because I couldn't afford to lose that
16	money out of my pay check. Three years ago, while
17	I was working as a cook at a restaurant on
18	Junction Blvd. in Queens, I had an accident on the
19	job. I was cooking when a pan of hot oil fell on
20	me, burning my shoulders, armpit, and wrists. The
21	managers did not want me to call an ambulance, so
22	I had to go to the hospital alone. The next day I
23	returned to work. The managers gave me \$40.00 and
24	told me not to return to work, because they did
25	not want any problems. I felt desperate, due to

the burns on my skin, and I also no longer had a job. I soon began to receive threats from the managers, because they did not want me to sue. I was seriously injured while working, and not only did they not pay me for the time I spent in the hospital and at home recovering, but I also lost my job, I had to recover. That accident was not my fault, yet I was fully responsible for the consequences. Please pass the Paid Sick Time Act so that people like me who get sick or hurt can take the time to recover without fear that they will lose their jobs. Thank you.

 $\label{eq:CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: The next speaker.} The next speaker.$

MS. DOE: My name is Andrea Doe, and I'm here to testify in favor of the paid sick time before the City Council. I was a bank teller and I was fired because I took two days off from work to be with my three year old daughter when she was in the hospital and unable to breathe. I want to share my story with you. On Saturday, March 27th of this year, I worked at the bank, a job I had for about six months until 3:30 p.m. and then I went to attend my class, as I am also going

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to school. When I picked up my daughter at her babysitter she was having trouble breathing. had a cold and a fever, and I was very worried about her. My daughter was born premature and spent a month in the hospital after her birth, and has a number of medical problems. So I knew I had to make sure the doctor saw her when she was so sick. I took her to the hospital emergency room, where they told me that her oxygen intake was blocked and dangerously low, and they would have to admit her in order to be able to clear her airway and allow her to breathe again. admitted her to the hospital and gave her a lot of medication to help her breathe. When it became clear to me on Sunday night that my daughter would still be in the hospital on Monday when I was due at work, I tried to call in and let the bank know. Unfortunately the service was not working, so I was unable to leave a message. But at 6:30 a.m. on Monday I again called, and this time spoke to a supervisor, explaining the seriousness of my daughter's condition and that I had to be with her. My supervisor said that was fine and I should just bring in documentation of the

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

hospitalization when I returned to work. I told her I didn't know exactly when I'd be back, and she said that it was okay. My daughter was released from the hospital at 6:30 in the evening on Monday, March 29th. The next two days were my days off from the bank. No one from the bank called me during my two days off to let me know there was any problem. When I returned to work on Thursday morning, after my daughter was out of danger, however, I was told that I was being fired for taking the time off to be with my daughter, even though I had proof that she had to be in the hospital. No mother should ever have to choose between being with her little girl, who can't breathe, in the hospital, and losing her job. I hope that the City Council will pass this Paid Sick Time bill so that all workers in New York City know they will never have to make such a choice. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: Thank you.

Your next speaker, and if I could encourage you just not to clap. Sir.

MR. GAVILANES: Good afternoon,
City Council members, my name is Romulo Gavilanes,

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and I'm a restaurant worker and a member of ROC New York. I'm 25 years old now and I've been working in the restaurant industry for about ten years or so, on and off. The first restaurant I ever had was a really good place, you know, they treated me good. They gave me sick days whenever I needed because I got sick, or whenever I needed a day off to take care of myself. But lately on my last job, this is last year, I worked in a restaurant here in New York City where it was understaffed, and I was working from doing server, runner, busboy, even being a floor manager, booking parties for them and everything. And pretty much it came down to I was exhausted from working this many hours, I was working 80 hours a week. When I requested time off from my boss, because obviously I was getting sick, I had started showing up to work, you know, with the flu, and it came up to the point that I lost my voice during my working hours. I couldn't ask for an order to the customer, because they wouldn't be able to hear my voice. And when I asked for a day off to my boss, he had said the only way I can take a day is if I was dead, like if I was to show

up in a casket, and you know, I can't work no more. And if I didn't show up to work, he told me that, in order for me, if I don't come to work, I would be deducted in my week's pay for the days I didn't show up to work, because I was sick. So basically if I didn't show up to work, I was making their business lose money, they didn't care about my health or my money and person, you know. That's what I have to say.

CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: The next speaker.

DR. MILLER: Hi, my name is Kevin Miller, I'm from the Institute for Women's Policy Research in Washington, D.C. We've been doing analysis on paid leave and paid sick leave for almost a decade, since the issue first drew the attention of policy makers. I personally presented our research in several states as well as previously in this chamber, so thank you for having me back. We released our report in October of last year, detailing our estimate of the costs and benefits of the proposed bill at that time. And I've resubmitted our report to you. So what I would like to talk to you both about our estimate

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of last year as well as the estimates of several other organizations. So our estimate last year was conducted using publicly available date from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, as well as the New York State Department of Labor, and other sources detailed in our report. We estimate, to answer another question, or to give another piece of data, as to how many New Yorkers lack paid sick leave, our estimate is 1.2 million. The average cost to New York employers implementing the policy in our analysis is about \$7.50 a week, or about twenty one cents per hour worked. The cost would be lower, about fifteen cents per hour worked, at small businesses, due to the lower number of days requirement in the bill, and the lower average wages paid at small businesses. Encouragingly, from my point of view, in March of this year, the Federal Bureau of Labor Statistics for the first time released their own estimate of the cost of providing paid sick leave to employees. estimated the average cost is twenty three cents an hour, but that costs are lower in some occupational categories, eighteen cents among sales and office workers, or eight cents in the

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

service industry. So these numbers are very much in line with IWPR's independent estimate of twenty one cents an hour. I'd also intended to speak at some length about the five borough chamber alliance's estimate of last year on the total cost to the city of passing the law, but since they seemed to no longer have confidence in their own estimate, I will just skip that and allow them to come up with another estimate when they've had time to do so. But I would like to say briefly that, although all of these organizations, including mine, have come up with estimates of the costs of this bill, we are the only one that made a serious attempt to measure the benefits of the bill, by estimating the amount of money employers will save through reduced turnover, through reduced contagion of seasonal flu, and through reduced contagion of other sorts. All these costs, or these benefits to employers are estimated in the millions of dollars, in fact are anticipated to completely defray the cost of implementing the bill. In addition, since I have fifteen whole seconds, since I last spoke here, we've released several more analyses, including an

1	COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR 113
2	job, because obviously I got sick and I couldn't
3	take it no more, obviously. And I went to the
4	Health Department, you know, to complain about
5	them, and everything. I still haven't heard from
6	them.
7	CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: Well, can I
8	my office will refer you to the Human Rights,
9	there's an office we have of Human Rights, and the
10	people are creating, in one sense, an unsafe
11	working conditions, and certainly an unfair one.
12	Folks have rights, period.
13	MR. GAVILANES: Yes.
14	CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: And we can
15	talk of that later, because this is
16	MR. GAVILANES: (Interposing)
17	Absolutely.
18	CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: Simply, New
19	York City is going to be New York City for
20	everybody.
21	MR. GAVILANES: Exactly, and I like
22	New York, you know.
23	CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: We can do
24	that. We love New York, I love New York.
25	MR. GAVILANES: We all do.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 industry within New York City.

CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: Thank you, I certainly will study it. To the young ladies, especially those who have fear of being fired, we certainly have heard your testimony. We look forward to the day when nobody in New York needs to stand behind a barricade, stand behind a The City Council certainly will be the shield. shield of the people in this condition. Again, I have ... it sounds like there is no one who is in favor of not having a sick, a paid sick day. I'm hearing is differences of what this means, and how to go about it. So that means that I'm assuming there's goodwill and therefore we can reach something. I will see if my colleagues have any statement or question. Council Member Brewer.

very much, and thank you everybody who has testified, it's very powerful, very honest and I appreciate it. Dr. Miller, my question is, when you look at these numbers, and you were certainly very close and the Bureau of Labor statistics were very close to you, in terms of the numbers, do you think that the information was gathered in a way

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that does relate to the number of one million or 1.8 million? Because we heard testimony earlier from the chambers stating that they didn't think there was enough of a sample. I was just wondering if you could comment on that. I think you were here when that was testimony was produced.

DR. MILLER: Well, the Yes. Community Service Society's unheard third survey, which they were referencing with the sample, I believe has a sample of around fifteen hundred. And while I can't comment directly on the adequacy of that for the sort of estimates that I utilize or that I create, our estimates utilize an entirely different data source. So our methods use Bureau of Labor statistics, estimates, which are based on interviews with employers in which they ask employers whether or not particular categories of employees at their business receive certain benefits, including paid time off, although their reporting leaves something to be desired as a researcher. They do actually ask about paid time off and recorded as sick leave, if that is offered. So at least in our estimate of

1	COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR II
2	so that in the interests of time and saving and
3	money - time is money - that we can do a
4	reasonable study and come close, if not reach the
5	same conclusions, we can both accept that the
6	finding is valid. Council Member Brewer.
7	COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: I'm sorry,
8	one more question for Dr. Miller. I know New
9	Jersey was mentioned, and I don't know if that
10	particular type of benefit, is that paid family
11	leave insurance and not sick days, or maybe you're
12	not aware of what New Jersey is doing? Because
13	I'm quite familiar with Cincinnati and Washington,
14	D.C. and San Francisco, but not with New Jersey.
15	DR. MILLER: Sorry, I believe you
16	meant Milwaukee from the Midwest.
17	COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Milwaukee,
18	I'm sorry, I apologize. But what's the story, do
19	you know what's going on I'm sorry.
20	DR. MILLER: In
21	COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER:
22	(Interposing) I really apologize.
23	DR. MILLER: That's okay. New
24	Jersey has a paid, I believe they have a paid sick
25	leave bill that's been proposed, though it's not,

O'Reilly, Cybersearch Global; Thomas Ferrugia, The

25

themselves and provide you with comments.

