CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR

----- X

March 3, 2017

Start: 10:26 a.m. Recess: 2:52 p.m.

HELD AT: Council Chambers - City Hall

B E F O R E:

I. DANEEK MILLER

Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Elizabeth S. Crowley

Daniel Dromm

Costa G. Constantinides
Robert E. Cornegy, Jr.
Julissa Ferreras-Copeland

Brad S. Lander

Ydanis A. Rodriguez

Lorelei Salas Commissioner NYC Department of Consumer Affairs

Liz Vladeck
Deputy Commissioner
Office of Policy and Standards
NYC Department of Consumer Affairs

Steven Kelly Associate Commissioner Office of Policy and Standards NYC Department of Consumer Affairs

Amit Bagga Deputy Commissioner External Affairs NYC Department of Consumer Affairs

Rachel Laforest Director Retail Action Project

Arthur Cheliotes
President
Communications Workers of America,
Local 1180

Kyle Bragg
Secretary-Treasurer
SEIU 32BJ

Stuart Appelbaum President Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union

Hector Figueroa President SEIU 32BJ

Jessica Walker
President and CEO
Manhattan Chamber of Commerce

Varun Sanyal
Director of Economic Development Policy
Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce

Jay Peltz General Counsel and Vice President of Government Relations Food Industry Alliance of New York State

Jedidiah Labinjo Campaign Organizer Retail Action Project

Janika Reyes Member Retail Action Project

Harmony Higgins Fast Food Worker at Chipotle

Jose Juarez
Fast Food Worker at Domino's

Shantel Walker Fast Food Worker at Papa John's

Harold Stolper
Senior Labor Economist
Community Service Society of New York

Andrea Hegewisch
Program Director
Employment and Earnings
Institute for Women's Policy Research

Susan Lambert Associate Professor University of Chicago

Lonnie Golden Labor Economist Economic Policy Institute

Andrea Johnson
Equal Justice Works Fellow
National Women's Law Center

James Parrott, Ph.D.

Deputy Director and Chief Economist
Fiscal Policy Institute

Richard Heckler Wendy's

Melvyn Jones Manager Wendy's

Denee Brown
Fast Food Worker
Wendy's

Jackie Martincic Manager Wendy's

Sherry Leiwant Co-President A Better Balance

Barbara Allen
Member
Public Policy Committee
Women's City Club of New York

2 [sound check]

[pause]

2.2

I'm Council Member I. Daneek Miller; I'm the Chair of the Committee on Civil Service and Labor; I'd like to thank everyone for coming out this morning. Today we'll be holding a hearing on a very important package of bills that seeks to reform the scheduling of fast food industry within the City as well as create a voice of support for a network which will allow workers to navigate through the City's landscape and provide the quality of life that they so richly deserve.

The first bill will be Intro 1384,

Council Member Julissa Ferreras-Copeland. This bill will give fast food employees the ability to make voluntary contributions to a not-for-profit organization of their choice through payroll deductions.

Intro 1387, from Member Corey Johnson, will prohibit retail businesses from conducting on-call scheduling practices.

Intro 1388, also from Corey Johnson, would prohibit consecutive work shifts in fast food

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR
restaurants involving closing and opening of

3 businesses.

2.2

2.3

Intro 1395, from Council Member Brad

Lander, requires fast food managers to offer

available shifts to their current employees before

hiring additional ones to fill those shifts.

Intro 1396, also from Council Member Brad Lander, would create provisions as to when certain managers of fast food establishments would have to let employees know when their shifts would change within 14 days in advance and pay premiums if workers' times change after this notice.

And Intro 1399, from Council Member

Deborah Rose, would ensure employees in fast food industries are able to seek flexible work arrangements in certain emergency situations.

So before this hearing I had the opportunity to meet with advocates from fast food workers as well as representatives from the fast food industry. There is obviously a lot of concern about this legislation, but because of its impact, there's a lot of work that was put into it and potentially a lot of work and negotiation that will be done.

I am very proud to be part of a City

2.2

2.3

Council that has established such things as paid sick leave/paid parental sick leave for residents, along with protecting those who are caregiving for the most vulnerable of the City's residents. I strongly believe that the City will be stronger and better by allowing these pieces of legislation to empower and improve the quality of life of the workers and thereby improving the quality of life of their

families and the communities that they serve; this is

the intent of this legislation and which is why I am

proud to co-sponsor this legislation.

The point of privilege in my other life as a president business agent of a local union, I had one of the responsibilities and that was within the transportation industry and one of those responsibilities was managing not just the workforce from a labor standpoint, but the operations and planning and scheduling, recognizing how important it is to move hundreds of thousands of New Yorkers.

This industry is no different and the services that they provide, so we are here to recognize the importance of fast food workers and services that they provide and what needs to be done in order for

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR 9
us to ensure that these services are provided; that
workers are treated with dignity and respect and
business does not suffer but it continues to move

2.2

2.3

forward and profit.

I'd like to thank my counsel here, who is working very diligently on this, Matt Carlin, Kendall Stephenson, Garfor Zoloff of the Finance Committee; in addition, Annie Decker, Alice Wanzenberg [sp?] of the Legislative Committee for drafting this legislation.

I'd like to thank members of the

Committee for being here, of the Committee of Civil

Service and Labor, Council Member Dromm; we're also

joined by bill sponsors Council Member Brad Lander

and Julissa Ferreras-Copeland and Council Member

Ydanis Rodriguez.

So with that, I would like to kick this off and pass it over to Council Member Lander for his statement.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Thank you so much Chair Miller for convening this hearing today -- obviously we've got a great full room -- and for all your work in general to support working people in New York City.

2.2

2.3

24

25

prescription.

2 Without a stable schedule, who could 3 build a stable life without knowledge of when you're going to be working; how is it possible to schedule 4 5 child care; to arrange to go to school to get an additional degree, and without access to enough 6 hours, even if you're making \$15 an hour, how is it 8 possible in this city to pay rent and utilities, much less save up for new clothes for the kids or even the occasional vacation. Unfortunately, unpredictable 10 11 schedules are all too common, especially for poor New 12 Yorkers. A recent report by Community Service 13 Society highlighted some really just stunning 14 statistics: more than 1 out of 3 employed New Yorkers 15 are given their work schedules less than two weeks in 16 advance and that's more than half of poor New 17 Yorkers, and those low-income New Yorkers with 18 unpredictable schedules and less than advance notice 19 are more than twice as likely to fall behind on rent, 20 face eviction or foreclosure, wind up skipping meals due to lack of money, or even be unable to fill a 21

Schedules that change from week to week are of course an especially serious problem for parents and for women and low-income workers with

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

fluctuating schedules and less than a week's notice are three times more likely to have lost their jobs than those with stable hours. New York working families should not be subject to on-call scheduling, to lack of notice and to being forced to remain as involuntary part-time workers, workers who would like to get enough hours to be able to be full-time employees but are prevented from doing so by the scheduling practices of their employers, and that's why we're here today as a result of great organizing by workers in New York City and organizations that support them; we've got the chance, a great package of six bills, to move New York toward having a fair workweek and I'm so pleased to be here along with cosponsors Julissa Ferreras and our other co-sponsors, Corey Johnson; Debi Rose and pre-intro co-sponsors like Danny Dromm and Laurie Cumbo to make this happen.

I'm pleased to be the prime sponsor of two of the bills in today's package, Intro 1396, which establishes advanced scheduling for fast food workers which would require fast food employers to provide 14 days advance notice of work schedules to employees and to pay a premium if after that time

your shifts are changed or canceled in a way that obviously does great harm to workers' abilities to know their schedules and earn a living.

That bill also provides some of the general provisions for the other bills in the package, including definitions of key terms, giving the authority to Department of Consumer Affairs to conduct investigations, giving a private right of action and complaint procedure for workers.

I will note; if you've looked at that bill, it also does some work creating space in the code, but don't worry; there is no actual shipboard gambling being discussed in today's hearing, despite the fact that we moved around some pieces of the Administrative Code to make this work.

on is Intro 1395, which would establish access to hours for fast food workers and that bill would require fast food employers to offer any additional hours or shifts to existing employees before moving to hire new employees so that those folks who want to become full-time are not kept as involuntary part-time workers; something that we know affects hundreds of thousands of New Yorkers, unfortunately.

2.3

A few thank yous; there's a great set of advocates who have helped us get here -- SEIU 32BJ, A Better Balance, Center for Popular Democracy, RWDSU, Make the Road; Community Service Society. A lot of work has gone into thinking about and drafting these bills, so thanks to the Council's legislative team -- Matt Gewolb, Annie Decker, Wes Jones, Matt Carlin, Alexis Wanzenberg, and Terzah Nasser.

I want to give a big shout-out to my

Policy Director Annie Levers, who has put an enormous

amount of work into this package, and I want to thank

the Administration, the Mayor for taking leadership

especially on several of these bills, but also to

Commissioner Salas and OLPS Deputy Commissioner Liz

Vladeck and Joni Kletter and Amit and the whole team

here; we've done a lot of work together as we are

trying to figure out how we take these shared goals

of a fair workweek and make them practical and

effective legislation.

In that vein I'll say; I look forward to hearing testimony today from workers, employers, franchise owners, policy experts, and the Administration. This is a critical set of goals and we want to have a really thoughtful and collaborative

legislative process and that includes hearing from franchise owners and employers as well; we want to achieve the goals of this legislation and we want to do it in a practical, effective way that's easy to comply with, that's easy to enforce and make sure everyone has the opportunity to achieve those goals of a fair workweek and a stable life. Thank you very much Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you Council Member Lander. Now we'll hear from the sponsor of Intro 1384, Julissa Ferreras-Copeland.

COUNCIL MEMBER FERRERAS-COPELAND: Thank you Chair Miller. I am proud to sponsor Intro 1384, the Fast Food Worker Empowerment Bill. This first of its kind legislation will enable fast food workers to form their own nonprofit, to educate their coworkers about their rights on the job and advocate for changes they need in their community. This bill is especially important for fast food workers who have no bank accounts or are underbanked, and who otherwise could not support an organization like this. This bill also establishes penalties and remedies for violations by employers who break the

1 COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR

15

2 rules and helps protect workers against retaliation

3 should they come forward with complaints.

Today I'm also co-sponsoring legislation that will help bring hardworking New Yorkers reliable schedules that will enable them to take care of their children and continue their education, as was mentioned earlier.

Most of the jobs created since the Great Recession have been in low-wage work; this obviously includes the fast food workers, which is something that was highlighted by the Comptroller, by Director Dean Fuleihan and myself. With more and more workers entering this industry, there is more and more of a need to give them a voice. Under this new administration on the federal level, whoever the new Labor Secretary ends up being isn't likely going to be someone who stands for workers' rights in the slightest; most Americans, and certainly most New Yorkers, support efforts to raise the minimum wage, ensure safe working places and protect workers; that is why it is crucial that the City step in and give these workers a voice, which is what this package of bills aims to do today and why it is so important.

24

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

1

3

4

6

7

8

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Excuse me; before

The newly created Office of the Labor Standards will largely fill the gap created because the Federal Department of Labor isn't doing enough.

I too have a long list of thank yous, but I'm just going to ditto what Brad Lander said, because I think most importantly we want to hear from the Administration, the advocates and everyone that's here today, so thank you all for being here today, and Chair Miller, thank you for holding this very important hearing.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you so much, Council Member Ferreras-Copeland and with that we will call the first panel, who is already seated, and that is Deputy Commissioner Liz Vladeck from Department of Consumer Affairs; also from the Department of Consumer Affairs, Amit Bagga, Associate Commissioner; also, Steven Kelly... [background comment] and of course, Commissioner Lorelei Salas. [background comments] Okay; did I miss anyone? [background comments]

LORELEI SALAS: Good morning Chairman

Miller and members of the Committee... [interpose]

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR

2 LORELEI SALAS: Sure.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: get started... Do you affirm to answer all questions truthfully to the best of your ability?

LORELEI SALAS: Yes.

[collective affirmation]

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.

LORELEI SALAS: Good morning, Chairman Miller and members of the Committee. I am Lorelei Salas, Commissioner of the Department of Consumer Affairs. On behalf of Mayor de Blasio, it's my pleasure to represent the Administration at today's hearing, which will address the Mayor's signature proposal to introduce fair scheduling practices or a fair workweek into the fast food industry. I am joined by my colleagues from DCA; to my left is Liz Vladeck, Deputy Commissioner for the Office of Labor Policy and Standards and to my right, her Associate Commissioner, Steven Kelly, and to the left side of the table is Amit Bagga, Deputy Commissioner for External Affairs.

Around the country, workers in low-wage industries face immense challenges in trying to make ends meet and support their families. By passing and

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

implementing the Paid Sick Leave, Commuter Benefits, Paid Care, and Freelance Isn't Free Laws, as well as additional laws that protect workers and job seekers from discrimination, Mayor de Blasio, Speaker Mark-Viverito, and the Council have demonstrated great leadership in making our city a better, safer place for workers. In the fast food industry, in which low-wage jobs are the norm, the problems created by low wages can be exacerbated by unpredictable scheduling practices that leave workers not knowing when they're going to work, how many hours they're going to work, or how much money they're going to earn in a given week. This uncertainty makes it difficult for workers to plan their lives and their budgets. It prevents workers from planning for child care or elder care, taking classes to further their education, or sometimes holding a necessary second It also means that they do not know how much money they will take home at the end of the week, making it challenging to budget and plan for the future.

At DCA, it is our mission to protect and enhance the daily economic lives of New Yorkers; central to this mission is bolstering financial

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

health of New Yorkers and expanding protections to cover the most vulnerable worker populations in our city. Addressing pernicious scheduling practices in an industry that already pays low wages, leaving New Yorkers financially unstable, is a top priority for our agency. We are particularly concerned about these issues now, as the new presidential administration has not indicated any interest in continuing the previous administration's deep commitment to aggressive, meaningful enforcement of labor and employment laws. It is critical that we in local governments across the country step in to fill the anticipated gaps. We have seen a jump in Paid Sick Leave complaints since the beginning of this calendar year, which coincides with the transfer of power in Washington. This underscores the importance of our work, especially since many low-wage or vulnerable workers in our city are immigrants, who are the lifeblood of our communities and our economy.

I moved to the US at the age of 19 and I held various jobs while raising two young boys. If I didn't know my scheduled in advance when I was working and putting myself through school, I would not be here today holding this position. Let's work

2.2

together to ensure that our city's fast food workers

-- so many of whom are immigrants, just like me -have the same opportunities so many of us have been
afforded, and that beginning with the fast food
industry, we establish access to a predictable,
transparent schedule as a right, not a privilege.

I am now going to ask my colleague Liz

Vladeck to provide you with updates about the

expansion of our work and specific comments on the

bills being heard today. Following her comments, my

team and I will be pleased to answer any questions

you might have.

LIZ VLADECK: Thank you Commissioner Salas.

Our Mayor, the Speaker, all of you in the Committee and the Council have shown great leadership in pursuing policies and laws that ensure out city's workers, particularly the most vulnerable among them, have the support they need to take care of themselves and their families. Through the collaborative efforts of the Administration and the Council, DCA's Office of Labor Policy and Standards (OLPS) has been established as the dedicated voice of workers in City government, and the City has demonstrated its

commitment to building on its historic role of serving as a laboratory for new, progressive policies; again, especially important, given our new political reality. Our office's staff of attorneys, investigators, outreach and education specialists, as well as research and policy analysts, take very seriously our mandate: to work in deep collaboration with the stakeholders of our office, including work organizations, labor unions, employers, and the public about workplace protection; conduct original research and use it to advance new policy initiatives that can raise the floor for workers; and, of course, to enforce key workplace laws and rules.

I'd like to offer some comments on the package of bills being heard today and I'd like to start with the four bills that apply to workers in the fast food industry; I'll then talk about a fifth bill that applies to retail workers, and the last, which, as drafted, would apply to all private-sector employers in our city.

Intros. 1388 and 1396, which together constitute the Mayor's "Fair Workweek" proposal that he announced back in September, are a critical next step for cities like ours that are leading the way in

have on our communities.

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

establishing important new minimum labor standards.

Our testimony today is supported by critical research that has been conducted over the last five-six years that makes clear the scope and the scale of the negative impact unpredictable scheduling practices

This research has shown us that not

having sufficient advance notice of work schedules makes it hard to budget, go to school part-time, and arrange for child and elder care. When we look in particular at fast food workers, the Community Service Society recently conducted a study of lowincome workers in New York City and found that more than 80% of workers who identify as restaurant workers -- a category that includes fast food workers -- get less than two weeks' notice of their schedule, and 40% experience significant fluctuation in their hours from week to week. These practices lead to serious hardships that Council Member Lander had referred to, including falling behind on rent and mortgage payments, being unable to afford subway and bus fare, skipping meals because there's not enough money to buy food, and having trouble purchasing prescription medication or paying utility bills.

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2015 study by the Economic Policy Institute that looked at a certain set of low-wage workers found that unpredictable or nonstandard schedules were actually linked to negative behaviors and mental health in the children of workers with such schedules. The impact on these children and their families include depression, anxiety, withdrawal, and aggression. So these unpredictable schedules really strain family life and negatively impact our public health. Parents need to know well in advance when they have to work so they can provide predictability and stability for their children. We know too that in New York City, the nature of the fast food industry is such that these scheduling practices disproportionately impact workers who are people of color and immigrants and women, and we know that there is a clear correlation between folks who are lower on the income scale and folks who have unpredictable schedules; this is unacceptable.

It is worth noting that despite the everincreasing profits that fast food chains are
experiencing, profits in the billions of dollars,
real wages for New York State fast food workers
declined by 3.6% in the period from 2010 to 2014, the

committee on civil service and Labor 24 same period when profits increased by close to 15%. So the Mayor's proposal to ensure that fast food workers have predictable, transparent schedules in

2.2

2.3

I'd like to give some detail about what these bills would do.

advance is clearly an imperative.

Taken together, Intros. 1388 and 1396 would ensure a number of critical protections for fast food workers, including the following:

First, fast food employers would have to post schedules for all of their non-salaried employees 14 days in advance of the workdays on that schedule. Schedules would have to include at least half of the anticipated shifts for the work period — and those are regular shifts that must be included, not on-call shifts — for each worker for that work period.

Changes to that schedule following its posting would incur premium pay to create incentives for employers to commit to the posted schedules, stick to those schedules once posted, and compensate workers for the unexpected.

When workers are first hired, they would receive an individual good faith estimate in writing

of their schedules so that they could have a baseline expectation for when and how much they are likely to work from week to week; with their exact schedule for any given week to be posted along with everyone else's two weeks in advance, as I've described. That good faith estimate would also have to be updated anytime the employer decided to make a long-term or indefinite change. So an example of how this would work is; if a worker has always worked Mondays through Fridays, they would have to receive an

These bills would protect employees under a broad definition of retaliation. The bill defines retaliation to include actions based on perceived immigration status, as we know that immigrant workers are often targeted when they try to assert their rights at work.

updated written good faith estimate if their employer

decides they'll now be working Tuesdays through

There are various provisions in the bill that I'm happy to talk about at greater length that ensure that workers who want more work, or more flexibility in their schedule, can have it.

2.2

2.3

Saturdays instead.

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR

2.2

2.3

Finally, our legislation addresses the issue of "clopenings": shifts where workers are required to both close the shop and be back within a few short hours to reopen. Defined in Intro 1388 as two consecutive shifts spanning two calendar days with less than 11 hours in-between the shifts, this practice would be limited to circumstances where employees either request or consent in writing to working the clopening shift, for which they would receive a \$100 premium for doing so.

Taken together, we think this package of initiatives would significantly reduce harmful scheduling practices and strengthen fast food workers' opportunities for sustainable and sustaining employment.

I'd like to also offer brief comments on the four other bills that are the subject of today's hearing, beginning with Intro 1395, which we are describing as the "Access to Hours" bill.

The Administration largely agrees with the goal of this bill, which is that those fast food workers who are employed part-time and desire the opportunity for full-time employment can pursue it when those additional hours exist. We believe the

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR

bill as drafted would benefit from further thought and specificity to ensure that final legislation would set clear and manageable expectations for employers, as well as creating a reasonable and

6 effective enforcement scheme.

1

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

The fourth bill, Intro 1384, relates to provide fast food employees the ability to make voluntary contributions to not-for-profit organizations of their choice through payroll deductions. And I apologize, but I need a sip of Intro 1384 would require DCA to certify nonprofits that seek such contributions and also require that we pursue enforcement actions against employers that refuse to make those deductions once 500 employees of a given chain fast food restaurant have signed authorizations for the deductions. First, we'd like to note that this deduction mechanism to make voluntary contributions via payroll deductions to nonprofits does already exist under Section 193 of the New York State Labor Law. For example, the United Way, a large and well-known nonprofit organization, often conducts workplace campaigns where workers sign up to make regular voluntary contributions via payroll deduction. The

new element in this bill is the establishment of local enforcement authority, which would become effective if employers refuse to abide by workers' requests voluntarily to make those contributions. A mechanism like the one in this bill would make it much easier for workers to support nonprofit organizations of their choice, particularly those that might be best suited to provide them with important services or support or to work toward shared goals.

