

Labor and Public Employees Committee

JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

Bill No: SB-436 / [Bill Status](#) / [Public Hearing Testimony](#)

AN ACT CONCERNING ADVANCED NOTICE OF AN EMPLOYEE'S WORK
Title: SCHEDULE BY AN EMPLOYER.

Vote Date: 3/12/2026

Vote Action: Joint Favorable

PH Date: 3/10/2026

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:

The reason for this bill is to provide workers in certain sectors, who work for employers of certain sizes, with predictability to their work schedules, by requiring that schedules are published in advance. This would help prevent workers from having to be "on call" at all times and provide incentives for workers who are called in unexpectedly on short notice at unscheduled hours, thus providing increased stability to said workers.

RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:

Dante Bartolomeo, Commissioner, CT Department of Labor: Submitted testimony on SB 436 stating the bill would cover a large population of employers from wholesale, retail, restaurant industry, nursing residential care, and hotels. Section 8 would establish a private right of action to allow for compensatory damages. CTDOL would still have responsibilities under this bill such as in section 9 where CTDOL must review whistle blower complaints and issue a decision on if it should proceed to civil action on behalf of the state. CTDOL would have to issue a decision in thirty days of receipt of the complaint and opposes this section as it intervenes in an individual right to access the judicial branch. The thirty-day limit is also a concern as there are significant complaints already in the wage and workplace standards division that should be prioritized by seriousness not a mandated timeline.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:

Martin Looney, Senate President Pro Tem, SDO: Submitted testimony in support of SB 436 stating it would require employers to provide employees scheduling stability by giving

them 24 hours' notice of their shifts. Mr. Looney believes this would improve quality of life for shift workers who have very little control of their schedules. The little control makes it almost impossible to make last minute arrangements for such things as childcare. The employees can still work last minute shifts if they agree with their employer.

Jess Zaccagnino, Policy Counsel, ACLU-CT: Submitted testimony in support of SB 436. They stated stable jobs provide opportunity and security. When work schedules are unpredictable or fluctuate from week to week, then workers cannot rely on a consistent paycheck. Employers can deny their employees full time employment, health insurance and other services by denying them full time hours. They state the people working these unpredictable jobs are more likely to be justice impacted and have consequences from their criminal records. The collateral consequence of any sentence puts up legal barriers to full societal participation. Zaccagnino states when incarcerated people do find employment it is usually with insecure low paying jobs that would be covered under SB 436. The bill would give the more than 140,000 food service, retail, long term care and hotel workers the ability to have a more predictable schedule and paychecks. They state business would benefit as well since a study in the Harvard Business Review found that stores with predictable scheduling experienced increased sales and labor productivity.

Rochelle Palache, Connecticut State Director and Vice President, 32BJ SEIU: Submitted testimony in support stating that their members are the backbone of the property services industry. SB 436 would offer long-overdue protection to working families from employers who use abusive scheduling practices. Palache states that too many hourly workers contend with inconsistent scheduling practices that negatively impact their income, caretaking responsibilities, educational pursuits, and other commitments. A third of workers in retail or food service jobs report that they are required to work "clopening" where they would be denied adequate rest and complicates caretaking responsibilities. They explain that as of 2017 in CT, 77% of Latino workers and 76% of black workers held jobs that were hourly and abusive scheduling practices are predominately concentrated among the vulnerable hourly service workers. A growing number of states and localities have already acted against these types of abusive schedules. Those states include Oregon, Vermont, San Francisco, Berkeley, Emeryville, San Jose, Seattle, New York City, Chicago, Philadelphia, and Los Angeles.

Sarah Ganong, State Director, Working Families Power: Submitted testimony in support stating that on-call scheduling causes low wage workers to struggle and suffer unnecessary challenges. Unpredictable schedules cost workers money and makes it difficult to find last minute childcare. The bill would also address the harmful practice of under scheduling where employers hire several part time workers instead of offering those hours to its current employees or making them full times. They state CT must join its fellow neighboring cities and state such as Oregon, New York City, Seattle, San Francisco, San Jose, Philadelphia, Chicago, and Washington DC that have already enacted similar legislation.

