

Labor and Public Employees Committee

JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

Bill No: HB-5387 / [Bill Status](#) / [Public Hearing Testimony](#)

AN ACT CONCERNING DISCLOSURE OF WAGE RANGES AND BENEFITS

Title: ON PUBLIC AND INTERNAL JOB ADVERTISEMENTS.

Vote Date: 3/12/2026

Vote Action: Joint Favorable

PH Date: 3/3/2026

File No.:

***Disclaimer:** The following JOINT FAVORABLE Report is prepared for the benefit of the members of the General Assembly, solely for purposes of information, summarization and explanation and does not represent the intent of the General Assembly or either chamber thereof for any purpose.*

SPONSORS OF BILL:

Labor & Public Employees Committee

REASONS FOR BILL:

This bill expands existing salary disclosure laws to require all employers to include a position's wage or wage range, and a general description of the position's benefits, in both public and internal job advertisements. At present, employees and applicants can request this information from employers. This would ensure that individuals applying for jobs are aware of the salary range and benefits they would receive.

RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:

None provided.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:

Kate Farrar, Representative, HDO: Submitted testimony in support stating CT is taking steps to close the wage gap for women. Women working year-round typically make only 83 cents to the dollar of men. They state for the first time since 1960 the wage gap has widened for two years in a row. The gender gap is more severe for black and Latina women being 59 cents and 49 cents when compared to white men in CT. The wage gap would be nearly \$500,000 lost over a 40-year career. Several states including New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Maryland, Illinois, Colorado, Hawaii, Minnesota, California, and Washington have similar laws already. They state the bill can help reduce the unexplained wage gap by increasing transparency.

Tonishia Signore, Policy Director, She Leads Justice: Submitted testimony in support as it would aim at closing the gender wage gap and increasing women's economic security. They state women in CT make \$0.84 for every dollar a man makes. A black women would need to work until they are 90 years to catch up to the earnings of a white man at age 60. For native women it would be 95 and for Latina women it would be 103 years. They state wage transparency would be crucial to addressing this.

Ed Hawthorne, President, Connecticut AFL-CIO: Submitted testimony in support stating that a report from the National Women's Law Center found that women typically are paid 81 cents for every dollar paid to men. This translates into \$13,570 less per year in median earnings. In CT the rate is only slightly better being at 84 cents. He explains that this bill helps address this gender wage gap by requiring employers to provide salary ranges on public and internal job postings. When job applicants are informed, they can negotiate their compensation which would help close the wage gap.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:

John Cattelan, VP Government Relations, CT Alliance of YMCAs: Submitted testimony in opposition stating it would increase administrative requirements that would result in additional costs. They also explain that their staff include seasonal employees and staff who hold multiple roles with different pay rates. Capturing all those distinctions in a job posting could result in communications that are lengthy and confusing.

Paul Amarone, Senior Policy Director, CBIA: Submitted testimony in opposition as it expands wage transparency requirements by mandating the salary range and general description of benefits. The bill would also increase the employer liability by allowing statutory damages. The rigidity the bill would create would reduce the flexibility employers have and create ambiguity for what is required in the general description of benefits. They state the recurring mandate to update the positions yearly would add an administrative burden and open them up to further litigation. Mr. Amarone also states that business would need to evaluate which positions fall under CT law if they are working out of state but report to a supervisor in CT. This could deter multi-state employers from expanding operations to CT and reduce flexibility in compensation planning.

Reported by: Lawrence Sanchez

Date: 3/25/2026