

Approaching a \$15 Minimum Wage at Trent University

Includes:

Final Report

By

Rachel Flinders

Completed for: OPIRG

Supervising Professor: Heather Nicol

Trent Community Research Centre Project Coordinator: David Tough

Department:	Geography
Course Code:	4030Y
Course Name:	Community Based Research in Geography
Term:	2016-2017 Fall - Winter
Date of Project Submission:	April 2017
Project ID:	4674

Trent Community Research Centre

www.trentcentre.ca

Approaching a \$15 Minimum Wage at Trent University

Community Based Thesis

**Presented to H. Nicol of the
Department of Geography**

Trent University

**In partial fulfilment of the
requirement for the degree of
Bachelor of Science**

By

Rachel Flinders

**Department of Geography
Trent University
Peterborough, Ontario
April 16, 2017**

Dedication and Acknowledgements

Firstly, I'd like to thank Kay Ma from OPIRG Peterborough for proposing this project to the Geography Department of Trent University, and for being so helpful and accommodating during the research and writing process of this report. I would also like to thank Naser Miftari, who recently became OPIRG Peterborough's new coordinator, for his insight in the final stages of the research process, which challenged me to further contemplate the contents of my discussion and conclusion. I believe our work together has created a solid platform for further research to be built upon in the near future, in terms of bringing a \$15 minimum wage to Trent University and Peterborough.

Secondly, I'd like to thank David Tough as my coordinator from the Trent Community Research Centre who was the voice of reason for this project. Thank you for encouraging me when I felt lost or overwhelmed, and for helping me keep my research on track. You made my final experience at Trent relatively stress-free and I am forever grateful!

I would also like to thank my professor Dr. Heather Nicol for her unwavering encouragement and guidance throughout this endeavor. You have made my final year at Trent one to remember, and I am extremely grateful for the priceless knowledge I have gained from you for the past 7 months. Thank you for providing me with everything I was truly hoping to experience in the final year of my undergraduate career!

Lastly from the University, I would like to thank Marilyn Miller (past secretary of the Geography Department) and Mary O'Grady for their guidance and support throughout my time at Trent. You never failed to make me feel a little more confident and calm when I was feeling lost or overwhelmed, and you encouraged me at the times when I was feeling the most insecure about my education or even myself. Thank you for everything you have done, and continue to do! You are amazing!

Finally, I would also like to thank my family and friends for their support and encouragement throughout my educational career. Particularly to my mom, dad, grandparents, and fiancé... thank you for being the encouragement, the strength, the love and the motivation that kept me going, and allowed me to become the person I am today. You are my rocks – this is for you just as much as it is for me. We did it!

Thank you all for being a part of the most challenging, but the most unequivocally rewarding experience of my life thus far. Words are not enough!

Table of Contents

Contents

1. Introduction	2
1.1 The \$15 Minimum Wage Movement.....	2
1.2 (OPIRG) Ontario Public Interest Research Group	2
1.3 Introduction to the Project	3
1.31 Purpose	3
1.32 Research Questions.....	3
1.33 Geographical Relevance.....	3
1.4 Methodological Approach	4
1.41 Study location	5
1.5 Difference in Economic Inflation.....	6
1.51 The Kaitz Index: A Ratio of Minimum Wage to Full-Time Median Wage	6
1.52 Determining a Minimum Wage to Median Wage Ratio	8
2. Case Studies	10
2.1 San Francisco.....	10
2.11 Proposition J.....	11
2.12 Posting Notice Regarding Minimum Wage Ordinance	13
2.13 Payroll Records.....	13
2.14 Retaliation	14
2.15 Violation and Consequences.....	14
2.2 New York City & State	16
2.21 Following San Francisco’s Lead	16
2.22 Trends in the Wage Schedule: New York City.....	18
2.23 Trends in the Wage Schedule: New York State.....	18
2.24 Comparing Wage Schedule Trends: City vs State	19
2.25 Increases in Industries.....	19
2.3 Alberta.....	22

2.31 Trends in the Wage Schedule: The Province of Alberta	23
2.32 Basic Rules.....	24
3. \$15 Minimum Wage at Post-Secondary Campuses.....	25
3.1 University of Washington	25
3.12 The Services and Activities Fee Committee	25
3.2 University of California.....	26
3.3 York University.....	26
3.31 Campaign Activities at York University	27
4. Discussion.....	29
4.1 Overview of Case Studies.....	29
4.11 San Francisco.....	29
4.12 New York City and State.....	30
4.13 Province of Alberta	30
4.2 Overview of Post-Secondary Campuses	31
4.21 The University of Washington.....	31
4.22 University of California.....	32
4.23 York University	32
4.3 Proposing a General Model	32
4.31 Public Proposition	33
4.32 Public Vote	33
4.33 Posting Notice Regarding Minimum Wage Ordinance	33
4.34 Payroll Records.....	33
4.35 Retaliation, Violation and Consequences	34
4.36 Wage Schedules	34
4.37 Institution Contractors.....	34
4.38 Basic Rules.....	34
5. Conclusion.....	35
5.1 Recommendations	35
6. References	36

List of Tables

Contents

Table 1 Minimum Wage to Median Wage Ratio 7

Table 2 Consumer Price Index by Canadian City (Monthly) 8

Table 3 Minimum Wage Increase for the City of San Francisco from 2015, Forward..... 11

Table 4 Official Summary Report of Proposition J..... 12

Table 5 Penalties and Citations for Violations Regarding San Francisco's Minimum Wage Code 15

Table 6 Wage Schedule of the Proposed Policy in New York 17

Table 7 Industries Affected by Minimum Wage Increases in New York..... 20

Table 8 Cumulative Change in Operating Costs for Selected Industries in New York, 2021 21

Table 9 Upcoming Changes to Minimum Wage in Alberta, 2016 – 2018..... 23

List of Figures

Contents

Figure 1 York University’s Wall of Wages 27

Abstract

The goal of this report is to research post-secondary campuses and cities that have implemented a \$15 minimum wage, as well as campaigns and concrete strategies for doing so. Guided by this research, it will propose the best approach to implementing a \$15 minimum wage at Trent University and in Peterborough. The methodological approach used to address the research questions raised in this particular study will be to acquire and analyze data through the completion of a comprehensive literary review of previously available and related knowledge, as obtained from primarily academic, government and university website documents. Successful movements toward a \$15 minimum wage as experienced in the City and County of San Francisco, the City and State of New York, and the province of Alberta are analyzed. Successful movements toward a \$15 minimum wage the in post-secondary institutions of the University of Washington, the University of California, and York University are also analyzed. From this research, the most important aspects of a successful \$15 minimum wage movement are identified, and a general model to approaching a \$15 minimum wage has been created. It is recommended that moving forward in campaigning for and/or implementing a \$15 minimum wage in Trent and Peterborough, that this general model be considered as a guide. It is also recommended that further research be completed on the effects of a \$15 minimum wage on the Trent University and Peterborough Economy, prior to implementation.

1. Introduction

1.1 The \$15 Minimum Wage Movement

In March of 2013 following a four year minimum wage freeze at \$10.25 across Ontario, the Campaign to Raise the Minimum Wage was launched (\$15 and Fairness Campaign, 2016). Communities across the province demanded that the Ontario government ‘melt the freeze,’ and as a result, in 2014 minimum wage was increased to \$11.00. Movements in the United States began to surge in 2014, supported by campaigns demanding a \$15 minimum wage, paid sick days, better hours and unionization. Inspired by this idea, individuals across Ontario came together to create the \$15 and Fairness Campaign, which is a social movement that fights for a \$15 minimum wage for all Ontario employees with no exemptions. The movement also demands *decent hours for decent incomes*, which encompasses the promotion of full-time, permanent employment, fair scheduling, no exemptions from paid overtime, and at least 3 weeks of paid vacation to be made available on an annual basis. The \$15 and Fairness Campaign also asks for worker’s right to organize and unionize, respect in the workplace, paid sick days, and universal employment standards coverage that provides minimum standards to protect all workers.

1.2 (OPIRG) Ontario Public Interest Research Group

The specific research questions for this project were presented to Trent University by OPIRG, which is a student run initiative that aims to “create and sustain student and community-based engagement through research, education, and action in social justice” (OPIRG, 2016). The idea for OPIRG’s research proposal arose from the \$15 and Fairness Campaigns, which were inspired by similar movements fighting for standard minimum wages among other demands.

OPIRG has determined they would like to research the possibility of approaching and implementing a \$15 minimum wage at Trent University and in the City of Peterborough, and have created specific research questions that this study will aim to answer.

1.3 Introduction to the Project

1.31 Purpose

The purpose of this project is to research post-secondary campuses and cities that have implemented a \$15 minimum wage, as well as campaigns and concrete strategies for doing so. Guided by this research, it will propose the best approach to implementing a \$15 minimum wage at Trent University and in Peterborough.

1.32 Research Questions

As proposed by OPIRG Peterborough, there are three key research questions which will be investigated in this study. They are as follows:

- a) What post-secondary campuses and movements in other cities have implemented a \$15 minimum wage, or have campaigned for/developed a strategy to do so?
- b) How have these minimum wage campaigns/movements in other cities been successful in obtaining their goals?
- c) What might the best practices for Trent University to consider in implementing this \$15 minimum wage be?

1.33 Geographical Relevance

In terms of its academic context, the research topic is most relevant from a human geographical perspective, a field that explores the behaviour of humans as they interact with different components of their environment (Norton, 2013). Minimum wage differs widely by geographical location and as such affects a wide range of human activities. The topic of a \$15 minimum wage is interlinked within the geographical sub-disciplines of population, politics and economics, and can even be associated with the concept of urbanization. In order to make these important connections between the research topic, the academic study of geography and everyday society, the methodology described in the following section has been selected and utilized.

1.4 Methodological Approach

As stated in section 1.31 *Purpose*, the goal of this report is to research post-secondary campuses and cities that have implemented a \$15 minimum wage, as well as campaigns and concrete strategies for doing so. Guided by this research, it will propose the best approach to implementing a \$15 minimum wage at Trent University and in Peterborough. The methodological approach used to address the research questions raised in this particular study will be to acquire and analyze data through the completion of a comprehensive literary review of previously available and related knowledge, as obtained from a variety of sources.

According to Hart (1998), a literature review is an important document, or set of documents, that provide an overall understanding of a given topic, how it has been applied and developed, and provides a context of comparison to other relatable topics. Literature reviews provide an understanding of previous studies, key issues that are involved, as well as criticisms and difficulties encountered in any related work. These are all important variables to consider when completing any research project.

Undertaking a literature review is often viewed as an obvious, easily completed task (Hart, 1998). However a proper and succinct literature review that contains the required information to answer a given research question adequately is rather difficult to achieve. A literature review involves the partitioning of large quantities of quality information from a variety of sources, which provides "appropriate breadth and depth, rigor and consistency, clarity and brevity, and effective analysis and synthesis" (Hart, 1998). Depending on the particular topic and the amount of previously related literature, this task can be difficult to complete. It is important to note that poor reviews of topic literature are not always the fault of the writing researcher, as it is possible that there can be a lack in research education or available data on the topic.

During the completion of the comprehensive literature review, concrete evidence of the \$15 minimum wage movement was discovered in primarily academically peer reviewed literature from Berkeley University. Government policies from Canada, Alberta, as well as the City and County of San Francisco and the Office of Labor Enforcement Standards also constituted for much of the research regarding minimum wage changes. Lastly, news articles, academic books and information from various university websites was also compiled and utilized to come to the conclusions as discussed in this study. These sources provided the most concrete evidence of either implementation of or campaigning for a \$15 minimum wage in Canada and the United States, and are analyzed throughout the study.

1.41 Study location

For this particular study, the City of Peterborough and the residing institutional community of Trent University will be identified as possible candidates for the \$15 minimum wage movement. Minimum wage greatly differs with job category and geographical location due to variance in provincial laws; is it important to therefore research relevant data specifically from Ontario (Ontario Ministry of Labour, 2016). However it is integral to note that in the absence of adequate data relating to the \$15 minimum wage movement in Ontario, it may be necessary to utilize data from elsewhere, but with discretion.

