

To whom it may concern:

We are vehemently opposed to this proposed bill. The hearing is tonight and we cannot be there. Hopefully, there will be enough opposition attendance to get the points across this is unaffordable, unsustainable, and a job killer. We would even more seriously consider folding our tent in Oregon due to this type of overreach.

Here is some of the math in round figures:

With our [Company's](#) Annual payroll of about \$7.5 million, the employer contribution to the fund is about \$37,500. Doesn't sound like too much, does it? This is on top of all the other additional burdens placed on employers, i.e., rising minimum wage, state imposed sick leave, etc.

Our average wage employee would kick in about \$150/yr. Again, doesn't sound like much. I can't *even* get most of those qualified to contribute to their 401K plan! Plus, once they know they are contributing, you can bet there will be a percentage of folks feeling entitled to that money. Where are the checks and balances to abuse? Who manages that and what are the penalties? I see they are spelled out for the employer who doesn't comply...

The start-up costs are not defined, only that they would come out of the fund. Will we need new buildings, furniture, Board members, employees, etc., to get this going and maintain it?

The cost to manage at the employer level is not insignificant, again given it would be an add-on to all the other programs mandated. The real significant costs come when an employee uses the program. Holding a job for someone and maintaining benefits for them during the period of time not working and then replacing them during their leave with temporary employees, thus carrying the costs for them and their benefits and the unemployment burden, etc., etc., is where the 'hidden' cost skyrocket.

[Oregon currently extends family and medical leave far beyond what is federally mandated. This new legislation appears to increase the amount of leave available to employees, creating an even greater burden on employers who need to fill the void left by employees. Employers must recruit, hire, train, manage a new employee for the duration of the leave and when the employee on leave returns the temporary employee is generally laid off which affects the employer's unemployment burden. And what are my chances of finding qualified temporary employees that have no ties to the long term health of our Company? And wouldn't the temp also be afforded the bill's benefits once they meet the minimum hours worked threshold?](#)

The bill introduction states we are the only West Coast state without such a plan. Whoop de doo! That's no reason to propose the most egregious extended leave program in the country! Washington and California, if you were to do a comparison to Oregon's proposed bill, are very tame. California, for example funds [theirs](#) out of the current disability program.

Other worries include once the camel's nose is under the tent, more and more will be added to the program. Also, the trust factor for the State managing the fund properly is very low.

Given I received the notice on Friday, with the hearing on Monday, these are my initial thoughts on the subject. I respectfully suggest you oppose SB 3031 and encourage all others in the legislature to do the same!