

April 7, 2009

Rick Medlin Executive Vice President Russell Corporation 3330 Cumberland Blvd. #800 Atlanta, GA 30339-5995

Dear Mr. Medlin:

Russell Corporation has claimed, in numerous communications, that it offered paid time off to the Jerzees de Honduras (JDH) workforce to enable workers to search for alternative employment, prior to the closure of the factory. Russell has cited this program as an example of the benefits JDH workers have received under Russell's remediation plan.

As you know, in a recent survey of 141 former unionized JDH workers, carried out by the Worker Rights Consortium and the monitoring group EMIH, all 141 stated that they were never offered such an opportunity. We consider the survey results to be highly persuasive evidence that a factory-wide, non-discriminatory program to provide such paid leave did not exist.

Russell, however, maintains that such offers were made and has stated that the WRC's report to universities on the survey is "misleading." We presume the company is prepared to provide the university community with substantive proof of the veracity of its claims. The only substantive information the company has provided to date is a form showing that leave was provided to a singe employee. As I am sure you will agree, providing documentation that a benefit was afforded to one employee does not prove the existence of a general program that was ostensibly available to 1,800 workers.

We therefore request your response to the following questions:

1) Did Russell offer paid leave to JDH workers, in general, so they could seek alternative employment, prior to the closure of the factory? To avoid any confusion, we are asking whether offers of paid leave were made to regular workers, in a non-discriminatory manner, throughout the factory – as opposed to a policy benefiting only management employees and select others.

2) If such a program existed, please provide a description of the steps that Russell took to inform the workforce that such leave was on offer – i.e., distribution of written material to workers, posting of written material inside the factory, public address announcements, meetings with supervisors to instruct them to inform workers of the program, etc. – and the specific dates on which at least some of these actions were taken. In a factory of 1,800 workers, any meaningful program of the kind the company claims to have carried out would no doubt have involved significant efforts to make sure workers were

informed. We presume it is not the company's position that the program existed, but that management didn't see a need to tell anyone about it.

3) If such a program existed, please inform us as to the total number of employees who availed themselves of the company's offer in the months between the closure announcement in October and the actual closure of the factory at the end of January. If there were managers, supervisors and/or confidential employees who received this benefit – as opposed to regular workers – please provide a <u>separate number</u> for this group. To be clear, we are asking for the number of regular, non-management workers who benefited from the program. Please do not include managers, supervisors or confidential employees in this number; instead, please provide a separate number for them.

4) Is Russell prepared to provide a copy of the permission form for each of the workers who the company claims benefited from the program? For each worker who benefited, a form presumably exists. We would like you to confirm that this documentation exists and that Russell is prepared to make it available to monitoring organizations.

We await your reply to these questions. Please acknowledge receipt of this letter by email, along with an indication of when a reply will be provided.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Scott Nova