In conducting research for this study, it was determined that following federal inaction in regards to the four year minimum wage freeze prior to 2013, the first major wage breakthroughs were experienced by cities in the United States (\$15 and Fairness Campaign, 2016) (Reich et al., 2014). These cities primarily consisted of San Francisco, Los Angeles and New York, and will be further discussed in *Section 2 – Case Studies*. However, as the \$15 minimum wage movement has only been present since approximately 2013, there is only 3 years' worth of available literature that is relative to this study, limiting the extent of the literature review. Furthermore, according to Duff (2016), popular support for the \$15 minimum wage has been sweeping the continent of North America, with the most important victories at present located in cities in the United States. With very limited information available for Ontario specifically in regards to implementing or campaigning for a \$15 minimum wage, the ample data provided by minimum wage movements in the US will thus be largely used as representative models for the City of Peterborough and the post-secondary institution of Trent University.

1.5 Difference in Economic Inflation

1.51 The Kaitz Index: A Ratio of Minimum Wage to Full-Time Median Wage

As previously mentioned in *Section 1.41 Study Location*, the Ontario Ministry of Labour (2016) states that minimum wage greatly differs with job category and geographical location due to variance in laws in different regions. Thus, in order for economists to interpret and compare minimum wage data from one location against another, a standard metric is undoubtedly required.

In response to this dilemma, a minimum wage metric known as the Kaitz Index, a *ratio of minimum wage to full-time median wage*, was created (Reich et al., 2016) (Manhattan Institute, 2016). It is a measure of economic inequality, and aids in determining the effectiveness of how a particular minimum wage can be absorbed into a regional labor market and the economy (Reich et al., 2016).

According to the Manhattan Institute (2016), there is a global Kaitz Index benchmark of 0.5, and represents that the minimum wage is exactly half of the median full-time wage for that particular location. If the Kaitz ratio is too low (i.e. less than the global benchmark of 0.5), “the wage floor cannot lift low-wage workers toward the middle class” (Manhattan Institute, 2016). On the contrary, if the ratio of minimum to median wage is too high (i.e. greater than the global benchmark of 0.5), “the wage floor may significantly distort the labor market by forcing wages too far above their natural market level for too large a share of the workforce” (Manhattan Institute, 2016). That is to say, a ratio far less or far greater than the standard 0.5 would have negative impacts on the labor market, and thus a target 0.5 Kaitz ratio is the preferred economic goal in terms of wages.

Table 1.1 is from (Reich et al., 2016), and portrays the minimum wage to median wage ratio for locations that have been successful in moving toward a \$15 minimum wage in the United States. Minimum wages to median wage ratios as well as the percent of workers experiencing a pay increase are displayed for New York City and State, California State, as well as the Californian cities of San Francisco, Seattle, and Los Angeles. While the States of New York and California, as well as the City of Los Angeles all contained a ratio greater than 0.6, the average minimum to median wage ratio for all locations on the table is 0.6. Although this ratio is greater than the global Kaitz Index standard of 0.5, it is not by copious amount (Manhattan Institute, 2016). Thus, it can be assumed that the ratios portrayed on the table are the result of relative wages that have positive impacts on the labor markets and economy.

Table 1 Minimum Wage to Median Wage Ratio

Table 1	Minimum wage to median wage ratio	Percent of workers getting pay increases
New York State		
New York City	0.57	34.8
Balance of New York State	0.63	38.3
Other states and localities		
California	0.65	34.4
Los Angeles City	0.67	41.3
Seattle	0.53	29.0
San Francisco	0.46	23.4

Table 1 is derived from (Reich et al., 2016) and depicts the minimum wage to median wage ratio for the States of New York and California, as well as the cities of San Francisco, Seattle and Los Angeles. The percent of workers getting a pay increase is also conveyed. The average Kaitz ratio is approximately 0.6 for all locations, indicating wages have positive impacts on the relative labor force and economy.

The Kaitz Index is an integral component in determining if implementing a \$15 minimum wage in a specific location would be economically feasible (Manhattan Institute, 2016). The Manhattan Institute (2016) provides a great illustration of how the Kaitz Index works, using Myrtle Beach and Washington in the United States as an example. If proposing a \$15 minimum wage in a location like Myrtle Beach where the current median wage level is less than \$13 an hour, it would be economically equivalent to raising the minimum wage in a location like Washington to \$30 an hour. In terms of current economic growth rates, the national median wage will take approximately 25 years to reach \$30 an hour Washington should not reach \$30 an hour for approximately 25 years, while Myrtle Beach would take 45 years to reach a median wage of \$30 an hour. In this sense, the Kaitz Index rationalizes the economic inequality of raising wages, specifically to \$15 an hour, in different locations.

In terms of implementing a \$15 minimum wage at Trent University and in the City of Peterborough, the Kaitz Index could be quite useful in determining the outcome of various

wage variables within the local job market and economy. The use of this index in this study will be further discussed in *Section 5.1 Recommendations*.

1.52 Determining a Minimum Wage to Median Wage Ratio

To determine a minimum wage to median wage ratio, or Kaitz Index, it is first necessary to compile population data containing wages for the given region (Manhattan Institute, 2016) (Reich et al., 2016). This information typically arises from survey data, and is then utilized to determine median wages for the previous year. The median full-time wage is then inflated based on a core inflation index for the area. In Canada, this core inflation index is known as the Consumer Price Index (Government of Canada, 2016).

Table 2 is derived from the Government of Canada (2017), and portrays the Consumer Price Index by Canadian City on a monthly basis as of Feb 24 2017. It is an example of the information required to determine the Kaitz Index for a particular region.

Table 2 Consumer Price Index by Canadian City (Monthly)

Table 2	January 2016	December 2016	January 2017	December 2016 to January 2017	January 2016 to January 2017
	2002=100			% change	
All-items					
St. John's (N.L.)	128.9	133.7	134.9	0.9	4.7
Charlottetown and Summerside (P.E.I.)	128.6	130.2	131.6	1.1	2.3
Halifax (N.S.)	128.2	129.5	130.5	0.8	1.8
Saint John (N.B.)	125.9	128.2	130.0	1.4	3.3
Québec (Que.)	124.5	125.2	126.1	0.7	1.3
Montréal (Que.)	124.8	125.5	126.2	0.6	1.1
Ottawa-Gatineau (Ont. part)	126.5	128.1	128.9	0.6	1.9
Toronto (Ont.)	129.0	131.5	132.1	0.5	2.4
Thunder Bay (Ont.)	122.8	124.2	124.9	0.6	1.7
Winnipeg (Man.)	126.7	127.6	129.4	1.4	2.1
Regina (Sask.)	131.5	132.2	133.9	1.3	1.8
Saskatoon (Sask.)	131.5	131.8	133.6	1.4	1.6
Edmonton (Alta.)	133.4	134.7	136.9	1.6	2.6
Calgary (Alta.)	134.3	135.3	137.4	1.6	2.3
Vancouver (B.C.)	122.7	124.7	125.3	0.5	2.1
Victoria (B.C.)	118.9	121.0	121.6	0.5	2.3
Whitehorse (Y.T.)	124.1	126.1	126.9	0.6	2.3
Yellowknife (N.W.T.)	130.7	131.9	133.6	1.3	2.2

Table 2 depicts the Consumer Price Index (CPI) by Canadian City in January 2016, December 2016 and January 2017. Furthermore, Table 1 portrays the percent change in CPI from December 2016 to January

2017, and January 2016 to January 2017. This information is required to inflate the median full-time wage of a particular area when determining the Kaitz Index.

2. Case Studies

In the face of federal inaction, cities and states have moved to become the forefront of minimum wage increases, and \$15 minimum wage movements are now sweeping across North America (Reich et al., 2016) (Duff, 2016). The most important victories at present are located in cities and regions within the United States, beginning with the implementation of a \$15 minimum wage in the City of San Francisco, California. Starting with San Francisco, *Section 2.1*, of *Case Studies* will analyze each city's wage plan in regards to a \$15 minimum. Inspired by the success experienced by San Francisco, the cities of Seattle and Los Angeles implemented a similarly efficient \$15 minimum wage plan shortly thereafter (Reich et al., 2014) (Reich et al., 2016). Also inspired by San Francisco, the Canadian province of Alberta and their recent movement to a \$15 minimum wage will be investigated (Government of Alberta, 2017). Finally, some of the most successful \$15 minimum wage movements in post-secondary institutions in Canada and in the United States will be introduced, and their campaigns analyzed.

2.1 San Francisco

The first place to successfully increase the minimum wage to \$15 an hour was San Francisco, California, in 2014 (Reich et al., 2014). San Francisco is not only known as the city responsible for *spearheading* the \$15 minimum wage movement - it was also the first city in the United States to adopt a universal minimum wage law in 2003. Reich (2014) states that although there *is* previous literature relating to a \$15 minimum wage prior to San Francisco, this research is suggestive and thus cannot definitively determine the effects of increasing minimum wage "beyond existing local, state, or federal mandate" (Reich et al., 2014). As a model for other cities also considering implementing a \$15 minimum wage, it is the first to be analyzed.

2.11 Proposition J

On November 4th 2014, citizens of the City of San Francisco voted to pass Proposition J, a policy which would effectively raise the minimum wage to \$15 by 2018 (City and County of San Francisco, 2017). San Francisco mayor Ed Lee referred to the proposition as a “compromise between a coalition of labor interests and business interests” (City and County of San Francisco, 2017). According to the Ballot Simplification Committee (2014), Proposition J would increase the minimum wage in San Francisco on May 1 2015 to \$12.25 per hour. On July 1 2016, the minimum wage would increase to \$13 per hour, and July 1st of 2017 would increase again to \$14 an hour. July 1 2018 the minimum wage will increase to \$15 an hour. Furthermore, beginning July 1 2019 and every year thereafter, the minimum wage in San Francisco will increase annually based on core inflation rates. A date for which this minimum wage increase will halt was not given, and it can therefore be assumed that this will be a perpetual movement in San Francisco.

The following table is derived from the City and County of San Francisco (2017), and portrays the increase in minimum wage from May 1 2015, to July 1 2018 and beyond, as determined by Proposition J. The complete copy of Proposition J as created by the City Council of San Francisco can be located in **Appendix A**.

Table 3 Minimum Wage Increase for the City of San Francisco from 2015, Forward

Table 3	
Effective Date	Minimum Wage Rate
5/1/2015	\$12.25
7/1/2016	\$13.00
7/1/2017	\$14.00
7/1/2018	\$15.00
July 1st Each Following Year	CPI Increase

Table 3 is from the City and County of San Francisco (2017), and portrays the minimum wage increase schedule as proposed in Proposition J for the City of San Francisco from May 1, 2015 onward.

In San Francisco, the minimum wage was \$12.25 as of May 1, 2015, and increased to \$0.75 to \$13 an hour as of July 1, 2016 (City and County of San Francisco, 2017). This is the smallest increment of wage increase within San Francisco’s wage schedule. On July 1 of 2017, the minimum wage will increase \$1 to \$14. The City will reach the target \$15 an hour on with another wage increase of \$1 on July 1, 2018. Furthermore, on July 1st of each year following, the minimum wage rate will continue to increase as per San Francisco’s Consumer Price Index. The wage increments increase by a maximum of \$1.00, unless the CPI inflation determines otherwise in 2019 and forward.

Following a summary of the proposition, was a concluding statement of what a vote “yes” or “no” would imply. A vote “yes” would imply that the voter wants the City of San Francisco to increase the minimum wage to \$15 an hour as of July 1, 2018. On the contrary, a vote “no” would imply that the voter does not want the City of San Francisco to increase the minimum wage.

The following table is derived from the City and County of San Francisco (2014) and portrays the summary of votes in regards to Proposition J. 77.43% of people voted “yes” for a \$15 minimum wage by July 1 2018.

Table 4 Official Summary Report of Proposition J

Table 4

**Consolidated General Election
November 4, 2014
Summary Report
The City and County of San Francisco
Official Summary Report**

Local Measure J	597/597 100.00%
Yes	174,143 77.43%
No	50,771 22.57%
Total ...	224,914 100.00%

Table 4 is from the City and County of San Francisco (2014), and provides an official summary of the consolidated general election regarding Proposition J, or Local Measure J as it is referred to. Of a total of 224,914 votes, 174,143 or 77.43% were in favor of Proposition J, and 50,771 or 22.57% were *not* in favor of Proposition J. With the majority of votes in favor of the proposition, it was accepted.