Nick Teeling, Advocacy Director, Connecticut Voices for Children: Submitted testimony in support as it would require employers to provide employees with two weeks' notice of an upcoming work schedule change and would require them to pay one additional hour of pay if they violate the advance notice requirements. If an employer reduces the number of scheduled hours, then the employer will pay one half the employee's regular rate of pay. They state the One Big Beautiful Bill Act (OBBBA) ushered a new, rigorous work requirements for recipients of SNAP. The work requirements from OBBBA make needing a

predictable work schedule have an even greater importance. Irregular schedules negatively impact the workers' health, wellbeing, and economic stability. Those schedules also limit the ability to plan for childcare or even making doctors' appointments. Teeling states that worker with stable hours is better positioned to negotiate higher wages or pursue other opportunities.

Sara Parker McKernan, Policy Advocate, New Haven Legal Assistance: Submitted testimony in support stating that their low-income clients are often living paycheck to paycheck. They are often subject to unpredictable or insufficient work schedules that make it difficult to meet they're at home obligations. Last minute schedule changes make it difficult to find last minute childcare. McKernan stated that the financial security that comes with predictable scheduling makes a significant difference in lowering stresses and increasing the level of stability for low-income families.

Tim Gabriele, UNITE HERE Local 34: Submitted testimony in support stating too many workers in CT are subject to poo planning on the part of their managers. Their poor planning results in workers financial instability, missed appointments and a struggle to find last minute childcare. They state that the administrative challenges managers would face are being outsourced to their own employees to be used as a cost saving measure and even a disciplinary tool.

Janee Woods Weber, Executive Director, She Leads Justice and Tonishia Signore, Policy Director, She Leads Justice: Submitted testimony in support of SB 436. Weber states that unpredictable work schedules make building a stable life more difficult. According to the SHIFT Project, 65% report irregular schedules week to week, 50% work "clopening" shifts that do not allow for adequate rest time between closing a night and opening a workplace for morning. 50% of these workers report that their work schedules do not allow them to care for their families. Weber states that unstable work schedules increase difficulty for families to budget. SB 436 would set standards so employees would have two weeks' notice about their work schedules and offer incentives for workers whose schedules were changed last minute.

Daniel Parker, MPA Student, University of Connecticut: Submitted testimony in support as the bill would require employers to provide a work schedule two weeks in advance to their employees. It would also establish compensation requirements when employers make last minute schedule changes including one hour pay at the employees' regular rate or one-half of the employee's regular rate for each work hour reduced. Irregular scheduling exacerbates economic insecurity by disrupting incomes. It also makes it difficult for them to schedule childcare, attend medical appointments or pursue education. Parker states that the varying hours would undermine the ability to meet the work requirements of public benefits programs such as SNAP and Medicaid.

Ed Hawthorne, President, Connecticut AFL, CIO: Submitted testimony in support stating all workers are entitled to a good, stable job that pays a living wage. However unpredictable work schedules negatively impact families and prevent them from spending time with their children and scheduling adequate childcare. Mr. Hawthorne explains that SB 436 represents an important step to giving workers predictability they need to properly balance their family and personal responsibilities.

Wendy Cardenas, Co-Deputy Director, Make the Road CT: Submitted testimony in support stating that workers in fast food and retail face loss wages due to last minute cancellation or reduced hours. Business with predictable scheduling have lower staff turnover, higher worker satisfaction, and lower hiring costs.

Taylor Biniarz: Submitted testimony in support stating that they experienced having schedules change last minute repeatedly. The constant uncertainty and stress caused a great burden on their health and finances.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:

Meri Wick, President, Connecticut Lodging Association: Submitted testimony in opposition stating hotels and inns operate in a 24 hour, seven-day-a-week environment and staffing levels need to change quickly based on reservations. Flexibility in scheduling is essential to that industry. They state the scheduling requirements in the bill would create significant operational challenges and additional costs. Mr. Wick explained that the industry was still dealing with the lasting impacts of COVID-19 while facing rising energy costs and increasing operating expenses.