The Administration largely agrees with the goals of this bill. Fast food workers have been engaging in powerful collective efforts to drive change in their industry and beyond for several years, and they have achieved critical victories that have helped to improve working conditions, raise wages, and put the treatment of low-wage and vulnerable workers front and center in our national conversation about labor issues. Recognizing that they have often engage in these efforts by building relationships with nonprofit organizations that support their goals, we believe it is sensible to acknowledge this reality by codifying workers' ability to financially support such organizations or

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

any other organizations they collective might deem relevant, useful or deserving.

The bill as currently drafted raises some important concerns. From DCA's perspective, as a civil law enforcement agency, our primary interest is in ensuring that the law that is ultimately adopted realizes the stated goal of the bill while also safeguarding workers from bad actors who might with to take advantage of this new tool. For this reason, we believe that in order to be effective, the bill needs some key revisions. First, requiring an agency such as ours to certify a nonprofit we would propose to change, as we do not believe we are an appropriate entity to act as a gatekeeper or to bestow upon any given organization approval to do what they may already do under the law. Instead, we advise that the certification requirement be substituted by a registration function, which would be pro forma and not content based. Second, we would offer that the bill require disclosures to workers including certain basic information about any nonprofit seeking workers' contributions before workers actually sign their authorizations to have deductions made.

Additionally, we believe it appropriate for DCA to be

2 empowered to take action if we discover that workers'

3 requests to revoke an authorization for deductions

4 are not being honored. Provisions to ensure workers

5 have due notice of their rights under the law,

6 including their right to revoke an authorization, are

7 also important. In general, we believe that the bill

8 | would also benefit from further revision to ensure

9 sufficient enforcement tools are available if DCA

10 were to encounter unscrupulous nonprofits in the

11 course of implementing this law. With that said, we

12 are optimistic about the benefits legislation such as

13 | this could bring to workers' lives and look forward

14 to working on it further.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Let me now speak about Intro 1387, which would ban on-call scheduling for retail workers, establish minimum hours for retail workers and establish certain requirements for retail workers to receive notice of their schedules. As the Mayor said in September when he announced the Fair Workweek proposal, we recognize that the fast food industry is only one of several in which unpredictable schedules are a serious problem. We know that retail employees quite often face the same challenges as those that

fast food employees face, and we agree that

. _

addressing those challenges is an important and shared goal. We believe that the provisions of this bill in particular require further analysis but look forward to working on the legislation and working with stakeholders to ensure there is legislation that creates a scheme that is both effective and reasonable towards solving these problems on behalf of retail workers.

Finally, we'd like to offer comments on

Intro 1399, which would establish a right for

employees to seek or receive flexible work

arrangements, both in general and in certain

emergency situations. As written, to be clear, this

bill would apply to all or nearly all private-sector

employees.

A key provision of this bill would require employers to allow for employees to receive a temporary adjustment to their work schedule when they have a caregiver emergency -- a term defined in the legislation -- such as a sick child or parent or unexpectedly requires the caretaker to provide assistance and support. Given that there are estimates that make clear that a large majority of us of the workforce include those who are caregivers,

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

parents; children taking care of elderly parents, the Administration very much recognizes the challenges that face so many of our country's and our city's workforces. Unsurprisingly, these challenges are particularly acute for women, people of color and low-wage workers in general, so we support the goal of emergency caregiver leave, and we also agree that workers should be allowed to ask for flexible working arrangements outside of emergency situations. separate section of this bill creates the right for workers to request a change in their schedule and ensures that they should not face retaliation when they make such a request. Now that said, we have some concerns about how this right to request provision would work, as we think it is important to be careful not to create a misimpression that workers would have a new right under a right to request provision, since the right to request a schedule change is not the same as the right to receive that change. As such, the bill as currently structured, which would require for an interactive process with respect to schedule changes would be, in our view, unduly burdensome on employers and enforcement resources without providing a countervailing benefit

to workers.

1

2

3

legislation, including Section 1252, which sets forth

We also think other elements of this

4 a universal notice of schedule to all private-sector

-

5 workers, could interact with other elements of other

6 bills in this package in ways that require a fuller

7 examination. Notwithstanding these points, we are

8 eager to hear from and work with all stakeholders

9 about the important value that legislation like this

10 could bring to workers and businesses, and we are

11 | optimistic and look forward to working further on

12 | this bill.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

We'd like to thank the Council for your partnership with the Administration on so many issues — especially that of unpredictable scheduling in the fast food industry — as it negatively impacts so many New Yorkers. At DCA, our Office of Labor Policy and Standards is very committed to helping to raise the floor for workers and we look forward to supporting and working on implementation of final legislation.

Thank you very much, and we are happy to take any questions that you may have.

[background comment]

_

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yeah, I was waiting to see if anyone else was going to testify there.

So thank you very much to the

Administration for your very thoughtful and insightful testimony, obviously it demonstrates the depth of the understanding of the issues here and because of that, I am very hopeful that at the end of this process that we will achieve our goals here today, and so I'm going to kind of get rid of this here, because you've demonstrated that type of depth of understanding of what we are trying to accomplish and talk more about what the Administration and what the role of your agencies would be around implementation and what impediments that you may foresee in doing so; what can we do differently to make sure that enforcement occurs upon passage?

LIZ VLADECK: Certainly. Yes, if the question is about what steps we would envision taking following passage, you know our experience in implementing the Paid Sick Leave Law provides us with a very powerful roadmap, and by that I mean, you know obviously we have done extensive due diligence in ensuring that there is a great deal of information available in as many possible formats to help

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

employers, employees and the public understand what the new scheme is and how it works. As part of that, when we launched Paid Sick Leave, we actually spent the first six months after the effective date conducting a highly visible public education and awareness campaign before we issued any fines. understand that these are new minimum labor standards and we want to make sure that everyone understands their rights and obligations before we move to enforcement. That said, I am very proud of the work our office has done enforcing the Paid Sick Leave Law to date; we have recovered over \$4.5 million in fines and restitution to workers on behalf of upwards of 15,000 workers in two years of enforcement. think, you know, particularly now that we have the Office of Labor Policy and Standards set up where we have, because of the bill you passed and the law that structures our office, we have not only terrific enforcement resources, attorneys and investigators, but we have policy and research and outreach and education mandates, and expertise as well. we would bring all of these resources to bear in making sure that implementation of new scheduling legislation was effective and efficient.

1

3

4

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: That again was pretty thorough because you kind of rolled it all up, and so you are convinced that you have the necessary workforce between agencies that could enforce this legislation; give it the type of enforcement that it deserves, uhm...

LIZ VLADECK: So I would say, you know we certainly have tremendous expertise and experience, now of course we are always in conversations with OMB about appropriate staff levels for our agency; we would need to see what a final package of legislation looks like, but we're confident that pending that final package, should additional staff be required for this legislation, we're confident there would be sufficient resources provided to us.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. I know that some of the legislation that we've passed involving many in this room and then others, as we advocate for working people, have had a cost associated with that and you've come back to us and we've kind of budgeted or some way figured out how we were going to address that. Is that something fair to say that we may see that in the future, as well as... you mentioned Paid Sick and some of the other legislation that has come

1 COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR

out of this Committee, and as we look at its rollout and its implementation, is that the template that we'd be looking at in terms of education in terms of the period that we'd actually implement maybe six months going out after the education industry-wide?

LIZ VLADECK: Yeah, so I think -
[clearing throat] excuse me -- I think, you know we

very much look forward to a robust dialogue with all

the stakeholders to help us be clear on what the best

way to do a rollout is, but yes, we're definitely

open to discussing an initial education period.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay, so thank you; with that, I'm going to... [interpose, background comments] Okay, I will now take -- you'll hear questions from the council members and sponsors of the legislation, beginning with Council Member Lander.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Thanks very much,
Mr. Chair. Thanks for the thoughtful and detailed
testimony and I think the spirit and clarity that
there's -- we have common vision on the goals here
and there's some work to do and that's why we have a
thorough hearing. We've got some examples from San
Francisco and Seattle about how to design and

2.2

2.3

implement fair workweek legislation, but we also are learning and we want to make it work well, achieve those goals, make it simple for employers to comply, make it simple for workers to know their rights, and make it as straightforward as we can for OLPS and DCA to enforce the law, so you know for me, that's a great starting place and we'll be better to continue the conversation about the details actually after we've heard today's testimony. So I don't want to go too far into the weeds with you guys here, but I'll just ask one question on each of the bills for which I'm lead sponsor.

You hinted at this, Deputy Commissioner
Vladeck, in your comments on the scheduling;
obviously one thing we want to achieve is giving
predictable schedules while still leaving some room
so that if there needs to be a switch or a swop
between workers, you know and we want it obviously to
be... we want employers... you know adding a schedule on
occasion is a whole lot better than taking away a
scheduled and certainly than taking away a schedule
at the last minute, which can really be devastating
in the same way that on-call scheduling can. So can
you just speak a little more to how the bill is

So in

2

3

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

structured to achieve that balance of advance notice and predictability and consequences if that's violated with that set of goals to make sure that workers can achieve what they need?

LIZ VLADECK: Certainly.

Intro 1396, Subsection 1221 sets forth the advance scheduling requirements and Section 1222 sets forth the premiums that would be required when schedules are changed after the 14-day notice. And the premium payments are structured, as you've said, Council Member, to recognize that adding hours is a better outcome for workers than taking them away. schedules are changed with less than 14 days' notice, first of all, workers may be offered the hours; they are entitled to turn those additional hours down. I said in my testimony, flexibility for workers is important and so workers may say yes, I'd like those extra hours, but they may also say, I don't have someone to cover my child care or I have a class at that time. If they do consent to taking those additional hours, that is a schedule change that would trigger a \$15 premium payment -- just to be clear, that's one payment; it's not for each hour worked, it's only \$15. In cases where hours are

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1920

2122

2.3

24

subtracted from their schedule as it had been posted, either specific hours or if whole shifts are removed, there's a \$45 premium payment -- again, just that one lump sum -- in recognition of the fact that they've lost those wages from those hours that they've lost.

One modification to that is that if changes are made within 24 hours, specifically changes that cause a loss in income, either the subtraction of a shift or of hours, then the premium payment that's required is \$75, which in most cases will likely still be less than the worker would have earned if they had kept those hours that had been on their schedule. As you referred to, there are exceptions to when premium payments would be required pursuant to 1222, and those exceptions include when employees trade shifts; when they want to have that flexibility, they're entering into those arrangements and we're not seeking to have employers, you know, put money into the pot. But we do think the way we've structured premium payments -- or the way that you have -- is important, because we think it creates the right incentive in terms both of predictability, reliable income and also flexibility.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

payments.

2 COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Thanks. 3 think the clarification on shift swapping is 4 important; I've actually heard a little bit, the 5 concern about that, and you know if that weren't the case, of course, and you and I were both workers at 6 7 the same branch, we could swap shifts and then go to 8 the employer and say, alright, now you owe [sic] us both more money; that was not the goal of this 10 legislation and it's not what this legislation 11 accomplishes; it's a long bill, so it's hard to find 12 all the pieces of it, but I appreciate your pointing 13 out the section that makes clear that employee 14 initiated swaps don't trigger the predictability

LIZ VLADECK: Yes indeed. And if you would permit me, I would just like to add that the same provision that permits swaps without the incurring of premium pay also exempts premium pay in such case that an employee requests in writing a change to their schedule.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Okay. And then
I'll just ask one question about the access to hours
bill as well, and I appreciate your testimony there
as well, and the goal -- and I think it's useful in

the way the bill works, it requires employers to show

25

5 requirement that you have to show that you gave those notices out. Now it seems to me there will be some 6

employee. So it essentially is a kind of notice

43

7 real differences in what might be behind that; you

could imagine an employer who actually has mostly 8

full-time employees and is doing what we would want

and one time forgets to send out the notice; you 10

11 could imagine a different employer that actually has

12 mostly involuntary part-time workers, and I actually

think one change I'm looking at post-hearing is that 13

the bill as drafted doesn't really distinguish 14

15 between those two things and I think one thing I'd

16 like to do is make sure that DCA and enforcement has

17 the power to distinguish between, you know violation

18 of a small notice provision and a business model

19 which is keeping a whole set of involuntary part-time

20 workers. So I mean does that make sense; is that

21 something we could look at together after the

2.2 hearing?

2.3

24

4

LIZ VLADECK: Absolutely, and I would say that -- you know within our office we have a

tremendous investigators team and they know -- as 25

questions, but given that fast food workers

25

/

2.3

experience wage theft and dangerous working conditions and other workplace challenges, does it make sense for them to create a self-sustaining organization that can be a vehicle to change? I know you have it in your testimony, but I want to make sure that we codify it and make sure that we have it in the record, so if you can just repeat.

office and our agency believes minimum labor standards are so important is because ultimately we want workers to be able to make their own decisions about what they need and what they want and what's important, and so where there's a movement of workers that have identified that a nonprofit organization is a useful vehicle for them to further those interests, you know, how can we argue with that.

COUNCIL MEMBER FERRERAS-COPELAND: Right.

And I just was talking about this useful vehicle,
given the Trump agenda has laid out on immigration;
do you think that there is a role for the nonprofits
to sustain through workers' payroll deductions to
organize communities to fight for what is essentially
what we feel is a racist and very nationalist agenda,
that this nonprofit can help organize -- do you know

2 your rights -- and just be able to educate this group

3 of workers?

2.2

2.3

silver lining from the last six, seven weeks in this country it's that we have seen people mobilizing and organizing around such a large range of issues; I think we've seen that happening at local levels, which is especially encouraging, and so yes, I mean short answer to your question is yes, of course.

COUNCIL MEMBER FERRERAS-COPELAND: I just want to... any opportunity that we prove and show the contributions that immigrants have in our nation, and in particular, in our city, I think it's a great opportunity to showcase that and I believe that the nonprofit is a vehicle to help do that.

Would you agree that voluntary payroll deductions are a more feasible and efficient means of supporting an organization for workers who lack bank accounts or credit cards or debit cards? And we also assume -- look, it's challenging, as you've mentioned; they may have credit cards; they also may be maxed out credit cards, because they're trying to make ends meet; I've seen... you know, I go to my local supermarket; I see more and more families putting

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

1213

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

their groceries on credit cards, so to be able to have an opportunity to have these deductions made prior to them getting their check I think is the most feasible vehicle to do that, but can you speak to that?

LIZ VLADECK: Sure. I mean I think that's right and I think even beyond that, you know, the notion that... the bill is... of course you know, the mechanism for DCA to get involved is triggered when 500 workers have signed the kinds of authorizations that are envisioned here and so if we think purely about the administrative effort involved in 500 workers, every week taking the amount they want to contribute from their paycheck to the nonprofit, that's a much more challenging mechanism and so I agree with you that I think both for folks who are unbanked or underbanked, and as a general practice in terms of the ease of making those contributions that workers want to make, I think this mechanism makes a lot of sense.

COUNCIL MEMBER FERRERAS-COPELAND: Right.

And now to also speak, if you use other mechanisms,

such as credit cards or debit cards, those have

additional bank fees, potentially... [crosstalk]

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR

2 LIZ VLADECK: That's right.

2.2

2.3

there will be bank fees for the contribution that they're making to the nonprofit, which is exactly what, you know, our families can't afford and shouldn't be doing. Doesn't this suggest that payroll deductions are not unduly burdensome, especially in the example that you gave in your opening statement -- we make contributions to organizations such as the United Way or organizations -- there's tons of organizations that we can do payroll deductions on, so I would think this proves that it's not unduly burdensome on the employer.

deductions are already being made for taxes, social security, and depending on the employee, any number of other items; this is just one more line on the list, and frankly, you know again, the bill itself clearly states that employers would have to be compensated by nonprofits for the reasonable costs associated, if to the extent there are any with such deductions. So we don't view this as burdensome.

COUNCIL MEMBER FERRERAS-COPELAND: Great.

And you know, in your opening testimony you

highlighted that you'd like to see that there is a right to revoke an authorization and sufficient enforcement tools to the right to revoke and I get that, right, like you're identifying this for unscrupulous nonprofits; however, what would the mechanism be on the reverse if we have unscrupulous owners or employers that are harassing workers and pushing them to not take on these deductions or to de-incentivize them from making these contributions;

what's the mechanism that you have in place for that?

that the anti-retaliation provision in the bill is strong and it's broad and it enables us to take strong enforcement action if workers are facing adverse consequences for attempting to take advantage of this tool, but there's also a strong scheme of fines and penalties and we are empowered to take enforcement action if an employer is simply refusing to comply with their obligations under this bill.

COUNCIL MEMBER FERRERAS-COPELAND: So if we see, for example, that a particular business had let's say 15 workers that decided that they want the payroll deduction and all of a sudden a month later

2.2

2.3

LIZ VLADECK: Absolutely.

2.2

2.3

COUNCIL MEMBER FERRERAS-COPELAND: Okay.

Thank you, and we're eager, obviously, to hear the testimony of all the people that are here today, so thank you for coming today.

LIZ VLADECK: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you, Chair

Ferreras. Man, these members are really prepared

today; normally when we do this... [interpose,

background comment] yeah, well we... yes, we've done

our homework and normally, as the Labor Chair, that I

sit up and really have to highlight the hearing and

that is not the case and I'm really glad to see that

we are so thoughtful on this legislation that had

been put forth. We have been joined, again, by

Council Member Cornegy; we are going to now hear from

Council Member Rodriguez.

COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: Thank you.

Thank you Chair and Commissioner and the rest, again

[sic] thank you for your work and you know especially

Mayor de Blasio for his leadership to be able that we

create opportunity for the business community to do

especially in the city, takes the leadership when it

25

2 comes, how can we continue serving the City but also

3 protecting the workers' rights. I used to be a

4 teacher for 13 years and I know that many students,

5 they were relying working at McDonald's the Domino

6 Pizza, but there was times you know that they have

7 issue with scheduling and this is what I believe, I

8 hope, that those representatives of the business

9 community get it from this hearing today -- we are

10 | not here to hurt the business community, we are here

11 to say you can keep doing well, but at the same time,

12 | let's fix what isn't working; let's be sure that we

13 have the best scheduling system in place so that the

14 worker knows in advance what their schedule is going

15 to be a week; two weeks from now.

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

First of all, I apologize to my friends in the Fast Food Worker Coalition; I couldn't be at the rally because I was taking my daughter to school.

I had a question or a concern, which is; how many fast food workers are teenagers having temporary jobs versus adults supporting themselves and their family?

LIZ VLADECK: Thank you. While I don't have the exact answer to your question, I would refer you to -- and all of us -- to an excellent study done

2.2

2.3

by Susan Lambert, Peter Fugiel and Julia Henly; the title of the study is: "Precarious Work Schedules Among Early-Career Employees in the US," as well as the Fast Food Wage Board report; I think these two reports together do give us a good demographic picture and also help us to understand the different but similar strains experienced both by young adults for whom this may be a first job; maybe a student, as well as families and parents with children.

COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: And can you name other industries where on-call scheduling is a common practice?

think we've seen this as a problem in fast food and retail and in other low-wage industries in general. So the Economic Policy Institute's recent report shows that the lower workers' wages are, as a rule, the more likely it is that they experience both unpredictable and volatile scheduling, meaning that they don't know their schedules ahead of time and their schedules are more subject to change from week to week and that study, particularly EPI's study, gives a good picture of how those issues cut across different industries.

2.2

2.3

2 COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: When you look
3 at the data that the Department is able to collect,
4 have you seen a change on workers having their hours

being reduced after their salary was increased?

LIZ VLADECK: That's not data that we collect per se, but I believe that -- please correct me if I'm misunderstanding your question -- I think that there is strong research that shows that increases in the minimum wage do not lead to loss of employment.

COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: But what I heard, again, at the local level, is that some workers came to me saying that they saw a reduction of hours, especially after the whole [sic] coalition were able to get an increase in the salary.

LIZ VLADECK: After an increase in the wage in particular...? [crosstalk]

COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: Yes. Yes.

LIZ VLADECK: Yeah, so you know I'm not familiar with those particular reports; what I can say is, there is a reason that the Administration's legislation is looking at the fast food industry as the first case. If you look at the way that the legislation defines employers, we're looking at fast

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR

2 | food chains with at least 30 establishments

3 | nationwide. So in other words, large global

4 corporations that we are confident have the

5 wherewithal to more than sustain the legislation as

6 | it's proposed.