2.12 Posting Notice Regarding Minimum Wage Ordinance

Prior to increasing the minimum wage, each employer in the City of San Francisco is responsible for posting a notice regarding the upcoming change in compensation (City and County of San Francisco, 2017). These notices are provided by the Office of Labor Standards Enforcement (2017) and the City of San Francisco, and must be posted by January 1 of the year in which the corresponding minimum wage increase will occur. The notices must be made available in every language spoken by 5% or more of the employee population, are to be printed on standard 8.5x11 inch printer paper, and must be clearly posted in a conspicuous, general location accessible to all workers. The most recent minimum wage notice as presented by the Office of Labor Standards Enforcement on January 1 of 2017 can be located in **Appendix B**. There is also an employee form that allows all workers to know and understand their rights in terms of minimum compensation ordinance, and is to be signed by the employee. The most recent of these forms as distributed by the Office of Labor Standards Enforcement on January 1 of 2017 can be located in **Appendix C**.

2.13 Payroll Records

Authorized to ensure all employers are abiding by the laws relating to minimum compensation ordinance (MCO), is the San Francisco Office of Labor Standards Enforcement (City and County of San Francisco, 2017). This agency is responsible for monitoring compliance by employers as the minimum wage increases annually. To ensure accuracy in monitoring, the Office of Labor Standards Enforcement states that all employers in the City of San Francisco must keep payroll records from the beginning of the minimum wage increase in 2014, through to July 1 of 2018 (Office of Labor Standards Enforcement, 2017) (City and County of San Francisco, 2017). In case of an audit, these records will aid in establishing whether a particular business has been complying with the San Francisco minimum compensation ordinance.

2.14 Retaliation

In the event that an employer refuses to comply with the minimum compensation ordinance, retaliation by employees is prohibited (City and County of San Francisco, 2017). Employers are restricted from retaliating against employees in search of more information regarding the minimum compensation ordinance. If an employee feels that they are being “discriminated or retaliated against for inquiring about or exercising rights under the MCO,” it is recommended that the Office of Labor Standards Enforcement be contacted and an MCO complaint can be filed (Office of Labor Standards Enforcement, 2017).

2.15 Violation and Consequences

There are consequences when violating any part of the MCO. A major violation of this ordinance can occur if an employer declines the right to let the Office of Labor Standards Enforcement complete an audit of their business (City and County of San Francisco, 2017). While the Labor agency does have a responsibility to make an employer well aware of an audit and to have it take place during regular business hours, declining an audit yields the same consequence as finding an inconsistency in the data, had an audit been completed. It can be considered an unlawful breach of Chapter 12R.7 of the San Francisco Minimum Wage Code. Depending on the violation, consequences can include, but are not limited to, legal action.

The following table is derived from the City and County of San Francisco’s Minimum Wage Code, and portrays the Chapter 12R.6 Penalties and Citations for violations of the MCO (City and County of San Francisco, 2017).

Table 5 Penalties and Citations for Violations Regarding San Francisco's Minimum Wage Code

Table 5 VIOLATION	PENALTY AMOUNT
Failure to maintain payroll records or to retain payroll records for four years – Administrative Code Section 12R.5(c)	\$500.00
Failure to allow the Office of Labor Standards Enforcement to inspect payroll records – Administrative Code Section 12R.5(c)	\$500.00
Retaliation for exercising rights under Minimum Wage Ordinance – Administrative Code Section 12R.6 The Penalty for retaliation is \$1,000.00 per employee.	\$1,000.00
Failure to Post notice of Minimum Wage rate – Administrative Code Section 12R.5(b) Failure to provide notice of investigation to employees – Administrative Code Section 12R.7(b) Failure to post notice of violation to public – Administrative Code Section 12R.7(e) Failure to provide employer’s name, address, and telephone number in writing – Administrative Code Section 12R.5(b)	\$500.00

Table 5 is derived from the Minimum Wage Code for the City and County of San Francisco (City and County of San Francisco, 2017). It depicts the type of minimum compensation ordinance (MCO) violation, and the corresponding penalty amount that must be paid is included.

According to Chapter 12R.6 of the minimum compensation ordinance for the City and County of San Francisco, there are 4 categories of violations (City and County of San Francisco, 2017). The first is failure of an employer to maintain payroll records from the beginning of the wage increase in 2015, through to obtaining a \$15 minimum wage in July of 2018. This is further discussed in *Section 2.13 Payroll Records*. The corresponding penalty amount is \$500.00. The second infraction is failure of an employer to allow the Office of Labor Standards Enforcement to inspect payroll records in the form of an audit. This is also further discussed in *Section 2.13 Payroll Records*. The corresponding penalty amount is \$500.00. The third category of violation is for an employer to retaliate against an employee, and is discussed in *Section 2.14 Retaliation*. The corresponding penalty is \$1000.00 *per* employee retaliated against. The final category of MCO infraction is failure of an employer to post notice regarding changes in the minimum wage rate. This is further discussed in *Section 2.12 Posting Notice Regarding Minimum Wage Ordinance*. This violation category also includes failure of an employer to provide notice of investigation to employees, to post notice of a violation in public, or failure to provide employer’s contact information in writing. The corresponding penalty for this violation is \$500.00.

In the event that a violation is made by an employer, payment of the corresponding penalty amounts are made to the City of San Francisco (City and County of San Francisco, 2017). Subsequent violations of the same provision and by the same employer within a three year period will receive a cumulative increase of 50% for each penalty, up to \$10,000 a year. Without a subsequent violation of the same provision, an employer can pay a maximum of \$5000 a year in penalties. Furthermore, depending on the particular case and violation, the Office of Labor Standards Enforcement may also incur additional costs - attorney fees for instance - which will rise above and beyond the annual maximum of \$10,000/\$5000 a year per employer.

2.2 New York City & State

2.21 Following San Francisco's Lead

Following San Francisco's lead in increasing the minimum wage, New York State modeled a very similar plan (Reich et al., 2016). The Governor of New York proposed an economy wide minimum wage of \$15 an hour in the City of New York by 2019, and on a larger scale, proposed a minimum wage of \$15 statewide by 2021. A public vote put this plan into action.

New York was the first location to propose a "minimum wage schedule", which consisted of a minimum wage plan occurring in seven phases over a period of five years. Table 6 is derived from Reich et al., (2016) and depicts each of the seven phases of minimum wage increase over five years in both New York City and New York State.

Table 6 Wage Schedule of the Proposed Policy in New York

Table 6

Year	Date	Minimum wage (nominal dollars)	Percent increase from previous year	Minimum wage (2015 dollars)	Percent increase from previous year (2015 dollars)
New York City					
2015	December 31	\$9.00		\$9.00	
2016	April 1	10.50	16.7	10.29	14.4
2016	December 31	12.00	14.3	11.77	14.3
2017	December 31	13.50	12.5	12.91	9.8
2018	December 31	15.00	11.1	13.98	8.2
2019	December 31*	15.41	2.7	13.98	0.0
2020	December 31*	15.82	2.7	13.98	0.0
2021	July 1*	16.25	2.7	13.98	0.0
Balance of New York State					
2015	December 31	\$9.00		\$9.00	
2016	April 1	9.75	8.3	9.56	6.2
2016	December 31	10.75	10.3	10.54	10.3
2017	December 31	11.75	9.3	11.24	6.6
2018	December 31	12.75	8.5	11.88	5.7
2019	December 31	13.75	7.8	12.48	5.0
2020	December 31	14.50	5.4	12.81	2.7
2021	July 1	15.00	3.4	12.91	0.8

Table 6 is derived from Reich et al., (2016) and depicts the proposed minimum wage schedule in New York City and State. The minimum wage in both New York City and State will increase from \$9.00 to *\$15.82 in seven stages over the duration of five years (from 2015 to 2020). The year and date for each wage increase, as well as the minimum wage in nominal dollars is displayed on the table. The percent increase, relative minimum wage based on 2015 dollars, as well as the percent increase from previous year based on 2015 dollars is also provided.

*On July 1st of 2021 and each year following, the minimum wage will increase based on inflation from the regional Consumer Price Index.

In order for Reich et al., (2016) to amalgamate the data required to create Table 6, information was compiled from the American Community Survey (ACS), which is the largest annual census survey in the United States. This data allows for assessment of number of workers affected and average pay increase for each affected worker. ACS data also includes place of work. The closest Canadian equivalent to this data would be information compiled in

the census by Statistics Canada (Statistics Canada, 2017). The 2011 National Household Survey would be most useful to gain access to similar parameters as the ACS. However, as the last Canadian National Household Survey was not mandatory during the 2011 census, a large percentage of citizens did not partake, decreasing the accuracy of that particular information (Statistics Canada, 2017).

2.22 Trends in the Wage Schedule: New York City

From Table 6, it can be determined that the largest wage upturn in New York City occurs on April 1, 2016, and represents a 16.7% increase in wage from the previous year. This phase also represents the first of the seven stages in this particular wage schedule. The next increase, occurring approximately nine months later on December 31, 2016, represented a 14.3% increase from the previous year. As the wage schedule for New York City (Table 6) progresses through the seven phases over the duration of five years, the increase relative to the previous year declines slightly in percentage. On December 31, 2019, the wage increase will reach a 2.7% increase from the previous year, which is the smallest increment within the wage schedule. This 2.7% increase remains until 2021, when the relative wage increase will then be based off of core inflation rates and the Consumer Price Index.

2.23 Trends in the Wage Schedule: New York State

From Table 6, it can be determined that the wage schedule for the Balance of New York State is similar to the schedule for New York City, in that there are seven proposed phases that will occur over a period of five years. The first wage increase for New York State will occur on April 1, 2016, and is aligned with the first wage increase that will occur in New York City. On the contrary to New York City's proposed wage schedule however, the largest wage upturn occurs in the second phase on December 31, 2016, and represents a 10.3% increase in wage from the previous year. As the wage schedule for the Balance of New York State (Table 6) progresses through each of the seven phases over the duration of five years (with exception of the first phase, as discussed), the increase relative to the previous year continually declines slightly in percentage. On July 1, 2021, the wage increase will reach a 3.4% increase from the previous year, which is the smallest increment within the wage schedule. Unlike the proposed schedule for New York City, wage increases for New York State will not continue past 2021 based on the core inflation rate or the CPI. A target and final minimum wage of \$15 an hour is scheduled for July 1, 2021, and will remain.

2.24 Comparing Wage Schedule Trends: City vs State

By observing Table 6 as derived from Reich et al., (2016), there are similarities in the wage schedules as proposed in a city, and a state. Each New York City and State has proposed a minimum of \$15 an hour by 2021, and will obtain this goal through seven phases of wage increase over a period of approximately five years. However there are also several observable differences in these proposed schedules.

Firstly, it appears as though the percentages of wage increases are higher in the city than the state. The increments of increase in New York City range from 16.7% to 2.7% and in contrast, the increments of increase in New York State range from 10.3% to 3.4%. Furthermore, the increments of wage percentage increase are more consistent for New York State than New York City. The wage increments also increase more drastically within the City's schedule in comparison to that of New York State. The wage increase reaches a maximum of \$1.50 within New York City, and only \$1.00 in the Balance of New York State. A final notable difference is the change in wage in 2015 dollars in New York City and State. The minimum wage in 2015 dollars in New York State is much lower than that for New York City when the wage reaches the target \$15 an hour in 2021. While these are all notable differences, they all are likely explained in the differences in economics of a city in relation to relevant economic variables present on a state wide scale (Reich, 2016).

2.25 Increases in Industries

According to Reich et al., (2016), minimum wage increases do not affect all industries equally, and thus payroll increases are not the same for each industry. Table 7 is derived from Reich et al., (2016) and portrays the major industries contained within the economy of New York, and the corresponding increase that is expected.