25

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

talking about the mom and pop dry cleaners who cannot get away from their businesses. their situation and their problem. This cleaner optimistically is grossing about \$300,000 a year in sales. It's usually a husband and wife team, working anywhere from 66 to 70 hours a week in the store, that's 7:00 in the morning till 6:00 at night, six days a week. Their rent is between six and eight thousand dollars a month, their utilities twenty five hundred to three thousand, their supplies another two or three thousand. Two thirds of their sales are on credit cards, which costs them another \$6,000 a year. 1% of their orders aren't picked up, which is sales down another \$3,000. You've got insurance, water costs, permits, fees, hazardous waste disposal, phone, postage, repairs and maintenance, and at the end of the day, you're looking at another 50 or 60 thousand dollars there. A low-side estimate of his costs of doing business are about \$187,000 So at the end of the day, when folks say, why does small business oppose this, this man has \$113,000 available to provide payroll for four people, including himself. His presser is going

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to make about \$35,000 a year, his marking baggerassembler is going to make about another \$25,000, which leaves for the owner and his wife, who are working between 66 and 70 hours a week, the handsome sum of \$53,000. Now when the presser goes out for a week because he's sick, and believe me, I feel the presser's pain, as does he, but he's going to need to get those pants and dresses and shirts out, because nobody wants to wait an extra week for their dry cleaning because the presser isn't available. Which means he pulls in temp help for \$700 a week. Now he has to pay the presser, who's out sick, \$673 a week, and where does this \$700 come from? So that week, with his 66 to 70 hours, he makes nothing, and his wife gives up \$192 of her pay. And that's why small business in New York City can't afford this. Keep in mind that even if the economy bounces back, it's not going to help the cleaner. Because if his volume goes up another \$50,000, he's going to pay another \$35,000 for another presser, he's going to have a commensurate increase in most of his costs, maybe not rent, maybe not the utilities, but everything else is going to go up.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And he's going to wind up with maybe out of that an extra \$50 a week. Nobody is saying that these people shouldn't be paid, the question is who is going to pay them. And right now, he's probably the lowest paid person in his operation. don't think that's what you're proposing here. Ι don't think you want to take a business owner who's barely making ends meet himself, and ask him to work a week for nothing, in order to pay somebody else who also isn't able to work. So I think what we need to find is a way to be fair about this. I don't think you envisioned penalizing the business owner. And the fact of the matter is, when you look at statistics and you say, will it cost jobs, this cleaner will not lay that presser off. He can't afford to, he needs him to get the work out. The same thing with the marker and assembler. So if you look at it statistically, you're not going to have a job lost because the cleaner has to pay him, but you certainly are not going to have the situation that's fair, in that you have somebody who can ill afford to pay, paying for something. So that's our story, we think we need to find some kind of

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

an exemption or other arrangement for small business, and we're happy to work with it, but the way Intro 97 is presently constituted, our association and its members have to oppose. Thank you for your time.

CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: Thank you.

I'll speak at the end. The next speaker.

MR. FERRUGIA: Thank you, I'm Tom Ferrugia, I'm the director of government relations for The Broadway League, we're the principal trade association for the commercial Broadway theater industry. I'll go through the highlights of my testimony. Last year Broadway - and again, I want to thank the Chair, Chairman Sanders, and the Committee members for holding this hearing - we definitely support the intent of the proposal, however our concern is that the legislation does impose unnecessary burdens on industries like the arts, that have always respected their employees and understood that a content staff member is a productive worker. Now there are three portions of the bill that I would like to address: collective bargaining agreements, part-time employment and the lack of distinction between

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

small, mid-size and large offices. Last year Broadway employed ten thousand people, over ten thousand people in New York City, the large majority of those employees were unionized workers. Now, when it comes to collective bargaining agreements, every word of the contract agreement, including hours, salaries, health benefits, pension contributions and paid leave days, are painstakingly negotiated over the course of several months. In the majority of instances, all parties have long-standing relationships and well-established methods for reaching agreements. Employees are vigorously represented by advocates elected to act in the union's best interests, and ultimately the membership votes to ratify the negotiated terms. And incidentally, Broadway's union workers are highly compensated, and except for matinee days, generally work just three or four hours a day. We don't think there's any justifiable rationale for requiring parties to affirmatively waive provisions of the local law, and then go on to require them to impose those minimum requirements. At best, the language could stall negotiations while employers and union

representatives deliberate the application of the 2 3 legislation to the collective bargaining process, at worst it might result in unnecessary litigation, if there's a disagreement between the 5 parties on the terms of implementation, or how a 6 municipal law incorporates into the National Labor 7 8 Relations Act. You have to remember, we're already constrained by the rules of federal and 9 10 state law when it comes to collective bargaining 11 relationships and the proposal creates 12 difficulties for union members, because it imposes 13 the City Council's judgment on union leaders, directing their priorities during negotiations. 14 15 We don't believe union leaders would want their 16 hands tied by parties who have no relationship to 17 the bargaining process, because every union has 18 unique issues and depending upon countless other 19 factors, paid sick time may not be the most 20 important thing that the membership is considering 21 at that time. They may have an interest in 22 pension contributions or some other form of 23 compensation which could be negotiated against paid sick time. These exchanges do not take place 24 25 in a vacuum. Every new term in a collective

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

bargaining agreement requires a re-examination of the document, with a determination of the value of that new term and an appropriate consideration the other side must offer. Employers and union representatives need flexibility when negotiating these contracts and all parties to the discussion must be on equal footing. We respectfully submit that this legislation, no matter how well intended, would disrupt the careful balance unions and employers have worked to create over the decades to accommodate the unique environment we live in. We strongly urge the Committee to revise the proposal and provide a clear, unambiguous exemption for all employees working pursuant to a bona fide collective bargaining agreement, not just the construction industry. Okay, I'm out of time, I'll just briefly touch on my other points. I'll just be a moment. The other issue that we had I'll paraphrase. We have a concern that the exact nature of part time employees who already work, generally work fewer than 35 hours a week, and generally have plenty of flexibility within their schedules, should not be eligible for paid sick time. We also feel that if they are eligible

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

for sick time, the far fewer hours a week that they work should be reflected in the accrual rate and in the maximum hours per year that a part time employee may be eligible for. Finally, we ask the Council to take a look at the D.C. law on paid sick leave that has a third tier in distinguishing between small, mid-size and large businesses, which not only adjusts for the maximum hours that an employee can accumulate, but also adjusts the amount of hours that they have to work in order to accrue a paid sick leave hour, because we think that more accurately reflects the myriad of businesses that you have in New York City. again, thank you for your time and we again support the proposition, but we think that the bill might be over-broad and might impact businesses that already have good employeeemployer relationships and are doing the best that they can for their employees. And we have some specific language that we propose to your Council, and we would be happy to have meetings with you and discuss it further. Thank you.

MS. BRODHAGEN: Okay, good afternoon. My name is Pat Brodhagen, and I'm the

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

vice president of public affairs for the Food Industry Alliance, which is the trade association that represents grocery stores. So whatever conventional grocery store, hopefully the ones that you shop in, are members of mine. Thank you as well for this opportunity to speak, and let me say at the outset that we appreciate that the new bill, Intro #97, does a couple of ... has made a couple of changes that we found beneficial, one limiting the purposes for which sick leave may be taken, and also proposing a more specific definition of family members, as compared to the predecessor bill. Those are two positive changes. But we, as some of the other groups that you've heard from, have some very specific issues that are still out there that really must be addressed from our perspective. And piggybacking on what Tom said, and what you also heard from the hotel association, it's the same issue with union contracts, and the collective bargaining agreements. Many of our members are in fact union employers, with collective bargaining agreements that do include paid sick leave as part of a comprehensive benefit package. So to require sick

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

leave benefits comparable, and that's the word in the bill, to those specified ... comparable to those in the bill in a one-size-fits-all formula, will disrupt comprehensive benefit and compensation packages that have been specifically negotiated with, and agreed to, by union associates. Moreover we would add that in the language who or by what process will compliance with those terms be determined, and at what cost. So our recommendation is that the language in the bill relating to collective bargaining agreements should be, again, extremely clear cut, and should read "the provisions of this section shall not apply to any employee covered by a bona fide collective bargaining agreement". That would be our recommendation, to clarify that point. Secondly, the other really pressing issue for us is the issue of part time workers, because we are an industry that is heavily part time. As I think you know, we're the source of a lot of entry-level jobs and a lot of supplemental-income kinds of jobs. We employ students, we employ kids, high school kids after school, summer workers, senior citizens who still would like to make a little

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

supplemental income, parents who are trying to fill in their schedule around their kids' schedules. And these are folks whose schedules are extremely flexible, and in our business those schedules are worked out every week. And our employers are pretty willing to work around the individual's schedule to give them enough hours, so we're looking at ten to 30 hours a week, and our recommendation would be that paid sick leave should be limited to full time employees. really where we're coming from on that. And then let me just quickly add our perspective on some of the other, mostly the points having to do with accrual. And let me just state in the positive, I'm not going to critique what's in there, let me just say where we're coming from. And it's that sick days should be available to employees only after a waiting period of a year, or at the very least, six months. That to us more resembles what actually goes on in the real world. Sick leave should be accrued in days, not hour by hour, increasing with the number of years of employment, up to a maximum to be determined, based on the overall level of benefits available to employees.

After the waiting period, available sick days for calendar year may be taken as needed. You can take them all in January, if they're sick in January. Sick days may be taken in no less than half day segments, and sick time does not carry over year to year. So that's the summary of where we're coming from, and my colleague, Mitch, I think who knows a lot more about supermarket operations, can fill in some of the blanks. So I'll pass the mic to him and thank you very much for your attention.

MR. KLEIN: Good afternoon, Council members, my name is Mitch Klein, and I'm vice president of government relations from Krasdale Foods, we operate out of the south Bronx. We've been there for a hundred years. In the supermarket industry we really recognize that a sick employee on the floor does not do much for our business whatsoever. Usually it kills the business faster than anything else we can do.

Most of our employees, especially all of our full time employees, do receive sick time compensation, and we've recognized that for many, many years.

We do have two basic issues that I think we need

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to clarify. Where we have a union contract in place, the union contract should absolutely supersede, especially when it does indicate that there's sick leave, over the sick leave bill of the city. If you're going to have two that are going to come into play, where they're going to constantly, someone's going to have to decide which one is more advantageous over the other, there is going to be constant interpretation, constant bickering, and if there is a union contract, and I think you've heard it from a few other people before, the union contract should take precedence over that, especially when it has sick leave already in the bill. A lot of our part time workers, which is our other issue, a lot of our part time work is really supplemental income. A lot of our part time people have full time jobs elsewhere. They come to us because they want a job for an afternoon or a Saturday, to supplement their income. A lot of our part time people work eight hours a week, nine hours a week, ten hours a week. The difference that they make in our stores is that keeps one extra checkout lane open, so that the lanes don't back up because no one wants

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to stand in line in a supermarket. People will wait all night in an electronics store to buy the best thing and sleep in the street in the winter, but if there's more than three on line in a supermarket, people are leaving disgruntled. recognize that. That extra person helps us keep one line open. This is not the person, though, that necessarily does not have money to stay home or take care of their child. We work very readily with even the part time people that work eight or nine hours for whatever they need, that's why they have a nine hour a week job with us. We're very willing to work with the City Council, as we have in the past, but we would like to see some fine tuning to this, so that it is fair for all sides. Thank you.