2.2

2.3

COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: And another concern that I have is that, you know, first of all, thank you, Hector Figueroa and the whole coalition, you know, 32BJ for, one more time, standing for the workers' rights and we will win [applause, background comments]. I always say that... [background comments] I always say that the Occupy Movement is [inaudible], but now it's much better because now it has spread throughout the five boroughs fighting for workers' rights.

So you know in our community we had the Domino's Pizza and one thing that happened at the local level, and I would like to know if that's happening also -- this is something that also you've been able to identify; that some owners of the franchise at the local level don't represent the whole franchise industry, they've been going after those workers who are leading the effort fighting for their rights and of course we will stand with the

2.2

2.3

Domino's workers at 181st, and we have done in the past, we will stand today and we will go to any community saying to workers you represent, you are the voice of the voiceless, because I know that when we're there at the Domino's Pizza at the beginning was like a few; most of them they were afraid, most of them they thought they would have a lot of fear; when we tried to enter to the McDonald's on 181st, the same thing; the manager, they were throwing the door [inaudible], they didn't want us to get inside. But have you been able to identify some behavior from some of those managers and local franchise owners trying to go after some of those workers' leaders, that they were leading the movement fighting for

things about that. The first is that, as you know, our office enforces the Paid Sick Leave Law here in the City and we have used the anti-retaliation provisions in that law to their full extent because we know that when workers are trying to make changes in their workplace; whatever the issue is, if they face retaliation, that becomes the first order problem, and so we take pushing back against

their brothers and sisters?

retaliation in enforcement cases very seriously in our own enforcement effort. Second, I very much appreciate that our statute that creates the Office of Labor Policy and Standards requires us to educate workers, employers and the public about their rights not only under our City laws, but under state and federal law as well, and I know that fast food workers who have been organizing have brought significant litigation at the National Labor Relations Board because under the National Labor Relations Act workers are explicitly prevented from being retaliated against because they are trying to make changes in their workplace. And so we are more than happy to help spread the message about those

council Member Rodriguez: I would like end saying that, you know, four years ago the City gave a mandate to the leadership that we have, which is, we want to build a city for all and that city for all means supporting the business community but also supporting our workers' rights, so as Cesar Chavez said, "Si se puede." Thank you.

[background comments]

2.2

2.3

protections.

1

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

13

12

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you, Council Member Rodriquez. We'll now here from Council Member Cornegy.

COUNCIL MEMBER CORNEGY: Thank you, Chair Miller. Good af... well, it's still good morning. Good morning. [background comments] So I've gotten in a lot of trouble for saying that I believe as the City and the Administration we can walk and chew gum at the same time, so I believe that we can... while there was no place I quess in this suite of bills to really separate between large multinational retail and small mom and pops, but I chair the Committee on Small Business and I'm always acutely aware that sometimes these laws will disproportionately negatively impact our small mom and pops, right, and I don't think that it's mutually exclusive to think that we can protect workers' rights while building capacity within small businesses to do more. is a statistic that says if every small business in the City of New York was able to hire one more employee we'd reduce the rate of unemployment by 50%, so I'm tasked with trying to build capacity while simultaneously protecting workers' rights. So I want

So I think, you

2 to know what language do you use to differentiate

3 between large multinational retail and mom and pops?

4

24

5 know, first, in terms of the package of legislation,

LIZ VLADECK: Sure.

6 four of the bills would apply to fast food only and

7 | that fast food as defined in the legislation is the

8 | large national chains. It is -- 1387, the on-call

9 | bill for retail workers, does not make a similar

10 distinction; does not contain a cap that would, you

11 know, a minimum number of employees for an employer

12 to be covered. And so, you know part of what... I

13 | think we really want to explore and we are eager to

14 hear from all those who are going to testify about

15 how this bill and all of the bills may impact the

16 | business community, but I would offer a couple

17 | things. You know there was also a lot of concern

18 | when Paid Sick Leave was introduced; Paid Sick Leave,

19 of course, exempts businesses only with fewer than

20 | five employees, and there's a very valuable and

21 | helpful study that came out last September; part of

22 | why it's valuable and helpful is because it

23 | specifically surveys employers, they want to know

what employers think. And what the survey found, the

25 | study, which is called "No Big Deal," right, like

1

3

4

6

8

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

great name for a study, issued by the Murphy Institute and the Center for Economic Policy and Research; the study found that upwards of 85% of employers surveyed had not experienced paid sick leave implementation as imposing any greater costs on their business. And part of the reason I believe for that is that you know the reality is that providing paid sick leave, being responsive to workers who have schedule needs and emergencies, these are practices that frankly many businesses are already doing in some form or another, and so you know to that degree I think what we're trying to do is create greater transparency while not taking away the ability of employers to run their business.

COUNCIL MEMBER CORNEGY: So I hear from small business regularly and there's no small businesses I've heard from that doesn't agree that the recent policies and initiatives implemented over the last legislative cycle don't in and of themselves individually disproportionately affect their business, but in culmination. So I want to be careful as we implement things layered that they don't have the unintended consequence, right. So in and of themselves, paid sick is terrific, obviously;

4 some small mom and pops in their ability to hire.

when it culminates, it culminates in the reduction in

I just want to be careful that as we individually are

looking at these things and understanding that 6

they're great policies and that they protect workers,

we all agree that that should be the City's policy; I

don't want to be at the end looking at how we didn't

stagger them and how they all kind of stacked up and 10

11 then there's a business who normally hires 20 people

who can now only hire 14 because of the 12

13 implementation of policy and initiatives over a very

14 truncated period of time.

3

7

8

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

LIZ VLADECK: We agree and I think we're very hopeful to hear from small businesses as part of the legislative process; we very much want to know their perspective on how the legislation is drafted might impact, obviously, in conjunction with the other laws that they're currently complying with. And I think in that sense it makes so much sense that the Office of Labor Policy and Standards is part of the Department of Consumer Affairs because of the extensive day in and day out contact that we have

with small and medium-sized businesses in the City,

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

so that served as my assurance that in addition to studying the legislative record very closely, we're also going to be very actively engaging with our own stakeholder businesses to make sure we're hearing from them on this as well.

AMIT BAGGA: And Council Member Cornegy, if I could just add -- this is Amit Bagga, also from DCA. You know where a small business exemption does not exist we are very interested in hearing from small businesses in particular about the nature of the impact that they think that, you know, any legislative package, this and others, might have and that is very much something we consider as part of the legislative process. The Administration also very much shares your notion that we can walk and chew gum at the same time, which is why we've done a couple of things since the Mayor has come in in 2013 to ensure that we are also relieving some of the burdens on small businesses. At DCA, we have reduced our small business fines by more than 50%, which is a sum that is more than \$15 million annually, [background comment] since 2013, which is a major reduction from where we were with the Bloomberg Administration. We have also committed very strongly

2 to doing as much business education as we possibly 3 We regularly conduct one to two business 4 education days every month where we go door to door 5 with our sister agencies specifically along small business strips all across the city, handing out 6 information to businesses about how to comply with the law and this is -- you know, we do this in a way 8 where our inspectors will be with us and instead of issuing fines and violations the inspectors will 10 11 point out, for example, what could potentially be a 12 violation of the law and in that way we are very 13 committed to educating businesses as opposed to 14 fining them without ensuring that they have the tools 15 that they need. And one final point on that, and I 16 know you and I have talked about this before, but 17 we're also incredibly committed to ensuring that we 18 are educating small businesses in the languages that 19 Language access is a top priority not they speak. 20 only for this administration, but very specifically 21 for DCA, as we know that two-thirds of our city's 2.2 small businesses are owned or operated by immigrants, 2.3 and so any publication that we put out there, we do it in no fewer than a dozen languages -- I use a 24 dozen loosely, but you know everything from our paid 25

enforcement comes down.

2

3

4

5

6

,

8

9

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

sick leave information to our commuter benefits information to our general inspection checklists that businesses can easily access on our website are in multiple languages and we really want to ensure that business owners have all the tools that they need to understand how to comply with the law before

COUNCIL MEMBER CORNEGY: So I just want to say, you know, I've been very close to the tremendous work DCA has done, so that was certainly not a shot at DCA, but what I would encourage DCA to do though is to partner with the Chamber On-the-Go initiative to be able to get the information out simultaneously. We've had long talks about DCA changing its brand so that it wasn't, you know, only there punitively and you've done a great job with education as opposed to enforcement -- not as opposed to, but you know, a lot more education than enforcement, and so I and small businesses across the city certainly appreciate that. So I'm just going to end my comments the same way I started them, that we can walk and chew gum at the same time and I am a cosponsor on five of the six bills, so I'm not against it, but I do have a keen and acute eye out for the

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR

disproportionate effect over long-term that it could have on small mom and pops. So let's hope we don't have to revisit that in terms of what it does to small mom and pops in the City of New York, and I'm concerned because 84... you said that 84% of employment is in small businesses in New York City, so we don't want to in any way damper the ability for small businesses to build capacity to hire more. So thank you.

LIZ VLADECK: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you, Council
Member Cornegy. Once again we've demonstrated really
thoughtfulness and preparedness, but also
demonstrates that, as I said in my opening testimony,
that this package of legislation we have worked on
together and met with advocates and industry folks
and we will continue to do that to make sure that we
come up with a package that [sic] ultimately will
serve working families and communities that they
serve and that businesses certainly will not suffer
in any shape, form or fashion. I'm sure that the
Chair of Small Business will lend his expertise to
ensure that does not happen. But once again, this

2 Council has really demonstrated their preparedness on

3 this issue.

2.2

2.3

Before the Administration... we call the next panel, in terms of 1384, you mentioned United
Way and certainly other not-for-profits that are engaged in the check-off, and you talked about... there was some conversation about some potentially unscrupulous not-for-profits that may be involved, but at the same time this has been occurring for a number of years; you mentioned that there is currently legislation that permits that to happen; what would be the differences in 1384 and the current legislation that allows for payroll deductions?

standing New York State Labor Law Section 193,
employers may agree -- if a worker requests -- the
employer may agree to make these deductions and remit
them directly to a nonprofit and this is the United
Way model. United Way conducts workplace campaigns,
for example, because an employer has said sure, come
on in and talk to the workers here, and anyone who
wants to make these deductions, we'll go ahead and
process them when we do our payroll. What this bill
adds, it supplements that scheme, our 1384, by making

5 workers across a chain, not in any one given fast

up and asked to do so. And to be clear, that's 500

67

food restaurant location. And the way that that 6

mechanism of requiring the deductions is enforceable

8 is that DCA will take action against an employer who

improperly refuses to make those deductions once the

request has been made. So it expands on an existing 10

11 mechanism by making what is now voluntary for

12 employers mandatory.

4

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Doe this limit the not-for-profits available for this deduction?

LIZ VLADECK: So only to the extent that, you know a not-for-profit would really need a significant base of support in order to trigger the law's requirement. You know, signing up 500 people to support and make these contributions is not some... you know, for anyone who's collected signatures to run a campaign or for any other purpose, it takes

2.2 some time, you have to talk to people; that's really

2.3 the only barrier.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay, thank you.

And does... [interpose] 25

2 AMIT BAGGA: Chairman Miller, if I may...

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Uhm-hm.

2.2

2.3

AMIT BAGGA: provide some additional thoughts. I'd like to clarify and bolster some of the comments that I made earlier in response to one of Council Member Cornegy's questions. You know the Administration, as I said earlier, does very much agree with the Council Member that we can in fact walk and chew gum at the same time and in an effort to demonstrate our continued support for concerns that small businesses have, we want to make clear that we do want to explore a small business exemption in one of the bills and we do have concerns with the fact that it's not currently included, and that is something we look forward to working very closely with the Council and all stakeholders on.

COUNCIL MEMBER CORNEGY: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And thank you, and thank you to the panel. Commissioner, thank you so much for giving us your time and really for your preparedness and readiness and thoughtfulness that you've put into this process and we look forward to continuing to work with you as this process goes.

We've been joined by Council Member Costa

I'm the Director of the Retail Action Project. I am

25

1 COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR

2 here to testify on Intro 1387, a bill that bans the

3 practice of on-call scheduling in retail.

2.2

2.3

The Retail Action Project (RAP) is a workers center initiative of the Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union (RWDSU). With the power and voices of a growing network of over 1,200 workers in New York City, we are improving workplace standards in the retail industry and in the communities our members call home.

In 2011, RAP and our partners at the Murphy Institute at CUNY embarked on a study in order to begin tracking the wages and working conditions of frontline, non-managerial workers in New York's retail industry. Our study and many others have found that the uncertainty of on-call scheduling is a problematic practice for retail workers, causing high levels of stress, not to mention financial insecurity. On-call schedules make it difficult for workers to attend to other aspects of their lives, thinks like enrolling in school or taking another part-time job, scheduling medical appointments, caring for sick family members or arranging for child care. And a 2015 study by the Economic Policy Institute -- referenced earlier -- also shows that it

J

2.2

is the lowest income workers who face the most irregular schedules and that retail is one of the industries where on-call is used most prevalently.

On average, just over 50% of the retail workers who come through our doors are dealing with the pressures and problems of on-call. We hear outrageous stories of workers having to skip rent payments, forego meals, rely on a complicated network of neighbors to care for their children and give up on the possibility of ever going to school because of the uncertainty of their schedule and inability to get consistent hours.

And the practice of on-call is not only affecting workers. While the advancement of scheduling software, a key tool used for more precise on-call scheduling, was originally held as a cure-all for employers and employees alike, many retailers are finding that the practice hurts their businesses in the long run because of high turnover and low morale, but most continue to employ it nonetheless.

At RAP and the RWDSU we've been [bell] organizing around the ban of on-call for years. We both pushed for and took advantage of the Attorney General's intervention with some of the worse

1	COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR 72
2	perpetrators and while our organizing and education
3	work has had some impact on a store-by-store basis,
4	it is often temporary and based on individual
5	management reactions. We need the on-call ban to be
6	legislated, to be applied to all retail workers
7	throughout the industry in New York, over 2 million
8	people.
9	It is imperative that government act to
10	protect those who are most vulnerable to abuse and
11	that Intro 1387 be passed so that more New York
12	families can thrive.
13	Thank you for the opportunity to testify
14	today.
15	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Thank you. Do you
16	have written testimony?
17	RACHEL LAFOREST: It was submitted.
18	[background comment]
19	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Okay, thank you.
20	Arthur.
21	ARTHUR CHELIOTES: Good morning. My name
22	is Arthur Cheliotes, I am President of CWA Local 1180
23	and thank you for the opportunity to speak before you

on this important legislation.

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR

2.2

2.3

CWA 1180 represents 8,900 hardworking administrative workers in New York City government and the nonprofit sector.

The union has continued New York City's proud history of being at the forefront of labor rights and joined in the Fight for \$15. We are here before you today to support Fast Food Workers

Empowerment and a Fair Work Week.

The bills before the Committee uphold the basic human rights and address fundamental needs that all workers share; the ability to plan their lives based on a fair expectation of work; the need to balance work with family life and other commitments; it is essential that a fair work schedule allow them to honor these commitments.

The struggle of these workers is not new, the fight for the eight-hour day dates back to the 1880s. The slogan back then was eight hours of work, eight hours of rest, and eight hours of what you will.

In Chicago's old Haymarket produce district there is a monument commemorating the Haymarket Riot of 1886, a tragedy with international significance. Workers gathered in support of a

1 COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR

2.3

O 4

strike demanding an eight-hour day when a bomb exploded, killing seven police officers and four bystanders.

In the aftermath, those who organized and spoke at that meeting were arrested, unfairly tried, and in some cases, sentenced to death even though none could be tied to the bombing itself.

The fight for the eight-hour day, for justice, and the right of every human being to pursue an equitable and prosperous life continues today in the work that is being done with the fast food workers.

History may not repeat itself, but it sure does rhyme and each of these six bills are important elements that will make a real difference in the lives of workers as they struggle for a just, equitable and prosperous life.

Thank you very much.

KYLE BRAGG: Good morning Chairperson

Miller and Committee members, I am Kyle Bragg,

Secretary-Treasurer of SEIU 32BJ and I thank you for
the opportunity to testify here today. 32BJ's 80,000

plus New York City members stand shoulder-to-shoulder

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR 75
with fast food workers in their fight for better jobs

3 | and economic justice.

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

Our members know what it means to have a job that allows workers to support a family and contribute to their community. It means getting paid a fair hourly wage and having enough hours to earn a decent income. It means knowing your schedule in advance so that you can care for your loved ones and yourself. As a young lady indicated on the steps earlier today, that because of her challenging schedule she could not be there to care for her terminally ill mother or to schedule the most important prenatal business that she needed for herself. It means having the stability and time to pursue higher education and to advance your skills. It also means being able to give back locally by shopping in neighborhoods and stores and trusting that you'll have the time to volunteer for needy causes.

That is why we are here today. A fair work week means the same thing for fast food workers as it does for cleaners, janitors and building service workers in our union.

The largest three fast food chains in the

3 4

communities.

1

2

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

city -- McDonald's, Wendy's and Burger King -- have over 300 stores and employ almost 15,000 workers between them. If these bills are passed, it will mean workers in neighborhoods in every borough of this city -- including my own home borough of Queens that has more than 50 McDonald's restaurants -- will for the first time have a right to access additional hours as they become available in stores. Instead of being stuck on part-time poverty wage jobs, workers will be able to earn a full-time income and inject their spending back into the local businesses, our

If these bills are passed, workers in the fast food industry will for the first time have a right to know their schedule two weeks in advance and will be protected from retaliation if they refuse to work shift changes or family unfriendly clopening shifts -- which you heard earlier means closing a store at night and then a few hours later having to open it in the morning. In an industry in which almost 90% of the workers are people of color and 64% are foreign born, this will provide the kind of vital

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR

stability that is so often denied and is essential

3 for families and communities to thrive on.

2.2

2.3

The Fast Food Worker Empowerment bill will make it easier for workers to form their own not-for-profit that can bring about the changes that they need in their communities. This organization will be able to advocate for affordable housing, better schools and other issues that these workers face in their neighborhoods and communities. This bill is especially important for workers who have no bank account -- as you heard earlier -- and wouldn't be able to support an organization like this otherwise.

On behalf of our membership I urge you to pass these bills and help fast food workers build the kind of lives that enrich all of our communities.

Thank you.

STUART APPELBAUM: Good morning Chair

Miller and the members of the Committee. I am Stuart

Appelbaum; I am President of the Retail, Wholesale

and Department Store Union (RWDSU) and I'm testifying

today in support of legislation that would ban the

exploitive practice of on-call scheduling in the

retail industry.

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR

2.2

2.3

The RWDSU represents 100,000 workers in the United States, with 45,000 residing in New York. RWDSU members work in retail, food processing, and many low-wage sectors. Our union is deeply involved in progressive activism and movements for economic and social justice. The RWDSU is committed to raising job standards across industries and occupations.

On-call scheduling is a pervasive and exploitive employment practice where workers do not find out until just before a scheduled shift if they will be required to work or not. It is a form of precarious employment that has spread throughout low-wage industries and is harmful to workers and their families. It shifts the costs of doing business from the employer to low-wage employees, those who can afford it least. Research has even shown that it has a negative impact on businesses in the form of higher turnover and reduced morale, leading to lower customer satisfaction.

The ability to join a union is one of the cornerstones of America's economic prosperity. The most effective way to bring about good and stable jobs has historically been through collective

bargaining. Exercising this right helps workers win time off to spend with family and friends, decent pay, health care, retirement security, and protections against dangerous or discriminatory working conditions. In retail, not everyone has the protections of the union; I wish they did. Workplace regulation is required to stamp out the harmful practice of on-call scheduling and to protect workers who need it the most. Regulation raises the bar so employers are not forced to compete in a low-road fashion, driving standards down and exploiting

Workers whose shifts change drastically week to week or day to day and hour to hour cannot plan for child care or college classes or to take a second necessary job to earn the income they need and which they don't get from a part-time job. This ban will bring about predictable scheduling and stabilize workers' lives and have a positive impact on businesses also. It is time now for New York City, the retail capital of the world, to pass predictive scheduling and set the standard for good retail business practice.

2.2

2.3

workers.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

to testify today. Thank you. HECTOR FIGUEROA: Good morning,

Thank you for your time and allowing me

Chairperson Miller, Committee members. Buenos dias New Yorkers of all perspectives here today. We want to provide testimony in favor of the measures that are before this Committee that will, in our view, go a great length to benefit both fast food workers and retail workers. And you heard from my brother Kyle Bragg earlier about who 32BJ is and how many members we represent, so I'm going to go straight to the issue that we are proud to stand with fast food workers and retail workers, and very specifically, fast food workers that we have seen taking action on behalf of workers since 2012, including going on strike, rallying and winning a \$15 minimum wage here in New York State and winning wage increases for over 22 million workers around the country. We are here speaking for them because we believe that this is a workforce, alongside the retail workers and many other low-wage workers in New York that deserve that this City of New York stand with them and make their lives and their working conditions a little easier.