Table 7 Industries Affected by Minimum Wage Increases in New York

Table 7	Percent of covered workforce	Percent of all workers getting a raise	Percent of industry's workers getting a raise
A. Private, for-profit sector	72.5	82.8	41.9
Agriculture, fishing, forestry, hunting, and mining	0.4	0.6	62.8
Construction	4.4	4.2	34.4
Non-durable manufacturing	2.6	2.8	38.8
Food Manufacturing	0.6	0.9	50.1
Durable manufacturing	3.7	3.1	30.8
Wholesale trade	2.3	2.0	32.7
Retail trade	10.9	17.2	57.7
Grocery stores	2.3	4.2	67.8
Transportation, warehousing, and utilities	3.6	3.9	40.3
Information	2.8	1.5	19.7
Finance, insurance, and real estate	7.6	4.1	19.6
Professional services	6.6	2.9	16.1
Administrative services	3.3	4.5	49.5
Employment services	0.5	0.5	41.4
Building services	0.9	1.3	54.7
Educational services	2.7	2.6	34.8
Health and social assistance	10.4	12.1	42.4
Ambulatory care	4.3	5.6	48.2
Hospitals	3.1	2.0	23.6
Residential care	1.6	2.0	46.0
Social assistance	0.8	1.3	57.8
Child day care services	0.7	1.2	65.7
Arts, entertainment, and recreation	1.5	1.9	47.2
Accommodation	1.0	1.4	52.0
Restaurants	6.1	13.3	79.7
Other services	2.5	4.8	69.0
Personal services	1.4	3.1	79.7
B. Private, nonprofit sector (selected industries)	11.2	9.6	31.3
Educational services	2.5	1.8	26.0
Health and social assistance	4.5	4.0	32.4
Ambulatory care	0.6	0.6	37.0
Hospitals	1.8	0.8	16.0
Residential care	0.8	1.0	50.4
Social assistance	1.0	1.1	39.1
Child day care services	0.3	0.5	51.8
Other services	1.7	1.7	35.0
Personal services	0.1	0.1	65.6
Religious organizations	0.6	0.7	44.4
Civic and social organizations	0.8	0.7	32.1
C. State and local government	14.6	7.6	19.1
Local government	9.9	5.4	20.1
State government	4.7	2.2	16.9
D. All New York workers	100.0	100.0	36.6

Table 7 is derived from Reich et al. (2016), and depicts the differences in minimum wage increases for different industries in New York. Due to economic variables, wage upsurge will influence each industry in a unique way, affecting the minimum wage increases that will be experienced by different industries.

Furthermore, there is an estimated change in operating costs for each selected industry. Table 8 is also derived from Reich et al., (2016), and portrays the cumulative change in operating costs for selected industries in New York’s economy of 2021.

Table 8 Cumulative Change in Operating Costs for Selected Industries in New York, 2021

Table 8	Percent change in payroll costs in 2021	Labor cost percent of operating costs in 2016	Percent change in operating costs in 2021
All industries	3.3	22.1	0.7
Nondurable manufacturing	3.9	6.9	0.3
Food manufacturing	7.6	10.7	0.8
Wholesale trade	2.7	6.2	0.2
Retail trade	8.1	10.8	0.9
Grocery stores	14.1	12.2	1.7
Administrative services and waste management	6.0	61.1	3.7
Health care and social assistance	3.6	48.4	1.8
Ambulatory care	5.4	52.9	2.9
Hospitals	1.2	44.1	0.5
Residential care	5.9	52.2	3.1
Restaurants	23.1	30.7	7.1
Other Services	12.8	33.8	4.3

Table 8 is derived from Reich et al. (2016), and depicts the cumulative change in operating costs for selected industries in New York in the year 2021. The percent changes in payroll costs in 2021, labor cost percent of operating costs in 2016, and percent changes in operating costs in 2021.

2.3 Alberta

Of the most successful \$15 minimum wage movements in North America, were San Francisco, New York, Seattle and Los Angeles (Reich et al., 2016). Following recent economic downturn in the region, Alberta, Canada, decided to also adopt a \$15 minimum wage province wide, and would use research completed on primarily San Francisco and New York as a model to achieve this (Duff, 2016) (Government of Alberta, 2017). Alberta's plan to increase their minimum wage includes a 33% reduction in small business tax rate from 3% to 2% in 2017 (Duff, 2016). New tax credits will also be implemented to provide more access to capital. The minimum wage plan will take place in 3 phases over a period of three years. Although this movement is currently underway, research on relative data conveys that the province is well on track when it comes to reaching their target of a \$15 minimum wage by October 1, 2018 (Fisher & Schmidt, 2016).

Devised by the Government of Alberta and presented by Christina Gray, the Minister of Labour Alberta, Table 9 is from Fisher & Schmidt (2016), and portrays the changes in Alberta's minimum wage from October 1, 2016 to October 1, 2018 (Government of Alberta, 2017).

Note that liquor servers will be paid the same amount as general employees. Salespersons and Domestic employees (bottom two columns) are positions which are not based on an hourly wage, and therefore are irrelevant in this particular study.

Table 9 Upcoming Changes to Minimum Wage in Alberta, 2016 – 2018

Table 9

Type of employee	October 1, 2016	October 1, 2017	October 1, 2018
Most employees – General minimum wage	\$12.20/hour	\$13.60/hour	\$15/hour
Liquor servers (as of Oct. 1, 2016 the liquor server rate was eliminated)	\$12.20/hour	\$13.60/hour	\$15/hour
Salespersons (including land agents and certain professionals)	\$486/week	\$542/week	\$598/week
Domestic employees (living in their employer's home)	\$2,316/month	\$2,582/month	\$2,848/month

Table 9 is derived from Fisher & Schmidt (2016), and portrays the upcoming changes in Alberta's minimum wage. Most general minimum wage employees, as well as all liquor servers will reach a \$15 minimum wage by October 1, 2018.

2.31 Trends in the Wage Schedule: The Province of Alberta

Following the implementation of a minimum wage schedule as proposed by New York City and the Balance of New York State, a similar policy was passed in the Province of Alberta (Table 9) (Fisher & Schmidt, 2016). As Salespersons and domestic employees are positions not necessarily based on an hourly wage, they are deemed irrelevant to this particular study and thus will be disregarded.

Alberta's minimum wage schedule takes place in three phases over three years. In the first phase, the minimum wage increased to \$12.20 an hour on October 1, 2016. During the second phase, the minimum wage will increase \$1.40 to \$13.60 an hour. In the final phase, the target minimum wage of \$15 an hour will be reached on October 1, 2018. It is important to note that unlike the wage schedule as proposed by the City and County of San Francisco and the City and State of New York, minimum wage increases in Alberta are not scheduled to be ongoing.

2.32 Basic Rules

There are several basic rules that all employees and more specifically employers, must abide by (Fisher & Schmidt, 2016). Firstly, employers must pay employees a minimum wage, which is based on a standard for each province. Secondly, there is to be no age bias in compensation rates, meaning that all adults, liquor servers, adolescents and young people are to be paid the same hourly wage. Furthermore, wages exclude the addition of tips or expense money, and will be considered above and beyond regular pay. Lastly, each time an employee is required to be at their place of employment, they must be paid for no less than three hours of their time.

3. \$15 Minimum Wage at Post-Secondary Campuses

3.1 University of Washington

Inspired by the successes as experienced by the most victorious of \$15 minimum wage movements in the United States, the University of Washington, Seattle, announced that it would also like to raise the minimum wage to \$15 an hour for all student workers (Balta, 2015). Modeled closely on the actions of San Francisco, Seattle too, began the process of implementing a city-wide minimum wage of \$15 an hour. In March of 2015, the University began collaborating with students to assess the feasibility of increasing the minimum wage. In April of 2015, the University announced that it would be increasing the minimum wage to \$11 an hour effective April 1 2015 (Balta, 2015). An analysis of the impact on the student programs and institution economy and community was completed by the Services and Activities Fee Committee (SAF) for the University of Washington, which is responsible for allocating student fees for applicable programs (Balta, 2015).

3.12 The Services and Activities Fee Committee

In their research, the Services and Activities Fee Committee discovered that increasing the minimum wage to \$11 an hour as of April 1, 2015, would have an influence on the programs funded by the University and SAF (Balta, 2015). For a population of 2,600 workers, the committee determined that there would be an aggregate cost of approximately \$400,000. Further research determined that “funding the increase and costs associated with this (minimum wage increase) will either have to come from an increase in the Services Activities fee, further administrative support for some programs, or a reduction of programs” (Balta, 2015).

In September of 2015, the University of Washington announced that due to the success of the increase at \$11 an hour in April, the institution would remain consistent with their commitment to Seattle’s minimum wage law and would raise the minimum wage to \$15 by January 1, 2017 (Balta, 2015). The increase would occur in three stages over a three year period. April 1 2015, the minimum wage at the University for all student workers increased to \$11 an hour. Following suit with the state of Seattle, the minimum wage was then again

increased \$2/hour to \$13 on January 1 of 2016, for *all* workers. As of January 1 2017, the University of Washington has increased their minimum wage to \$15 an hour, affecting approximately 5,500 workers, 3,500 of which are students.

According to Balta (2015), the SAF of the University estimated the cost of bringing all workers to \$13 in January of 2016 is approximately \$3.2 million, \$2.9 million of which would be returned to student workers. Additionally the SAF also estimated that increasing the wage to \$15 an hour in 2017 would cost approximately \$7.9 million, \$6.7 of which would be returned to student workers.

3.2 University of California

On July 22 of 2015, the President of the University of California announced the intent to move toward a \$15 minimum wage for all workers (UC Office of the President, 2015). It would use a very similar model as used by the City of San Francisco, and would influence approximately 195,000 employees. The minimum wage at the University would be \$13 an hour by October 1 of 2015, \$14 an hour by October 1 of 2016, and would reach the target wage of \$15 an hour by October 1, 2017. Furthermore, the University of California will continuously monitor compliance of this wage increase through audits, and all contractors currently in business with the University must agree to abide by state and institutional laws. It is expected that the majority of the costs relating to wage increase will be “covered by non-core funds such as those from self-supporting auxiliary services such as bookstores and food services,” as these revenues are separate from tuition fees and other core funds (UC Berkeley, 2016).

3.3 York University

The campaign for \$15 and Fairness began in the late fall of 2015 at York University (Bush & Abdelbaki, 2016). Attracting only three individuals to the first meeting, the campaign began with just a small handful of people. However by ensuring constant outreach on campus and within the University community, 1400 people signed the Fight for \$15 and Fairness petition for a \$15 minimum wage and fair working conditions. The Fight for \$15 and Fairness Petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario is located in **Appendix D** (\$15 and Fairness, 2017). The York University \$15 minimum wage campaign was successful in gaining the attention and securing endorsements from student associations including the York Federation of Students, York University Graduate Association, as well as OPIRG (Bush & Abdelbaki, 2016).

3.31 Campaign Activities at York University

Of the most successful campaign tools that York University utilized in their \$15 and Fairness campaign, were the use of interactive workshops (Bush & Abdelbaki, 2016). York held a workshop in conjunction with the Worker's Action Center (WAC), which effectively connected people on campus with airport workers, as well as organizers from the WAC. The University also hosted an interactive workshop in Vari Hall on Keele Campus, in which students had an opportunity to place their current wages on a giant scale relative to a minimum wage of \$15. Figure 1 is from Bush & Abdelbaki (2016), and depicts the results of this particular workshop. The majority of the student's wages fell well below the \$15 minimum wage line.

Figure 1 York University's Wall of Wages



Figure 1 is from Bush & Abdelbaki (2016), and portrays the results of the Wall of Wages, an interactive workshop at York University. Most of the wages were located below the \$15 minimum wage line.

Following York University's campaign, a \$15 minimum wage movement was also considered by the York University Graduate's Association (YUGSA) (York University Graduates Association, 2017). At YUGSA's 2016 Annual General Meeting, a vote was made on whether or not to endorse the campaign. The majority of voters voted "yes," and YUGSA now joins with York University and the York Federation of students to raise support for the \$15 and Fairness campaign.

York's success has sparked more recent campaigns across Ontario. Most recently is Nipissing University in North Bay, where students from the University's equity office are currently collecting signatures on the Fight for \$15 and Fairness Petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario (see **Appendix D** for full form) (Young, 2017) (\$15 and Fairness, 2017).

4. Discussion

4.1 Overview of Case Studies

In completing the literature review, it was determined that although \$15 minimum wage movements are sweeping across North America, cities and states have moved to become the forefront of minimum wage increases (Reich et al., 2016) (Duff, 2016). Research of these minimum wage movements established that the most important victories in terms of implementing and/or campaigning for a \$15 minimum wage were located in regions of the United States (Reich et al., 2014)(Reich et al., 2016). The most successful locations were that of the City and County of San Francisco, and the City and State of New York. Inspired by these successful movements, Alberta, Canada also recently proposed a \$15 minimum wage, which has been successful as well (Government of Alberta, 2017). Each of these locations is analyzed in detail in *Section 2 – Case Studies*.