Tim Phelan, President, Ct Retail Network: Submitted testimony in opposition stating it would do more harm than good. They state that retailers have schedules that are ever changing on both sides of the equation. Many retail employees choose retail as it allows them to work a flexible work schedule. Those retailers already ask employees to provide information on their availability and this legislation would impose more hurdles at the wrong time. They state the bills seek to impose predictability in a very unpredictable time.

Francis Palasieski, Director of Government Affairs, Lumber Dealers Assn CT: Submitted testimony in opposition stating they represent independent lumber and building material dealers. Palasieski stated that the bill would require employers to provide advance notice of employees work schedules and this would significantly increase costs. He states that the additional regulatory burdens inevitably increase operating costs which are then passed on with higher prices for building materials. This would raise costs for residential and commercial construction projects.

Jessica Olander, President, CT River Valley Chamber: Submitted testimony in opposition to the bill stating it would impose a rigid, one size fits all scheduling mandate with very limited opportunity for change. The bill could have significant unintended consequences for workers, small business, and the state's economy. They state that SB 436 would impose significant administrative burdens on employers and mandating compensation for schedule changes. For many employers with fluctuating demands like in retail, hospitality and healthcare, the requirements in SB 436 would be impractical. Mr. Olander stated that the additional paperwork, costs, and potential legal risks could discourage business owners from hiring new employees and might even result in job cuts.

Matthew Barrett, President, and CEO, CAHCF: Submitted testimony in opposition stating the bill would require a nursing facility to pay an employee one hour pay every time they change their schedule with less than 14 days' notice. They would also have to pay half the employees' regular rate for hours canceled. They state this would not work for nursing

facilities as there is often a fluctuation in occupancy levels. The scheduling requirements would undermine compliance with federal and state staffing rules as a flexible staff is needed to meet resident's needs.

Matthew Kagel, Senior Director State GR, IFA: Submitted testimony in opposition stating it treats franchise businesses differently than locally owned non-franchise businesses. They state it would require the franchised own to adhere to the scheduling in the bill while the smaller non franchised one would not. They state the potential growth is threatened by assuming franchise brands are owned partly by the franchisors and make employment decisions for them. Kagel explains that franchise brands are locally owned small business operating under a national brand. No franchisor has the authority over how their franchisees choose to manage their employees.

Mag Morelli, President, LeadingAge CT, RI: Submitted testimony in opposition stating that the bill specifically applies predictive scheduling requirements to nursing homes. They state that places where this law has been adopted have typically been focused on retail, hospitality, and food service sectors not healthcare providers. They explain staffing requirements often change and cannot be predicted fourteen days in advance. The industry relies on trained per diem staff and on-call systems. Morelli states that at a time when nursing homes continue to face workforce shortages the bill would create additional administrative burdens and make it difficult to comply with staffing requirements.

Sean McLaughlin, Regional Vice President, NAMIC, Eric George, President, Insurance Association of CT, and Kristina Baldwin, Vice President, APCIA: Submitted testimony in opposition stating that while they understand the intent of the proposal sections 8 and 9 of the bills would create a new private cause of action. McLaughlin explained that an aggrieved employee, a collective bargaining representative, the Labor Commissioner, or a whistle blower acting on behalf of the state can file a complaint in Superior Court for alleged violations of the scheduling requirements. Those actions could seek compensatory damages for disputes that could be handled through existing administrative or regulatory processes. The result would be increases in litigation that will drive up costs for employers in the form of increased liability insurance.

Steve Matiatos, Area General Manager, Courtyard Marriott New Haven: Submitted testimony in opposition stating that hotels operate 24 hours, seven days a week, where staffing must be adjusted for frequently due to guest needs, occupancy, weather conditions, travel patterns and events. They state that if the bill is enacted it would create additional administrative burdens, scheduling challenges and be an unnecessary cost for hotels.