J

2.3

Fast food workers are majority people of color, there are about 60,000 fast food workers in the City of New York, over 160,000 in New York State; close to 88% are people of color. And the question that Council Member Rodriguez raised earlier, 90% are 25 years or older. These are working people that are working to save themselves and quite often their families.

\$15 and a union here in the City and throughout the country -- they are still fighting for a union and they will continue to fight for the union, and Local 32BJ will help them win a union. However, in the meantime, the City Council can be a [inaudible] of promoting workers' rights, ensuring fair schedules for fast food workers and retail workers and protecting vulnerable communities.

The Fast Food Workers Empowerment bill specifically would be the first of its kind and present a new model for workers to pool resources together and build collective power to be able to learn and educate themselves and other coworkers of their rights under the law to be able to support issues that affect them, from affordable housing to

discrimination to criminal justice system reform to immigration justice and other issues. We see this bill being a complement to the enforcement mechanisms already in place and also contemplated by DCA and other agencies.

Fast food workers should have the ability to contribute to their own organization, organizations that they deem worthy of their support, to create a permanent infrastructure that can enforce the gains that we have recently obtained through the Wage Board, through City legislation and State legislation and to enforce the kind of corrections to the work schedules that we are seeking here today.

When you pass the scheduling bill, the organization that the workers can create through the Fast Food Workers Empowerment bill will ensure that workers quickly know about the law and quickly understand their rights under the law.

Many workers in the industry, as

Secretary Kyle Bragg mentioned, do not have bank

accounts; allowing them to make deductions from the

payroll is the only way they can aggregate their

contributions and create a sustainable and

independent organization and support those

2.2

2.3

rights.

organizations that stand with them. In the absence of fair labor standards and effective enforcement in the fast food industry, we have seen very often a race to the bottom to keep wages low and to extract profits at the expense of workers, keeping the workers in poverty. We know that there are many good actors out there, but there are also considerably many that are not. The organization that workers could create with this bill would go a way [sic] to ensure that workers know their rights and help them solve problems on the job and give them the confidence that they will not be subject to employer retaliation and [inaudible] they do, that there will be remedies to protect them in exercising the new

When families are at risk of being torn apart through immigration raids and deportations, as we have seen under the new administration, when we have seen a complete change of focus on the rise of working people, New York should be out there setting the pace for a category of workers to be able to stand by themselves proud and be able to build the kind of future that they deserve. The organization that fast food workers can build will also set the

3

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

1213

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

_ 1

25

possibility for them to engage in broader fights for justice at the moment that they need it the most.

I strongly encourage you to hear from the workers today in addition to us labor leaders so you can really hear their voices and understand their concerns, but also realize the hope that they have placed on this City Council and on this package of bills, and of course, I urge you to pass this set of bills; you will make a big difference in their lives, it will change forever the dynamic in this industry and you will do it without hurting the employers that provide them with the jobs. We believe that the package of bills today expand the flexibility in the workplace, so flexibility is not only a consideration for managers and employers, but also the flexibility that comes for the workers so they can really plan their life and be able to meet the needs for those who they work for.

So Council Members, I hope that you will pass this legislation and that you will be able to hear the voices of the workers themselves. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: We've been joined by Council Member Crowley, thank you, and I know there

2 are

are a few questions as well, so. First of all, I want to say thank you to the members of this panel for lending your expertise and your voice and resources to these industries of folks who have often not had a voice, and having kind of sat there, I understand what that experience is like and I know that often it is very easy for you to focus on those dues-paying members that you have, but the conscience of America has always been the labor movement and I'm glad that you are stepping up, proud to be a part of that movement as well.

So given that experience, having organized and representing workers in various industries, like industries such as fast food and other portions of retail, around the concept of scheduling, what have you seen in terms of improving quality of life and has there been any adverse affects on those businesses involved as well?

HECTOR FIGUEROA: We are in the process of experiencing the increases on the minimum wage here in New York, we are now on year two; for the fast food workers will be year three, but the experience so far has been a positive one in that the workers are seeing raises being mandated and a number

2

3

4

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

of them enjoying those raises. However, not every employer out there is complying with increases and it is often a challenge for us to give the workers the education they need; the workers themselves are the best ones capable in the workplace itself to educate each other; we're hoping that the empowerment bill will provide another level of support for them to do that. We have seen that unfortunately a number of employers have been cutting the hours and taking advantage of the irregular schedules that are overwhelmingly prevalent in this industry, depriving workers from the regular stream of income that they need. So we think that this bill will help to an extent by requiring workers who want to work more hours, for example, to be given the first choice to do so and by providing advance notice requirements that that will bring a level of stability upon which the wage increases will be more meaningful for the workers and their families.

We also have seen in other places that are further along the curve of raising the minimum wage that the impact on the industry has been really minimal, if at all. Seattle, Los Angels, Chicago; other cities around the country that were earlier

2 than New York City have not experienced the kind of

3 calamities that some analysts and commentators and

4 people from the industry argued for. So we think

5 that we are on a solid and strong path, but we need

6 to create more stability in the workplace for the

7 workers to benefit and it will not come at the

8 expense of the employers. The set of bills

9 themselves have considered significantly the needs of

10 | business; we believe that they don't impose any

11 additional burdens that would prevent them from doing

12 | their work, but they will take burdens away from

13 working people who need support the most.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

retail. When we negotiate contracts with retailers in the city, scheduling is always near the top, if not the top of the list of our demands and we have negotiated bans on on-call scheduling in contracts throughout the city and those employers have been able to operate successfully and even more successfully as employee morale is increased and turnover is decreased, so it can be done without hurting businesses. For workers it is often the number one concern they have. If they have a part-

time job they can't earn enough to support

2.2

2.3

themselves; they don't have a part-time family and they need another job and if you don't know what your schedule is going to be, you can't arrange for the second job. If you're a mother, a single mother and you want to arrange for child care, how do you do it if you don't know if you're going to be working that day or not until the last moment? If you want to go to school to advance yourself, you can't do it when you don't know if you're available to take classes. So I think this is something that has been done successfully in retail employers across the city and it is one of the greatest concerns that retail employees in this city have.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you. Council Member Lander.

much, Mr. Chair. First I want to offer you the opportunity; I know that you were here for the test... first of all, let me say thank you all for being here and for the work that you and your institutions have done to advance not just the interests, as the Chair said, of your own members, but of working people more broadly; the organizations and unions that are up here I think have distinguished themselves in trying

So you guys

89

1 2 to push for a more fair economy and as I think the 3 Chair has said and as we all believe, that doesn't 4 have to be a zero sum game, businesses can treat 5 their workers well, give them full-time jobs, give them decent pay; give them fair hours and there's 6 7 lots of examples of that as well. You know there's a great book called The Good Job Strategy, by Zeynep 8 Ton that shows that retail and service and businesses that are even in relatively low-wage markets, there 10 11 are some employers that treat their workers well with 12 respect and stability, there are some employers who 13 don't; those that do of course get economic benefits 14 as well as doing the right thing; their employees 15 stick around, they have less turnover. 16 have shown that that's possible and obviously unions 17 only succeed where employers succeed; workers have to 18 be working for successful employers to have their 19 jobs, so I appreciate that you've shown that time and 20 again.

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Commissioner Salas and OLPS Director Vladeck went through the bills that in several cases spoke to some concerns in them, while sort of giving general support, so I just wonder if you want the opportunity, I guess in particular on the on-call

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

scheduling bill or the Empowerment Act bill, to respond to anything that they said? You know I think the goal here it so to work with them and with all the stakeholders to achieve the most effective bills possible, but I just thought I'd offer you that opportunity if there's anything that you want to say in response.

HECTOR FIGUEROA: Well we are really in support of many of the ways that the Administration described the bills, and particularly on the empowerment bill, I think that they presented a picture that we agree with; that this is a mechanism for the workers to be able to make contributions and it carries no burden on the employers; in fact, employers would be compensated by the nonprofits who are the recipients of contributions from workers, and you know, they certainly described, in our opinion, very well the way in which the workweek bills will work. We understand that there are some issues that obviously still need to be developed further; we look forward to hearing from the industry too, just like you are, to understand exactly what the concerns are. These are not anti-industry bills; these are bills that are trying to create a better environment for

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

91

RACHEL LAFOREST: Is this on? Okay, With regard to on-call scheduling, I think thanks. you, Councilperson Lander and Ms. Vladeck answered it as eloquently as I could. When the Attorney General's office issued a battery of letters to some of the worse perpetrators of on-call scheduling in the city, we saw something of a turnaround in some of those spaces; it didn't affect their bottom line; in fact, what we hear from our members who don't have the benefit of union protection yet but who come

and they cannot really benefit from the thing that

this Council of the City has tried to do.

through our doors, is that if they feel that they have that greater control, there's more loyalty to the brand and to the employer itself, they're more eager to help sell the product and actually be connected to the employer's own interest in building the business over time, and there is very little, if

nothing, that comes out of the employer pockets in

order to ensure that that's done.

STUART APPELBAUM: And I would just add that we would be willing to work with the Council, of course, and the Administration, of course, on any questions or concerns they may have about the bills.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Super. And just one more... Oh, I'm sorry, yeah, [background comment].

MRTHUR CHELIOTES: [inaudible] to take a moment and say thank you to the City Council, this progressive City Council that understands how important this is. Economists have identified a class of workers called the precariat; people who live in precarious situations where their income; their job schedules are all at the whim of the boss and we know that's wrong as human beings; we know how that is a core issue for all of us, certainly in the labor movement [sic], but in society generally. And

2.2

2.3

I'd like to thank the City Council for the work that you have done and the understanding that you have of these issues in making life better for working people in the city, for the precariat, so that they are not as precarious in their lives, and this legislation speaks to that issue, and on behalf of my members, none of whom are in the precariat, but who understand that they have sisters and brothers and children who might be, how important this is for all New Yorkers, and really on a national scale. So I'd just like to take this moment to thank you for them.

HECTOR FIGUEROA: Thank you.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: I just have one more question for this panel, and it really relates to the Fast Food Empowerment Act bill and you know, the sort of new models of work organizing, because I think it's easy for people to be suspicious, you know, on the one hand saying, isn't this just like a money grab or on the other hand, aren't traditional labor protections and traditional models doing everything we need them to do; I have seen — obviously we have the Retail Action Project up there, so we have one on this panel, but I think you've all also had the opportunity to work with organizations

)

that are trying some new things and it's clearly a moment when we need them, so I guess I want to invite a little more reflection on the value of some new models of work organizing that don't in any way erode existing labor protections, but how people work together on a broader range of issues, as I think you said, President Figueroa, so just to, you know, to allay the suspicions people have -- you know why this is a valuable thing to do that will help make it a better city for, obviously in this case, fast food workers, but as model more broadly as well.

HECTOR FIGUEROA: Yeah, thank you for the interest and think about the labor market as an ecosystem, right; think of it as an ecosystem which has different ways in which workers can advance their interests and address their concerns and do well for themselves. We have labor unions, such as ourselves — 32BJ, UFCW, RWDSU, and CWA here at the table; we represent a number of workers in our industries and we negotiate collective bargaining with employers that go beyond the system common ground of laws and mandates that affect all the workers; that continues, and in fact, fast food workers, I have no doubt one day will be sitting, and sooner rather than later,

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

across the table with their elected representative bargaining with their employers for such a contract and conditions like we all have the benefit of negotiating in our sectors; I have no doubt about that. But again, looking at the image of an ecosystem, an ecosystem that is dominated by one species, by one reality is not a healthy one. are too many workers that need to be educated about the rights; about their conditions. And I would say even more now than ever, side by side with a union movement you need to have other mechanisms, other vehicles for workers to advocate for themselves. We have organizations in our communities, we have advocacy groups; we have the enforcement that is created by the City and by the State and what we are proposing is that for fast food workers the workers themselves should have an opportunity to be part of that, that the workers themselves can choose to contribute to an advocacy organization of their own on whatever issues they have interest. We suspect, based on the conversations with the workers, that this entity can be helpful for them to be educated about the new [inaudible] rights. Very few workers know about the raises in the minimum wage; very few

racial justice, to workers here in the City of New

York who have joined the fight for immigrant justice

24

25

2 and

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

19

_ _

2122

23

24

25

and for getting people to be concerned about the increasing issues around affordable housing. Fast food workers are already engaged; what we want to do is for them to be able to sustain their engagement alongside their efforts to build a union and alongside other concerns they may have.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you Council Member Lander. We'll now hear from Council Member Crowley.

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Thank you, Chair Miller, thank you for having this important hearing today, for your work on this package of bills, for all the sponsors and advocates for their work, and especially for this panel for being here today. know so many of you have done advocacy work that has helped tens of thousands of New Yorkers, many of whom aren't even your members. So my question is; if you're a member of a union, does it preclude you from the benefits of this package of bills? With your collective bargaining agreement, if you're a retail employee, do you already have the right to an opportunity at more hours right now in the retail workforce if you're represented by RWDSU? Let's say you're just about working 30 hours a week -- and a

2 lot of my constituents have a situation -- I know a

1

3 lot of New Yorkers like this -- are working two

4 somewhat part-time jobs, working like 35 hours a

5 week, wanting to work 40 or more, but employers are

6 not giving them that option because they're afraid

7 | they may have to pay overtime, god forbid if their

8 employee works that many hours, but unfortunately, I

9 have a constituent that has almost two full-time

10 minimum wage jobs -- and I know I'm not alone, many

11 of my colleagues have that same experience -- but if

12 more hours open up and you're already represented by

13 | a union, is that part of the contract, Mr. Appelbaum?

14 STUART APPELBAUM: The example you

15 provide of the person with two full-time jobs and

16 wants to work more hours; when they don't know their

17 | schedule, they're not able to arrange for more hours

18 | which they need. In our contracts, we provide that

19 people are able to get more hours, we protect

20 scheduling; we have extensive and lengthy discussions

21 | in negotiations on how to deal with scheduling, but

22 where employers don't provide fair scheduling and

23 still use on-call scheduling, that creates penalties

24 | for good employers; they have to compete with low-

25 road employers, and I think that is bad for the City.

2 Because not everyone is covered by a union contract,

3 that's why we're looking for regulation so that good

4 employers are not put at a disadvantage for what they

5 do and so that standards throughout the industry

6 rise; we all rise when we do that. But our contracts

do provide for fair scheduling.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: Right. Right now if you're a good employer you're getting penalized and that's not right; we don't want to create an atmosphere like in New York City.

And Mr. Figueroa, you know you really led a fight on the \$15 an hour minimum wage here in New York City and helped so many airport workers who were experiencing similar type situations. How have things changed; would your airport employees benefit from these bills, or are they already protected in their new contracts?

that the 8,000 workers that have been part of the airport campaign in LaGuardia, Newark and Kennedy just negotiated a collective bargaining agreement this past December that actually has language that provides this set of protections on workweek schedules and seniority rights, which are not

25

part of this bill, but as an example of what I'm 6

need to be out there, there are 41,000 workers, still 8

saying about an ecosystem of labor conditions that

mechanism. But in the airport system, which is not

100

contracted workers, that are not necessarily having

those benefits, right, because they don't have 10

11 collective bargaining; that group is having its own

set of demands and is having its own campaign. 12

13 the fast food workers, what makes it very specific,

14 our mind, for these kinds of protections and the

15 empowerment bill, is that we have a whole movement in

16 the country behind them that resulted in New York in

17 the calling for the Wage Board by the Governor that

18 set wages to increase, and that was really what

19 turned a corner for winning the minimum wage in New

20 York State of \$15 an hour. But our experience is

21 that after it happened, the workers have not been

seeing the \$15 an hour resulting in the income that 2.2

2.3 many of them expected; hours have been cut, schedules

have been changed; many workers are not aware of that 24

and the passage of the paid sick leave, so we know

that even workers are cheated of what they have to
earn under the law. So what the workers are asking
for is an opportunity to be given to them; if 500 of
them come together and 500 of them say we want our
employer to honor a deduction into an organization or
more than one that they feel will advance the
education and knowledge of their rights, the
understanding of their conditions while they continue
to advocate, organize to win eventually the union,
that they feel that that will go a long way for
fixing the problems and for them to enjoy the
benefits of what they fought for. So that's really
what we're looking for. The empowerment bill is not
a substitute for a union; it is not a [inaudible]
union; it is a way for the workers to, right now, who
are incredibly glad of the victory they accomplished,
to have the ability to band together and use their
very, very modest resources to create efforts that
advance their interests, but they're not going to
create the fight for the union, and when the union
happens and the union comes, workers who may not have
that benefit will still have a voice to advance
issues that concern them.

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR

2 COUNCIL MEMBER CROWLEY: No further 3 questions. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you, Council Member Crowley. I just have one more question on, I think it's 1395, about the hours, and when you talk to industry folks they will tell you that the amount of the hours in the industry is a product of the environment, part-time workers and the flexibility and not related to, as Council Member Crowley just alluded to, two full-time jobs and the opportunity to earn at that one location, 'cause obviously there are struggles that come with transportation, and others, in-between two full-time jobs. Have we seen where employers have intentionally disallowed individuals from either becoming full-time employees or picking up those hours which may change their status, and what would that mean aside from premium pays?

HECTOR FIGUEROA: Let me see if I understand the question. You mean in terms of the premium that is added when the workers are called to perform work or... [crosstalk]

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: No, not according to this bill... [crosstalk]

HECTOR FIGUEROA: Oh okay.

2425

1

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

1

3

4

6

7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: under the current situation. Under the current situation, if they were a full-time employee, what would change in terms of what would then become available to them [inaudible] ... [crosstalk]

HECTOR FIGUEROA: If they're already full-time employees with this, they will still have the advance notice [inaudible] will benefit from it, because their schedules will have to be changed with two weeks' advance notice; right now they don't have that.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: If they were a parttime employee seeking additional hours.

HECTOR FIGUEROA: If they were a parttime employee seeking additional hours, this creates now the possibility for them to have it if they want it and the employer would be required to offer the workers first the extra hours and if the workers don't want it they don't need to have it, but if the workers are seeking full-time employment, it opens the door; it creates a possibility for them to get those extra hours.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Are there additional benefits that come to full-time employment or that

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR

2 are associated with the hours [inaudible]...

3 [crosstalk]

1

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

HECTOR FIGUEROA: There are...

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: premium paid for

healthcare?

HECTOR FIGUEROA: If the ACA keeps -- you know, which right now we don't know, Council Member, what's going to happen with the ACA mandates, but under the ACA mandates, if workers pass a threshold of hours, they are eligible for health care; the employer, under the current ACA, needs to provide for health insurance; whether that will remain in place or not, we don't know. However, many workers are working... we're talking about really minimal, minimal hours, we're talking about many workers that are working 15 hours a week, 20 hours a week; some workers we know are working even 12 hours a week, and these workers have a long way to go in terms of hours offered by the employer to even trigger the mandate under the ACA. So it's quite possible that an employer could increase the hours of fast food workers without triggering the health care and the workers will be getting the benefit of extra hours; extra income before they employ additional workers.

For example, during the holiday season, during moments in which the demand for fast food is greater, all too often employers bring new people, new people to be there in the stores when the existing employees will very much benefit during those peak periods from working full-time or working more hours than the very few hours they regularly get.

and in the industry, one of the costs that an employer would incur would be training of new employees, but if you balance that with having to pay premium pays for over 40 hours, for additional hours or health care; are we seeing that as a motivation to limit the hours of employees...? [crosstalk]

Well we would argue... we would argue and we would love to be in a conversation with the industry; we're interested, that when you offer more hours to workers, the cost of having to find new workers to fill the shift and having them know what they're doing obviously would be reduced; the loyalty of the workers, like brother Appelbaum was saying -- and that is true of retail; it's true of cleaning; it's true of fast food -- increases the commitment that workers have to the job. I am more

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR

2.2

2.3

likely to be absent from a job that is 12 hours, 15 hours and I have to have three or four more jobs to provide my income during the week than if I have a job that is predictable scheduling, provides enough hours -- I want to keep that job because that's a better job. So the cost of having to replace workers, we don't measure that; that is a cost carried through the city taxpayers; through the employer in their operations for having such a revolving door of employees, and you know the industry very often doesn't talk about that.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you.

HECTOR FIGUEROA: What this bill creates is a disincentive for employers to capriciously change scheduling, right; they can still do it, but they have to pause and think, because there is now a cost that has been revealed that the worker was before wholeheartedly carrying; now it's a shared responsibility; the employer will make a decision about last-minute changes in scheduling; it carries a price, but that's a responsible way to do it because right now the only ones who are paying for those changes at the last minute are the workers, and

Thanks, Chair; I

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

13

12

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

nobody is taking note of that except the workers themselves who are suffering from it.