4.11 San Francisco

Spearheading the \$15 minimum wage was San Francisco, which was not only the first city to adapt a universal minimum wage law in 2003, but was also the first place to successfully increase the minimum wage to \$15 an hour in 2014 (Reich et al., 2014). At the time San Francisco began campaigning for a \$15 minimum wage, previous literature *did* exist relating to a \$15 minimum wage, however it was “suggestive” (Reich et al., 2014). The literature was not able to definitively determine the effects of increasing the minimum wage to \$15, which was “beyond existing local, state, or federal mandate” (Reich et al., 2014). San Francisco was the first location to increase the minimum wage past this mandate. In conjunction with this and the success of the movement, has been referred to as “spearheading” the \$15 minimum wage movement by the literature. Of the most important aspects in San Francisco’s model are the creation of a public proposition, public voting, posting notice, payroll records, retaliation, and violation and consequences. These features were the primary foundation for the city’s success in implementing a \$15 minimum wage (Reich et al., 2014). These aspects inspired other cities, states, provinces, and post-secondary locations, who also modeled their movements off of San Francisco’s, each creating their own adaptations unique to their geographical and political region.

4.12 New York City and State

Closely following San Francisco's lead, New York City and State also experienced success in campaigning for and implementing a \$15 minimum wage. New York implemented the aspects of a public vote, posting notice, payroll records, and also recognizes retaliation, violation and consequences similar to that of the City and County of San Francisco (Reich et al., 2016). To these important features in successfully implementing a \$15 minimum wage, New York added a proposed minimum wage schedule. Furthermore, as both the City and the balance of New York State are simultaneously attempting to reach \$15 an hour, trends within minimum wages on a smaller scale (city), and a larger scale (state) are able to be compared. It was determined that percentages of wage increase are able to be higher in the city than the state (see Table 6). Furthermore, the increments of wage percentage increase are more consistent throughout the state than in the city. The wage increments also increase more drastically within the city's schedule in comparison to that of the state. A final notable difference is the change in wage in 2015 dollars in city versus the state. The minimum wage in 2015 dollars in New York State is much lower than that for New York City when the wage reaches the target \$15 an hour in 2021. While these are all notable differences, they all are likely explained in the differences in economics of a city in relation to relevant economic variables present on a state wide scale (Reich et al., 2016). Thus it is important to take the specific economics of a location into account when approaching the alteration of a minimum wage. New York's \$15 minimum wage movement also introduced the factor that there are specific increases for different industries (see Table 7). Minimum wage increase *does not* affect all industries equally, and thus payroll increases are not the same for each industry. Furthermore, New York's model also identified that there will be a change in operating costs for each selected industry (see Table 8). These are important economic factors to take into account when approaching a \$15 minimum wage.

4.13 Province of Alberta

In campaigning for and implementing a \$15 minimum wage, the province of Alberta also closely followed San Francisco's model, and implemented similar aspects regarding public voting, posting notice, payroll records, retaliation policy, and violation and consequences (Duff, 2016) (Government of Alberta, 2017). Alberta also implemented a minimum wage schedule, similar to that of New York's. Alberta's plan to increase their minimum wage specifically includes a 33% reduction in small business tax rate from 3% to 2% in the first year, and new tax credits will be implemented to provide more access to capital (Duff, 2016). Furthermore, Alberta implemented *basic rules*, which are aspects regarding employers and employees that

must be followed (Fisher & Schmidt, 2016). These rules state that all employers must pay employees a minimum wage, which is based on a standard for each province. Secondly, there is to be no age bias in compensation rates, meaning that all adults, liquor servers, adolescents and young people are to be paid the same hourly wage. Furthermore, wages exclude the addition of tips or expense money, and will be considered above and beyond regular pay. Lastly, each time an employee is required to be at their place of employment, they must be paid for no less than three hours of their time. These factors have been integral in the success of campaigning for and implementing a \$15 minimum wage in Alberta, and would be a good option to consider for future minimum wage movements, particularly in Canada.

4.2 Overview of Post-Secondary Campuses

Inspired by the large scale wage movements occurring in cities, states and provinces, the literature also determined that there were several post-secondary campuses that had either implemented and/or campaigned for a \$15 minimum wage. Containing the most concrete evidence of success in this movement was the University of Washington, the University California, and York University in Ontario (Balta, 2015) (UC Office of the President, 2015) (UC Berkeley, 2016) (Bush & Abdelbaki, 2016). These locations are analyzed in detail in *Section 3 - \$15 Minimum Wage at Post-Secondary Campuses*.

4.21 The University of Washington

The University of Washington was inspired by the successes as experienced by San Francisco in implementing a \$15 minimum wage (Balta, 2015). A wage schedule was also developed. In 2015, the University began collaborating with students to assess the feasibility of implementing a \$15 minimum wage through the campus Services and Activities Fee Committee, which is responsible for allocating student fees for applicable programs. It was determined that increasing the minimum wage *would* influence the programs funded by the university. Funding the increase and costs associated with the wage increase would either have to come from an increase in the Services Activities fee, further administrative support for some programs, or simply a reduction in programs altogether. This is an important consideration to make when approaching a minimum wage increase at an institution like Trent University – where will this money come from? The University of Washington succeeded in meeting a \$15 minimum wage on January 1st, 2017, and effects approximately 5,500 employees.

4.22 University of California

The University of California also used a very similar model as used by San Francisco to achieve a \$15 minimum wage (UC Office of the President, 2015). A wage schedule was also developed. Specifically, the University of California will focus on monitoring ordinance compliance through audits. Furthermore, the responsibility of contractors currently in business with a post-secondary institution is established. It is expected that all contractors must agree to abide by the state and institutional laws. The majority of the costs incurred in increasing the minimum wage will be covered by non-core funds such as those from self-supporting auxiliary services such as bookstores and food services (UC Berkeley, 2016). The University of California is on target to reach a \$15 minimum wage by October 1st, 2017.

4.23 York University

York University adapted San Francisco's model for implementing a \$15 minimum wage in late fall of 2015 (Bush & Abdelbaki, 2016). Ensuring continuous campus outreach through interactive workshops like the Wall of Wages, approximately 1400 people signed the Fight for \$15 and Fairness petition. The York University \$15 minimum wage campaign was successful in gaining the attention and securing endorsements from student associations including the York Federation of Students, York University Graduate Association, as well as OPIRG. York's success has sparked more recent campaigns across Ontario, most recently being Nippising in North Bay where students from the Equity Office are currently collecting petition signatures (Young, 2017) (\$15 and Fairness, 2017). York University has just recently reached their target in March of 2017.

4.3 Proposing a General Model

The initial model created by San Francisco inspired many other cities, states, provinces, and even post-secondary campuses, who created adaptations of the successful aspects of the movement as implemented by San Francisco, to also approach a \$15 minimum wage. Using the literature, it is possible to amalgamate the successful aspects of each analyzed \$15 minimum wage movement *Sections 2 & 3*, and create a general model that may be used in the future at a location like Trent or in Peterborough.

4.31 Public Proposition

A public proposition, similar to that of San Francisco's Proposition J, should be created. It will be a public policy outlining the aspects of increasing the minimum wage in a particular region, as per politics and geography of the location. An example of a public proposition can be located in **Appendix A**.

4.32 Public Vote

Once all related information regarding a wage change has been made public in a proposition, a public vote should be made that will determine whether the community would like to move forward with increasing the minimum wage. An example of a public vote regarding a \$15 minimum wage movement can be located in Table 4. If more than 50% of voters agree, the proposition may be passed. Another option to obtain public opinion would be to get signatures on a petition. **Appendix D** contains an example of a Fight for \$15 and Fairness Petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

4.33 Posting Notice Regarding Minimum Wage Ordinance

A public notice outlining any changes that will be made to the minimum wage should be posted on January 1st of that year. It should be made available in every language spoken by 5% or more of employees, and must be posted in a visible, general location on standard 8x11 inch paper. An example of a public posting regarding minimum wage ordinance can be located in **Appendix B**.

4.34 Payroll Records

To ensure employers are abiding by the laws relating to the minimum compensation ordinance, each employer should be responsible for keeping payroll records from the beginning of a minimum wage increase, through to the target minimum wage. The employer must agree to an audit of these documents at any time.

4.35 Retaliation, Violation and Consequences

In the event that an employer refuses to comply with the MCO, retaliation by an employee should be prohibited. Employers should be restricted from retaliating against employees in search of information regarding minimum wage changes. MCO complaints should be able to be filed and investigated. Violation of the MCO should contain the corresponding penalties as displayed in Table 5 of this study.

4.36 Wage Schedules

A wage schedule should be created, depicting the changes in wage, and the dates that it will occur. It should be made available to the public. The most successful wage schedules conveyed a plan including approximately 3-5 phases over 3-5 years. The wage increases should be no more than \$1.50 per phase on a small scale (city/post-secondary), and \$1.00 per phase on a large scale (state/province)

4.37 Institution Contractors

All contractors currently in business with an institution must agree to abide by the regional and institutional laws regarding minimum wage.

4.38 Basic Rules

These basic rules should be followed: Firstly, all employers must pay employees a minimum wage, which is based on a standard for each province. Secondly, there is to be no age bias in compensation rates, meaning that all adults, liquor servers, adolescents and young people are to be paid the same hourly wage. Furthermore, wages exclude the addition of tips or expense money, and will be considered above and beyond regular pay. Lastly, each time an employee is required to be at their place of employment, they must be paid for no less than three hours of their time.

5. Conclusion

As determined by the literature, the most successful \$15 minimum wage movements in North American cities have been in San Francisco, New York, and Alberta. Within post-secondary institutions, the Universities of Washington, California, and York University also developed successful \$15 minimum wage movements. It was thoroughly analyzed how these locations campaigned for and/or implemented a \$15 minimum wage, and their strategies were compared. It was determined that the initial model created by San Francisco had been the spark that inspired many other cities, states, provinces, and even post-secondary campuses, who created adaptations of the successful aspects of this initial movement to approach a \$15 minimum wage of their own. By amalgamating the successful aspects of each analyzed wage movement, it was possible to formulate a general model that could be used in the future at a location like Trent or in Peterborough (*Section 4.3*). Based on the research completed in this study, there are a few primary recommendations.

5.1 Recommendations

There are a few primary recommendations that this research provides in advancing with approaching a \$15 minimum wage at Trent University and in Peterborough. In terms of campaigning for and implementing a \$15 minimum wage, it is recommended that the general model as conveyed in *Section 4.3* be considered as it contains a variety of successful aspects as analyzed in the literature throughout this study. It is also highly recommended that the effects of implementing a \$15 minimum wage on the Trent University and Peterborough economy be thoroughly investigated. The use of the Kaitz index to determine the effectiveness of how a \$15 minimum wage may be absorbed into the Trent and Peterborough labor market and economy may be beneficial. In taking these recommendations into consideration, as derived from this study, these would be the best possible approaches to implementing a \$15 minimum wage at Trent University and in the City and County of Peterborough.

6. References

\$15 and Fairness Campaign. 2016. The Movement. <http://15andfairness.org/the-movement/>

Ballot Simplification Committee. 2014. Minimum Wage Increase. *FINAL Digest*.

http://web.archive.org/web/20140910034830/http://www.sfgov2.org/ftp/uploadedfiles/elections/ElectionsArchives/Meeting_Information/BSC/agendas/2014/November/5-A%20FINAL%20digest%20-%20Minimum%20wage.pdf

Balta, V. 2015. University of Washington raises minimum wage to \$11 per hour for all student workers. <http://www.washington.edu/news/2015/04/10/uw-raises-minimum-wage-to-11-per-hour-for-all-student-workers/>

Balta, V. 2015. University of Washington to raise minimum wage for workers to \$15 an hour. <http://www.washington.edu/news/2015/09/28/uw-to-raise-minimum-wage-for-workers-to-15-an-hour/>

Bush, D., & Abdelbaki, R. 2016. Fight for \$15 and Fairness. <http://glrc.apps01.yorku.ca/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/GLRC-WP1-Fight-for-15.pdf>

City and County of San Francisco. 2014. Consolidated General Election November 4, 2014 Summary Report. *Official Summary Report*, pg 4. <http://sfgov2.org/ftp/uploadedfiles/elections/ElectionsArchives/2014/Nov/SummaryFinal.pdf>

City and County of San Francisco. 2017. Minimum Wage. *California: San Francisco Administrative Code, 12R*.

