

**CONFIDENTIAL**  
**LEGISLATIVE BILL REVIEW FORM: 2016**

Bill Number: H.187 Name of Bill: An act relating to absence from work for health care and safety

Agency/ Dept: DHR Author of Bill Review: Thomas Cheney  
Date of Bill Review: 3-8-16 Related Bills and Key Players Main Street Alliance, Voices for Vermont's Children, VBSR, Rep. Toleno, Rep. Head, Sen. Baruth, Sen. Mullin, House/Senate General, Grocers, Chambers of Commerce, AIV, AGCVT, VT Dept of Labor

Status of Bill: (check one): ☐ Upon Introduction ☐ As passed by 1<sup>st</sup> body ☒ As passed by both

**Recommended Position:**

☒ Support ☐ Oppose ☐ Remain Neutral ☐ Support with modifications identified in #8 below

**Analysis of Bill**

**1. Summary of bill and issue it addresses.** *Describe what the bill is intended to accomplish and why.*

The bill requires employers to provide a paid time off policy to include a minimum of 3 days in a twelve-month period to employees until 2018 and 5 days from 2018 going forward. Businesses with five or fewer employees are given an extra year to comply. It exempts certain types of employees, including: part time, temporary and seasonal workers; sole proprietors, executive officers; per diem employees; substitute teachers; and individuals under 18 years of age. H. 187 addresses concerns that too many workers, especially women, are not offered sick leave which contributes to a less productive and less healthy workplace.

**2. Is there a need for this bill?** *Please explain why or why not.*

Yes. Approximately, 60,000 Vermont workers do not have access to paid leave. A lack of access to paid leave can result in an unhealthy, unsafe, and less productive work environment.

**3. What are likely to be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for this Department?**

The State will be required to offer paid leave to approximately 280 State employees. The financial impact to departments and agencies will be negligible.

**4. What might be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for other departments in state government, and what is likely to be their perspective on it?**

The bill will have operational impacts on the Department of Labor, however, an additional appropriation is not expected to be required. Labor is in support of the bill. Commissioner Noonan can explain in detail. As noted above, departments and agencies will be required to absorb the cost of benefit for the newly eligible employees. Some State contracts, including health workers, may be impacted.

**5. What might be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for others, and what is likely to be their perspective on it?** *(for example, public, municipalities, organizations, business, regulated entities, etc)*

Employers will bear additional cost and administrative burdens as a result of the bill. The business community is split. Those in opposition are generally opposed because the bill imposes a mandate on all businesses.

*Please return this bill review as a Microsoft Word document to [Jahala.Dudley@vermont.gov](mailto:Jahala.Dudley@vermont.gov) & [Jessica.Mishaan@vermont.gov](mailto:Jessica.Mishaan@vermont.gov)*

## 6. Other Stakeholders:

### 6.1 Who else is likely to support the proposal and why?

Unions, progressive groups, DNC, and the White House. This bill is a key part of agenda of these organizations in Vermont and nationally.

### 6.2 Who else is likely to oppose the proposal and why?

The bill mostly finds opposition from business and conservative groups.

## 7. Rationale for recommendation: *Justify recommendation stated above.*

In addition to its being good policy, the bill would have a limited impact on DHR and state government as a whole.

## 8. Specific modifications that would be needed to recommend support of this bill: *Not meant to rewrite bill, but rather, an opportunity to identify simple modifications that would change recommended position.*

N/A. The Administration worked closely with the committees of jurisdiction to craft a bill the State could support.

## 9. Will this bill create a new board or commission AND/OR add or remove appointees to an existing one? If so, which one and how many?

No.

*Secretary/Commissioner has reviewed this document:* \_\_\_\_\_ *Date:* \_\_\_\_\_