Thank you. CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Council Member Lander.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: just want to offer one reflection on your question as well, if I might. I've been talking with some franchise owner and operators and fast food business folks and one thing I've heard is, you know we have a model where about half our employees are full-time employees who want full-time jobs and about half are employees who want to be part-time; they're students, they have other obligations; if you had that model, the access to hours bill would be perfectly compatible with your business, you know, and if someone left, full-time worker left; maybe if a parttime worker did want the additional hours or the full-time position they could get it, but you could keep going with half full-timers and half parttimers; this would prevent you from having only involuntary part-time workers, and it is true -- I just want to own what you said -- if you are looking to save some money, you know, as an employer and kind of go that low road route and say, I don't want to

want to say, as we are... as labor standards get

diminished and the attempt to get diminished, coming

out of Washington and other things that we're seeing

throughout states -- fortunately, it's not happening

here in New York City -- that it is important that we

Please identify yourself.

25

general concerns around the bills that are targeted

25

2.3

towards fast food restaurants, and that's mostly because they're franchises here in the city, so many of them really are small businesses with thin profit margins, so I just want to sort of make sure that we highlight that.

But I really want to focus my remarks on two bills, which really target and capture businesses beyond just fast food establishments; that's

Intro 1396 and 1399. So the concerns are broad, but

I'll just outline sort of three overarching issues that we see here.

One is that I think that the legislation is a little too rigid in terms of not allowing flexibility where it's needed in some areas; two weeks is certainly a long time; I think we want to look at how many days we need to focus in that regard. Certainly, as we've heard, many workers do want some last-minute changes, and I think that there are some improvements that could be made there, so that's the first issue.

The second is; I think that in many areas of these bills the enforcement seems to be overly punitive. I think that we all remember the bad old days between 2002 and 2012; in that 10-year period

2 the fines on small businesses nearly doubled and it

3 was just a huge source of revenue for the City and I

4 think small businesses particularly felt nickel-and-

5 dimed, so we don't want to go back to that; I think

6 that the fines and the premiums in this legislation

7 could potentially open that door, so that's very

8 concerning to us. There's also a private right of

9 action I believe in Intro 1396, which is concerning,

10 that sort of opens the doors for lawsuits, so want to

11 look at that.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

1

And then thirdly, the concern has to do with a lot of notice requirements in 1396 and 1399. Our fear here is that we're starting to create an environment where small businesses are almost forced to have to have a human resources department, which they cannot afford. I think some of the bills are targeted towards small businesses that have five or more employees, so that really is a very small business, and so this is just sort of concerning in that regard. And I'm happy that the Administration sort of singled out 1399 as one area that could be potentially burdensome on small business.

But in general, I just want to sort of put myself out there; I think that, as I said, we do

2 understand the goals of the legislation; I'm happy to

3 sit with each and every one of you to sort of go

4 through the bills line by line to, you know, see

5 where we can make improvements and really try to get

6 something that's not so burdensome for small

7 | businesses. So thank you.

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

VARUN SANYAL: Good afternoon, Chair

Miller; Committee members. I am Varun Sanyal,

Director of Economic Development Policy at the

Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce and today I'm delivering

testimony on behalf of our President and CEO, Andrew

Hoan.

The Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce is a membership business organization that represents the needs of over 2,100 member businesses across the borough of Brooklyn. The Brooklyn Alliance is our economic development arm that addresses the needs of businesses through direct business services.

I would like to commend the Committee for a broad ranging set of legislative measures meant to improve the labor conditions in New York City. While many of the proposed pieces of legislation are good and well-intended, we do have some concerns on issues that may overly impact the ability of businesses to

1 COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR 114
2 comply and remain successful. Also, with the
3 addition of so many pieces of legislation at the same
4 time, we are concerned for the cumulative impacts.

The following are our observations and some recommendations for ways to move forward.

2.2

2.3

Intro 1384: We believe that this needs further consideration and study as well as conversation between business owners and the not-for-profits concerning the feasibility of this benefit to all parties involved.

Intro 1388: There are many employees who are seeking additional hours and overtime opportunities; this would hamper their ability to earn those hours. We encourage amendments to the proposed legislation that would allow for the option for employees seeking the hours to clopen while protecting those who do not.

Intro 1395: The flexibility of part-time work is an attractive feature for many employees. We believe that hearing from both employers and employees on this matter will be critical because it could limit workers ability to keep minimal hours that they may need to pursue education or other training, or to attend to personal matters.

2.2

2.3

Intro 1396: We support good protections for scheduling changes and think this is a worthy bill. We believe that 14 days maybe too much. We recommend that when this takes effect there should be a review process to determine the impacts on small businesses after a year and reconsideration for the

Intro 1399: Calls for employees to have flexible work schedules, yet this bill may contradict 1396.

duration depending upon the results.

For the past five years, government regulations, fines and violations has been one of the top ten obstacles to doing business in Brooklyn, based on responses gathered from the Brooklyn Chamber's Annual Member Issues Survey.

We encourage a serious dialogue with the business community as well as consideration for the phasing of these measures so that they don't take effect all at once, so as to allow businesses to adapt better.

We also would suggest an associated campaign of awareness so that businesses are not caught unaware or fined unnecessarily.

1

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2 2.3

24

25

We support all policies that are conducive to a thriving and beneficial climate for small businesses. We respectfully ask that the City Council reexamine the proposed bills and consider amendments to those bills.

Thank you for providing us the opportunity to testify on this matter.

KEVIN DUGAN: Good afternoon, Chairman Miller and good afternoon to the rest of the Council Members who are joining us today. I want to first say thank you for the opportunity address all of you this afternoon.

My name is Kevin Dugan; I am the Regional Director for the New York State Restaurant Association; the Association is the largest hospitality trade association in the State, representing hundreds of thousands of businesses across the State; the largest constituencies regulated by the City are a key... more than 20,000 eating and drinking establishes in the five boroughs. Our members represent one of the largest constituencies and are a key economic engine of New York City.

1

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2 2.3

24 25

accommodate this employee's request.

New York City is one of the pillars of the culinary world. Our restaurants employ hundreds and thousands of New Yorkers; in the quick-service industry along employs more than 65,000 individuals across the city. Our members support millions of residents and tourists that visit our city each year. As one of the most important industries in New York City, its growth and survival should be supported by all levels of the New York City government.

Although this package is well-intended, I do fear that it will hurt those that it is intended to help. Flexibility is a key selling point to many of those who work in this quick-service industry. This package takes away that flexibility in many ways. These bills would mandate that restaurants rigidly schedule their employees with the schedules scheduled out to 14 days. At first glance this might seem beneficial to the employee, however countless employees rely on their ability to pick up extra shifts when needed. This flexibility often results in greater take-home pay. While this legislation doesn't exclusively prohibit this, it does impose onerous fines on restaurant owners who are looking to

while we don't believe a scheduling mandate is necessary or beneficial to the industry, if the Council does pass a mandate, a schedule timeline of seven days would make much more sense for all parties involved. This would help employees looking for certainty in their schedules, which also allowing other employees to seek flexibility and would protect the small business owner against situations where an employee is suddenly forced to deal with someone leaving the business or not being able to schedule a change for up to two weeks. While an owner may be able to survive a few days of being short staffed, going two weeks without calling in a replacement is simply untenable.

It's important to remember that many of these franchise owners are small businesses, and that's the one point I would really like to make clear today. It is easy to lump these restaurants in with the big corporations they're associated with, but these owners are almost always local business men and women who employ individuals who live in their community. The restaurant industry at every level survives on super razor thin profit margins -- most restaurants operate between 4-6%. Every dollar

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

becomes extremely important and has a large impact on the bottom line. Costs in the restaurant industry are on the rise, making it tougher for restaurant owners to make ends meet. Food costs, labor and rent are just a few examples of the major increases that the industry has been dealing with in New York City and these higher costs have led to several restaurants to reduce staff or turn towards automation, hurting the very employees that legislators were hoping to help. As an industry we fully understand that the targets of some bills are things that should be addressed. For example, we do not endorse business practices such as clopening, although as was said before, we would support a measure that would allow employees to opt into such a situation. We do ask that if certain employees would like the opportunity to earn overtime and volunteer to take on some additional shifts that may conflict with the clopening legislation that they be able to do so.

We respectively acknowledge that members of the New York City Council have the best interests of the restaurant industry employers and employees in mind; however, we are disappointed that groups such

1 COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR

'/

as ours that represent employers were not invited to participate in the discussions related to the Fair Work Week package before introduction. We ask that you listen to some of the concerns that the industry has with the hope that we can find workable solutions to some of the issues that we have addressed today.

I thank you again for the opportunity to testify today; I look forward to future discussions that will protect the owners who help create thousands of jobs and help keep the local economy strong. Thank you again.

JAY PELTZ: Good afternoon Chairman

Miller and members of the Committee. Thank you for
the opportunity to testify today on behalf of the

Food Industry Alliance of New York State (FIA). FIA
promotes the interests statewide of New York's
grocery, drug and convenience stores. We are putting
testimony in opposition to 1399 and 1387; I will
summarize both testimonies.

FIA opposes 1399, which provides the right to request a flexible work arrangement at any time, among other things. While well-intended, we believe this bill will be disruptive to the point

where struggling food retailers may not be able to keep their doors open.

One problem is that the legislation does not expressly state that the good faith denial of an employee's request because it is inconsistent with business operations is an affirmative defense that completely shields a food retailer from liability. We respectfully request that proposed section 20-1253(c) be revised to provide such a shield. In addition, the right itself — authorizing most workers in a grocery store to make a request for changes to work arrangements at any time — is by definition inconsistent with business operations and will therefore threaten the viability of NYC grocery stores.

This is mainly because jobs in a supermarket are not interchangeable. A person hired to stock shelves is not trained to work in baker or produce and does not have the requisite skills to cut meat. It takes considerable time and effort to train workers for these positions and training/transferring workers on a regular basis would indeed be disruptive. In addition, food retailers try to honor seniority wherever possible. Allowing junior workers

1 COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR

122

2

3

4

5

6

/

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

to leapfrog senior staff with respect to desirable shifts and/or better paying jobs will demoralize employees as a whole. Accordingly, we respectfully request that this legislation be held in committee so that stakeholders can discuss a more productive approach to these issues.

In addition, this bill does not contain an exemption for workers subject to a CBA (collective bargaining agreement). Employees represented by attorneys and bargaining agents, have a full and fair opportunity to address these issues covered under the legislation through the collective bargaining process. CBAs negotiated through that process reflect a delicate balance designed to protect workers' rights while allowing the business to maximize profitability. The failure to exempt such workers under this bill threatens that delicate balance while disrupting the business through the obligations and costs imposed on grocers. Accordingly, we respectfully request that workers subject to a CBA be exempt from the provisions of this legislation if those provisions are expressly waived in a CBA.

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

FIA also opposes Intro 1387, which prohibits on-call scheduling; it's not the concept that we oppose, it's certain provisions in the bill that are problematic for us.

Under the legislation, for example, grocers cannot cancel any scheduled hours of work for a retail employee within 72 hours of the start of such hours. It also prohibits food retailers from requiring an employee to work with fewer than 72 hours' notice. This does not allow, for example, schedule adjustments due to severe weather. Typically, before a major weather event such as a blizzard or a nor'easter, sales increase significantly as people stock up before the storm arrives. Grocers need the flexibility to schedule additional personnel on less than 72 hours' notice in such a circumstance. Business then slows as the storm begins, thus creating the need for less staff and to send workers home safely. However, under the legislation, sending workers home in that circumstance would cause food retailers to violate the late by canceling scheduled hours of work even though the cancellation would be due to a dangerous circumstance beyond an employer's control.

Accordingly, we respectfully request that proposed sections 20-1261(a)(2) and 20-1261(a)(2)(3) be revised to exempt cancellations or a requirement to work on less than 72 hours' notice due to severe weather.

Finally, with regard to both bills, we believe that the penalties for violating the provisions of the proposed local laws are excessive. We therefore respectfully request that enforcement of the provisions of both bills be limited to standard enforcement actions by the Department of Consumer Affairs.

Thank you for your time; we look forward to working with government stakeholder to address our concerns regarding both bills. There's a lot more detail about our objections to both bills in both testimonies, but I didn't want to take up too much of your time, so thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you.

[background comments] So I am thankful for your participation here today as well. We have a few questions, but I'm also encouraged that there was not an outright dismissal of the legislation beforehand and I think that you recognize that it does have a

1	COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR 125
2	value, and part of, I think what we said earlier, and
3	what we've seen from other panels and the membership
4	here, is that we said whatever work that was required
5	to move forward on this legislation that we're
6	willing to do, and certainly this committee is
7	willing to hear what you have to say and take into
8	account your input, and so I do have a few questions
9	and certainly I'll start with who just left the mic
10	there, and the supermarket industry and those and
11	I think you said retail drug stores as well?
12	JAY PELTZ: Yes.
13	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yeah. So how many
14	of those workers within those industries that you
15	represent are organized or represented by CBAs?
16	JAY PELTZ: On the grocery side it's
17	probably most, I would say.
18	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. And on the
19	drug stores?
20	JAY PELTZ: We represent one drug store
21	chain, Walgreens-Duane Reade; I don't think they're
22	organized in New York, I don't believe so.
23	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.

[background comment]

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR

JAY PELTZ: Oh, Duane Reade is, sorry.
Yeah; good to know [sic].

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And... and was it your contention that this legislation will supersede those collective bargaining agreements?

JAY PELTZ: Well that's an issue that concerns our members; they're worried about conflicts between CBAs, provisions in CBAs and provisions in the law, which is why in one bill we're looking for... we want a standardized exemption in both, which is that, if the provisions are expressly waived under the CBA; then the provisions of the law would not apply to those employers which would create any conflicts, and it could be handled through a private negotiating process.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: That is not something that generally occurs; that new legislation supersedes the collective bargaining agreements, and as you said, I would think that unless somewhere along the line those representatives would be willing to waive that, but certainly that wouldn't be a part of this here, but that's certainly something that we would be willing to explore and talk about in the future.

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR

2 For the restaurant association...

KEVIN DUGAN: Yes, sir.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Do you represent

5 catering halls as well?

2.2

2.3

KEVIN DUGAN: Yes, sir.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: In terms of scheduling, how is that a little less traditional as opposed to what we're seeing here in terms of full-time; part-time employees?

KEVIN DUGAN: Yeah, catering kind of represents a special instance; very different than kind of what we're here to talk about today in terms of scheduling for quick-service establishments.

Catering is very much traditionally based on when and where you have events and parties and so currently caterers would call in staff and schedule staff, depending on how often they have events and parties to cater, for lack of a better term. So it is a bit of a challenge for that industry to have any kind of predictive scheduling, just because it's almost solely based on outside forces.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: So do you have particular objections based on that portion of the industry?

KEVIN DUGAN: Not on that portion of the

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

1

industry as pertains to these bills here. I think that industry would be able to kind of work around certain aspects, or not work around; work with certain aspects of this legislation to accommodate, especially those who are looking to go full-time; part-time. Many of the catering halls in New York City, especially and mainly the ones that we represent, tend to be frequently busy and have events almost daily, I would say, whether it's weddings on the weekends and dinners during the week; most catering halls are always looking for new employees and additional employees; always looking for people to fill hours, including their current employees. I would say that's true for the full-service industry of New York State as a whole, statewide and in the city, restaurants are always looking for new employees to fill needed shifts 'cause their current staff can't meet those.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: So in general the panel, I think the one thing that the panel has in common here is the objection to the amount of time, the 14 days, in that we thought that was too much

3

4

5

6

7

8

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

129 Did you offer a suitable amount of time for those adjustments?

KEVIN DUGAN: Talking to some schedulers that I have, especially in these quick-service establishments, scheduling for a week is generally the accepted practice they have now; the changes that occur in that week for the employees looking to switch shifts and change shifts and needing to call out to go to the doctor here and there or if somebody gets sick are already a lot and I guess the fear that we have is moving to a two-week or a 14-day schedule would just kind of exacerbate that problem and make scheduling that much more difficult, and then with the penalties of changing these shifts, especially --14 days is kind of a long period of time -- if someone does get sick during that time period and needs to miss a number of shifts during that two-week stand; the penalties associated with calling somebody else in you know are a bit excessive for -especially considering that issue is outside of the restaurant's control, so a week is generally what we're hoping for here; we think that gives enough scheduling certainty to the workers and also it protects the employer if something were to happen

1 COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR

2 where an employee had to miss a number of days in a

2.2

row.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Any other ideas on

-- this is for the panel in general -- on what would

be a suitable amount of time or if there's any just

dissent that portion of the legislation at all?

JESSICA WALKER: I want to agree; I think that that's right and I think that it's also very concerning the two weeks, particularly with the current enforcement mechanisms in place; I think that that really goes to the heart of the concerns around that.

The issue here is; the problem we're coming up against is the one-size-fits-all approach is always problematic no matter what, so 14 days could be perfectly fine for some, but not for others, and so it's trying to find that middle ground, so I think that one week probably is best. And also, again, I think we would alleviate a lot of concerns if we were to play with the enforcement a little bit as well.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay, Council Member Lander.

kind of thank you guys for being... well first, thanks for being here and we know it's, you know, whatever [sic]; it's a room with a lot of people who are pushing hard to adopt this legislation and we do want to hear from you and I think a lot of the things that you have said on this panel you know are things we want to look at; as we said, we want to listen; the idea of looking at emergency conditions and severe weather I think are things we can certainly do here afterwards, so I appreciate your being here, and that you're broadly, at least in some ways, supportive of the concepts and the goals of the legislation, so that's helpful.

I will start by saying though that I do
think it strains credulity to talk about corporate
fast food as though it's an industry of small
businesses. It is true that the franchise owners
themselves are, but we're talking about an industry
in which many of the terms and conditions are
essentially set through the franchising arrangements
and you know the top ten publicly traded fast food
chains in New York City had profits of nearly \$10
billion last year, so there may be thin margins at

3

4

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

certain places through the system, but if you've got you know \$10 billion in profit, the idea that the workers could have stable schedules just -- you know, it's something we can achieve, and I guess I'll start I don't think anyone's looking to require the franchise owners to have human resource departments; just the scheduling software, that in most cases, at least as I understand, that the franchises provide and encourage the franchisees to use, which makes complying with most of this legislation really quite simple, so help me understand that, you know, why the scheduling software that's provided -- and look, what we want is for the chains to change their practices, provide the software in a way that -- look, we'd like to see this just be true what's in fast food all across the country; we didn't start here, they got ahead of us in Seattle and San Francisco, but we want to be part of that effort.

JESSICA WALKER: Yeah, so -- no, I appreciate that. I think dealing with the fast food establishment and talking about sort of that they're associated with the big guys, I totally understand that, but I think you are aware that the conditions in New York City, in terms of the minimum wage being

and the TransitChek benefits... [crosstalk]

25

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Any evidence that it impacted profits within the fast food sector?

JESSICA WALKER: Well I think that this is sort of playing out now; as employees have sort of been starting to accrue paid sick leave; I think it's going to be... we're going to see; it's sort of a wait and see period to see how that's going to play out.

But you know, there's sort of other
things as well -- TransitChek benefits -- there's
actually a whole industry that's popped up around the
country in terms of just selling the posters of all
the notice requirements that you have to have for
employees, you know these big posters which are thin
type, that nobody looks at, but that you know by law
you have to provide. And so that's sort of where
we're headed and I think that it is concerning, small
businesses who have five employees, this is a big
deal, there's a lot of time spent on this.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: But again, I mean for fast food we don't have small... for the four bills that are related to fast food, we are just not talking about anyone who's a small business with five employees at all.

about the scheduling and software that a lot of these

25

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR

1

2

3

4

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

companies provide their franchisees with, I think we'll hear from a number of them later today or some of them later today, and a lot of them do use these software programs, which do allow employees to view their schedules, you know as most of our folks here schedule well over a week out, and I think the concern is these penalties that are associated with changing of the schedules when it comes to things that are outside of the employer's control; I think that's the issue with the longevity of the two weeks, so if schedules needed to change for issues that would come up, that would arise from the employee themselves, I think if there were no penalties involved in that I think we would be sort of open to [inaudible]... [crosstalk]

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: So let's talk about these onerous penalties for a minute too...