[http://library.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/administrative/chapter12rminimumwage?f=templates\\$fn=default.htm\\$3.0\\$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca](http://library.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/administrative/chapter12rminimumwage?f=templates$fn=default.htm$3.0$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca)

City and County of San Francisco. 2017. City of San Francisco Minimum Wage Increase Referred Measure, Proposition J (November 2014). [https://ballotpedia.org/City_of_San_Francisco_Minimum_Wage_Increase_Referred_Measure,_Proposition_J_\(November_2014\)](https://ballotpedia.org/City_of_San_Francisco_Minimum_Wage_Increase_Referred_Measure,_Proposition_J_(November_2014))

City and County of San Francisco. 2017. Office of Labor Standards Enforcement. <http://sfgov.org/olse/minimum-wage-ordinance-mwo>

- Crawley, M. 2017. Campaigners push Liberals for \$15 minimum wage in Ontario. *Canadian Broadcasting Corporation*. <http://www.cbc.ca/beta/news/canada/toronto/15-minimum-wage-ontario-1.3940676>
- Duff, J. 2016. OFL Applauds Ontario NDP Support for a \$15 Minimum Wage. <http://ofl.ca/index.php/ondp-15-minimum-wage/>
- Fisher, J., & Schmidt, S. 2016. Minimum Wage. <https://work.alberta.ca/employment-standards/minimum-wage.html>
- Government of Alberta. 2017. Minimum wage research. <https://www.alberta.ca/min-wage-research.aspx>
- Government of Canada. 2016. Bank of Canada's preferred measures of core inflation. http://www.statcan.gc.ca/eng/dai/btd/preferred_measures
- Government of Canada. 2017. Consumer Price Index, by city (monthly). <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/tables-tableaux/sum-som/l01/cst01/cpis02a-eng.htm>
- Hart, C. 1998. *Doing a literature review: Releasing the social science research imagination*. London: Sage Publications.
- Manhattan Institute. 2016. Is a \$15 Federal Minimum Wage Appropriate? *The Narrative*, (2016), 1-5. <https://www.manhattan-institute.org/download/9108/article.pdf>
- Office of Labor Standards Enforcement. 2017. City and County of San Francisco: Minimum Compensation Ordinance (MCO). <http://sfgov.org/olse/minimum-compensation-ordinance-mco>
- Office of Labor Standards Enforcement. 2017. City and County of San Francisco: Minimum Compensation Ordinance (MCO), Know Your Rights. http://sfgov.org/olse/sites/default/files/Document/MCO_Know_Your_Rights_2017_Effective_Jan_%201_2017_0.pdf
- Office of Labor Standards Enforcement. 2017. City and County of San Francisco: Notice to Employees, Minimum Compensation Ordinance. http://sfgov.org/olse/sites/default/files/Document/MCO%20POSTER%202017_English_Effective_Jan_1_2017.pdf

- Ontario Ministry of Labour. 2016. Minimum Wage.
<https://www.labour.gov.on.ca/english/es/pubs/guide/minwage.php>
- Ontario Ministry of Labour. 2017. Minimum Wage.
<https://www.labour.gov.on.ca/english/es/pubs/guide/minwage.php>
- Ontario Public Interest Research Group (OPIRG) Peterborough. 2016. OPIRG Peterborough.
<http://opirgptbo.ca/>
- Rediscovering Geography Committee. 1997. *Rediscovering Geography: New Relevance for Science and Society*. <https://www.nap.edu/read/4913/chapter/5>
- Reich, M., Jacobs, K., Bernhardt, A., & Perry, I. 2014. San Francisco's Proposed City Minimum Wage Law: A Prospective Impact Study. <http://irle.berkeley.edu/files/2014/San-Franciscos-Proposed-City-Minimum-Wage-Law.pdf>
- Reich, M., Allegretto, S., Jacobs, K., & Montialoux, C. 2016. The Effects of a \$15 Minimum Wage in New York State. *Center on Wage and Employment Dynamics*.
<http://irle.berkeley.edu/files/2016/The-Effects-of-a-15-Minimum-Wage-in-New-York-State.pdf>
- Statistics Canada. 2017. 2011 National Household Survey. *Data Quality and Confidentiality Standards and Guidelines (Public)*. https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/nhs-enm/2011/ref/DQ-QD/2011_NHS_Confidential_Guide_Public_Eng.pdf
- UC Berkeley. 2016. UC president announces \$15/hour minimum wage.
<http://hr.berkeley.edu/news/uc-president-announces-15hour-minimum-wage>
- UC Office of the President. 2015. UC president announces \$15/hour minimum wage.
<https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/press-room/uc-president-announces-15hour-minimum-wage>
- York University Graduate Students' Association. 2017. The Fight for \$14 and Fairness.
<http://www.yugsa.ca/15-and-fairness-1.html>
- Young, G. 2017. Students Join Fight for \$15 Minimum Wage.
<http://www.nugget.ca/2017/02/14/students-join-fight-for-15-minimum-wage>

7. Appendices

Appendix A: Document - Proposition J

Appendix B: Document - Notice to Employees: Minimum Compensation Ordinance

Appendix C: Document - Minimum Compensation Ordinance: KNOW YOUR RIGHTS

Appendix D: Document - Fight for \$15 and Fairness: Petition to the Legislative Assembly of
Ontario

Appendix E: Document - Tables and charts

Appendix A: Proposition J

FILE NO. 140687

AMENDED IN COMMITTEE
7/17/2014

MEASUREMENT NO.

1 [Initiative Ordinance - Administrative Code - Minimum Wage]

2
3 **Motion ordering submitted to the voters an ordinance amending the Administrative**
4 **Code to increase the minimum wage for employees in San Francisco to \$12.25 per hour**
5 **on May 1, 2015, with annual increases, reaching \$15.00 per hour in 2018, followed**
6 **thereafter by annual cost-of-living increases; following 2015, provide only for annual**
7 **cost-of-living increases in the minimum wage for two narrow categories of employees;**
8 **and include the City government and In-Home Supportive Services Public Authority as**
9 **employers subject to the minimum wage ordinance, at an election to be held on**
10 **November 4, 2014.**

11
12 **MOVED,** That the Board of Supervisors hereby submits the following ordinance to the
13 voters of the City and County of San Francisco, at an election to be held on November 4,
14 2014.

15
16 **Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to increase the minimum wage for**
17 **employees in San Francisco to \$12.25 per hour on May 1, 2015, with annual increases,**
18 **reaching \$15.00 per hour in 2018, followed thereafter by annual cost-of-living**
19 **increases; following 2015, provide only for annual cost-of-living increases in the**
20 **minimum wage for two narrow categories of employees; and include the City**
21 **government and In-Home Supportive Services Public Authority as employers subject to**
22 **the minimum wage ordinance.**

23 **NOTE:** **Unchanged Code text and uncodified text** are in plain font.
24 **Additions to Codes** are in *single-underline italics Times New Roman font*.
25 **Deletions to Codes** are in ~~italics Times New Roman font~~.
Asterisks (* * * *) indicate the omission of unchanged Code subsections or parts of tables.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. The Administrative Code is hereby amended by revising Chapter 12R, Sections 12R.3, 12R.4, 12R.7, 12R.10, 12R.11, and 12R.17, to read as follows:

SEC. 12R.3. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Chapter, the following capitalized terms shall have the following meanings:

"Agency" shall mean the Office of Labor Standards Enforcement or its successor agency Living Wage/Living Health Division of the Office of Contract Administration or such other City department or agency as the City shall by resolution designate.

"City" shall mean the City and County of San Francisco.

"Employee" shall mean any person who:

(a) In a particular week performs at least two (2) hours of work for an Employer within the geographic boundaries of the City; and

(b) Qualifies as an employee entitled to payment of a minimum wage from any employer under the California minimum wage law, as provided under Section 1197 of the California Labor Code and wage orders published by the California Industrial Welfare Commission, or is a participant in a Welfare-to-Work Program.

"Employer" shall mean any person, as defined in Section 18 of the California Labor Code, including corporate officers or executives, who directly or indirectly or through an agent any other person, including through the services of a temporary services or staffing agency or similar entity, employs or exercises control over the wages, hours or working conditions of any Employee. "Employer" shall include the City and the San Francisco In-Home Supportive Services Public Authority.

1 "Government Supported Employee" shall mean any Employee who is: (1) under the age of 18
2 and is employed as an after-school or summer Employee in a bona fide training or apprenticeship
3 program in a position that is subsidized by the federal, state, or local government ; or (2) over the age
4 55 and is employed by a Non-Profit Corporation that provides social welfare services as a core mission
5 to individuals who are over the age of 55 and is in a position that is subsidized by federal, state, or
6 local government. The second category shall apply only to Non-Profit Corporations operating as of
7 January 1, 2015, and apply only as to the number of employees over the age of 55 holding positions in
8 the Corporation as of January 1, 2015 that are subsidized by federal, state, or local government, plus
9 25% of that number. Any employees hired by a Non-Profit Corporation after January 1, 2015 that
10 exceed the numerical threshold in the prior sentence (including the additional 25%) shall not qualify as
11 "Government Supported Employees." If at any time the number of employees over the age of 55
12 holding positions in the Corporation that are subsidized by federal, state, or local government falls
13 below that numerical threshold (including the additional 25%), then those positions shall qualify as
14 "Government Supported Employee" positions.

15 "Minimum Wage" shall have the meaning set forth in Section 12R.4 of this Chapter.

16 ~~"Small Business" shall mean an Employer for which fewer than ten (10) persons perform work~~
17 ~~for compensation during a given week. In determining the number of persons performing work for an~~
18 ~~Employer during a given week, all persons performing work for compensation on a full-time, part-time,~~
19 ~~or temporary basis shall be counted, including persons made available to work through the services of~~
20 ~~a temporary services or staffing agency or similar entity.~~

21 "Nonprofit Corporation" shall mean a nonprofit corporation, duly organized, validly
22 existing and in good standing under the laws of the jurisdiction of its incorporation and (if a
23 foreign corporation) in good standing under the laws of the State of California, which
24 corporation has established and maintains valid nonprofit status under Section 501(c)(3) of
25

1 the United States Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended, and all rules and regulations
2 promulgated under such Section.

3 "Welfare-to-Work Program" shall mean the City's CalWORKS Program, County Adult
4 Assistance Program (CAAP) which includes the Personal Assisted Employment Services
5 (PAES) Program, and General Assistance Program, and any successor programs that are
6 substantially similar to them.

7 **SEC. 12R.4. MINIMUM WAGE.**

8 (a) Employers shall pay Employees no less than the Minimum Wage for each hour
9 worked within the geographic boundaries of the City.

10 (1) Except as provided in subsection 12R.4(b), the Minimum Wage paid to Employees
11 shall be as follows:

12 (A) Beginning on May 1, 2015, the Minimum Wage shall be an hourly rate of
13 \$12.25.

14 (B) Beginning on July 1, 2016, the Minimum Wage shall be an hourly rate of
15 \$13.00.

16 (C) Beginning on July 1, 2017, the Minimum Wage shall be an hourly rate of
17 \$14.00.

18 (D) Beginning on July 1, 2018, the Minimum Wage shall be an hourly rate of
19 \$15.00.

20 (E) Beginning on July 1, 2019, and each year thereafter, the Minimum Wage
21 shall increase by an amount corresponding to the prior year's increase, if any, in the Consumer Price
22 Index for urban wage earners and clerical workers for the San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose, CA
23 metropolitan statistical area, as determined by the Controller.

24 (b) Beginning on May 1, 2015, the Minimum Wage paid to Government Supported Employees
25 shall be an hourly rate of \$12.25. Beginning on July 1, 2016, and each year thereafter, the Minimum

1 Wage paid to Government Supported Employees shall increase by an amount corresponding to the
2 prior year's increase, if any, in the Consumer Price Index for urban wage earners and clerical workers
3 for the San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose, CA metropolitan statistical area, as determined by the
4 Controller, the effective date of this Chapter, the Minimum Wage shall be an hourly rate of \$8.50. To
5 prevent inflation from eroding its value, beginning on January 1, 2005, and each year thereafter, the
6 Minimum Wage shall increase by an amount corresponding to the prior year's increase, if any, in the
7 Consumer Price Index for urban wage earners and clerical workers for the San Francisco-Oakland-
8 San Jose, CA metropolitan statistical area.