MR. KITA: Chairman Sanders and members of the Committee, my name is Henry Kita, I'm senior vice president for Building Trades Employers Association of New York City. We're an organization that represents 28 union contractor associations in the construction industry, and our umbrella organization is comprised of over seventeen hundred construction managers, general

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

contractors and specialty trade subcontractors doing business here in New York City. The BTEA is in a unique position today. We have a strong partnership with Building Construction Trades Council, which is the umbrella union organization on the other side of the bargaining table, and regularly appear together before the City Council to support or oppose legislation that affects our industry, together with the Building Construction Trades Council. However, when it comes to the current legislation proposed in Intro 97 regarding paid sick leave for employees, the BTEA and the BCTC must agree to disagree, in this particular Echoing what several members of the instance. panel said here, as well as Mr. Spinnato from the earlier panel with the Hotel Association, the basis of our disagreement here with the legislation has to do with collective bargaining agreements. Although this legislation specifically provides an exception for the construction industry, through a provision it allows a waiver to be granted in including the collective bargaining agreements, the BTEA cannot support this bill because the inclusion of this

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

waiver in effect gives labor an unfair advantage at the negotiating table. When we negotiate collective bargaining agreements in the construction industry here in New York City, we sign agreements with labor based on an overall economic package. In other words, it's the responsibility of the labor union to allocate spending however they choose, whether it is to increase wages, benefits, etc. If BTEA members sit at the collective bargaining table with labor and need to request that a specific waiver be placed in agreements in order to receive an exemption from this proposed legislation, then we will be, as the employer, as the contractor, at a major disadvantage in the collective bargaining This legislation will eliminate the process. equal footing that our members and labor start with when they begin the negotiating process. have seen recently in a current round of negotiations that are taking place between several of our member associations and several of the unions this issue come up already, and before this legislation has been approved. So the seed has been planted already at this particular point.

I'd like to thank the City Council for allowing me to present these comments on Intro 97. The BTEA believes that this bill has good intentions, and you've heard that from the other employer associations here. But we cannot support this legislation due to the waiver that must be provided in our collective bargaining agreements. Before you further consider this bill, I hope that you will seriously consider the negative effect that this legislation will have on the fairness of the collective bargaining process in the New York City construction industry. Thank you.

timing. I may just want to refer everybody that the other side, if you wish, is saying that many of your ... if you're providing these services, if you're providing anything comparable to paid sick leave, anything comparable or better, that you are excluded. I just want to remind you of that, and I also want to take your cards. I'm going to have a person take your cards, so I can find out where we differ. If you're saying that that is not the case, then I need to understand that. On a personal note, I just want to say that I haven't

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

seen in a while, Mr. Klein, nor Ms. Brodhagen,
it's been many moons, we have to stop meeting like
this. We'll find some other excuse to come
together. Are there any questions from Council
Member Gennaro?

COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I certainly want to thank this panel for being here. And Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to state for the record that I'm kind of in the same orbit as you, that I was under some impression that if these benefits were provided, then groups would be exempted, and there really wasn't a big issue with regard to collective bargaining, and this bill having an impact on Most of the groups, however, that choose to see me regarding this bill are talking about precisely that issue. And I know that they know very much what they're talking about and have certainly done everything they could to get a full grasp on what the bill does. So I just want to state that there are many folks that, you know, deal with collective bargaining, who have very serious issues with this bill. So I quess that means that you and I have more work to do.

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

okay. We can do that. And so I want to take this time for me ... well, it's not for me to thank, I'm not acting as Chairman, but I just wanted to thank the many folks here for coming to see me and talking to me and for being here today. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

8 CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: Thank you.
9 Brother Jackson.

COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: afternoon, panel, and thank you for coming and listening and staying. And Mr. Chair, I don't really have, I guess, a question at this point in time, but I do appreciate this woman here who represents, for example, I think the dry cleaning association, the way you laid it out, as far as the situation. And you know, I can truly understand how difficult it is to do business in New York City. But also I do understand though, that I know that as someone who hires people, and I supervised people in my previous role, as a director of a staff, how important it is that you have people to come to work, come to work healthy. And not to come to work sick and make other people sick, that's not good for business. So I am

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: I worked

for the Department of Labor from 1975 to 1980, and this oldtimer, his name was Bill, and that time you could smoke at the workplace, he used to smoke all the time. And he used to every two weeks add up his time, and he had so many hours, maybe thirteen hundred hours of sick leave, because it was by the hour, the State of New York. And he told me a story about one time that he used to use leave nilly-willy, you know, and then he got sick and he was hospitalized for about three months, and he used all of his time, and he was on leave without pay. And since that time, he said he never, you know, he always used sick leave only when he was sick. And when I left state service and I was only in state service for about five years, I had over three hundred and something hours that went back to the employer because I wasn't sick. And then I worked after that twenty two years for a labor union, before I was elected to the City Council. Do you know I had so much sick time, that basically I went off the chart and I was losing sick time, because sick leave is only supposed to be used when you are sick, and not for

Public Health Association of New York.

25

2.0

2	CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: Wait a
3	minute, I like this, I heard a Sanders, and you
4	know the Sanders has to go first. A distant
5	relative? You've got that right. At the risk of
6	being biased in favor of Sanders', I'm going to
7	let Ms. Emily go first.
8	MS. SANDERS: All right, thank you.
9	My name is Emily Sanders, I've been in restaurants
10	for probably the last nine years. My last

My name is Emily Sanders, I've been in restaurants for probably the last nine years. My last restaurant I was a bartender and generally speaking, there's always fewer bartenders than there are servers in restaurants, so that creates a problem immediately. I often went to work sick regularly, and I actually at one point went to work with food poisoning. This was, I don't know who's had food poisoning, you can imagine, etc.

MALE VOICE: I had food poisoning.

MS. SANDERS: I actually tried to get the shift covered and I could never find people to work for me at this restaurant.

MALE VOICE: I had food poisoning.

MS. SANDERS: I was at home before work and was feeling nauseous, and I knew it wasn't a good idea, but I went in anyway. And

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

when I was setting up, I told the manager that I wasn't feeling well, that I shouldn't be there. And he shrugged and walked away, because that's not his problem. We opened for dinner, and as I was bartending, I ... again, anyone who has had food poisoning, it got instantly worse, anything that happens in a bathroom, you can go on with the details on that, that was happening to me. bar service was horrendous, servers were not getting their drinks. The owners were at their computers downstairs, so they were unaware. One of my regular customers told me I looked disgusting, shouldn't be there. I went downstairs where the owners were sitting with the manager, and I said, "I'm not feeling good. everyone I know at this restaurant, no one can come in to work for me, I need to go home." two owners turned around and looked at their computers and went back to the work, and the manager told me to stick it out. I went home because that's what any person in their right mind would have done, regardless of what was going to happen to my job. That's that one. And additionally I often get bronchitis, like our

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

friend earlier this afternoon. I have had two different incidents at various restaurants, two restaurants, where I went into work coughing, sneezing, blowing my nose, etc., because no one would work for me. As I have never had health insurance with the restaurants, I don't go to the doctor as such, I just wait it out with The one time I was sent home was bronchitis. because a regular customer again complained that they shouldn't have me working like that, and the owner who was sitting next to her became embarrassed and sent me home. As a bartender my hands are always wet, we touch fruit, we touch bottle tops, we touch glasses, we squeeze limes, lemons, we muddle your mint for your mojitos. anyone who does that for their work should come in sick is unclear to me. I think something like paid sick days would change that attitude that restaurant workers' work is not important, because it would give restaurant workers an important right. The structure and reality of restaurant work currently, especially in New York City, is that I expect nothing from my owner, my boss, which isn't right. I feel like I'm on my own,

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that there's a constant fear of getting fired, and there's no one watching out for you. In addition, to highlight this point, and to address Councilman Halloran's earlier comments regarding whether employers tell employees not to touch food when they're sick, I would like to comment, especially as someone who has been friends with many cooks in my life, that they're never told that, and they're told they may not have a job the next day if they refused him. We need to change that. I as a restaurant worker can't say that enough, and I encourage City Council to pass sick days immediately, paid sick days, and I thank you very much for your time and attention to this really important matter.

CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: If I may remind everyone, we're not clapping. Our next person.

MS. DOLAN: Thank you, Council
Member Sanders, and the Committee, for being given
an opportunity to address you this afternoon. My
task here today is I have been asked by the United
States Senator from the great adjoining state of
Connecticut, Senator Chris Dodd, who is the

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

sponsor of the Federal Paid Sick Days Bill, which is the Healthy Families Act, and I received a copy of this letter, Council Member Sanders, that is addressed to you and Speaker Quinn, and as Chair of the Paid Family Leave Coalition, I am cc'd, as well as Council Member Brewer. So he asked me, we were in D.C. two weeks ago at a conference and he was very interested in the fact that there is a bill in the New York City Council on paid sick days, and he stressed the importance of sending a message to all of you. And I would like to read this for the record. "I write in deep appreciation for, and in strong support of, New York City's paid sick days legislation. As you know, nearly 40 million private sector workers in America, including more than a million in New York City, have no paid sick leave. When they get sick they have a choice: go to work sick, put off going to see your doctor, and risk infecting your coworkers, or stay home and lose a day's pay. One in six Americans say they have lost a job or been threatened with termination if they took time off because they, or someone in their family, became sick. This is deeply unfair to workers, but it's

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

a public health issue for everyone. When Mayor Bloomberg urged New Yorkers to stay home from work and keep their kids home from school should flu symptoms arise, he was offering commonsense advice in light of the outbreak of the H1V1 virus, but that advice loses its value when following ... when it puts an even greater economic strain on working This burden disproportionately falls on families. low and middle income minorities, and ironically those workers who have the most contact with the public, such as food service, retail and hospitality workers. Far from harming businesses' bottom lines, paid sick leave would benefit employers through lower health care costs, a healthier workplace, higher rates of employee recruitment and retention, and a more productive workforce overall. One estimate that we've heard, referred to earlier today, puts the cost at twenty three cents per hour for high wage employees, eight cents per hour for workers in the service New York's legislation is carefully sector. written to insure that employers benefit. It's incredible to think that in a world where 137 countries guarantee paid sick leave, America still

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

lags behind. That's why I fought so hard for the Healthy Families Act, which would implement paid sick leave nationwide. But in the meantime, New York City has the opportunity to lead the nation by standing up for its workers and guaranteeing them paid sick leave. No one should have to choose between their job and their health, and so I urge the Council to approve this legislation. Sincerely, Christopher J. Dodd, United States Senator." Thank you.