[crosstalk]

KEVIN DUGAN: Yeah.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: I just want to make sure I really understand what you're talking about. So let's pretend that Chair Miller and I both work at a fast food franchise and yeah, so he gets sick and he can't make his scheduled hours; now you

1 COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR 137 2 know, if he's a shift employee, he's not going to get paid for that shift that he wasn't, you know. 3 4 first thing he could do is call me and say, hey, I'm 5 sick; can you cover for me tomorrow and then I'll cover for you, you know, the next day, when I'm well, 6 and now we're in each in good shape; he didn't miss 8 his hours; we each got paid, and there was no penalty. But let's say that he can't do that, he's sick, and you need to find someone to replace that 10 11 shift and you call me and it's, you know, two days 12 from now, let's just say; the big penalty is what? 13 KEVIN DUGAN: I'd have to have the 14 language in front of me; I know it's not all that 15 high... COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: \$15... [crosstalk] 16 17 KEVIN DUGAN: Right. 18 COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: what you have to 19 do is pay me -- so in addition to the shift I was 20 gonna make, \$15 bucks. Now I'll grant you that 21 Daneek's illness was not in your control, but it 2.2 wasn't in my control either and I might need child

care to cover for that shift or I might have to pay

something else, so is it really a onerous penalty to

for transportation to get there or to arrange

2.3

24

25

onerous about that... [crosstalk]

2.2

2.3

the wrong word, but I mean are we penalizing restaurants for things that are outside of their control? I mean I guess that's the slip... it seems to be... maybe it's not the \$15 but just the fact that -- again and the flexibility is key here; we're trying to maintain flexibility with employees, but I guess the question is; are we really, you know, is it... I know \$15 is \$15, but at the same time, it's still \$15.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Well all I will say is; I'm pretty sure in this situation we're talking about it matters a lot more to that employee...
[crosstalk]

KEVIN DUGAN: No, and I'm not saying it... and I'm not...

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: than it does to the company and the difference is this; like, it's not a penalty, it's not onerous; it's that \$15 premium for a late-scheduled shift that yes, is gonna

disrupt my life in all likelihood more than the store's and what it really functions as is a disincentive to do it massively, right? If you are running a business where for the most part you're scheduling your employees in advance with god-stable [sic] schedules and yes, occasionally someone gets sick: then the \$15 bucks to the worker who has to cover it extra is really not gonna add up to much for the employer. If you make that a practice where you under-schedule on your advance notice and add tons of shifts later; now yeah, sure, those \$15 bucks will add up if you do it tons of times, week after week after week, but that's sort of the point; if you're following the rules here, using your scheduling software; this is just not going to cost you very much and I just don't think it's accurate to say that

JESSICA WALKER: The fines are quite significant, and I think as we know, if folks are not aware of the law or not in full compliance, and part of it is the notice and you know, being able to follow through on the posting and the notice requirements; you know, being able to -- the HR

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

it's onerous.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

1112

13

14

15

16

1718

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

functions, essentially, if you fall down on those things; that can potentially be very onerous.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: So first I quess then, I would just ask that we could make some distinctions between the predictability pay and the fines, 'cause you've lumped them all together. The predictability pay is what gives the workers themselves a little boost if their schedules are shifted or adjusted late; there are fines if there are violations of the rules, which is different from predictability pay, and at least in my experience, the Office of Labor Policy and Standards and DCA -and I do think this is true on paid sick days, and if it's not, I'd love to hear from your members -- it is my sense that they have been pretty thoughtful about where an employer wasn't aware, first-time violation, small procedural violation, and given quite small penalties versus where there was really a systematic violation by an employer who was aware of and chose to ignore the rules, in which case there should be significant penalties, and I made clear then in access to ours, I'm open to working with you to amend that legislation, because today it doesn't really distinguish between somebody who forgot to give a

2.2

notice one time and somebody whose whole business practice is premised on having everybody be involuntary part-timers... [interpose]

JESSICA WALKER: Right.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: So we're glad to work with you to try to make some distinctions that the maximum penalties are for people that are really engaged in systemic violations, you know, so that what can range from -- it's just that \$15 bucks up to something more severe where there really is a severe and persistent problem.

MEVIN DUGAN: Yeah and I guess that was my mistake too; not making clear the fines versus the, I guess the premium pay; I think, again, the \$15 is not necessarily something [sic] that we were objecting to on grounds, but I think the fines is — if we can get some clarification from the Department of Consumer Affairs, like you mentioned, about exactly — like as long as they're not — and look, we're... if there are restaurants out there committing systematic failures, I think was the word you used; I think they deserve to, of course, be held responsible for that, and I think we're here not representing the bad apples as it were, or the bad actors, as it were;

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

we're here representing the folks that are trying to do right by their employees as well, and be good employers and treat their employees like family. So I think if there are some discussions we had with DCA in terms of what would constitute a fine; what would constitute a systematic failure just so there's some clarity on that and I think that would be important.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: So we would I'm going to ask you guys to go back welcome that. and talk to your members about sick days, because I do think some of this has to be done with some discretion to the agency; it's difficult to figure out in legislation how to ban the bad acting provisions and leave a little room for good actors to make a little mistake every now and then; that's hard to do in law; my sense is that OLPS and DCA are enforcing sick days in a way that is pretty thoughtful and honestly, I've heard more complaints from the employee side than the employer side; if that's because you just haven't had them get to me -we want to get this right, so... [interpose]

MEVIN DUGAN: And I've talked to our membership about the sick days thing as well and that's come up and I would -- if they were still

2 here, I would like to applaud DCA for the way they're
3 handling that, in terms of treating... [crosstalk]

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: We will make sure they are aware of that, so that's great to hear.

KEVIN DUGAN: treating the [inaudible]
with enough notice... [crosstalk]

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: And that's the goal, right; I mean the goal is thoughtful enforcement that helps people comply with the law, so.

My last question is just on this picking up of extra shifts, and I guess -- my concern there is... my sense is people are desperate to pick up extra shifts because they can't get enough shift schedules and that if the law were working so that people were able to get additional hours and move into more stable and more full-time work; they wouldn't be saying to the employer, please, any extra shift you could possibly throw me; when Daneek gets sick we wouldn't have that problem, so I don't want to build a system that's premised on people needing, you know, begging for an extra shift at the last minute...

2.2

2.3

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 KEVIN DUGAN: I... I think some of that was 3 addressed, at least from our end, from the Consumer Affairs testimony before, in terms of like extra 4 shifts wouldn't necessarily count towards the changing of the schedule; I think that's just part of 6 7 the clarification with the fines; again, you know the fines are just a scary amount for the changing of the 8 schedule on short notice and if somebody wanted to pick up an extra shift, would that [inaudible] for 10 11 this change of schedule; I think their answer earlier 12 was saying if they picked up more hours, obviously that would be to the benefit of the employee and they 13 14 wouldn't classify that in the same classification as 15 certain other shift changes. So I think they did 16 provide some clarity, and again, that would be 17 something that we would like to just get more information on. 18 19 COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Thank you all. 20

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you, Council Member Lander.

So there was some... I think that the Administration, particularly DCA, testified on what the rollout would look like, and I know there was

than relevant concerns about the intricacies of

25

2

3

4

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

implementation of this, whether or not there are conflicts or things that we did not see the unintended consequences, and certainly that's why you're here and why we have hearings so that we can address those, and I think that, as you have spoken to the Administration and will continue to have conversations, that we'll get there. In terms of the scheduling piece again and the software, you know, in my other life I came from an agency that managed thousands of workers, scheduling that moved millions of people, hundreds of thousands of trips every day, and it happened because of technology and software and that included and that included every provision of the collective bargaining agreement and at the end of the day, not only were the employees able to figure that out, but they were also able to utilize those resources to kind of undermine provisions of the collective bargaining agreement, and because they account for every person, every minute, every work role and they were able to often push the limit, and just to the point that they did not have to pay premium penalty, and certainly the technology exists and the major corporations that we are dealing with here today certainly have the resources to invest and

1	COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR 147
2	they probably already have it there and it only
3	takes, you know, enhancing software that currently
4	exists, but to say in this day and time that we don't
5	have the capacity to do that, I dismiss that and if
6	anyone has seen <i>Hidden Figures</i> and seen the great
7	minds that we have and now the computers and the
8	software that can do that, we know that anything is
9	possible and certainly that we can figure out
10	scheduling around a minimal amount of workers. But
11	we will continue to work with you and work with each
12	side to ensure that when this is rolled out that it
13	will be rolled out in the best interests of New York
14	City. So I thank you for coming out and sharing your
15	time and your testimony and we're going to call the
16	next panel.
17	KEVIN DUGAN: Thank you.
18	JESSICA WALKER: Thanks.
19	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: [background comment]
20	Harmony Higgins; Rosa Rivera; Wilton Major, Mayor
21	COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Major, yeah.
22	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: and Janika Reyes.
23	COMMITTEE COUNSEL: They all here?
24	[background comments] [inaudible] call a couple more
25	[inaudible]

1	COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR 148
2	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. And then
3	there's uh
4	COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Are the other people
5	not here?
6	[background comments]
7	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Wilton Major?
8	COMMITTEE COUNSEL: The other three
9	aren't here? Then we'll call three more.
10	[background comment] Call three more.
11	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Oh, I didn't call
12	that one.
13	COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Oh. Jedidiah
14	[background comment] Labing [crosstalk]
15	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: bingo [sic].
16	COMMITTEE COUNSEL: uh Labinjo [sic]
17	[crosstalk]
18	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Okay and
19	COMMITTEE COUNSEL: And call two more.
20	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yeah. Edica Reese;
21	[background comment] Shantel Walker.
22	COMMITTEE COUNSEL: No, neither?
23	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Jose Juarez.
24	COMMITTEE COUNSEL: No?
25	CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yeah.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Yeah; he's here? No?

3 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Here he comes.

2.2

2.3

Okay; you can begin from either end; whoever's prepared to go.

JEDIDIAH LABINJO: Hello? Yeah. Good afternoon, Chairman Miller and the members of the Civil Service and Labor Committee. My name is Jedidiah Labinjo and I am the Campaign Organizer for the Retail Action Project. I am here to testify on Intro 1387, a bill that bans the practice of on-call scheduling in retail.

The Retail Action Project (RAP) is a member-based organization with the mission of building worker power, elevating industry standards, and promoting family-sustaining jobs.

I'm here today to offer my own experience with on-call and let people know that as a young person of color in New York City, the inability to prioritize and manage our day-to-day activities is not only an inconvenience but a major barrier to becoming a productive, self-sustaining member of my community.

Before being an organizer I was also a retail worker and I dealt with the grunt work on the

2.2

2.3

shop floor and felt undervalued, just like many of my coworkers. I remember the first time I noticed on my schedule that I had two shifts highlighted in yellow. I asked my manager what that indicated and I got an explanation of how an on-call shift works. It was bad enough that I needed to find other means to produce income when I was not scheduled and also being told to wait and see if my "off" days would be productive ones or a bust.

And I heard grumblings from coworkers about on-call before; it seemed the company put the coworkers through hell, preventing them from getting other jobs and having to scramble to find last-minute child care, or even canceling doctor's appointments that had taken weeks to schedule in the first place. And if you don't accept the on-call shifts, there's usually a threat that you would maybe lose your job altogether.

I was also a full-time student then and several of the shifts that I was being asked to stay on-call for conflicted with my class schedule. There were times when I had to push back and say no and then there would be a threat of like losing my job if I didn't make myself more available. But the company

3

1

4

6

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 2.2

2.3

24

25

was asking me to be more available for uncertainty and less available for ensuring the stability of my own life, and that's wrong and unacceptable, right?

I ultimately became a lead in organizing that store and while the demand for on-call didn't stop, it slowed a bit and there were a few of us who were able to get a small increase in regular hours. I'm proud of the organizing that I did to improve conditions there, but I know it's not enough. how organizing helped to build a demand to completely ban the on-call practice but I know the passage of Intro 1387 will make that real and help secure more stable schedules and incomes for all retail workers.

Thank you for your time and the opportunity to testify.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay, thank you. And there is a three-minute time clock, so try to stay within that.

JANIKA REYES: Good morning members of the Civil Service and Labor Committee and of course, Chairman Miller, thank you. My name is Janika Lee Reyes and I am a member of the Retail Action Project. I am here to testify on Intro 1387, a bill that bans the practice of on-call scheduling in retail.

_

2.3

As a caregiver, I have firsthand experience with the challenges of on-call. Before having to make the hard choice to step away from formal employment to care for my ailing mother, I worked at a retailer called Camper, a high-end footwear company from Spain. Like most retailers, they ask a great deal of their workers. When I began working with them, I was given 15 hour a week with the promise of being "called in" during busy times to make hours, but I didn't realize at the time what they meant was my having to accept on-call shifts.

My mother is battling cancer. While I worked at Camper I often found myself torn between answering an on-call phone call from my manager or staying by my mother's side while she underwent chemotherapy. It's a horrible choice to have to force any worker to make between family or food, but it's one that thousands of retail workers are having to make each and every single day. I so desperately needed the hours to bring money into the house but my mother relied on me and quite frankly, I wanted to be there to support her. A stable schedule of minimum quaranteed hours would have allowed us to work her

1 COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR

153

2 care around my availability and know what my paycheck

3 would look like each week.

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

In my experience, the on-call requests at Camper were also very ageist and gendered. It seemed to always be the young, college-aged women who were pushed to agree to on-call, without any regard to our lives. There is an assumption that we're not the breadwinners for our household, not parents ourselves or caregivers of our own elderly or sick parents. Sorry; just speaking about my own issues just gets me There is an assumption that retail workers in crazy. general are frivolous, that we rely on our families for support and are at our jobs for extra weekend money. This is simply not true. So many of us are struggling to feed our families off of retail work and we need these jobs to be stable and sustainable.

I've left the retail world for now and am babysitting in my community. I am not able to contribute taxes or build toward my own social security, but it allows me to be close by to my mother each day and have more control over my schedule and how much I make each week. I don't feel I should have had to make this choice, however.

2.2

2.3

While I have an organization like RAP to

work through and with, we can't do it alone, so

that's why we're here. We rely on the government, on

you all, to help protect those of us who are

regularly exploited. With seven seconds, I would

like to say a quote by Margaret Thatcher, right.

"Sometimes you have to keep fighting the same battle [bell] before you win it," so we'll be here.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you.

HARMONY HIGGINS: Hello, my name is

Harmony [sp?] Higgins and I work at Chipotle; I'm a

Chipotle worker.

I would like to first start off by saying thank you to Chair Miller and committee members for holding this hearing.

The fast food industry can make workers feel like their lives matter less than stores and making money.

Restaurants over-hire and under-schedule workers without worrying if anyone or worker has enough hours to make ends meet, let alone save for the future. I am currently pregnant and expecting my child in July. I work 12 to 18 hours a week but need to work more. However, my store continually hires

2.2

2.3

new people so they have a larger pool of workers to call in. With so few hours for each worker, morale in the store is low and turnover high. It is hard for workers to develop loyalty to companies and stores or retail when they can't imagine it supporting them long-term.

My current location requires that workers submit the dates of days they can't work two weeks in advance. Unfortunately, workers only find out about their schedule each other Sunday for the next week. Our requests for days off are routinely ignored and late changes always happen. This makes it impossible for me to plan my budget as I never know how much I will actually earn. I try to support my grandmother and my mother, but without a steady income, it is hard to know how much I can give and how much I can save or how much I can contribute to anything or how much I could even put aside for rent and bills.

These bills will help workers by requiring stores to set scheduled two weeks in advance and it will deter stores from making late changes by mandating shift change premiums. The bills will also help workers earn better incomes by ensuring that existing workers are offered few [sic]

1 COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR

hours when they are scheduled; instead of offering it to new-hires you can offer it to the existing hires that have certain things going on in their lives that would actually be able to take upon those hours.

To keep strengthening the voice of fast food workers we need to be able to form our own organization that can educate people about their rights, deal with problems in the industry and helps to address issues that affect our lives outside of work. We need justice on the job and we need justice for our kids and our community. The Fast Food Worker Empowerment Bill would help make it easier for workers to pull their resources by contributions to nonprofit that is fighting for them.

I urge you to pass this bill to help fast food workers build lives filled with dignity and respect. [bell] Thank you.

JOSE JUAREZ: Spanish [03:05:16] [background comments]

TRANSLATOR: My name is Jose Juarez and I work in Domino's Pizza in Washington Heights for 4 hours and 8 months.

1

3

4

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

20

2.2

2.3

24

25

In my store, the manager cut hours in the last minute. Sometimes when you come to work they just send you back home; they say I don't need you, it's not too busy; you can go back home and come back your next shift.

Today we are here because we want to ask you guys, the Council to approve the legislation for our hours and we also need an organization so we can help our coworkers and educate ourselves on how to fight and improve situations of work. We, all the workers at my store suffering the same issue and that's why we're asking to approve and pass this legislations.

Thank you.

SHANTEL WALKER: Hello, my name is Shantel Walker; I work at Papa John's in Brooklyn. Excuse my voice.

I want to thank Chair Miller and the committee members for holding this hearing today.

I've worked in the industry for more than a decade and held positions all the way up as being a manager in the stores.

Based on my experience, I believe these bills will make an immediate difference for workers 3 within the industry.

1

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Fast food workers are committed to their jobs, but without protection they cannot be taken a ... excuse me... they can't be taken advantage of by employers. I've seen delivery drivers come from New Jersey to start a shift paying their own tolls on the way, only to be told to wait in the parking lot without getting paid until the store decides they can start. I've seen workers have their shifts cut when they arrive on the job, but help out anyway because they want to work and they like doing things and they want to see the work continue going on.

And I know workers who don't see their kids for days on end because they are asleep when they get home from one shift and still in bed for a few hours later when they are starting their next shift.

The scheduling bill before the Committee will help address these problems and give workers the protection they need to fight for their rights when they are not respected.

There are problems though that can be too big for individual workers to take on. Off-the-books

pay reporting for scheduled work?

25

2.3

24

25

store.

2 HARMONY HIGGINS: Yes. I have showed up to work one day, which was recently, which was 3 4 Monday; I had shown up for work really early and I couldn't find a hat, so we usually have a go-around hat in our store and randomly that day, they did not 6 7 have a go-around hat, so they told me that I couldn't work unless I find a hat to work with. And they also 8 -- we have a beanie that says Chipotle on it; they gave it to us as a gift for Christmas; we usually 10 11 would use that hat as a substitute, but they told me 12 I couldn't use that either. So I had to spend... I was 13 really early and I didn't start till 11:30, so I was 14 there like at 11:00, so I had to call maybe a 15 coworker that's not working to use a hat for me to be able to work. When I finally found a hat, which was 16 17 at another store, I didn't get back until 11:53. 18 When I approached her and told her I got a hat and I 19 got it from another store, she called me aside, let 20 the other coworker work and called me aside and told 21 me that she's gonna send me home because I did not 2.2 inform her that I was going to get a hat from another

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And what time were you scheduled to work that day?

2 HARMONY HIGGINS: 11:30.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: 11:30 and you were there well in advance and they knew that you were trying to find a hat... [crosstalk]

HARMONY HIGGINS: Find a hat. Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: a hat. Has anyone else had that experience?

SHANTEL WALKER: I've experienced that; it's been a couple of years ago for me, but at this time, to be honest with you, right now I have a case with the National Labor Relations Board, so it started from a discrimination -- I was actually fired for being a part of the Fight for \$15 movement; I was fired and the judge found that my coworker and myself were retaliated upon for participating in these strikes and you know, discriminated upon. I used to go to work and they would say, oh, it's slow; they I told them, why can't you call me, don't need me. call me; tell me something; I came all the way to the job and now they're saying they don't need me; I think is dead wrong and I think it's disgusting and I think they should be held accountable for that, because you're taking money out of my pocket now;

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

you're costing me and now I'm gonna make you pay for it. [background comments]

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: So under... and these are... this is the schedule that you had been given prior, for the week prior or... what is the... you get your schedule a week in advance? When do you receive your schedule for the work week?

JANIKA REYES: I usually receive my schedule the Sunday right before Monday, so yeah.

And I never know, right, like what I'm gonna do for the week; I can't plan anything, right; it's usually... sometimes my organizers are like, can you, you know, come here and I'm like, yeah I can, but you know what; let me check my schedule, and I have to wait until the end of Sunday and the next thing I know, I'm working that day and I can't say anything because I need those days, you know... [crosstalk]

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yeah.

JANIKA REYES: And then sometimes I might be scheduled working five days and then the next thing I know I'm only working one or two. So you know you can't really calculate how much you're gonna make for the week, let alone for the month, you know. And again, like, they think that because we're young

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.