9 (e) The Minimum Wage for Employers that are Small Businesses or Nonprofit Corporations
10 shall phase in over a two year period in order to afford such Employers time to adjust. For such
11 Employers, the effective date of this Chapter shall be January 1, 2005. For a transition period
12 beginning January 1, 2005 and ending December 31, 2005, the Minimum Wage for Employees of such
13 Employers shall be an hourly rate of \$7.75. Beginning January 1, 2006, the Minimum Wage for
14 Employees of such Employers shall be the regular Minimum Wage established pursuant to Section
15 4(b)1 of this Chapter.

16 * * * *

17 **SEC. 12R.7. IMPLEMENTATION AND ENFORCEMENT.**

18 (a) Enforcement Priority. It is the policy of the City and County of San Francisco that all
19 employees be compensated fairly according to the law and that Employers who engage in wage theft be
20 held accountable. Towards that end, the Mayor and Board of Supervisors shall study and review the
21 feasibility of enacting additional measures consistent with state law to enhance the Agency's
22 enforcement tools and the City's efforts to combat wage theft. The Mayor and Board of Supervisors
23 shall also take steps to ensure optimal collaboration among all City agencies and departments, as well
24 as between the City and state and federal labor standards agencies, in the enforcement of this Chapter.

25

1 ~~(a)~~ (b) **Implementation.** The Agency shall be authorized to coordinate implementation
2 and enforcement of this Chapter and may promulgate appropriate guidelines or rules for such
3 purposes consistent with this Chapter. Any guidelines or rules promulgated by the Agency
4 shall have the force and effect of law and may be relied on by Employers, Employees and
5 other parties to determine their rights and responsibilities under this Chapter. Any guidelines
6 or rules may establish procedures for ensuring fair, efficient and cost-effective implementation
7 of this Chapter, including supplementary procedures for helping to inform Employees of their
8 rights under this Chapter, for monitoring Employer compliance with this Chapter, and for
9 providing administrative hearings to determine whether an Employer or other person has
10 violated the requirements of this Chapter. The Agency shall make every effort to resolve
11 complaints in a timely manner and shall have a policy that the Agency shall take no more than
12 one year to settle, request an administrative hearing under Section 12R.7(b), or initiate a civil
13 action under Section 12R.7(c). The failure of the Agency to meet these timelines within one
14 year shall not be grounds for closure or dismissal of the complaint.

15 ~~(b)~~ (c) **Administrative Enforcement.**

16 (1) The Agency is authorized to take appropriate steps to enforce this Chapter.
17 The Agency may investigate any possible violations of this Chapter by an Employer or other
18 person. Where the Agency has reason to believe that a violation has occurred, it may order
19 any appropriate temporary or interim relief to mitigate the violation or maintain the status quo
20 pending completion of a full investigation or hearing.

21 (2) Where the Agency, after a hearing that affords a suspected violator due
22 process, determines that a violation has occurred, it may order any appropriate relief
23 including, but not limited to, reinstatement, the payment of any back wages unlawfully
24 withheld, and the payment of an additional sum as an administrative penalty in the amount of
25 \$50 to each Employee or person whose rights under this Chapter were violated for each day

1 that the violation occurred or continued. A violation for unlawfully withholding wages shall be
2 deemed to continue from the date immediately following the date that the wages were due
3 and payable as provided in Part 1 (commencing with Section 200) of Division 2 of the
4 California Labor Code, to the date immediately preceding the date the wages are paid in full.
5 Where prompt compliance is not forthcoming, the Agency may take any appropriate
6 enforcement action to secure compliance, including initiating a civil action pursuant to Section
7 ~~7(e)~~ 12R.7(c) of this Chapter and/or, except where prohibited by state or federal law,
8 requesting that City agencies or departments revoke or suspend any registration certificates,
9 permits or licenses held or requested by the Employer or person until such time as the
10 violation is remedied. *All City agencies and departments shall cooperate with revocation or*
11 *suspension requests from the Agency.* In order to compensate the City for the costs of
12 investigating and remedying the violation, the Agency may also order the violating Employer
13 or person to pay to the City a sum of not more than \$50 for each day and for each Employee
14 or person as to whom the violation occurred or continued. Such funds shall be allocated to the
15 Agency and shall be used to offset the costs of implementing and enforcing this Chapter. The
16 amounts of all sums and payments authorized or required under this Chapter shall be updated
17 annually for inflation, beginning January 1, 2005, using the inflation rate and procedures set
18 forth in Section 4(b) 12R.4 of this Chapter.

19 (3) An Employee or other person may report to the Agency in writing any
20 suspected violation of this Chapter. The Agency shall encourage reporting pursuant to this
21 subsection by keeping confidential, to the maximum extent permitted by applicable laws, the
22 name and other identifying information of the Employee or person reporting the violation.
23 Provided, however, that with the authorization of such person, the Agency may disclose his or
24 her name and identifying information as necessary to enforce this Chapter or for other
25 appropriate purposes. In order to further encourage reporting by Employees, if the Agency

1 notifies an Employer that the Agency is investigating a complaint, the Agency shall require the
2 Employer to post or otherwise notify its Employees that the Agency is conducting an
3 investigation, using a form provided by the Agency.

4 ~~(e)~~ (d) **Civil Enforcement.** The Agency, the City Attorney, any person aggrieved by a
5 violation of this Chapter, any entity a member of which is aggrieved by a violation of this
6 Chapter, or any other person or entity acting on behalf of the public as provided for under
7 applicable state law, may bring a civil action in a court of competent jurisdiction against the
8 Employer or other person violating this Chapter and, upon prevailing, shall be entitled to such
9 legal or equitable relief as may be appropriate to remedy the violation including, without
10 limitation, the payment of any back wages unlawfully withheld, the payment of an additional
11 sum as ~~liquidated damages~~ penalties in the amount of \$50 to each Employee or person whose
12 rights under this Chapter were violated for each day that the violation occurred or continued,
13 reinstatement in employment and/or injunctive relief, and shall be awarded reasonable
14 attorneys' fees and costs. Provided, however, that any person or entity enforcing this Chapter
15 on behalf of the public as provided for under applicable state law shall, upon prevailing, be
16 entitled only to equitable, injunctive or restitutionary relief, and reasonable attorneys' fees and
17 costs. Nothing in this Chapter shall be interpreted as restricting, precluding, or otherwise
18 limiting a separate or concurrent criminal prosecution under the Municipal Code or state law.
19 Jeopardy shall not attach as a result of any administrative or civil enforcement action taken
20 pursuant to this Chapter.

21 ~~(d)~~ (e) **Interest.** In any administrative or civil action brought for the nonpayment of
22 wages under this Section, the Agency or court, as the case may be, shall award interest on all
23 due and unpaid wages at the rate of interest specified in subdivision (b) of Section 3289 of the
24 California Civil Code, which shall accrue from the date that the wages were due and payable

25

1 as provided in Part 1 (commencing with Section 200) of Division 2 of the California Labor
2 Code, to the date the wages are paid in full.

3 ~~(e)~~ **(f) Posting Notice of Violation.** If an Employer fails to comply with a settlement
4 agreement with the Agency, a final determination by the Agency after an administrative
5 hearing officer issues a decision after a hearing under Section 12R.7(b), an administrative
6 citation issues under Section 12R.19, a decision made in an administrative appeal brought
7 under Section 12R.21, or judgment issued by the Superior Court, and the Employer has not
8 filed an appeal from the administrative hearing decision, administrative citation, administrative
9 appeal decision, or judgment, or the appeal is final, the Agency may require the Employer to
10 post public notice of the Employer's failure to comply in a form determined by the Agency.

11 **(g) City Employees.** Where the aggrieved party is an Employee of the City, the Employee shall
12 be entitled to all rights and remedies available under this Section 12R.7 except the Employee may not
13 recover the \$50 per diem penalty provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of this Section 12R.7.

14 * * * *

15 **SEC. 12R.10. APPLICATION OF MINIMUM WAGE TO WELFARE-TO-WORK**
16 **PROGRAMS.**

17 The Minimum Wage established pursuant to Section 12R.4 4(b) of this Chapter shall
18 apply to the City's Welfare-to-Work Programs under which persons must perform work in
19 exchange for receipt of benefits. Participants in Welfare-to-Work Programs shall not, during a
20 given benefits period, be required to work more than a number of hours equal to the value of
21 all cash benefits received during that period, divided by the Minimum Wage. Where state or
22 federal law would preclude the City from reducing the number of work hours required under a
23 given Welfare-to-Work Program, the City may comply with this Section by increasing the cash
24 benefits awarded so that their value is no less than the product of the Minimum Wage
25 multiplied by the number of work hours required.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

SEC. 12R.11. *EFFECTIVE OPERATIVE DATE.*

The changes to this Chapter adopted at the November 4, 2014 municipal election shall have prospective effect only and shall become operative effective on May 1, 2015. ninety (90) days after it is adopted. This Chapter is intended to have prospective effect only.

* * * *

SEC. 12R.17. VIOLATIONS.

(a) Separate and Continuing Violations; Penalties Paid Do Not Cure Violations.

Each and every day that a violation exists constitutes a separate and distinct offense. Each section violated constitutes a separate violation for any day at issue. If the person or persons responsible for a violation fail to correct the violation within the time period specified on the citation and required under Section 12R.18, the Director of the Office of Labor Standards Enforcement may issue subsequent administrative citations for the uncorrected violation(s) without issuing a new notice as otherwise required by Section 12R.18(b)(a). Payment of the penalty shall not excuse the failure to correct the violation nor shall it bar any further enforcement action by the City. If penalties and costs are the subject of administrative appeal or judicial review, then the accrual of such penalties and costs shall be stayed until the determination of such appeal or review is final.

(b) Payments to City; Due Date; Late Payment Penalty. All penalties assessed

under Section 12R.16 shall be payable to the City and County of San Francisco. Administrative penalties and costs assessed by means of an administrative citation shall be due within thirty (30) days from the date of the citation. The failure of any person to pay an administrative penalty and costs within that time shall result in the assessment of an additional late fee. The amount of the late fee shall be ten (10) percent of the total amount of the administrative penalty assessed for each month the penalty and any already accrued late payment penalty remains unpaid.

1 (c) **Collection of Penalties; Special Assessments.** The failure of any person to pay
2 a penalty assessed by administrative citation under Section 12R.16 within the time specified
3 on the citation constitutes a debt to the City. The City may file a civil action, create and impose
4 liens as set forth below, or pursue any other legal remedy to collect such money.

5 (d) **Liens.** The City may create and impose liens against any property owned or
6 operated by a person who fails to pay a penalty assessed by administrative citation. The
7 procedures provided for in ~~Chapter XX of Chapter 10~~ Chapter 10, Article XX of the ~~San Francisco~~
8 Administrative Code shall govern the imposition and collection of such liens.

9 (e) **Payment to City.** The Labor Standards Enforcement Officer has the authority to
10 require that payment of back wages found to be due and owing to employees be paid directly
11 to the City and County of San Francisco for disbursement to the employees. The Controller
12 shall hold the back wages in escrow for workers whom the Labor Standards Enforcement
13 Officer, despite his/her best efforts, including any required public notice, cannot locate; funds
14 so held for three years or more shall be dedicated to the enforcement of the Minimum Wage
15 Ordinance or other laws enforced by the Office of Labor Standards Enforcement.

16 * * * *

17 Section 2. The Administrative Code is hereby amended by revising Chapter 70, to
18 read as follows:

19 **CHAPTER 70: IN-HOME SUPPORTIVE SERVICES PUBLIC AUTHORITY**

20 * * * *

21 **SEC. 70.11. MINIMUM COMPENSATION.**

22 ~~(a)~~ All Employees of the In-Home Supportive Services Public Authority, including,
23 without limitation, IHSS personnel referred to consumers, or referred by consumers for
24 inclusion in the Authority, shall be deemed to be "Covered Employees" and shall be paid no
25 less than the "Minimum Compensation," as ~~such terms are~~ that term is defined in Chapter 12P-2

1 of the ~~San Francisco~~ Administrative Code, and shall be deemed "Employees" and paid no less than
2 the "Minimum Wage," as that term is defined in Chapter 12.R of the Administrative Code. This
3 Section shall be implemented in a manner that does not conflict with applicable federal or
4 State laws.