MS. PITTMAN: Good afternoon, can [pause] Okay, how's that? Is that you hear me? So good afternoon, Chairman Sanders and better? members of the committee. My name is Carol Pittman, I'm here to testify on behalf of the New York State Nurses Association. The Nurses Association represents 36,000 registered nurses statewide, including 26,000 in the five boroughs who work in both public and private health care facilities. NYSNA is the oldest and largest professional association and union for registered nurses in the state. We strongly support the paid sick time act, Intro 97, recently introduced in the City Council. Two million workers, nearly

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

half of working New Yorkers, do not receive paid sick time on their jobs. This is a shocking statistic when you consider the density of our population and the speed with which influenza, or other potentially deadly diseases, can spread. And let me just reiterate that influenza and other diseases that spread so quickly can, are potentially deadly. And you can get those stats from the Health Department or if you'd like I'll get them for you. Without paid sick leave, the goal of preventive care, so much the buzz word as a means to better health in reducing health care costs, is very much undermined when people can't see their doctor for disease control and management for lack of paid sick time. The lack of paid sick days by such a large portion of the New York City workforce has serious implications for public health. Without paid sick time, sick workers spread illnesses to coworkers and the public, especially in New York City's congested worksites, subways and food service establishments. When people become ill and can't take time away from work to visit a doctor or recover, they become sicker and are forced to

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

visit emergency rooms, adding to the already overcrowded conditions facing New Yorkers in our ERs at this time, which are complicated, even intensified, by the fact that we keep having hospital closings. Sick children get sicker and infect their peers in schools and playgrounds when parents can't take time off work to take children to the doctor or stay home with them while they get better. And people are aging, they need extra care after hospitalization, and help getting to medical appointments. Most hospital discharges and doctor appointments happen during working hours. One should not have to choose between helping a loved one and one's job. NYSNA stands ready to help make the paid sick time act law. thank Council Member Gale Brewer on this issue, and we thank you for this opportunity to testify.

DR. SIDEL: My name is Victor
Sidel, I'm former Chair of the Department of
Social Medicine, Montefiore Medical Center, and
I'm currently Distinguished University Professor
of Public Health at Albert Einstein College of
Medicine and Montefiore Medical Center. I've been
president of the American Public Health

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Association and President of the Public Health Association of New York City. I'm not going to take much of your time. Every single person I heard from this platform agrees that paid sick leave for every worker in New York City is required. If you read my testimony, you'll see all the public health reasons for that. The one point I want to make is that justice delayed is justice denied. I testified here six months ago in November, I gave essentially the same testimony, and at that point Council had this in front of them, it's moved forward since, but it's not yet been passed. I urge you to take action, I urge you to resolve the differences that we've heard about here today, and take action so that every person in New York City can get sick leave. I thank you very much for the opportunity for testifying.

CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: I thank you all for that, let me respond that I am the new Chair of Civil Service and Labor, but I'm also a man of action. We're not going to go another six months studying this issue, so I'm encouraging everyone to let's take this one serious, let's ...

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

if we think that there are ways that we need to tailor this better, then we need to do that. need to be serious about tailoring it to make sure that it fits. As a worker and a child of workers, I am very concerned about this. As the former Chair of Economic Development and the Chair of the Civil Service and Labor, I want to make sure that what we do is good for New York. I want to make sure that our precarious position of our great city does not slip. But I believe that there's a way of doing both of these things. I believe that there's a way of doing this one right, that this is something that we are heading towards, that as long as I pick up goodwill, we should have dialogue. As long as I'm picking up goodwill, that people are serious, the moment that I see that people aren't serious, I'm through with the conversation. So we won't ... as much as we are enjoying you, sir, we won't have you back six months from now on this issue. Perhaps you'll be at a victory celebration or some other type. Besides, I have to do that, I have a distant cousin on your panel speaking, so I have to make sure that Ms. Sanders does not come here on this

CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: I'll do it,

25

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to three weeks vacation pay, but this bill would make it impossible for me to continue to offer that kind of vacation pay, because when my commissioned people are off, they are my product that produce money, so when they are off, I lose their revenue. And when I lose their revenue, in order for me to then pay on top of the lost revenue will definitely devastate my bottom line. And I've given you on the back of the next two pages the annual cost of nine sick days per employee, so you can see that total for all three, for one of my companies on 72nd Street and Columbus, if I gave everybody nine sick days, it would cost me \$114,000 a year extra income that I don't know where I'm going to find it in my bottom line. Because if you see the impact on my small business, I'm already paying more in property taxes, my water tax went up, I have the new MTA tax, I've had increases in my rent per square foot, my health insurance is up 20%, my business insurance is up 10% to 15%, my electricity, Con Ed, is now talking about a 30% mandatory increase. I have to spend more money on marketing. I've done business in the last two years, it's

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

completely different than I've ever done business before. I've really had to get people in, people are stretching out appointments. I have to spend more money on marketing than I ever had to. a completely different animal. I am totally for people getting paid when they're off sick, I just think we have to find a way that is better for everybody. And I think what's happening is we're putting it all on the small business, which I don't think, you know, my business can't afford. I can't afford to grow. This proposed bill is not very supportive of small businesses like mine, which is the core of the neighborhoods of New York City. I'm looking for ways to grow my business, so that I can continue to offer services to the community and contribute to the economy, by opening more stores and employing more people. When I open a store, it employs 25 people on minimum. I feel penalized because that what's the difference because I'm a bigger business means I have a deeper pocket, so I should pay more than a small business, that really irks me. I really hope the city finds a way to help small business flourish, and one of the things I just really

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

quickly find hard about the bill that I read was, in San Francisco they are shrinking, people are not hiring in order to stay in. I was at a meeting where I was listening to Procter and Gamble talk about salon industries and businesses in San Francisco shrinking drastically in the last year and a half, and I wonder how much of that is due to this whole mandatory sick leave adding an extra burden solely on small business. I love what I heard earlier about sharing it along the way, like you do disability and everything else, on more of a federal level. And the sick time increments, the thing in the bill that popped out to me was that an employee can call in sick, or be late, an hour a day, to start accumulating that sick time. And I have no recourse about that, and that scares me. And the fact that an employee can bring me to court and I get tied up in legal fees to prove that he really should have been fired for something else, that scares me. I don't have time for that, I'm a working hairdresser behind a chair. I might have 190 employees, but I still work behind a chair, and I still cut hair and do what I started. And I just ... I really wrote

in New York City know that our businesses cannot

managing our employees. We take very good care of

run without a caring and graceful approach to

23

24

25

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

them, and they take very good care of us. The truth is, they are more like family than employees. We love them. We have given them paid sick time before, and while it might not have been part of our formal policy, we always did. feeling is that nine days is too many, five is more than adequate, and it's not that we're not compassionate. If we're forced to pay the 72 hours you're asking for, the city unfortunately puts us in a position to create ill will for our employees. We would have to stop paying them for Christmas, New Year's, Labor Day, Memorial Day, 4th of July, Thanksgiving. We know they wouldn't like that. Please keep in mind that many businesses in New York City, such as a drycleaning business, have tight production setups and commitments made to clients. We do not have the luxury of the garments waiting until the employee gets back to complete their job. I can't tell my client, "Sorry, Miss Jones, your suit is not ready as promised, because our presser had to go pick up his child from school today". Now we have to try to hire a temp, pay to replace the worker, and pay the worker for not being there. If you don't hire

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the temp, and the other workers prosper from the additional work that they've taken on, the business is still paying double. This is already a business that doesn't show a profit. This is a business that provides an income for my employees There are only so many dollars available and I. to small businesses and business doesn't seem to be getting any better. Another issue with the legislation is once a small business hits the 20th employee, their overhead increases significantly. This would ... we would all be very reluctant to hire the 20th employee. We'd all be less inclined to bend our rules for them. This policy would now be open for abuse by our employees, and all those whose nature it is to take advantage, will take advantage. I currently employ 24 people. If this legislation were to pass, I would unfortunately look to let a couple of people go to stay below the number of twenty. Also, I've heard many people in favor of this bill use San Francisco as an example of how great adopting this policy would be. There is no real data showing that this legislation has a positive impact on employment for small retail businesses. In fact, the data

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

shows that the only industry that has benefited from this has been the hospitality industry, and that's only because of the increase in tourism to California from 2006 to 2008. Small retail businesses have shown a decrease in employment of over 3%. People have lost out in San Francisco, there is an impact. And if we take a closer look, we may see that their expenses are not quite in line with those of New York City. New York City is one of a kind. And when I contact the commercial real estate brokers in San Francisco, inquiring about what space costs, I was shocked. The highest I found was space in Pacific Heights, by the marina, \$45 a square foot. In the financial district, they were offering spaces for \$30 a square foot. I don't know about you, but I would love to open up a drycleaning business on the corner of Broadway and Wall Street for \$30 a square foot. My rent in downtown Brooklyn is \$100 a square foot. San Francisco isn't looking so bad after all, I'm all for San Francisco, but can they adopt ... can we adopt their rent? The bottom line is, government cannot dictate to us how to run our businesses. Small business is the engine that

restaurant, the clothing business, the physician

25

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

or the pharmacy, has also professed genuine concern of how and whether they will be able to continue operating should this bill pass. regard to some of the comments that businesses who already provide paid leave will not be subject to this bill, one of the issues that we have seen that will become debatable is going to be whether the particular type of leave that you provide will meet the level of what's required under this bill. And I believe that that's something very important that needs to be addressed in these Committee discussions. With the economic downturn facing our entire country, small business has clearly claimed its place as the future employer for a healthy America. Instead of receiving tax cuts and other incentives to help them hire more people, a true economy stimulator, the passage of this bill may well force these small businesses to slash their payrolls by letting people go, or by decreasing hours. My clients have sadly admitted that because of this bill, they will have to cut back elsewhere if they are even to maintain the status quo. Whether the cuts are financial or operational, they are sure to decrease morale

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

among employees, and what is sad is that this will take place throughout businesses that are already providing paid sick time, paid vacation, and/or paid personal days. On the other hand, this legislation will not affect the employers who are paying their workers off the books, precisely those workers who needed protection against employer retaliation when they take a sick day. Additionally, the one-size-fits-all nature of the bill makes it unrealistic in a diverse environment constituting the business community in New York City. For example, this bill will be very expensive for people who employ seasonal workers if during the season that they're hired they'll be able to take advantage of the paid sick time. Businesses such as hairdressing salons and nail salons will lose business when operators call in sick, which will cost them, as my colleague here said, not only to pay for the sick time, but also in the loss of business. And looking at what has happened in D.C., there are many exceptions to the bill that was passed in D.C. For example, it excludes applicability to independent contractors, tipped employees, seasonal workers, temporary

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

workers, students, certain health care workers, and commissioned workers, none of which is being addressed in this bill that's before us. From a legal perspective, the vagueness of many of the definitions and principles of the bill will, I believe, leave it open to constant litigation. For example, what constitutes a serious illness, and who falls under the definition of child and parent, are legal disputes waiting to happen. Additionally, I am particularly concerned that the private right of action accorded to employees under the bill will lead to a barrage of frivolous lawsuits, and it's not every day that you have a lawyer arguing against legislation that would allow us to do more billing. What is more, the fact that there are no exemptions for businesses falling within the federal law definition of small businesses raises the question of whether the bill is vulnerable to legal challenge based upon a conflict of laws. And finally, the New York City Paid Sick Leave bill imposes a burden of paying sick or vacation days on employers, which is something so onerous that neither the federal government, nor any other state government, has to

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

date enacted a similar law. On the contrary, due to the dire state of the economy, in an unprecedented move, the New York State legislature has just passed a law requiring state workers to take one day furlough without pay, which will save the state \$30 million. Clearly, this is not the time to pass a paid sick time legislation bill that falls squarely on the shoulders of small business. Small business is the backbone of Staten Island's good health. Without it our borough cannot thrive. The added financial burden that will come from the imposition of this bill will, without question, force an increase in unemployment, thereby decreasing the quality of life for Staten Island residents. At a minimum, modification to the proposed law needs to be made to keep small business in business, something that will benefits employers and employees alike. Thank you.

