



Scott Crosson
Plant Manager
1600 West Main Street
Willimantic, CT 06226

February 27, 2011

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Dear Honorable Members of the Labor and Public Employees Committee,

I am the Plant Manager of a productive wire and cable manufacturing facility in Willimantic, Connecticut that employs over two hundred and fifty (250) associates and markets and sells its products in a competitive global business environment. I am writing to you because I am very concerned about the proposed paid sick leave bill that you are considering in the Labor Committee. For the reasons below, I urge you to vote no on this legislation.

With our union workforce, we actively negotiate with our associates over numerous terms and conditions of employment, and the collective bargaining process already gives our associates the opportunity to seek those benefits most important to them. I believe the provision of sick days has traditionally been and should continue to be a matter of negotiation between an organized labor force and its employer. As a matter of fact, we just had our most recent negotiated contract ratified (2/27/2011). Paid sick days was brought up during the negotiation process, however, it was withdrawn by the union in favor of more important issues.

In addition, our plant is a continuously operating manufacturing facility, structured along Lean manufacturing concepts. It is very costly and disruptive for employees to take unscheduled leave. To encourage the advance scheduling of time off, the company has implemented a very reasonable attendance policy and has negotiated with our associates fair and competitive wages and a leave of absence policy. Granting more paid time off in this manufacturing environment will interrupt the efficient operation of our facility, and make it more difficult for us to compete on a global basis with our products.

Not only will labor costs rise, but this legislation will result in lost productivity and increased use of temporary and day laborers. It is estimated that this legislation will cost our facility in excess of \$500,000 per year. Considering the current state of the economy, Connecticut should find ways to enable employers to be more competitive and retain jobs in this state. Unfortunately, this bill would only increase employers' costs at a time when many companies are trying to reduce costs to remain competitive. I'm sure no one in Connecticut wants to see more unemployed citizens due to government-mandated costs levied against employers.

Finally, this bill is not narrowly drafted and therefore, it could lead to abuse. The bill permits the carry over of accrued time from year to year, it permits sick days to be used for other family members, enables an associate to earn a higher rate of pay on a sick day than if he/she actually worked and it bars the employer from verifying the absences with documentation until after three consecutive days of absence. The collective bargaining process is an age-old method for resolving employee-employer disputes over wages and benefits, and I encourage you, particularly in today's economic environment, to allow this process to continue without interruption and to vote no on the paid sick leave proposal.

Very truly yours,

Scott Crosson