24

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR

JANIKA REYES: I had requested two
specific days off, right; in retail, people normally
don't like to work weekends; I welcome it, right, but
I requested two days out of the week so that I can be
able to be with my mom and you know they were like
fine with it; when I received my schedule, I went
from 35 hours to straight 15 hours, when I only
requested two days off, which is my usual two days
anyway, you know, and when I emailed my boss about
it and I wish I still had the emails, 'cause this
was two years ago she had responded, well you know
the days that you needed off, you know, like it just,
it didn't mix well with our schedule and what we had
for hours. That's retaliation in its most brightest
form; right, but I didn't have Retail Action Project
and if I had that, I'm pretty sure things would've
been a lot different. So but yeah.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay, thank you. Council Member Lander, you have...

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: First, just thank you guys very much; I know it takes courage to get up here and say this, especially if you've faced retaliation before, so... but change doesn't happen if people don't get the courage to do that and

)

especially when people get the courage to do it together, so thanks to all of you for being willing to do it and helping push the ball forward.

I want to ask about this question of how many people in your workplaces you've seen that are involuntarily part-time; would like to get either all the way to full-time work or at least just more hours, you know, you're at 15; you want to get to 20. There's not great data on that, right, you don't put it on your census form you're an involuntary part-time worker, so could you give us a sense in your workplace -- either for yourselves individually, but also just in your workplaces whether that's something that you see?

SHANTEL WALKER: I'd say predominantly more than half the workers in the workplace are not receiving — they're receiving from a range of 25 hours to 35 hours and the rest who are on salary, they're doing 60 hours plus in my store, and I see it every day, they're doing these clopenings, openings, closings, openings and it's taking the time away from their family and it's hurting the community and it's hurting the industry; it's hurting the other workers that are affected from these workers and also these

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

workers -- we've got workers out here that are driving over 12 hours a day, day in, day out, opening driver, closing driver, opening driver, closing When do we draw the line here? It's not safe.

HARMONY HIGGINS: In my store, specifically, nobody has a full-time or part-time; they give you what they want to give you. If thev feel like giving you eight hours one day; they'll probably schedule you to have eight hours one day; if they feel to give you four hours for the rest of the week and maybe one day of eight hours, they'll give you that. I volunteered for full-time; when I first got there, I said I wanted full-time, which is what I was applying for; they said they don't have fulltime, but with everybody else, the full-time, they'll give full-time to you one week and part-time the next week, so they give you what they want to give you that's accurate [sic] for them and everyone else, and that's with everybody there; not just me.

> JOSE JUAREZ: [03:18:32] Spanish

TRANSLATOR: In my store, it's obvious that the manager needs more workers and most of the workers in the store are making five hours a day; 25

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1920

2122

2.3

24

hours a week, but when the season necessity is of more work, they hire on more workers or calling more workers to come in instead of give the workers that are already in the store more hours, so they're trying to keep everybody 25 or even less, even though the people that are in there are actually asking and willing to stay more hours.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: And then I'll just make this final observation so we can move on to the next panel, but I think what a lot of you have said, in addition to speaking to the need for all this legislation, including the access to hours bill; I want to -- and Commissioner Salas or Director Vladeck spoke about this good faith estimate, which I think actually, as I'm hearing you, is really going to make a difference that when they hire you they have to say what hours you're generally going to work and that if there wind up being very large deviations from that and have to change that expectation so that your schedule also will match some reasonable expectation and not have such erratic schedule shifts as the ones that you're describing as being quite frequent.

SHANTEL WALKER: I just want to say this;

a lot of times like workers like us, when we get

these jobs, the first thing they tell us -- oh, we

have flexible hours; we have this, that. When do you

see the flexibility when we're not home half the

time; we come home -- hi, bye, hi, bye -- we don't

even spend time with our families; we just don't have

the time to do it and it's really crazy. I don't see the flexibility -- tell them to show us the

11 | flexibility.

2.2

2.3

JANIKA REYES: No, she's right; I remember... I went on a job interview just recently and just because I had put one day that I wasn't available, which was Sunday, I wasn't hired, which is insane, right, like I put my availability is open Monday through Saturday, 7 a.m., 10 p.m.; 11, if you need it, but I just needed that one Sunday to be with my parents and I couldn't even get that. So you know they preach flexibility, they... you know I think the problem here is just that they really don't want an open relationship with their employees, you know it feels more like a dictatorship, you know, they don't really care about our needs and it really sucks you know, because it trickles down onto the managers and

upward mobility for low-income New Yorkers. I'm here

just to briefly summarize our findings, our own

24

25

hours.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 And finally, perhaps the most distressing 3 finding is that this isn't a problem unique to young 4 workers or teenagers say they have more flexibility, as we've just heard; low-income parents in particular are also hit harder, both in terms of the prevalence 6 7 and the impact, so you know, falling behind on rent and prescriptions, these are things which can spill 8 over and affect children as well, so that's why it's particularly distressing. 10

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

ARIANE HEGEWISCH: Thank you also from me for the opportunity to testify. I would like to particularly speak about Intro 1399 and the right to request.

My name is Ariane Hegewisch; I am the

Program Director for Employment and Earnings at the

Institute for Women's Policy Research. The

Institute, since its inception, has worked on the

analysis of the mismatch between the world of work

and the world of caregiving and the implications for

the economic security of women and their families.

Lack of access to workplace flexibility is an

important contributor to gender inequality, of

course.

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR

2.2

2.3

While many workers have access to informal flexibility such arrangements are not reliability and depend on the goodwill of individual supervisors and managers; when those supervisors change the arrangements frequently fall apart, leading to lower motivation and productivity if not forced exit from the workplace altogether.

For the last two decades a growing number of countries have introduced law to improve workers' access to workplace flexibility and I have closely followed the implementation and impact of those laws.

Intro 1399 follows the UK Right to

Request law, which was first introduced in 2002 and

was subsequently expanded several times, each time

with the support of unions and employer organizations

and human resource managers.

While there was considerable skepticism towards the soft law approach in the law, the law has arguable proved as effective as more conventionally framed laws elsewhere.

The UK experience provides useful insight in what such a law can or cannot do. What it can do is that requests for flexible work arrangements increased and in eight in ten cases were accepted and

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR

2.2

2.3

requests were particularly common and as successful from part-time workers as full-time workers. And while the impact has been greatest on workers with caregiving responsibilities, access to flexibility

6 that workers want has increased also for workers

beyond the scope of the legislation.

Progress however has not been made across the board. The law has had little impact on sectors and workplaces with little prior flexibility, and while men's access to alternative work arrangements has increased, workplaces which mainly employ men have seen much less change than others.

The law has had the strongest positive impact in organizations which mainly employ women and already provided some flexibility, but often in an ad hoc manner. There it has helped these organizations by giving authority to HR managers and to workers to enforce uniform standards across their organizations and particularly to improve consistency between line mangers and supervisors. [bell]

In summary, the best and the worst employers have not changed much, but the mess middle, where many women work, has improved.

And finally, what was really important to the impact of the law was publicity and resources for both employers and employees.

Thank you very much.

Lambert and I am an academic researcher from the

University of Chicago and I've actually been studying
scheduling practices for almost 20 years and often
what I've -- part of my research is that I go into
firms and I look at what actually happens, why
employers do what they do, and I often partner with
businesses, in terms of finding more positive ways to
do scheduling.

I mostly study retail, but what we see from the national data and what we've heard today is that the stories from the fast food workers sounded a lot like the stories from the retail workers, and overall what national data shows us is that both are at high risk of working unpredictable, unstable hours over which people have very little control. Some national data indicates that -- both groups -- that over 90% of them experience fluctuations in work hours from week to week and those fluctuations and work hours for over 50% of these workers average

eight hours from week to week and that's a full day of pay. And for the overwhelming majority of these workers, those variations are not being driven by them or by calling off from work; they're being driven by employer changes. Central to New York's initiatives, 54% of food service workers only receive a schedule a week or less in advance, and as we've heard from the last panel, you know, a week would be a lot, compared to what people are actually getting.

One of the things I'd really like to focus on is what I've learned from doing some experiments in retailers who are trying to improve their scheduling practices, and the same kinds of arguments that we hear today from the panel, from employer groups are the same ones that you hear all the time for retailers as well -- we can't anticipate; we don't know what's happening; our employees want flexibility and we can't do this -- and what we found in our experiments is that it just takes time for both the managers and the employees to get used to a new way of scheduling; that employees have to get their requests in further in advance and what we find is they do, for the overwhelming majority of them, it's not a problem to the managers.

Managers have to figure out how to forecast better and they do. What we've also learned overall from more operations research is that when you look at variations in consumer demand over time, there's a lot more stability in those demands than there is stability in workers' schedules; that's there's a lot more predictability and stability that's already in these businesses that could be passed on to workers through better scheduling practices.

Another thing I think that's relevant here today is that people are talking about how much predictability is enough [bell] and from our research, what we find is that seven days doesn't do it; it has to be more than that in order to make a difference in terms of people being able to balance their work and families' lives in order to reduce the kind of stress the workers talked about, and so I encourage you not to follow the path away from 14-day.

Finally, I'm just going to end with one little data point; is that in October 2015, the Gap eliminated the use of on-call shifts and moved to posting schedules two weeks in advance and as part of a survey we asked hourly employees what they thought

1 COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR of that and fully 93% said overall eliminating formal 2

177

3 on-call shifts has been good for me; 95% agreed that

the elimination of formal on-call shifts has improved 4

my ability to balance work and personal

responsibilities, and we find this similar positive 6

7 responses for posting schedules two weeks in advance.

And I can tell you, as an organizational researcher, 8

these are very high numbers in terms of such a

positive response, because most people will oppose 10

11 any kind of organizational change.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Thank you Chair and LONNIE GOLDEN: committee members. My name is Lonnie Golden; I the Labor Economist, an associate of the Economic Policy Institute in Washington, and with the Project for Middle Class Renewal at the University of Illinois.

Having analyzed data from three large nationally represented surveys, I come to support all five aspects of the Fair Workweek legislation and admire your courage and taking the lead on this. That is for four main reasons:

1. Our analysis of the data suggests when workers report that their shift is either on-call or irregular or split shifts, they experience

significantly more conflict with work and family

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR 178
responsibilities and work stress than those with more

3 regular schedules.

2.2

2.3

- 2. Evidence shows that nationally from 10-16% of the employed, particularly those making less than \$23,000 a year, are more prone to these irregular on-call shifts and such variable and short notice scheduling is found to be more pervasive indeed in food services and production industry, affecting 21% of employees and among retail trade, which is 29%. In addition, those who report that their usual work week is to variable to even specify is higher in the food services industry than any other industry, except for agriculture.
- 3. Not unrelatedly, the rate of involuntary part-time employment -- that Member Lander is speaking to -- remains stubbornly high in the US and in New York in an otherwise solid economy, particularly for the reason that people settle for a part-time job when they're looking for full-time; this is especially the case, data show, in the two industries we've been talking about -- eating and drinking establishments and retail trade. Yet even this far underestimates the prevalence of the phenomenon of underemployment, that workers are

1

3

4

6

7

8

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

hungry for more hours so they can bring in more This is at 33% nationally and in New York it's 38% at the state level and among part-timers it's almost half.

Finally, the evidence suggests that the adverse effects of irregular on-call scheduling could be mitigated by employees having or gaining true flexibility that is measured by having or gaining true flexibility that is measured by having an ability to take out time during the workday or to adjust their starting or ending times.

In sum, these challenges can all be addressed with the bills at hand, in particular, the right to request at the individualized level and a process that instates that; that has proven workable in the English-speaking countries abroad. underemployment could be addressed straightforwardly with this access to hours and that those with caregiving responsibilities have a right to receive it, so the frequent work family conflict can be addressed with that and whatever length minimum we have for minimum advance notice is certainly going to be helpful. And with the [bell] pay premium, I think that would create the right incentive for that and it

would eventually level the playing field between employers in both these industries of retail and fast food. Thank you.

ANDREA JOHNSON: Good afternoon. My name is Andrea Johnson, I am with the National Women's Law Center in D.C.; we are helping lead the national movement to secure fair scheduling practices for working people because women are disproportionately affected by unpredictable scheduling practices, and particularly as we've heard today, women with caregiving responsibilities, so this is why the Fair Workweek legislation is critical.

Bill 1399 provides a simple but crucial protection that all workers need; ensures that an employee who asks if she can have Tuesday nights off to attend classes or a schedule that lets here see her children in the evening does not risk having her hours cut for making that request, as too often happens; I just want to give my support to that provision.

Also, the requirement of 14 days' notice and not less for fast food workers is essential. The consensus from workers across the country that we've spoken with and other advocates here today have

2 spoken with, is that workers need at least two weeks'

3 notice of their schedules in order to be able to plan

4 their caregiving responsibilities, schooling or a

5 second job. And there's a recent study of 3,000

6 workers; we found that workers who receive their

7 schedule less than two weeks ahead of time report

8 significantly higher rates of psychological distress

9 | than workers who receive at least two weeks' notice.

There is hard evidence to support the need for 14

11 days.

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Moreover, almost every bill that has been introduced across the country in recent years to promote fair scheduling practices has provided for at least two weeks' notice and the ordinances that have passed recently in Seattle and Emeryville and a few years ago in San Francisco also provide at least two weeks' notice.

It's crucial -- and I want to drive this

point home -- it's crucial that employers be required

to compensate employees for changes made at any point

within that 14-day period; not just for changes in

the last few days. This ensures that employers will

actually stick to the two-week schedule and that

employees are compensated for costs that they are not

in a position to absorb but the businesses are; anything less would be a step back for the fair scheduling movement and New York City would not want to do that.

I also want to make clear that the idea that this bill will limit employee flexibility to attend to personal and family needs is misleading --we've heard this today from the worker panels very clearly -- when employers give more predictable and stable schedules, employees can actually plan their lives so they can meet both their work and personal obligations. So in that instance, employees will call out of work less often.

I'll end by saying that, as I said,

Seattle, Emeryville, San Jose, and San Francisco have responded to this dire need for scheduling protections and passed robust fair scheduling legislations similar to the legislation before you. This year over a dozen states have introduced such legislation, including Massachusetts, New Jersey,

Connecticut, and Maryland, so some of your neighbors; it's time for New York City to step up like its peer cities and become a leader in this national movement

workers and their families.

to create workplace policies that truly work for

2

1

3

4

5

Ŭ

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

1314

15

16

17

18

1920

21

22

23

24

25

Thank you so much for this opportunity to lend our support.

JAMES PARROTT: Good afternoon Council

Member Lander; thanks for sticking through this.

James Parrott is my name; I am the Deputy Director

and Chief Economist of the Fiscal Policy Institute.

As was mentioned earlier, the fast food minimum wage in New York State was first raised at the end of 2015, so we now have a full year of experience to see what the effect has been; we don't have a lot of research on that, but one thing we do know is what happened to the aggregate level of employment in New York City in the fast food sector; the number of jobs grew by 4.3% in 2016 following the increase in the minimum wage; nearly three times as fast as total private sector job growth of 1.5%. fact, fast food job growth was faster during 2016 than 2015, when jobs increased by 3.5% and the minimum wage rose by 25 cents instead of the \$1.50 an hour increase that was in effect in 2016. As of December 2016, there are approximately 95,000 fast food workers in New York City, the level has been

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1112

13

14

1516

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

growing rapidly, so that's a higher number than what some of the earlier witnesses have indicated.

The importance of the proposed bills is underscored when you consider the demographic and social characteristics of the city's fast food workers. Eighty-six percent of the workers are age 20 or older -- relatively fewer teenagers. comprise 49% of the overall workforce in the city, but are nearly two-thirds of the fast food workforce. Fifty-six percent of all fast food workers have one or more children, and one-fourth are students. don't have the data on how many are caring for elderly parents, but we heard from earlier witnesses that that's often the case and we certainly heard that a lot during the fast food Wage Board hearings that were held in 2015. In two-thirds of the cases, the families of fast food workers live below 200% of the federal poverty line and two out of five families of a fast food worker depend on food stamps, making them more than three times as likely to receive food stamps as the citywide average for all industries.

We wouldn't be here today discussing these measures if there wasn't a compelling need to curb abusive scheduling practices that have become

2 all too common in retail and in fast food. These

3 bills put in place commonsense provisions to curb

4 practices that needlessly harm workers who are paid

5 | too little in the first place. These requirements

6 [bell] will not unduly impinge on effective business

7 management or profitability. In fact, as in the case

8 of raising the minimum wage floor, these bills likely

9 | will improve worker morale, reduce turnover and

result in enhanced overall business performance.

11 Thank you.

1

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you. I just have a few questions. It appears to me, based on the testimony, and I think that the data that was presented is pretty similar, data leading in the same direction -- unless I interpret it totally wrong -- and that is that the shift in the industry that we have seen is less towards the worker and the worker flexibility, because I think that -- I've walked into this, to a certain degree -- as was mentioned earlier, that from an industry perspective, they will tell you that the stores are half part-time; half full-time; data would suggest that it's not necessarily by choice and as we look at diminishing

hours and opportunities, it appears that they have

2 created an environment that is most profitable, and

1

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

3 so there is a degree of exploitation of workers and

4 | there is a diminishing of workers' opportunities in

5 many ways, and if we could kind of just touch on that

6 and then the impact that this current work

7 environment has had on those workers and those

8 communities and families that they support.

ARIANE HEGEWISCH: Can I start with one comment? When you said that the companies highlight profits over worker welfare; in fact, they may think they highlight profits, but we know that good scheduling practices are a. cost-effective and b. lead to both longer and short-term higher profitability. So in a way this intervention pushes industry into the right direction; there isn't much evidence -- I don't know; you may know -- but there isn't evidence that fairer scheduling undermines profitability.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: That is a good answer; not necessarily what I was expecting, but that's good to hear and... but... [crosstalk]

2.2

2.3

happened over the past years with the present construct of the industry, what has been the impact on those workers and the communities that they serve and families.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: but that is

potentially what can happen; the reality of what has

SUSAN LAMBERT: I was just going to provide an example of how it can be profitable to businesses and one of the experiments that we have done comparing -- what retailers will tend to do is to over-hire and so you get a lot of part-time workers, as you're describing, but even within the same firm, not all managers will do that; some of them will concentrate the hours that they have on a smaller workforce and the difference between those two stores, the turnover was 19% lower in the stores where managers chose to concentrate hours on a smaller workforce.

LONNIE GOLDEN: I can address that more directly. We do know that people that voluntarily take part-time jobs do better at balancing work and family. We find surprisingly -- just analyzing big national datasets -- that workers who are underemployed that are working these few hours --

maybe because it's a business practice to over-hire part-timers -- they don't better balance their work and family responsibilities and that might be because their scheduling is all over the week or that they're uncertain what they're going to be working in a very short-term period of time. So to create these incentives in addition to receiving additional compensation of one hour's pay would probably go a long way to relieving this chronic underemployment that we find among those who are being pushed in and kept in jobs that are in fewer hours than they'd prefer.

ANDREA JOHNSON: And I'll just add; at the National Women's Law Center we talk about fair scheduling as an issue very important to closing the wage gap, the equal pay issue, and these unpredictable schedules make it very hard for women and women with caregiving responsibilities to go to work, get the hours they need because they need to tend to their caregiving responsibilities as well and women still shoulder the majority of caregiving responsibilities, so it makes it difficult for them to be as active participants in the workforce as they want and make the money that they need and that plays

2 a roll in the wage gap being stagnant for the last

3 decade and still being large. And women are

4 increasingly primary breadwinners or co-breadwinners

5 and if you think also about, you know, they're

6 bringing home money for their families, so their

7 families are directly impacted if they can't get

8 enough hours. And if you think about single mothers

9 | who have nobody to share their caregiving

10 responsibilities with and they are the primary

11 | breadwinner for their family, these practices are

12 | incredibly detrimental. So yeah, direct impact on

13 | the woman, direct impact on the family and their

14 | economic security, which hurts communities' economy

15 more broadly.

16

24

25

1

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Council Member.

17 COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Thank you,

18 | Mr. Chair. Really good to have this panel and hear

19 | some sort of like voices from the other side, you

20 know I think in any kind of transition it's sort of

21 | stressful, people don't have confidence it'll work

23 | see some of that in like the anxiety about workers

| who are like desperate for additional hours and what

will happen to them and the answer is; well they'll

have more predictable schedules and they won't be so desperate for the additional hours, but so there's two questions about sort of what you've seen. One, I want to drill a little bit down more on the seven versus 14 days, because you heard that and I think we'll hear it again, and I find it a little confusing because the example that was given is; what if

seven days in advance or 14 days in advance; that's

someone calls out sick, which is not going to happen

11 about what happens one or two or three days in

12 advance and again, the only consequence here for that

additional shift as we've structured is the \$15

14 additional pay per shift. So to me, I'm not really

15 clear entirely that I understand the harm, but if you

could just elaborate a little more on why you think

17 | 14 is important.