MR. LATHAM: Good afternoon, Danny Latham, Latham's Communication, Brooklyn. Good evening, Councilwoman Brewer, Councilman Sanders. I don't know if Councilwoman Brewer remembers me from November. I had left here saying that I

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

would be going and taking away the vacation pay and converting it to coincide with the sick leave bill and I have done that. You can call my employees to verify that. You did take it back and you reworked it, but still no consideration has been taken for any type of an emergency or critical type businesses. Boiler repairmen, myself, an answering service, a hospital. Councilman Halloran said, there are no blackout dates set. I still would like to require if an operator calls out sick on one day, I can ask her for a note, if I should so choose. Three days is out of the line. The one hour lateness that they can accrue for sick pay, New York State Department of Labor has that as grounds for dismissal if they're late. Which law is going to supersede which? And as I said in November, I testified I would remove vacation pay, I have. I kept that promise, my new promise is Sunday I am leaving for Phoenix, Arizona to secure an office to relocate. You will now have eight unemployed women in New York City, because I cannot go on with this bill any more, because you cannot work it out right. Thank you.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: Thank you.

MS. KRAVET: Good evening, Council.

My name is Debra Kravet, I'm a business owner on the upper West Side in Councilwoman Gale Brewer's district, and I am also a resident of the upper West Side. My business and my residence has been there for 27 years. I also operate a drycleaning plant in the south Bronx, and was forced to move there three years ago when my property where I was renting in Harlem was taken away from me. So I've undergone numerous disadvantages in operating a business, including my lease in the historic Apthorp Building on the upper West Side, which as of June 30th will be sitting empty for two years. So no one can deny the social need for down time. However, the economic cost of providing this to small business is unaffordable in this economy. ask you to walk up and down the streets of the upper West Side, to see how many businesses have gone out of business over the years, the past two years, and the ones that are there, most I would say are barely holding on. The MTA has imposed a tax on us, Con Edison is increasing their rates, water rates have gone up. Fees, licenses, that we

pay in New York City to operate our businesses			
have all gone up. To impose this on small			
business at this time, and make it the			
responsibility of the employer only, I think is			
going in the wrong direction. You know, as my			
neighbor has said, if we could work something out			
where it's like a disability insurance, where			
everybody participates and pays into it, I can see			
it working. But the way it is now, I really can't			
imagine that it could work for small business.			
The lost production, paying overtime to other			
employees, or bringing in temps, and paying your			
employee at the same time, is just not a			
possibility. You know, we pay two weeks paid			
vacation, we give nine paid holidays. You know,			
these are things that we'll have to take away from			
our employees if we're required to meet these			
regulations. So I thank you for listening.			

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Debra, I have just one question, because it seems to me because you are very generous, would not your benefits allow you to be exempt from this legislation? I mean, I understand your colleagues talking about how would you define it, and is it

the same, and all of that. But if we could define a bill that stated if Apthorp Cleaners or whatever provides so and so, which you provide much more than what the bill does, then wouldn't that be sufficient for you to say, okay? As long as it doesn't include me? Because I am a good employer and I already provide. Now, not everybody on the panel will have the same situation, but in your case, you do.

MS. KRAVET: Well, I do provide the time, and I think it needs to be clearly written in the bill that, if we are providing time off, you know, for paid holidays, for vacation, if it's clearly written and there's no discussion that I don't need to call it paid sick time off. I mean, I presently have an employee in the hospital, he's been out of work now for five days. He is being paid, he's being paid because he deserves to be paid.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Okay, fine.

MS. KRAVET: And he is being paid.

And that has nothing to do with the other pay that he gets for his paid holidays or anything else. I mean, I'm a person with a heart.

1	COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR 172
2	COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: I know
3	that, that's why
4	MS. KRAVET: (Interposing) You
5	know.
6	COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: I know you
7	well, I know you are.
8	MS. KRAVET: And I think that the
9	way it is, and I think other people have stated
10	this also, you know, that those who will take
11	advantage will take advantage. And I think that
12	asking somebody three days to bring in written
13	notes.
14	COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: I wrote
15	that down.
16	MS. KRAVET: And in this day and
17	age, where everybody's on the computer and can
18	create their own document, you know, there needs
19	to be a more
20	COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER:
21	(Interposing) Rigorous is what you're looking for,
22	okay.
23	MS. KRAVET: Yes, rigorous way to
24	confirm that these people are really out because
25	they're sick.

1	COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR 173
2	COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Okay.
3	MS. KRAVET: If somebody's sick, I
4	have no problem, trust me.
5	COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Right.
6	MS. KRAVET: If I'm sick, I don't
7	want to go to work either, but unfortunately, you
8	know, I do have to.
9	COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Right.
10	MS. KRAVET: Because I do have a
11	business to run.
12	COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Okay. All
13	right, that's helpful, thank you very much.
14	MS. KRAVET: Thank you.
15	COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Next panel?
16	Thank you all very much.
17	COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Next up we have
18	Pat Purcell, UFCW Local 1500; Sarah Johnson, 32BJ
19	SEIU; and Sharada Polavarapu, CLC, Central Labor
20	Council.
21	COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Whoever
22	would like to begin should begin.
23	MS. POLAVARAPU: Good afternoon,
24	thank you
25	COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: You've got

2 to push the button.

3 MS. POLAVARAPU: Good afternoon, 4 thank you Chairman Sanders and the other members 5 of the Committee for the opportunity to testify today on Intro 97, the paid sick time act. 6 7 name is Sharada Polavarapu, I'm the political 8 director of the New York City Central Labor Council, a federation of 300 affiliated local 9 10 unions representing 1.3 million working men and women in New York City. I'm here to testify on 11 12 behalf of our president, Jack Ahern in support of The ability of a worker to earn a 13 Intro 97. minimum amount of paid time off so that they can 14 15 care for themselves or a family member when sick 16 is an issue of fundamental fairness, and a basic 17 right that should be applied to all workers. Everyone gets sick, that's a fact. Yet nearly two 18 19 million workers do not have a single day of paid 20 sick leave where they work, including nearly two 21 thirds of low-wage workers. Many workers are 22 forced to work sick or to send a child to school 23 sick because they cannot afford to lose a day's pay, or risk losing their jobs. Working mothers 24 25 are disproportionately impacted by a lack of paid

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

sick days, since they are often the primary caregivers and responsible for taking care of a child when it is sick. They suffer the most stress in trying to balance the needs of their families and the demands of their jobs. workers go to work sick, or send a child to school sick, they risk increasing the spread of contagious illness to co-workers, classmates and the general public. The public health risk is heightened in New York City by several hundreds of thousands of workers who lack paid sick leave in industries that have high levels of interactions with the public, especially those employed in food service and retail. From the employer's point of view, you don't want people to come into work sick. When someone comes in sick, they make other people sick. A minimum sick leave policy would allow employers to protect the workforce. Providing workers with the benefit of paid sick days is also good for business. When workers are provided paid sick leave, they demonstrate increased job satisfaction, commitment and morale, and their employees reap the benefits of high performance and productivity. This bill makes

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

complete economic and common sense, and the

Central Labor Council urges the City Council to

pass the paid sick time act, to set a minimum

standard for paid sick days and establish

quaranteed protection for all workers.

MS. JOHNSON: Is it on now? Oh it is, okay. Thank you, Chair Sanders and to the Committee, and to Council Member Brewer for hearing my testimony. I'm here ... well, first my name is Sarah Johnson, I'm with SEIU 32BJ, I'm here to read testimony on behalf of Hector Figueroa, our secretary-treasurer. Our union represents over 65,000 janitors, doormen, custodial workers, porters and security officers working in New York City. I'm here today to testify regarding the paid sick leave bill. This bill would take a leap forward in the ongoing fight to insure basic rights for all workers by allowing them to take days off work to care for their health without fear of losing their job. SEIU 32BJ fully supports its passage. We fight hard to win this basic workplace right for our members, however, nearly half of all New York City workers lack paid sick time. 32BJ represents

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

3,000 city-contracted security officers. men and women provide the first line of defense in municipal buildings and other city facilities, and until May of last year, just one year ago, they did not have the ability to take days when they or their families were sick. This is unacceptable. We believe paid sick leave is a basic workplace right, one that our members and all hardworking New Yorkers should have. The gap in paid sick leave in New York City provides yet another setback to already vulnerable workers, disproportionately high numbers of low income workers, immigrants and women lack paid sick However, this is not just a workers-rights leave. issue, it's a family issue for those who are unable to take time off to care for a sick child, and a public health issue for co-workers and customers endangered by people coming to work sick, an issue for all New Yorkers, and one we need to act on now. We strongly encourage the Council to extend this basic right.

MR. PURCELL: Thank you, Chairman Sanders, Council Member Brewer, thank you. I'm, instead of reading I'm just going to simply

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

comment, because I have been able to listen to a lot of testimony today. So let me just say that this has been very enlightening. I'm thrilled to hear that I think a lot of groups have come here today, saying we can do this. I was very happy to hear folks from the Food Industry Alliance, people that we very often partner with, come with some suggestions. And we think that's great, because we think there are people who, you know, belonging to a union, we know and understand what good-faith bargaining is. And I believe that there is an attempt here at good-faith bargaining to get together with the right bill. We strongly do support this bill, though, and say very clearly, though, the clock cannot go on forever. We need to get to the point where those that want to sit down and bargain in good faith, get in a room and We will, though, always have businesses that are going to oppose this. And you know, with all due respect, those are the same businesses that would oppose minimum wage increases, overtime after 40 hours, workers comp, blah, blah, blah. That's where this is ultimately going to come down We need to get into a room, we need to pass

sense are not in vain.

MR. PURCELL: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: If there are

4 no questions from the- -

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER:

(Interposing) I just wanted to say thank you to all three of you, as leaders in all senses of the best sense of the word, figuring out, always trying to see how we can work together as the great Pat Purcell has always stated, and to help guide us, because you have experience with workers every single day, figuring out what's good for their families, figuring out what is a good agreement, and we've been taking your lead in trying to make this bill work. So in all senses of the word, thank you.

