CITY	COL	JNCII	_
CITY	OF	NEW	YORK

----X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

of the

COMMITTEE ON CONTRACTS

----X

April 30, 2012 Start: 10:38 a.m. Recess: 11:50 a.m.

HELD AT: Council Chambers

City Hall

B E F O R E:

DARLENE MEALY Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Robert Jackson Letitia James

Melissa Mark-Viverito Michael C. Nelson

2 CHAIRPERSON MEALY: Good morning.

My name is Darlene Mealy. I serve as the Chair of the New York City Council Committee on Contracts. It is my pleasure to welcome you all here today for the vote on proposed Intro 251-A—the Living Wage Bill. Thank you all for attending. Before we proceed, I would like to recognize my fellow Council Members; Council Member Mike Nelson, Mr. Robert Jackson, and Council Member Oliver Koppell and Council Member Letitia James.

Proposed Intro 251-A would require direct recipients of financial assistance from the city to pay employees a minimum of \$10 an hour plus health benefits or \$11.50 per hour without health benefits. The Committee has held two hearings on prior versions of this legislation, and while the details of the bill have changed, the principle behind the law remains the same. When the city spends taxpayer dollars to create jobs, it should make sure that they are good paying jobs—jobs that would help New Yorkers support themselves and their families. This bill ensures that fair wages can be provided in a way that does not threaten job growth. I am proud to

2.

be a co-sponsor of this legislation, and just for
the record, I would like to just thank Reverend
Anita Bernsen [phonetic], who is head of
operations. She was a strong advocate on this
regards, and now we will turn it over to-and the
union also-I will turn it over to Mr. Oliver
Koppell who is the sponsor of the bill

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. I'm delighted we've come to this point with the living wage legislation, which—is it on?

MALE VOICE: It's on now.

COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL: Oh sorry.

I'm pleased that we've come to this stage and hopefully, later passage of the living wage legislation, which of course arose out of the debate concerning the development of the - - with heavy city subsidy where those of us in the Bronx in the Council particularly with the support of many of our colleagues from across the city insisted that if those subsidies were going to be given to the developer related company, they should guarantee living wages at the job site.

One of the responses to that argument was, "well,

this project should not be singled out. If we're
going to do something like this, it should be done
generally for subsidized projects wherever they
may be built in the city of New York." So after we
defeated the request to modify requirements with
respect to the Kings site and the developer
pulled out, we put in legislation which responded
to that particular demand and provided for living
wage requirements with respect to subsidized
projects throughout the city. Once we did that,
one might have expected those who opposed us on
King to come aboard, but they did not.
Notwithstanding the fact that living wage
legislation is in fact enforced in various
incarnations if you will if different ways in
different cities, notably I might mention Los
Angeles, San Francisco and Pittsburgh, but there
are many other communities that have these
requirements, and we have these requirements for
certain other jobs which the city supports,
including home care workers and of course, we've
had wage requirements with respect to government
supported projects that go back to the 1930s where
the Davis Bacon [phonetic] legislation under

federal law, which requires that federally
subsidized projects that construction workers at
federally subsidized projects be paid not only
living wages, but prevailing wages. That law was
signed into law by the well-known leftist
Herbert Hoover. I'm obviously being facetious,
but Herbert Hoover signed the Davis Bacon law in
the 30s, and as I say, he wasn't known as a
liberal. We now have legislation that is somewhat
limited because it applies only to the direct
recipient of subsidy, but clearly, direct
recipient of subsidy is the person who should be
held most responsible for paying living wage. In
addition, I might point out that the legislation
has language in it that encourages in very strong
way the city's economic development agency to take
into account living wage provisions when approving
projects in the future, and hopefully, the EDC or
whatever or the Economic Development Agency may be
involved will take those injunctions to heart and
we have very broad reporting statutes, reporting
requirements that will look at whether people in
these subsidized projects will pay the living
wage. Another important provision is that in

stadiums and arenas—and while we have built a
number unfortunately before this law takes place;
I'm sure there will be more in the future-
concessioners have to pay living wage. So I think
we are making a very important step forward
indicating a policy of this Council and hopefully,
of this city and I'm very proud to be a lead
sponsor and appreciate the Speaker giving her
support on this legislation. I thank the Chair,
who as chair of this Committee became a co-sponsor
of this legislation I want to thank. I also want
to say that many people around the city, including
particularly the clergy, have been lobbying for
well over a year-see this as a moral issue in
addition to an economic issue, and I want to pay
particular tribute to some of the key supporters
particularly the Bronx Borough President who led
this fight, and we have in the audience today, Al
Rodriguez [phonetic], counsel to the Borough
President and Tom McKenian[phonetic], also on the
staff of the Borough President who worked very
hard to fashion this legislation, and of course,
the RWDSU, which was the union in the lead. There
are other unions too. We have Adam here who

2.

worked very hard on this with us and with the
Speaker's Office, and many, many thousands who
demonstrated, who came to our Council meetings and
who I think will see some real results from their
efforts in their advocacy. So Madam Chair, I'm
delighted that this is on the agenda. I hope it
will move out and then pass later today in the
Stated meeting

CHAIRPERSON MEALY: Thank you. Any other colleagues? We've been joined by Mark-Viverito. She would like to have words.

COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:

Thank you, Madam Chair, and I just want to congratulate Council Member Koppell, - - and all those obviously that have been mentioned, the Borough President, RWDSU. I just want to make a comment. I really have been highly offended as I'm sure many have been with regards to our Mayor's comments last week when it came to his statements regarding prevailing wage and the living wage. We had a hearing here several weeks ago with the Community Development Committee that has the Commission on Economic Opportunity—the "Poverty Commission"—that the Mayor had set up to

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

talk about the new indicator, right? And being a more comprehensive indicator that really captures quality of life, how expensive it is to live in New York City, and according to their own figures what that revised indicator—poverty has increased in the city of New York. We have 28% of our children living in poverty. The rate of poverty overall increased by 1.3%, and according to them themselves that even if you were to factor someone that was making minimum wage working full-time with safety net programs like food stamps, et cetera that person would still and that family would still be well below the poverty level. That is not acceptable in this city. We should be aspiring to a higher standard. We should be encouraging our businesses to be paying better and providing better benefits, and that is the policy that we should be enacting in the city. That is the message that we're sending not only through the prevailing wage bill, but also now with the living wage bill, that we aspire to help families have quality jobs that are going to lift them out of poverty. We should not be aspiring to be a city that has wages to the bottom when it comes to

2	wages and benefits, so I am very proud of signing
3	onto this bill. I stand side by side with all
4	those, and I really want to thank Speaker Quinn
5	for her very strong comments in response to the
6	Mayor's comments against these two bills and now
7	will become law because it is about the middle
8	class and the working poor in the city that we
9	need to help, and that is the message of these
10	bills that will be law in the city of New York.
11	So thank you very much to all that made this
12	happen.
13	CHAIRPERSON MEALY: Again, thank
14	you all for attending. With no further to do, we
15	will let-now take the vote. We'll have roll call.
16	COMMITTEE CLERK: Kevin Pin,
17	Committee Clerk. Roll call in the Committee on
18	Contracts, Intro 251-A. Council Member Mealy?
19	CHAIRPERSON MEALY: Aye.
20	COMMITTEE CLERK: Nelson?
21	COUNCIL MEMBER NELSON: May I be
22	excused to explain my vote? It's not easy—a
23	vote. People may think it's just so easy to do
24	this. I don't think the Mayor is being a bad guy
25	with this. He has got to be a fiscal watchdog in

this city. Every time I drive along the BQE and I
look at Jersey City, I think to myself, this is
brought to you by New York City taxes and company.
I'm going to vote aye on this by the way 'cause I
want to put it onto the full floor as well. I'm
afraid some of these intros adversely impact our
economy and actually cause jobs to dissipate
for one. To ask for this amount of money is
certainly not too much. This is not even enough
quite frankly for somebody who lives in New York
City and that's why I'm balancing this all out,
but I don't see a clear decision on what is best
for the city of New York and the citizenry itself.
Will you get another thousand people happy and
then mess up another ten thousand? I do not
know. So I'm going to-having said all that, I'm
going to vote aye.

COMMITTEE CLERK: Jackson?

yes. Clearly anytime we give a business a million dollars of city money, it's not too much to tell them, not even ask them, but to tell them that they must pay their employees at least \$10 an hour with benefits or \$11.50 without. It's a no

2	brainer, and if anyone thinks that that is not the
3	case, then switch places with those individuals
4	that are earning less than that and they will get
5	a wake up to reality. I vote absolutely yes.
6	COMMITTEE CLERK: James?
7	COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES: Some
8	businesses have made record profits in this city
9	and this state and in this country, and too many
LO	people are living below the poverty level in the
11	city of New York, particularly children. The
12	fastest growing population living in homeless
13	shelters tonight will be children. This is the
L4	least that we can do in this state and in the
15	economy, and I proudly cast my vote in the
16	affirmative and vote aye so that we move this bill
L7	and I believe it's a step in the right direction.
L8	I'm looking forward in the future as we expand it.
L9	Thank you.
20	COMMITTEE CLERK: Mark-Viverito?
21	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO: Vote
22	aye.
23	COMMITTEE CLERK: By a vote of five
24	in the affirmative, zero in the negative-
25	COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL:

б

[Interposing] Before you close the roll, I omitted
to mention that my counsel, who spent many,
many hours on this has been instrumental in
putting this bill together and he should be
recognized as well. Thank you.

COMMITTEE CLERK: By a vote of five in the affirmative, zero in the negative and no abstentions, the item has been adopted. Members, please sign the Committee Report.

CHAIRPERSON MEALY: And for the record, do we have another? Well, one thing, we want to thank our borough president of the Bronx and RWDSU and just remember, Mr. Koppell, Mr. Koppell, when the mayor said that a lot of companies would leave the city if this bill passed, and I can say I know a lot of people will continue coming to the city. You cannot make money here. You cannot make money anywhere. And this is the Big Apple, so I am proud to co-sponsor this bill, and this meeting is now adjourned. Thank you.

23 [gavel]

I, Kimberley Uhlig certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. I further certify that I am not related to any of the parties to this action by blood or marriage, and that I am in no way interested in the outcome of this matter.

Signature Kimberley Uhlig

Date 5/17/12