



Dear Chair Lively, Vice-chairs Hack and Piluso and members of the committee,

Thank you, for your continued work on HB 3087, the Family and Medical Leave Insurance Act. Oregon AFSCME Council 75 would like to clarify a couple of things that were brought up in testimony from the representatives of local government associations.

In Mr Bovett's testimony for the Association of Oregon Counties he pointed to Multnomah County's paid parental leave and claimed that it meets or exceeds what is outlined in the bill. This is not the case. Multnomah County's paid leave covers only parental leave and not medical leave for oneself or a family member. Additionally, it is limited to 6 weeks and not up to 18 weeks as outlined in HB 3087. The only piece that exceeds what is written into HB 3087 is that the 6 weeks of leave is for employees' full salary.

The only other AFSCME represented local government with a paid leave policy is the City of Portland. There it is also 6 weeks and is for both parental and medical leave. Both Multnomah and Portland passed these policies as ordinances and not through collective bargaining. All of our other contracts require employees to use their sick, vacation, or PTO to receive pay during OFLA or FMLA and none of the representatives from our locals mentioned having short term disability insurance. For one local, a special district, the PTO is less than 4 weeks with a limited number of hours that can be carried over.

Certainly, it is true that an agreement could be reached through the collective bargaining process. But to have that happen, an employer must first agree to discuss the topic while in bargaining. In one current example, when AFSCME as gave the employer the intent to discuss paid family and medical leave in bargaining the employer balked and said that it isn't happening.

Ms. Sattenspiel raised concerns over the definition of family. For AFSCME members across the state, and of all political stripes, this expanded definition is significantly important and truly reflects how families look. Since submitting my original testimony, I have received word from more of our members on the importance of the bill and particularly this piece. People with long standing relationships that are outside of traditionally defined families still deserve the acknowledgement and benefits of our perceived dominant culture norms. For a school board or government employer to claim that following the definition isn't possible is disingenuous, as this is the definition that is used by the federal government for its employees.

On a personal note, I can tell you quite honestly, that people can try to plan major events around critical work schedules, but pregnancies and medical events happen when they happen. People have commented on my "well timed exit" for my impending leave. If planning worked exactly how I would have preferred, it would not have been legislative session that I would have missed. Missing work is inconvenient for all, employer and employee. Dedicated employees worry about leaving work behind,



and wondering if their job security and financial security are in jeopardy while taking leave to bond with their child, heal from illness or injury or care for a loved one, shouldn't add to this stress.

AFSCME is supportive of HB 3087, and we urge you to pass this bill to provide much needed financial security when caring for themselves or loved ones.

Respectfully,

Eva RippetEAU
Political Coordinator
Oregon AFSCME Council 75