MR. PURCELL: Council Member, let me say this. And I've had the privilege of working with all the Council members on so many different things. And I think everyone needs to recognize that you have gone above and beyond to hear the concerns. We've worked on a lot of legislation, but you have gone just so far above and beyond to really address the concerns of all the partners and the people affected by that, and

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

we commend you for that. And I just think, again, we're going to be at that point where we're all going to either agree to disagree, or we're going to come up with a real good compromise, and that's a testament to your leadership on this issue.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: I learned from the past from the Food Industry Alliance and from Local 1500. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: Let's try that again. I've been around for nine years'ish, and I've seen a lot of issues that have brought out some passion, living wage was an historic fight, and it brought out a lot of passion. The predatory lending law brought out a lot of passion. This one has, I would argue it would equal that, wouldn't you say that? It has equaled those in terms of passion. And the passion must be recognized, passion on both sides. people feel this strongly about something, that there's something there that needs to be looked at diligently, and the City Council is committed to doing that. But we are not simply a talking shop, we are not the simply the debating society. will come up with legislation, and with the help

New York City, establishments that provide over

200,000 jobs to New Yorkers, we urge the Council

24

25

not to pass this well-intentioned legislation. 2 3 Rather than read my testimony, I've been sitting here for about, as you have, for about five hours 4 now, so let me, rather than trying to read my 5 testimony, respond to some of the points that I've 6 7 heard, that seems to be where we are heading, you 8 know, in this issue. First, and foremost, well, first, not foremost. First is the issue of 9 10 whether or not this legislation, its former version or the exact same language in this 11 12 version, exempts businesses that provide days off in a number in excess of what is required in this 13 14 bill. And unfortunately it clearly does not. 15 that's its intent, great, let's work on it. It's 16 only one paragraph in a thirteen page bill, so I 17 will read it, so we all be clear on why it does It's sub blah, blah, blah, sub nine. 18 not. 19 employer with a paid leave policy, such as a paid 20 time off policy, who provides an employee with an 21 amount of paid leave sufficient to meet the 22 accrual requirements of this section", okay, so 23 that's the numbers, "and who allows for such paid 24 leave to be used for the same purposes, and under 25 the same conditions as this section, is not

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

required to provide any further paid sick time." So in other words, it's not enough that I may offer two weeks vacation per year, which could be used for paid sick, it has to be allowed in the same manner of this bill, and under the same conditions as this bill. Two examples of why, therefore, I would not be exempted in my law firm business. One, I don't allow people to use paid sick time if they're late. I'm going to take an hour of my paid sick time that I have accrued, I'm not late now. It doesn't that way in my office, it doesn't work that way in most businesses. And under this bill, I would not be exempt. Second, I'm a restaurant owner. I require my employees, when they call in sick, to document their illness, because I'm in the food industry. I need to know why they were sick, and I need to make sure it's okay for them to come back, before they start preparing your food. Well, if I require documentation, and I can require ... I can allow thirty sick days per year, not five, not nine, if I require documentation from day one, then I don't meet the qualifications of this law, and therefore it doesn't count. I've got to provide an

additional nine "don't ask/don't tell" days off. 2 3 So let's set that lie aside, this legislation does not exempt the tens of thousands of businesses that we've heard today that they do exempt, 5 because we provide lots of vacation or personal 6 Second, the cost factor. That is second 7 time. and foremost. We've heard that we are not opposed 8 to the concept as a business community of 9 10 strengthening the laws in the City of New York if 11 they need strengthening, our human rights laws, 12 Health Department laws, what have you, to protect a worker's right from taking a day off, or more, 13 if they are sick, or need to care for a loved one 14 15 because they are sick, without any fear whatsoever of losing their job or retribution. We are down 16 17 with that, no problem. Let's take that off the table. All that then leaves is, the demand here 18 19 that they not only be able to take time off if 20 they're sick, without fear of retribution, but 21 that they get paid for it. Well, that's the cost 22 factor, and that's where we are coming to 23 disagreement. The first witness that testified 24 here today, testified that the lack of paid sick 25 leave is concentrated in small businesses. That's

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

what she said. Well then I'm sitting here and I'm saying, well, we have to ask why. Why is that the case? And to me we either have to conclude as, I guess she has, that the thousands of mom and pop businesses in the City of New York are just moneygrubbing business owners. Or you have to conclude, as I have, is they can't afford to do You've heard from many small businesses here today. They seem to be pretty caring people to me. They seem to care about their business and about their employees. I know I do in my law practice, and I'm a small business owner. don't provide a benefit, it's because the margins are so thin I can't afford it. There is nothing in this legislation which is waving a wand and coming up with the money to help pay for this new moral issue that the advocates say paid sick leave And you know what? I have no problem with agreeing that it's a new moral issue. But then it should be handled like all government mandated social issues, such as unemployment insurance and workers compensation and disability. None of those are 100% employer funded. But all the parties pay their fair share. When an employee

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

gets hurt and cannot work, I don't pay their salary. A government insurance policy does. If I have to lay somebody off because the economy is bad, I'm not paying them \$400 bucks a week unemployment, an insurance policy does. And those insurance policies are paid for, partly by government, partly by the employee, and partly by the employer. That's what we're proposing. This bill is very cavalier with the limited funds of mom and pop business owners today, because it doesn't have any shared requirement, or any shared expense. Our legislation that we are proposing, our compromise does require some sort of shared 14 expense, and that we believe is where the solution here could ultimately lie. The rest of my ... you know, there are a number of specific issues about the number of days which is arbitrarily chosen here, the national ... one of the groups who testified here, when they testified before Congress on the national proposed legislation, they testified that on average nationally, the number of days people take off sick per year when they have paid sick leave, is four days per year. The number of days people take off per year sick

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

when they don't have paid sick leave is three days per year. Where we come up with nine, it seems like a figure, you know, pulled out of you know It's not based on any data anywhere. where. we're being told, don't worry, the employees won't abuse it. Well, then let's bring it down to the number of days that their own national data says people really need for paid sick leave. Those are some of the, you know, and we talk about the San Francisco bill, but they always don't talk about the Washington D.C. bill, and why is that? of all, that's the only bill in the country that actually went through a legislative process such as this. All the others were done by, you know, putting it out for a public referendum. You know, in San Francisco you could put out a public referendum that employers should provide everybody with a car, and that would pass. So, you know, let's not really look towards that. Washington D.C. bill, you heard, is much more balanced, has fewer days, has many exemptions. Ιf you want to look to legislation for a compromise, let's get in that room and let's start with the Washington D.C. bill. I've taken up too much

2 time, thank you.

3 MR. JULIANO: I agree with 4 everything he said. First of all, my name is Tony Juliano, and I'm the general manager of a small 5 bar in Chelsea called XES Lounge. I'm also the 6 chairperson of the Greenwich Village Chelsea 7 8 Chamber of Commerce. And I want to thank you, Chairman Sanders, and thank you, Council Member 9 10 Brewer, warmly for respecting me enough, and respecting the hundreds of businesses I represent 11 by sticking around and hearing my testimony today. 12 Let me begin by saying that Intro 097 has laudable 13 goals. You've heard that over and over today. 14 15 However, I believe that this bill would impose a 16 new local mandate of sweeping scope on businesses, 17 including the very smallest businesses that I 18 represent, at a time of economic distress, and in 19 a place, New York City, where high rents, high 20 taxes, high insurance, high fees, and a complex 21 regulatory process, have made it difficult for a 22 small independent business to survive, much less 23 thrive. In Manhattan in particular, in the community served by our chamber of commerce, and 24 that's Canal Street to the south, 34th, all the way 25

up to 34th Street, these small independent 2 3 businesses are vanishing. The lead sponsor of 4 this bill, Council Member Brewer, whom I have a deep admiration for, and you know that, she, 5 Manhattan borough president Scott Stringer, and 6 7 many other public officials explored this 8 phenomenon. Speaker Quinn, in her State of the City address, introduced some important 9 10 initiatives aimed at least in part in addressing this problem. The very need for such attention by 11 public officials should inform this Committee of 12 the need for support and relief for these 13 14 struggling entrepreneurs, not new and expensive 15 mandates that might well be the tipping point in 16 difficult economic times. Let me speak for a 17 moment about my company, XES Lounge. XES employs ten people. All but three are minimum wage tipped 18 19 employees. As such, the overwhelming majority of 20 their income is derived from tips. This bar, like 21 most in this industry, allows its employees to 22 swap shifts when illness strikes. Generally 23 speaking, the employee loses no work time, and no employee income is lost. And no one works while 24 25 they are sick. Without an exemption for tipped

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

employees, like Washington D.C.'s law has, the industry will be forced to change its policy. For this industry the new law will likely have the opposite effect of what was intended. Employees will not call in sick, lest they lose the bulk of their income. We are talking about bartenders and waiters. These are the very people that you do not want coming into work sick. Members of our chamber have similar stories. Most are small businesses with fewer than 25 employees, and expect the cost of the bill to range between \$5,000 and \$20,000 annually. Some estimate the cost to be much higher. Almost 40% said that they would eliminate jobs to offset the cost of this bill. Business owners understand the value of their employees, and many offer a balanced suite of benefits to their workers, including sick time, vacation, health care, and more. This bill, however, reaches down to the smallest business and mandates changes and imposes regulations that might well kill some businesses, eliminate jobs, stifle entrepreneurship, suppress growth and discourage new investment in our city. I urge you to support small business in New York and reject

this bill in its current form. Thank you.

3 MR. SUNSHINE: Chairman Sanders, 4 Council Member Brewer, I would like to just echo Tony's comments in just saying thank you to the 5 two of you for staying here, and the staying power 6 7 that you have with all the testimony that has been 8 given today. In deference to you, and everyone in the room, I think I will also deviate from my 9 10 script today because I think my counsel has done a 11 terrific job in presenting this to you at various 12 meetings that he's had. I just do want to say 13 that we represent the National Association of 14 Theatre Owners of New York State, we represent all 15 the major theaters in the city, AMC and Loews, 16 which have merged; Regal and United Artists, that 17 have merged; Clearview Cinemas and also National Amusements. We represent about 48 movie theaters 18 19 in the city, that represents 312 screens and 20 approximately eighteen hundred employees. The 21 major point that I want to make is that our 22 standard industry practice is, we do not fire an 23 employee for being sick. Our theaters have a tremendous amount of flexible hours. Because of 24 25 that, 80% of the people that work in our theaters

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

are either retirees, seasonal employees, or students. And because of that, they have the opportunity to work the hours they want. If an employee cannot work, he simply calls the theater, he talks to the manager, he says, "I can't come in today". The manager gets someone else to fill in, and that person has the opportunity to make up that time and not lose any pay. So although we feel that the intent of the bill is good, we think the way it is written is not. The one point I do want to make with regard to the law, specifically if you're going to follow some of the laws in either Washington or in San Francisco, is specifically on the accrual. We truly believe that it should not begin to accrue until after 90 days, and then we also believe that payment should be made until 90 days after, or 180 days. I just want to comment on one or two comments that were made by other people that were here today. comments were that this is not an expensive bill. Well, I can tell you we made a major study of this with our trade organization with the theaters that are operating in the city, and specifically one example, one of our members operates three movie

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

theaters in the City of New York. He has approximately 90 employees in those three, 70 of them are either part time or retirees. calculated that it would cost close to \$50,000 for those three theaters and for those 70 employees. This is a tax on business, this is a very expensive proposition. So just basically in closing, you'd have to be a heartless SOB to sit in this room and listen to some of the stories that were told and not feel bad for these people. So I think, being in the movie business, our terminology is, this bill needs a rewrite. And although we feel the intent is good, please rewrite it, take into consideration what many of us are saying. Thank you.