Scott Fanning, President, CT Franchisee Association: Submitted testimony in opposition stating the legislation seems to be singling out franchises. They explain franchises make the same investments into their communities and operate similarly to non-franchise businesses.

Andy Markowski, State Director, NFIB: Submitted testimony in opposition stating that the proposal would be impractical for certain small to mid-sized independently owned businesses in retail, hospitality, and food service. They state that mandating adherence to strict scheduling practices would be difficult for business who are already struggling to fulfill their work force needs. Businesses are also concerned with the potential for excessive enforcement or private civil actions for alleged violations.

Toby Malara, VP of Govt Relations, American Staffing Assoc: Submitted testimony stating that Temporary Staffing Services (THS) do not operate as such establishments and are thus not employers under the bill but do assign their temporary employees to work in such establishments. They state that this would require employers operating restaurants, bars, and hotels to provide temporary employees hired through THS with written, good faith estimates of their schedule upon hiring and additional pay if they are notified upon short notice that a shift had changed. This would be a costly burden on those establishments and chill their use of workers supplied by staffing agencies. Malara states that the bill would also bar employers from using the employees of a THS unless the employer first offers additional work to its existing employees. She states that because of this they request that SB 436 exclude temporary employees of a THS from the definition of employee like Oregon did in its 2017 fair schedule law.

Brenda Hamilton, Sebastian Colbert, and Mona Colwell, Intercessors for America, Alton Blodgett, and 3 anonymous testifiers: Submitted testimony in opposition stating it would be another rigid government mandate on employers.

Scott Dolch, CEO, CT Restaurant, Hospitality Assn: Submitted testimony in opposition due to it affecting franchises differently. They state that even if a locally owned franchise has a total of 30 employees, they would fall under this legislation due to their global franchise having many more employees. The bill fails to recognize the operational reality of the hospitality industry. They state the bill would make it more difficult for them to respond to real-time business conditions.

Sarah Bratko, AHLA: Submitted testimony in opposition stating it would affect franchises unfairly since it looks at them as a whole even if the local business does not meet the employee number requirements. The 14-day notice of scheduling would not work for hotels whose staffing needs change quickly due to factors beyond their control. They have concerns about requiring employers to offer additional hours of work before hiring additional staff. They state this would limit the employer's ability to hire the best person for an open position.

Chris Bird, General Manager, Saybrook Point Resort & Marina: Submitted testimony in opposition, explaining that hotels operate in 24 hour, seven-days-a-week environment where staffing must change as the occupancy, weather conditions, and travel patterns change. They state the bill would create additional administrative burdens that could be passed off onto the consumers.

Paul Amarone, Senior Policy Director, CBIA: Submitted testimony in opposition stating the bill would require employers to pay additional compensation when they make a schedule change after posting a schedule and includes partial wages for shortened shifts. The bill would allow for enforcement through civil penalties and whistle blower actions by the state. They state that this would be an unrealistic scheduling mandate that fails to include external factors that fluctuate. The hospitality businesses must regularly adjust their staffing due to demand; long term care providers have to make last minute staffing adjustments and restaurants have to operate with narrow profit margins. The bill would create substantial administrative complexity and create extensive litigation. They state CT is already facing workforce shortages, rising labor costs, and increasing regulatory complexity, that would restrict flexibility and increase costs for consumers.

Ryan Albers, Director of State Government Affairs, AAHOA: Submitted testimony in opposition stating that the bill would create significant operational and economic challenges. Hotels depend on rapidly fluctuating unpredictable demand. They warn the bill could force hotels to understaff during sudden surges and over staff during slow periods. The bill could lead to hotels reducing hiring, having fewer available shifts, and have a greater reliance on automation.

Mike Santangelo: Submitted testimony in opposition for reasons largely unrelated to the content of the bill.

Reported by: Lawrence Sanchez

Date: 3/24/2026