10

16

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

SUSAN LAMBERT: I think one of the reasons is that in fact, 14 days is kind of a compromise; I think when a lot of this effort got started across the United States it was three or four weeks and in fact we did an experiment where we'd tell managers we're posting schedules for a month at a time and if you look at practices in Europe, for example, you know you get your work schedule for

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

months at a time. And so from workers' points of view, in terms of being able to set up child care and very practical aspects of life, 14 days is kind of the minimum to be able to do those things and our research has -- you know when we are able to look at a range of where it takes effect, where is the kind of, almost -- you know you see that people can plan a little bit better, stress reduced; it's more than a week you know and you pick it up a little over a week, but the more predictability -- and I think there's a real difference, I mean the way that it happened in retail, for example, if you put schedules up for two weeks, of course some of those changes are going to be made, but people have a foundation on which to know when their days off are going to be, that they can plan their lives around it and that's to the benefit of both themselves, their families, but also to the employer because they know who's coming in when, you know, it's a foundation of stability on both sides.

LONNIE GOLDEN: But just to add real quickly, I think that one of the earlier panelists said that they wait around, like I did when I was a supermarket worker in a previous life, you wait

around on Friday afternoon and find out if you're working the next day; that's not really one week's notice, but they will post a schedule for the upcoming week, so you have to build in some sort of buffer to get these positive effects of being able to plan.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Right. I'll just be clear; I hope we're -- I have assumed we're talking that a week would be seven days from the first schedule, so I mean I see the argument, but whatever, I support the bill; the bill I'm sponsoring has two weeks from the very first shift, but obviously one day from the next shift is no notice... [crosstalk]

LONNIE GOLDEN: Right. That has to be made clear, because some people regard the next week as the next seven days.

ANDREA JOHNSON: I can add, and I think we've seen this movement more so in retail, but there has been increasing movement towards two to three weeks of notice for schedules and there's been some good employers in that regards, and Starbucks, though their track record recently has been mixed, is itself trying to move towards two weeks. So to set seven

weeks as a standard lowers the standard and I think that's a bad precedent for New York to set and when we have all these other jurisdictions setting two weeks as a standard, anything less is -- yeah, it gives employers an out to set a lower standard than they actually might be moving towards already as an industry.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you so much for your testimony. We'd like to call the next panel. Richard Heckler, Jacqueline Martinez [sic, Melvyn Jones, and Denee Brown. [background comments]

we... for people who aren't able to stick around, I just want to let you know that we really appreciate your being here and staying this long; we do read the testimony that's submitted for the record and we appreciate everyone who's been here and for this part of the day. [background comment]

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Very good

Councilman. [background comments] Yes, please be sure to leave your testimony and be assured that we'll be reading it and we'll also be in constant communication. [background comment] Okay, you can

1

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

1112

13

14

15

16

1718

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

begin. [pause] [background comment] You may begin; either end you want to start there.

RICHARD HECKLER: Thank you, Chairman and council members. My name is Richard Heckler; I work with a Briad franchise that has Wendy's here in the city and restaurants in Brooklyn, Queens and Bronx and here in Manhattan. I wanted to speak about 1396, about the restrictive scheduling. The very first group that was up here, first panel and the last panel, both mentioned of a lot of people that come to the industry for part-time jobs, whether it be for child care, parent care, school, and all that, and we see that same thing too; we do have about -- half of our employees are on set weekly schedules that they know every week they're working the same week; the other half is people that have requested initially individual schedules; I have hundreds of employees that have worked their way up now through this and they're shift supervisors, assistant managers and store managers and have done well. Some of the things that were mentioned earlier that we had concerns about were things like on February 9th when we had the large snowstorm and Council Member, you mentioned it earlier, we were here meeting with some

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

people when all of a sudden the weather was getting worse and worse; the next day the whole city closed down; we were making lots of phone calls to people saying please don't come to work, because you're so far away it's too dangerous to travel; we'll try to contact somebody close by within walking distance of the store, 'cause sometimes in the city we have employees that only live a block or two away; we're gonna still try to open the restaurant and still try to give some hours to our employees and take care of the people that are out on the streets. I was reading through the bills and you start to be hesitant whether you would call in anybody if you just closed that day; it worries your. When we do the schedules now, we do them about a week early and one of the reasons we wait till a week before is because of the fact that we have so many requests for special things, with daycare and parents with medical appointments and things like that and things with school, so we wait to make sure we get all those requests in to adjust the schedule for those, and what really struck me while I was reading the bill was I get a text from my son's band director who says next Tuesday's weekly practice is going to be held on

Wednesday and my son says to me, oh I've gotta call
the boss and say I wanna work on Tuesday now, but
I've gotta have off on Wednesday and I'm reading the
bill and saying well if it's \$15 for this and \$15 for
that; how soon does that add up? So I asked one of
my managers last week, in this store that's open from
6 in the morning until 3 in the morning, how many
times was the schedule changed and they said nine
times and I said, oh okay. Well, we've heard
comments about these multibillion dollar
corporations; we're just a little franchise [bell]
and I'll finish up quickly nine times, when I
have a 4% profit margin, I make 4 cents on a chicken
nugget, I have to sell 3,375 more chicken nuggets to
come up with those \$15 nine times and so I'm thinking
how much this restrictive scheduling is going to
punish people that are really trying to do it right,
trying to give the people the ability to come in and
put in schedules early and adjust the schedules for
them. But I will let the rest of the panel speak
since my time is gone. Thank you very much.

MELVYN JONES: Good afternoon Chairman and Councilman. I am here to give testimony of my personal experience. I started as an employee crew

20 see that -- I mean we start equally; I hire you, I'm 21 gonna provide you with the 40 hours, if that's what 2.2 it is, but then there's gotta be something that I

need to look at you, your performance, your

18

19

2.3

24

attendance. If I'm gonna just say okay, you have the

those rights because I wanted those hours; there were

some people that did not want those hours and now I

right to get this hours and he has the right to get 25

but what I'm seeing right now scares to even think ...

25

2 have that as a goal because I think that the goal was

3 to be profitable, you know to have your own

4 organization, to build something and have some kind

5 of way of, you know creating a great life for

6 yourself, but hey, I just can't relate to certain

7 things.

1

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

DENEE BROWN: Good afternoon Councilman, Chair Member, thank you for having me. I would first and foremost like to say I'm here because of a flexible schedule; I was supposed to work, but I don't have to go 'cause I'm here. I would like to say; in my 14 plus years of management I've never experienced those conditions. I've worked for the same company for about eight years already and the flexibility is what allowed me to continue. I am a full-time student; I also work full-time and I'm a parent of two and the flexibility I feel like is necessary. As a college student sometimes you know you have holidays and those days off they change your classes to the next day and flexibility allows me to do so; family emergencies, children emergencies; the flexibility is what helps. But me personally, I don't want a set schedule because it there are certain things you could get done in a certain time

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

of the day that it won't be done if you have a set schedule. And with my experience, like the crowd that I've worked with, they don't want the set schedule either and as far as 14 days, I think it's a bit much because sometimes -- tomorrow you have an agenda and it can be changed just as quick, so you want to have those too to be able to say okay, I can help you out here and without it, it just... it hinders a lot, it hinders growth, it hinders people personally and it technically hinders people when it comes to their job because if they can't do it they'll be forced to quit the job, which is a loss of So the group that I usually work with, they income. know how the business goes; if it's not busy, can I go home early; they volunteer, but they're not binded to the fact that they can have a set schedule -- if they want it they can have it, but a lot of them don't and the ones that do want it, they do have it, or if they're called to come in -- oh, can you work this day -- they're not penalized if they say no; they're not obligated to say yes; if they can come in they could come in; if not, they don't have to, but we usually gear it toward the people that want the extra hours, so hey, you wanna come in; this person

them and as I said, in my 14 plus years' experience, when it comes to working in the fast food industry I haven't had set schedules and the request for the set schedule is there; they can have it if they want; the option is not off the table. So you know, I feel like you know when it comes to this bill it's like you know, these people are being forced, but when it comes to, once again, my experience, they're not forced, they actually can have what they want; out motto is "yes we can," and if they ask, can we do it, of course we can. So can I have this off tomorrow? Okay, let me just see who can switch, just make the switch and it can happen; we don't tell them no, because I feel like to make things happen the flexibility is necessary and if it's taken away it hinders a lot of things and it's really detrimental to like somebody's livelihood; it can really be detrimental to that because they will be forced to quit if they cannot stick to one thing or they can't work around a schedule.

JACKIE MARTINCIC: My name is Jackie and I work for a fast food, Wendy's, Briad Corp. I agree

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR 202 with some of the laws that are trying to be proposed...

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

[crosstalk]

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I'm sorry, Jackie, what's your last name?

JACKIE MARTINCIC: Martincic, I'm sorry. I agree with some of the laws that are being proposed here; the only thing I don't agree with is the oncall scheduling. I'm now a manager there at Wendy's and we do have a lot of call-offs, almost every day and if we don't have enough people to cover their shifts, that means I'm working double hard for that person that called off and to penalize the company for that, I don't think that's right. Eventually that's gonna bring the company down which in turn is gonna bring the economy down. The whole restaurant business is gonna come down over this and I don't think that's fair to anybody. I don't think we should be able to -- a restaurant owner should not pay a premium for people that call off to have to schedule somebody else to come in. I don't think it's fair; I don't think it's fair to anybody. cannot predict an emergency when something happens, like today I got the news that my father was diagnosed with cancer; now I have to take a day off

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1920

21

22

23

24

25

to go see my father because he's in a different state. My boss allows me to do that and I like that and I love to work where I'm working at because of that. So we do have flexible schedules, so where all this is coming from I don't know. And thank you for having me.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you for your testimony; I think certainly what you're saying is it's not [inaudible]; we all want what you guys have had, but what we have seen, and not just based on this testimony today, is that that flexibility is not necessarily what we see on the norm, but what I would like to speak to, if I understand what you guys were saying correctly about the culture of the employees and whether or not... the amount of call-outs that you get on a regular basis, whether or not people, if they would not allow instant flexibility what the repercussions would be. What kind of training do you have for your employees going in and what are the expectations of your particular stores? Are you saying that the culture of being able to call out, not necessarily every day or the ultra flexible schedules are allowable and is that a sustainable business model?

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

MELVYN JONES: Well if I could speak on I'll give you an example. I have a restaurant that is in the middle of a commercial area, it is not residential; most of the employees come from either the Bronx, Queens or Brooklyn, so the call-outs are not intended; the call-outs mostly likely come from those -- because of the city, most of its employees are either students or college students and things just happen to come up. So the situation with the trains, the situation with, you know, inconvenience with the scheduling, either not because we didn't schedule it correctly, because they planned to be able to work that specific hour, but because something happened now they have to swap or change. So to answer your question when it comes to our training, we have a [inaudible] system where employees, they are given a package, we go with an orientation, they fully understand, because they get to read the entire package [inaudible] we have the ... our company policies, our regulations, so they get to read all these things and that's what's important and what's recommended and what should happen. system is in place, the communication is there, but again, these things are not something that happened

speaking, because quite frankly, what I was hearing

25

was there was a degree of irresponsibility of a workforce and that you were working around that irresponsibility as opposed to saying that these are our expectations and that you have to do the best you can to meet those expectations.

MELVYN JONES: Clearly we have the expectation and the employee know the expectation, but again, the reality is that it's happening.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Brad... Council Member.

things. One, I do just want to clarify, and I think we said this earlier, but there's been a lot said today, that employees can still swap shifts without a cost to the employer, so under this bill that could still happen without a cost to the employer, which is one of the things that you mentioned is a kind of flexibility that you utilize, so I just want to be clear, that's not something that would require predictability pay under the proposal we have here. And I guess just, you know the... you may not agree, but it sounds to me like from the last panel in the places they've done these, you know retention goes up and absenteeism goes down; I think it sounds to me

2 | 15

like one of the reasons why you wind up with so many call-outs is that when people have unpredictable and unstable lives it's a lot harder to figure out -like if you knew your schedule two weeks in advance you could schedule your doctor's appointment around it instead of winding up in a situation where you had to do everything day to day, so I guess I hope you'll just at least keep some openness to the possibility that the policies we're talking about putting in place here actually will wind up in ways that make it productive for employers as well as employees, of course.

DENEE BROWN: It's not about having like maybe an unset schedule; it's like -- of course it goes with the economy, but when you have somebody who's just doing more than one thing -- and I can put myself into place. Like I said, I work at the same company for eight years and I also worked it with a second job before I got promoted to assistant manager, so it's so much, like you said, unforeseen circumstances, like when you have children anything could happen; when it comes to school it's like, okay, studying and then sometimes where... there came a point where I was out of work for three months and it

were like this panel maybe we wouldn't need these

25

2 laws, you know, part of the challenges,

unfortunately... [crosstalk]

2.2

2.3

DENEE BROWN: Tell 'em to come work for us, we'll take 'em.

industry and it's not surprising the ones that would come here and testify would be ones who worked well with their employees; I don't think it's a secret that there are unfortunately a meaningful number of businesses out there where that's not true and we're stuck with laws to try to do the best we can and protect those employees. I also just want to say I'm so sorry to hear about the family news that you got and of course we all -- our prayers are with you and with your family, so thank you. Thank you,

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you so much for your testimony; it's been really helpful. Thank you for coming out. Next panel -- Anna Haley-Lock from Rutgers University; [background comment] I've got Phoebe

Taubman, A Better Balance; [background comments] Elianne Farhat, Center for Popular

Democracy; [background comments] Barbara Allen,

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR

Women's City Club of New York; Kevin Woodside, We

3 Serve New Yorkers Coalition. [background comments]

4 You may begin.

2.2

2.3

[background comments]

SHERRY LEIWANT: Okay, thank you so much for extending the panel day. My name is Sherry Leiwant; I'm not... Phoebe had to leave, so I'm testifying in her place. I am Co-President and cofounded of A Better Balance, which is a legal advocacy organization that's dedicated to helping workers balance the demands of work and family and we've worked on a lot of legislation such as Paid Sick Days and Caregiver and Pregnancy Discrimination that I think has helped a lot for workers in the city.

We helped to craft and we strongly support the entire Fair Workweek package and we think that they will really help workers care for their loved ones while maintaining their economic security. But I wanted to focus primarily on 1399, which is the Right to Request bill, because there seemed to be a lot of questions about it and I just wanted to clarify exactly what it's going to do:

Number one; it allows workers to request

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

1

flexible work arrangements and receive a response to that request. I want to emphasize, there's no requirement that that request be granted, except in one specific situation where there's an emergency, but otherwise, it's completely up to the employer whether or not to grant the request under the law; it's just hoped and I think the testimony by Ariane Hegewisch earlier shows that it will get the employer to think about and possibly be more inclined to grant such a request, but he or she doesn't have to. the main purpose -- the second part of it -- the main purpose is that it prohibits retaliation against an employee for asking for a flexible work arrangement or a different work arrangement. Data shows that there's real fear about that; a report we did with Scott Stringer last year showed that about 50% of workers are actually afraid to ask, and for good reason; there's really evidence of promotions that don't get granted when those requests are made; negative performance reviews; we heard from a worker earlier who said that she was cut hours because she asked for a Sunday off that she needed to take care of her family. So that's really the crux of this

212

2 | bill and it's really important to a lot of workers,

3 | including the last panel we heard about the

4 importance of flexibility. And then finally, there's

5 a limited right to receive a temporary brief change

6 in schedule for certain specified, very carefully

7 specified emergencies in the bill.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

explain it a little more; I'm happy to answer questions. We are working with the Administration to make this an even better bill and one that's even friendlier to business and to address any concerns that were raised today, but we hope to see it pass along with the rest of the Fair Workweek package. Thank you.

BARBARA ALLEN: Good afternoon. My name id Barbara Allen; I am a member of the Public Policy Committee of the Women's City Club and Chair of the Task Force on Fair Work Flexibility and Predictability, and thank you; we've been working with you on all this.

Today I'm speaking on behalf of the
Women's City Club, a nonprofit, nonpartisan, multiissue activist organization, and I want to thank you
for the opportunity to testify on these proposals,

2 they represent a clear path forward to protecting the

3 rights of many members of this city's vital

4 workforce.

2.2

2.3

For more than a century, our organization has dedicated to dismantling economic, racial and gender inequalities through education, issues analysis, advocacy, and civic participation.

Since our founding days, we have been committed to reducing income inequality in our city and ensuring equal opportunity across all five boroughs to improve the quality of life for all New Yorkers.

While the Fight for \$15 minimum wage was rightly focused on higher wages for millions of people across the United States, a similar effort has focused on workplace practices that are unreliable and inflexible. Most American workers are paid by the hour, and the job sectors facing most of the largest growth are the fast food and retail industries, yet those involve jobs that feature precarious schedules and unpredictable hours.

These measures offer remedies to systemic problems that the Women's City Club strongly believes must be addressed. They are necessary to ensure a

214

balance between family and work life, and recognize

3 the struggle that many parents face in providing

4 proper child care or caring for elderly relatives or

5 family members. These measures afford a level of

6 predictability in their work schedules and are

7 extremely important for workers, especially at the

8 lower end of the wage scale.

And I've outlined why we support each of the particular bills, but I won't go into that now.

The start reality is clear; workers in occupations across the labor market are at considerable risk of unpredictable and unstable work hours over which they have little control.

The ability to find stable work with predictable income has become a luxury in the 20th century. As a city, we have made considerable strides in wage increases, universal pre-K, and paid sick leave.

Yet many part-time workers are not able to take advantage of these benefits when work schedules are erratic and last-minute changes can cost them their job. The measures before you today are a good first step and we encourage you to

1

2

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

2 consider similar challenges faced by workers in other

3 sectors in the future.

2.2

2.3

The Women's City Club strongly urges the City Council to pass this Fair Workweek legislation. As a city, state and nation, we can only be stronger when we adopt measures that level the playing field and improve the quality of life for all.

[bell]

and how timely that was. Thank you for your advocacy there. You know what; I'm going to pass it to the Council Member here, because I think that you've articulated a lot of viewpoints that we're very much concerned about and the level of expertise kind of just adds to what we've seen, but I'm sure that Brad wants to drill down on it a little bit more.

want to say thank you to Sherry for lifting up the Right to Request bill; I think for good reason we are here focus... you know, we've got the fast food employees here and obviously those conditions demand change, but I have come to see through some of your work the power that Right to Request can have for workers across the income scale; the ability -- you

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 know and there is some tension here; you want more 3 predictability than involuntary part-time fast food 4 workers have; you also want people to be able to be in some dialogue with their employers to achieve mutual goals and the Right to Request legislation I 6 7 think can really help us do that, so thank you for lifting it up; we will have to work a little on this 8 kind of interactive process and finding a way to balance making it work, but I do want to assure it's 10 11 a piece of the package. I know Council Member Rose, who's had her own work life balance to achieve and 12

luckily they had an employer that made it more

possible. But we will be working with you to get

this bill in good shape and definitely, I'm certainly

committed to making sure it lands in a strong place

SHERRY LEIWANT: Thank you, Brad and thank you for your leadership and I want to thank the Committee as well. And yes, I mean there are definitely the process issues that we heard today; want to work on it, but I think as part of the whole package, and we're totally committed as well to the other pieces that really help the fast food industry

and retail, where there's been so many problems, but

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

1213

14

15

1617

18

1920

21

22

23

24

25

I think it's two sides of the coin to a certain extent, so the fact that it's all in one package I think is one thing that makes it extremely good for workers here in the city and really recognizes all the problems that they face. So thank you so much.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Thank you.

Thank you so much.

SHERRY LEIWANT: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER:

Next -- Pamela Majors, Jose Carillo, Jorel Ware, Jose Sanchez, Vianny Vargas; is that it? [background That's it for our testimony? I want to comment thank everyone... [crosstalk, background comment] I'm sorry? [background comment] There's more? [background comments] Hold on -- Edwin Cabrera, Rose Rivera, Wilton Major, Edica Reese, Mercedes Ramirez, Michael DeFreitas, Flavia Cabral; Vance Brooks. is it. Okay. I'd like to thank everyone for coming out; it has been a long and productive day; we discussed many matters on both sides of this issue; we look forward to working with advocates and industry folks as we further this legislation and most importantly, we look forward to the passage and signing of this legislation and to continue to uplift working families throughout this city. With that I'd

1	COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND LABOR 218
2	like to thank Council Member he made a quick exit
3	Lander for hanging in there with me and all those
4	who have stayed to testify and hear the testimony on
5	these very important issues I'd like to thank you
6	again and with that thank you, Gregory Rose, my
7	legislative director, for all the work that he has
8	done and all those who have testified; with that, we
9	will adjourn the hearing.
1,0	[gavel]
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	

World Wide Dictation certifies that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. We further certify that there is no relation to any of the parties to this action by blood or marriage, and that there is interest in the outcome of this matter.



Date April 2, 2017