MS. POST: Well, I guess it's good evening at this point, and I must say, as my other panel members, thank you very much, Chairman, for staying so late and being so patient in really hearing both sides of this obviously very important issue. And the remaining Council people, thank you again. My name is Kate Post, and I am actually here on behalf of the New York Staffing Association. New York Staffing

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Association actually represents temporary staffing firms here in New York City, and we are really responsible for about 120,000 employees annually here in the city, with an estimated impact on the city of \$1.6 billion every year. Our employees are really treated as employees, they are given very fair and competitive salaries, they're given benefits, they're given training. In addition to health care and anything mandatory, all provided for by each organization. But more importantly, we also provide a bridge between unemployment and full time employment, and we therefore help keep people off of the city's unemployment rolls, which is obviously something we think is very important, not only to the health of the city, but overall the state. 70% of our employees ultimately get full time work because of the temporary positions that they've been in. It provides them with additional skills, or they might get hired by the employer that has actually contracted us to temp them. Our industry, however, traditionally operates at a very low margin, approximately 3%, and that's impacted by many things, but in part because of the competitive pay, the benefits that

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

we do provide to our field employees. This bill, from our calculations, will cost the staffing industry about \$60 million annually in additional costs, which, frankly, at a 3% margin is tremendously impactful. That will make us do one of several things. Number one, we'd have to pass that cost on to our clients. Well, that seems logical, but that could definitely impact their willingness to actually come to a temporary staffing firm for temp help. We can certainly lower the rates of our employees. To us that doesn't seem like that's really a good option. The third option would literally force some of us to actually close our doors, which in a time of high unemployment in New York City, at 10.2%, we certainly don't think that that's what is meant to do by this bill. We actually agree that there should be, like everybody else has agreed, there should be a law passed, and a bill passed, that would actually make sure that individuals have some kind of sick pay. We would like, as an industry, a carve-out from this because of the unusual type of work that we do do, and the fact that we are really creating jobs and it could be

uniquely harmful to an industry where people are
not necessarily working 50 weeks a year through
us. They may be going other places, and not
through a temporary staffing firm to actually get
a job at times. So, if we are not able to get a
carve-out, what we would like to do is recommend
some changes, and I'm not going to go through all
of them, you've got them in the written testimony.
But we do also believe that accrual should start
at 90 days and that it's a pretty common waiting
period for most benefits. So we don't think that
would be unusual. Also, we believe that paid sick
time should be utilized for absences from
scheduled work. Last, we believe that the average
hourly rate really should be used for paid sick
time compensation, our employees may get varying
rates, depending on the assignment that they're
on. So there are several notices and posting
requirements that are also very, very burdensome
for our type of business, that is in the written
testimony. I'm happy to answer any questions, but
I wanted to keep it short and sweet. Thank you
very much.

CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: Last but

owner, I was incensed and shot off an angry email

25

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

However, since I did not hear from her to her. immediately, I thought that the next time I would have heard about the bill was after it was passed and published in the papers. But last week I received an email from her suggesting that I testify at this hearing. I have read Intro 97, and while I'm in favor of the spirit of the law, I respectfully believe that it should be modified to protect small businesses, especially the owners of mom and pop businesses. I'm talking about the true meaning of a small business, and not the meaning that the IRS has imposed upon us. IRS's definition of a small business is a business that has a yearly income of \$10 million or less, and I can tell you that none of the small businesses that I know, including my company, has never made \$10 million, or even made close to \$10 million in any one year, and for that reason I believe that Intro 97 should not be passed as it is drafted, because it will be burdensome to many small businesses, especially the owners of mom and pop businesses, who are struggling to make ends meet, and are struggling to put food on their table to feed their families and themselves. The

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

worst scenario if the bill is passed as drafted, it will invariably put many of us out of business. I can tell you this much, that if this law is passed where it compels small businesses, especially the owners of mom and pop businesses, to pay sick leave, I will shut down my business, a business that I love and have struggled to keep going for 19 years. I can tell you that it is very difficult to do business in this city, because every governmental agency is looking over your shoulder, and every governmental agency has their hands in your pocket, and I say, rather than giving them the fancy name, just call them the I see that the bill includes everyone, and mob. I'm including everyone and their families, including part time workers. But you fail to include the dog, and I'm not being facetious, since most people would argue that their dog is part of their family. My prediction is that if this bill is passed is that you will have both employers and employees getting very creative, by one, you will have employees seeking out unscrupulous doctors who will be handing out sick notes like candy, stating that they are sick, when

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

in fact they are lying on a sunny beach somewhere, two, more small employers will hire people on a part time basis, thus cutting down on their hours, three, employers will pay off the books, and d, in the extreme, some businesses will just close up shop, so there will be less revenues coming into the city. Therefore, if this bill is passed as drafted, it will end up being a lose-lose situation for all. And I'm finishing up. Therefore, if this bill becomes a law, it will become burdensome to many small businesses, especially the owners of mom and pop businesses. My proposal is for the bill to exclude any company that makes \$500,000 or less per year, and that sick time should not be carried over from year to Therefore, I urge all City Council members year. to give this bill careful consideration before passing this bill, because, remember that many of you will be out of a job in four years, and some of you will be running for higher offices where you will need our votes, and some of you might just end up being a small business owner. remember that the decision you make in 2010 might just come back to bite you in 2014. Thank you for

don't know you, Ms. Post, and I want to thank you

25

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

for the extra work you put into this. What happens now, I have many friends, thank goodness, with the temp agencies who are between jobs, and I have many friends in the restaurant industry, sou chefs and chefs and many, many times they are participating and get jobs. But what happens, I guess what happens, now my friends, desperate for the income, they wait in the morning and get the call, or the night before, and then they go to the restaurant, and sometimes corporate kitchens, and sometimes, you know, whatever. And they work there for like a week, a few days, and then, you know, they go back to looking for a full time job, as you suggest. But I think what would happen is, if they're ill, they would just say, they might say, "I need to go anyway", only because they're nervous about not working, because money is so So I assume that you discourage that. How does it work if somebody is ill now in the temp world?

MS. POST: Well, one of several things can happen. If they're hypothetically on a two or three assignment, and in the middle of that assignment they're ill, they may choose to go to

CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: Council Member Gennaro.

23

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: Thank you,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

to question you on that.

COUNCIL MEMBER GENNARO: It's quite clean. So thank you all, and thank you, Mr. Chairman.

25 CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: Thank you for

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

be one of the last people to speak in support of the paid sick time act. Our office provides free legal services to low income workers throughout the city on a range of employment matters in our Workplace Justice Project and Lower Manhattan Justice Project. And people usually don't come to our office unless things have gotten really bad, usually when they've lost their job. And often unfortunately that's too late for us to help them. A surprising number of people who come to our office have lost their jobs through circumstances relating to absence from work for medical reasons for themselves or their families. And because of the stories we've heard, we believe that this bill would provide much needed protection for workers, especially the low-wage workers who are extremely vulnerable in their jobs and also whose wages barely cover the cost of living in the city. know, small businesses, or businesses, are not the only ones who pay high rent in New York, as we all The people who we most often see with this problem are immigrants who work in the small businesses in their own immigrant communities. For people in these types of jobs, often they're

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

paid in cash, they have no benefits whatsoever. Not only might they not have paid sick days, they might not be allowed to take any days off at all if they're sick. And in fact we have seen several people who have lost their jobs simply because they had to take a day off from work. gentleman came to our office after he had been fired from his job as a waiter in a restaurant, after he asked for several days off because he needed dental surgery. He had extremely painful dental problems, the surgery required more than two days to recover. The employer said, "You could take one day off, but if you need two days, your job is over". He had to choose ... he chose to fix his dental problem, and he lost his job. Another man came to our office, he lost his job in a small grocery store because he was in a car accident on the way to work. He wasn't seriously injured, but he was taken to the hospital and he had to stay in the hospital during the day. And when he called his employer to explain what happened, he was told, "Well, you didn't provide us advance notice that you were going to be absent, you no longer have a job here". So I'm

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

sure there are many small businesses, people who have testified here, who do provide benefits, who are flexible, who allow people to take days off. Exempting these smaller employers from this bill, I think, will really exclude the people who most need the protection that this bill would offer. I will say that there are people who work in larger businesses, who have also had problems and come to us losing their jobs, even though they do have sick leave policies, whether they are flexible or informal or formal. Sometimes it's difficult to negotiate these policies, and employees can still find themselves without a job, after taking sick leave as they thought they were entitled to. of our clients was fired from his job at a large grocery store for going home early when he had the This gentleman had taken a day off two days flu. earlier, had gone to the emergency room and been diagnosed with the flu. The next day he was not scheduled to work, he recovered. The day after that, he chose to come in, even though he wasn't feeling completely better, because he wasn't sure how many absences he was allowed. He came in but he didn't feel well, he told his employer, "You

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

know, I have to go home", and they said, "Well, you know, you're doing it at your own risk". came in the next day and he had no job. another example I'll state quickly is a woman who worked at a major hospital. She was on vacation with her family in her home in West Africa, her daughter contracted malaria. She contacted her employer, explained the emergency. There was a provision in the employer's policy for her to take the leave, but even though she tried to do it, when she came back she was told she was terminated. So I think another thing that people haven't really spoken about much today is the anti-retaliation provision, and we believe that that provision is a very important piece of this law. So I'll just say that on behalf of MFY Legal Services and our clients, we urge you to enact this important legislation and thank you for listening to me today.

MS. BOURDIER: Hi, my name is Charo Bourdier, I was born in the Dominican Republic and raised here on the Lower East Side by my grandmother. I have a bachelor's degree in sociology and most of my work experience is as an

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

administrative assistant. I was working as an administrative assistant at the Garment Industry Development Corporation, a not-for-profit organization for fashion designers, but I got laid off from work last year. I went on unemployment, and two months later I got pregnant. actively looking for work from the moment I got laid off, and finally around August I was hired by a temp agency called Jennifer Temps. The job with Jennifer Temps was a customer service rep position for the New York City Department of Education, dealing with the school buses. I was four to five months pregnant at the time, just starting to show, but I didn't feel comfortable revealing that I was pregnant to my employers because I was afraid they wouldn't hire me. Around the same time I started work at the Department of Ed, my baby was diagnosed with having a swollen left kidney. The doctors explained that I would have to get a sonogram every two weeks so that they could monitor the condition of the baby's kidney. I would need time to attend these weekly appointments, taking time off from my employment would be difficult because the temp agency

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

stressed two things: you must not be late, and absence was not acceptable. Both of these conditions were stressed before I took the assignment, I tried to schedule my sonogram appointments in the evening outside of work hours, but I was told that the doctor's office couldn't do the sonograms in the evening. At my job I had no benefits and no sick days. Any time I took off during the day to go to my appointments, I would not get paid. Plus, I thought that if I had to take a lot of time off, they would just fire me and they would find someone else, since it was only a temp job. I knew that I was going to the sonogram appointments, it would take a lot of time during the day, between the travel time and the hours waiting in the waiting room. It was timeconsuming, but I was pregnant and my main concern was my child. I missed a sonogram appointment after a couple of weeks on the job because I did not feel like I could ask for the time off, or that I could afford it. I was really nervous and freaking out, because I was torn between doing a good job on the assignment and protecting the health of my unborn baby. Being a mom is my top

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

priority, and in the end I felt like I had to leave the job. I knew that the agency was not going to be flexible about my regular sonogram appointments when they were so adamant about not being absent. I called the temp agency and asked if they could offer me another assignment that was more flexible, or even part time, but they said Because of the conflict between my work no. schedule and my baby's health, I had to leave the I was found ineligible for unemployment benefits because the Department of Labor said I had left my job voluntarily. I had to go on public assistance, great, everybody in this room knows that I'm public assistance to support myself and my baby who is now three months. I feel like if this law had been in effect when I was working, I would have been able to take the time off I needed to go to my prenatal appointments. I would have been able to keep my job and take care of my health and my baby's health, rather than having to depend on unemployment or public assistance. feel really strong that I do not want to be an economic burden to anyone, and certainly not to the government. But in order for people like me,

economic downturn that the country has gone

25

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

through, unfortunately. However, no one has mentioned that people who work for a living have been affected by that economic downturn the hardest. The workers who are employed by these companies, where the owners get rich off the backs of the workers, many of whom don't provide benefits, which also very, if I sort of get off track here, a lot of people came up here and reiterated this same thing. A lot of these businesses, a lot of people who spoke, are already exempt from this bill, because they already provide either paid sick days or some sort of time off for their employees. Why they were here, I don't know. But again, this is part and parcel of what is systemically wrong in this country, not just New York City, but the United States of The fact that the richest country in the America. world could be on the borderline of being broke, that would eventually affect other countries in the world, is a joke. I would ask all the Council members who for whatever reason didn't find this important enough to stay throughout the entire thing, and just on that note, Council Member Halloran and his disrespectful attitude to the

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

members of the panel who sat before him, and his bullying attitude towards them was disgusting. I've been enlightened here today, because I had no idea that so many New Yorkers don't have this sort of benefit, whereas many of the people who spoke here today can afford to take time off, whether they're sick or otherwise. Yet it's unconscionable for many of the people who sat here today who are opposed to this, to say that some people would take advantage of this. Well, the workers of New York City have been taken advantage of for far too long. This is something that I feel very strongly about. You mentioned the word 'passion' earlier, Councilman Sanders. The reason that this is such a passionate issue for New Yorkers is that because we're sick and tired of this. We are sick and tired of carrying New York City on our backs, while people like Mayor Bloomberg, who mentioned a few months ago that, yeah, this is a city for the rich. Well, that may be the case, but the workers of this city could shut it down, and if need be, and if that's what it comes down to, then so be it. We will have to do that. Again, this is something that is a very,

very serious issue, and just before I turn it over, one of the other points that was being made is the language of the bill. The language in many things in this country seems to affect people negatively. Well, if we have to use first grade words for people to understand that workers make this city tick, then let's use first grade words. Because it's far too long now, we've gone without benefits, it's far too long that people in New York City, and like I said earlier, across the country, have had to suffer for the greed and just unconscionable behavior of the few.

CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: Again, last but never least, sir. However, sit as close to the mic as you can.

MR. PETERS: Hi, my name is Mr.

Joseph Peters. I just wanted to speak that this
bill should be passed. You know, I've been
hearing stories about people need this bill to be
passed. First of all, the only thing about like,
you know, it makes sense for a person to get fired
if they get sick. People have problems, so we
need benefits for workers. So I would say to
myself, it doesn't make sense that people who have

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to work like me that ever have a problem, I have to lose my job. I should not lose my job because anybody has problems. Everybody has problems, the rich, the poor, middle class have got problems. So we should not be fired because we don't have no benefits. You know, and I think that it is a shame that we have to just come here for people to try to delay this bill, because every day, like this bill should not be delayed, this bill should pass. You know, and it makes sense for like people that work in the city without benefits. You know, it's time for equality. There are people that work in this building, they have sick time, they have personal problems, when they take off, they don't get fired. They don't lose their jobs, so why should we lose our jobs because of Because we're nobody? That's not equality. why? It's time for equality, it's time for workers to have equality. You know, it don't make sense for us to suffer because we don't have no equality, we be human beings, we are human beings like anybody else, and we deserve equal rights, we deserve civil rights, we deserve human rights, and that's the bottom line. You know, it don't make sense

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

do it in ten seconds.

MR. BROWN: I can.

CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: I believe you

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 can.

MR. BROWN: Right above you, I think that says it all.

CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: I've often pointed that out to my colleagues. You were going to read some ... I want to thank you, I'm going to make a statement, but I'm going to let him read something into the record. I want to thank you all and get you all off the hot seat ... well, before you do that, let me thank this panel especially, to testify here is a very traumatic situation. It's a very traumatic situation and you've done well. You've done well coming up here. You spoke truth to power, and you put it out there as plain as you can bared ourselves and spoke of some painful things. How we have to deal with HRA sometimes, how we have to, you know, after we ... how we have to survive in New York City, and I can assure you that my colleagues on the Council, and I spend enough time with them to know, are really trying to figure out a way of making one New York. We've got our work cut out. Some may bet against us. They may be right, at the end of the day. But we're going to try to

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

really do justice here, and you can take credit
that your efforts have brought this about, that
your being there and seeing this thing through
have brought that about. So I want to dismiss you
from this panel. I'm going to ask him, my
attorney leads, my counsel leads, to read some
things into the record, then I'm going to make a
closing statement.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: I'm going to read the names and organizations that were submitted ... that submitted testimony but did not testify today, either by choice or because they had to leave due to time constraints. First, in favor of the bill were Dr. Marjory Hill for GMHC, Robert Perry from the New York Civil Liberties Union, John Petro from the Drum Major Institute, and Abe Markman, New York State Family Paid Leave Coalition and the New York Society for Ethical Culture. And against were Felice Farber from the General Contractors Association, Michael Kelly from the New York Association of Realtors, Nancy Aber Goshow of Goshow Architects, Tom Minnick of the Business Council, Lawrence Mandelker, New York Metropolitan Retail Association, John Banks, Con

Edison Company of New York, Richard Windram from
Verizon, K.Y. Chow, small business owner, and
Vicki Keenan, Printing Industry Alliance. In
addition we have several people who also planned
to testify but left. In favor of the bill, Andres
Renderos, Jacob Dorfman yeah, these are all in
favor, those were both from ROC New York, Jon
Fuhres, also ROC New York, Marlon Barrera, ROC New
York, Yahara Jacob, ROC New York, Steve Hasty, ROC
New York, Leslie Escobosa, ROC New York, John J.
Cronan, Jr., ROC New York, just one name Don,
excuse me, I think it says Delilah, ROC New York,
Hazel Alexander, ROC New York, Antoinette Delgado,
ROC New York, Angelica Saavedra, ROC New York,
Guadalupe Perez, ROC New York, Shailesh Shrestha,
ROC New York, Deloris Wright, Domestic Workers
United, and John Rodriguez, it just says worker.
And in opposition, Edward O'Reilly of Cybersearch
Global, and David Lui, Chinese Chamber of Commerce
of New York.

CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: Let me draw your attention that we spoke of the passion and energy of the business community and the five different chambers of commerce, at least, but I

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

also want to draw your attention that the passion is equal, if not greater, on the other side of our aisle. Make the Road New York, Make the Road stuck in here to the bitter end. The Restaurant Opportunities Center also. Many other friends of labor and friends of working people organizations were here, and some of the champions of labor were here, and they chose not to speak, they just wanted to see the process through. The Central Labor Council was certainly represented back here. Many of my Council members, each Council Member represents around 160,000 people, and those people are very possessive. And they really want you around and they deserve it. So it's hard to be in one place for a whole time, so that has to be kept in mind. I also want to thank these good people to my right who made sure that I had the information, the Council staff who made sure that we have everything that we need to have an adequate and positive hearing. I want to draw attention and thank the sergeants-at-arms who were doing their job, and no one ever says anything, but they do an excellent job, and did a fine thing. And if ... I even want to compliment the

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

camera person, and if you can figure out a way to make me look less gruesome, kind of switch my face with him I wouldn't mind. That way I could look good for a change, but that's a different story for a different day. Council Member Brewer, yours is a testament, this is the second of these hearings that you have sat through the whole one? You sat through the whole one? Go for it. She is a trouper. You must really believe in something So I commend, and your staff, of course, for really working with folks and trying to really do some stuff. We're going to find a way to grab your staff and mine ultimately, and maybe we'll take these guys up on their opportunity, and we'll go away from here. I have no idea where, but it sounds like we're going to need a day just to bounce stuff around, brainstorm and things of that nature, where we can think of something that's good for all of New York. You see, both of us agree that if New York were totally flush, this would be a no-brainer. We would have done this before. If New York was riding high economically, it might have been a five minute hearing. You're here, all in favor, let's go. But we also agree

that New York is in ... has its work cut out. But all of New York has to share the burden and share the opportunity, and that's what we are talking about. I want to set the record straight, that this is not the record hearing. We spent a good six, seven hours here. I did a hearing over Atlantic Yards, nine hours one day, seven hours the next day. It is still the record, and I shouldn't have said it, because you guys may decide to go for a few- -

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER:

(Interposing) No.

CHAIRPERSON SANDERS: I'm glad that you don't want to, let that record ... no, let that record stay, we don't have to do. My friends, again, we are not ... nor are we going to set a record on the longest legislation before it passes. We are going to bring this one to a head as soon as possible, as soon as reasonable and possible, but this airplane cannot stay in the air forever. We will land this one, and God willing, it will be a safe landing. So I wanted to thank everyone for being out here. You are troupers to the bitter end, and having said that, I shall say

1	COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR 226
2	no more, except to say, this hearing is now ended.
3	

I, Richard A. Ziats, certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. I further certify that I am not related to any of the parties to this action by blood or marriage, and that I am in no way interested in the outcome of this matter.

Signature	(Cultical Messais)	
Date	May 20, 2010	

D.O. 0 1/20 L