5
6 Section 3. Scope of Ordinance. In enacting this ordinance, the People of the City and
7 County of San Francisco intend to amend only those words, phrases, paragraphs,
8 subsections, sections, articles, numbers, punctuation marks, charts, diagrams, or any other
9 constituent parts of the Municipal Code that are explicitly shown in this ordinance as additions
10 or deletions, in accordance with the "Note" that appears under the official title of the
11 ordinance.

12
13 Section 4. Conflict with Other Measures. This Initiative will be deemed to conflict with
14 any other measure appearing on the same ballot establishing minimum wage rates. In the
15 event that this Initiative and any other such measure(s) are approved by the voters at the
16 same election, and this initiative receives a greater number of affirmative votes than any other
17 such measure or measures, this initiative shall control in its entirety and the other measure or
18 measures shall be rendered void and without any legal effect. If this Initiative is approved by
19 a majority of the voters but does not receive a greater number of affirmative votes than any
20
21
22
23
24
25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

other measure appearing on the same ballot establishing minimum wage rates, this Initiative shall take effect to the extent not in conflict with said measure or measures.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
DENNIS J. HERRERA, City Attorney

By: 
FRANCESCA GESSNER
Deputy City Attorney

n:\legana\as2014\1400571\00942780.doc

Appendix B: Notice to Employees: Minimum Compensation Ordinance

Please Post Where Employees Can Read It Easily

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO



EDWIN M. LEE
MAYOR

NOTICE TO EMPLOYEES

Minimum Compensation Ordinance

This employer is a contractor with the City and County of San Francisco. This contract agreement is subject to the Minimum Compensation Ordinance (MCO). If under this contract agreement you work at least 4 hours per week during a pay period, you must be provided no less than the Minimum Compensation outlined below.

THESE ARE YOUR RIGHTS . . .

1. Minimum Hourly Compensation:

For contracts entered into or amended on or after October 14, 2007

- For-Profit Rate: **\$13.64/hour** effective 1/1/17
- Nonprofits must pay no less than the S.F. Minimum Wage (\$13.00 effective 7/1/16)
- Rates subject to change; your employer must pay the then-current rate posted on the OLSE web site: www.sfgov.org/olse/mco

For contracts entered into prior to October 14, 2007

- For work performed within the City Of S.F.: SF Minimum Wage (\$13.00/hour effective 7/1/16)
- For work performed outside of S.F.: \$10.77/hour

2. Paid Days Off:

- 12 paid days off per year for vacation, sick leave, or personal necessity
- The paid days off for part-time employees are prorated based on hours worked

3. Unpaid Days Off:

- 10 unpaid days off per year
- Unpaid days off for part-time employees are prorated based on hours worked

**IF YOU BELIEVE YOUR RIGHTS ARE BEING VIOLATED CONTACT THE
OFFICE OF LABOR STANDARDS ENFORCEMENT AT (415) 554-7903.**

**Office of Labor Standards Enforcement (OLSE)
City Hall, Room 430
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102
www.sfgov.org/olse/mco**

Appendix C: Minimum Compensation Ordinance: KNOW YOUR RIGHTS

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

EDWIN M. LEE, MAYOR

GENERAL SERVICES AGENCY
OFFICE OF LABOR STANDARDS ENFORCEMENT
PATRICK MULLIGAN, DIRECTOR



Minimum Compensation Ordinance (MCO) KNOW YOUR RIGHTS

This notice is intended to inform you of your rights under the Minimum Compensation Ordinance (MCO), Chapter 12P of the San Francisco Administrative Code. The MCO requires your employer to provide a prescribed minimum level of compensation be paid to employees of (1) contractors and their subcontractors providing services to the City and County; (2) public entities whose boundaries are coterminous with the City and County who have city contracts; and, (3) tenants and subtenants on Airport property and their subcontractors. The Office of Labor Standards Enforcement (OLSE) is charged with enforcing the MCO. You will be asked to sign this document after you have reviewed the following information. Do not sign this document unless you fully understand your rights under this law.

THE MCO REQUIREMENTS

1. **Minimum Hourly Wage**
 - For contracts entered into on or after October 14, 2007 and existing contracts amended on or after that date, the rate for for-profit contractors is \$13.64/hour effective January 1, 2017. Nonprofit contractors must pay the San Francisco minimum wage (\$13.00/hour effective July 1, 2016).
 - For contracts entered into prior to October 14, 2007, the rate for work performed within the City of S.F. is the San Francisco minimum wage (\$13.00/hour effective July 1, 2016). The rate for work performed outside of S.F. is \$10.77/hour.
 - Rates are subject to change. Your employer is obligated to keep informed of the requirements and to notify employees in writing of any adjustment to the MCO wage.
2. **Paid Days Off**
 - 12 paid days off per year for vacation, sick leave or personal necessity
 - The paid days off for part-time employees are prorated based on hours worked
3. **Unpaid Days Off**
 - 10 unpaid days off per year
 - Unpaid days off for part-time employees are prorated based on hours worked
 - Temporary and casual employees are not eligible for unpaid time off

RETALIATION PROHIBITED

Your employer may not retaliate against you or any other employee for trying to learn more about the MCO or exercising your rights under the law. If you believe that you have been discriminated or retaliated against for inquiring about or exercising your rights under the MCO, contact the OLSE at (415) 554-7903 to file a MCO complaint.

Do not sign this document unless you fully understand your rights under this law. If you have any questions about your employer's responsibilities or your rights under this Ordinance, contact the OLSE at (415) 554-7903 or visit www.sfgov.org/olse/mco for more information about this law.

Print Name of Employee: _____

Signature of Employee: _____ Date: _____

Para asistencia en Español, llame al (415) 554-7903

需要中文幫助, 請電 (415) 554-7903

For a complete copy of the Minimum Compensation Ordinance, visit www.sfgov.org/olse/mco.

Appendix E: Tables and Figures



Petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario

Whereas a growing number of Ontarians are concerned about the growth in low-wage, part-time, casual, temporary and insecure employment; and

Whereas too many workers are not protected by the minimum standards outlined in existing employment and labour laws; and

Whereas the Ontario government is currently engaging in a public consultation to review and improve employment and labour laws in the province; therefore,

We the undersigned petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to implement a decent work agenda by making sure that Ontario's labour and employment laws:

- Require all workers be entitled to a starting wage that reflects a uniform, provincial minimum, regardless of a worker's age, job or sector of employment;
- Promote full-time, permanent work with adequate hours for all those who choose it;
- Ensure part-time, temporary, casual and contract workers receive the same pay and benefits as their full-time, permanent counterparts;
- Provide at least seven (7) days of paid sick leave each year;
- Support job security for workers when companies or contracts change ownership;
- Prevent employers from downgrading their responsibilities for minimum standards onto temp agencies, sub-contractors or workers themselves;
- Extend minimum protections to all workers by eliminating exemptions to the laws;
- Protect workers who stand up for their rights;
- Offer proactive enforcement of laws, supported by adequate public staffing and meaningful penalties for employers who violate the law;
- Make it easier for workers to join unions; and
- Ensure all workers are paid at least \$15 an hour.



Yes! I want to get involved in the campaign for a \$15 & Fairness

Name (print)	Address	City	Postal Code	Signature	PHONE / EMAIL

Submit completed petitions to the \$15 and Fairness Campaign c/o Suite 223, 720 Spadina Avenue, Toronto, Ontario, M5S 2T9

For internal use only

List of Tables

Contents

Table 1 Minimum Wage to Median Wage Ratio 7

Table 2 Consumer Price Index by Canadian City (Monthly) 8

Table 3 Minimum Wage Increase for the City of San Francisco from 2015, Forward..... 11

Table 4 Official Summary Report of Proposition J 12

Table 5 Penalties and Citations for Violations Regarding San Francisco's Minimum Wage Code 15

Table 6 Wage Schedule of the Proposed Policy in New York 17

Table 7 Industries Affected by Minimum Wage Increases in New York..... 20

Table 8 Cumulative Change in Operating Costs for Selected Industries in New York, 2021 21

Table 9 Upcoming Changes to Minimum Wage in Alberta, 2016 – 2018..... 23

Table 10 Minimum Wage to Median Wage Ratio

Table 1	Minimum wage to median wage ratio	Percent of workers getting pay increases
New York State		
New York City	0.57	34.8
Balance of New York State	0.63	38.3
Other states and localities		
California	0.65	34.4
Los Angeles City	0.67	41.3
Seattle	0.53	29.0
San Francisco	0.46	23.4

Table 11 Consumer Price Index by Canadian City (Monthly)

Table 2	January 2016	December 2016	January 2017	December 2016 to January 2017	January 2016 to January 2017
	2002=100			% change	
All-items					
St. John's (N.L.)	128.9	133.7	134.9	0.9	4.7
Charlottetown and Summerside (P.E.I.)	128.6	130.2	131.6	1.1	2.3
Halifax (N.S.)	128.2	129.5	130.5	0.8	1.8
Saint John (N.B.)	125.9	128.2	130.0	1.4	3.3
Québec (Que.)	124.5	125.2	126.1	0.7	1.3
Montréal (Que.)	124.8	125.5	126.2	0.6	1.1
Ottawa-Gatineau (Ont. part)	126.5	128.1	128.9	0.6	1.9
Toronto (Ont.)	129.0	131.5	132.1	0.5	2.4
Thunder Bay (Ont.)	122.8	124.2	124.9	0.6	1.7
Winnipeg (Man.)	126.7	127.6	129.4	1.4	2.1
Regina (Sask.)	131.5	132.2	133.9	1.3	1.8
Saskatoon (Sask.)	131.5	131.8	133.6	1.4	1.6
Edmonton (Alta.)	133.4	134.7	136.9	1.6	2.6
Calgary (Alta.)	134.3	135.3	137.4	1.6	2.3
Vancouver (B.C.)	122.7	124.7	125.3	0.5	2.1
Victoria (B.C.)	118.9	121.0	121.6	0.5	2.3
Whitehorse (Y.T.)	124.1	126.1	126.9	0.6	2.3
Yellowknife (N.W.T.)	130.7	131.9	133.6	1.3	2.2

Table 12 Minimum Wage Increase for the City of San Francisco from 2015, Forward

Table 3	
Effective Date	Minimum Wage Rate
5/1/2015	\$12.25
7/1/2016	\$13.00
7/1/2017	\$14.00
7/1/2018	\$15.00
July 1st Each Following Year	CPI Increase

Table 13 Official Summary Report of Proposition J

Table 4

**Consolidated General Election
November 4, 2014
Summary Report
The City and County of San Francisco
Official Summary Report**

Local Measure J	597/597 100.00%
Yes	174,143 77.43%
No	50,771 22.57%
Total ...	224,914 100.00%

Table 14 Penalties and Citations for Violations Regarding San Francisco's Minimum Wage Code

Table 5 VIOLATION	PENALTY AMOUNT
Failure to maintain payroll records or to retain payroll records for four years – Administrative Code Section 12R.5(c)	\$500.00
Failure to allow the Office of Labor Standards Enforcement to inspect payroll records – Administrative Code Section 12R.5(c)	\$500.00
Retaliation for exercising rights under Minimum Wage Ordinance – Administrative Code Section 12R.6 The Penalty for retaliation is \$1,000.00 per employee.	\$1,000.00
Failure to Post notice of Minimum Wage rate – Administrative Code Section 12R.5(b) Failure to provide notice of investigation to employees – Administrative Code Section 12R.7(b) Failure to post notice of violation to public – Administrative Code Section 12R.7(e) Failure to provide employer's name, address, and telephone number in writing – Administrative Code Section 12R.5(b)	\$500.00

Table 15 Wage Schedule of the Proposed Policy in New York

Table 6

Year	Date	Minimum wage (nominal dollars)	Percent increase from previous year	Minimum wage (2015 dollars)	Percent increase from previous year (2015 dollars)
New York City					
2015	December 31	\$9.00		\$9.00	
2016	April 1	10.50	16.7	10.29	14.4
2016	December 31	12.00	14.3	11.77	14.3
2017	December 31	13.50	12.5	12.91	9.8
2018	December 31	15.00	11.1	13.98	8.2
2019	December 31*	15.41	2.7	13.98	0.0
2020	December 31*	15.82	2.7	13.98	0.0
2021	July 1*	16.25	2.7	13.98	0.0
Balance of New York State					
2015	December 31	\$9.00		\$9.00	
2016	April 1	9.75	8.3	9.56	6.2
2016	December 31	10.75	10.3	10.54	10.3
2017	December 31	11.75	9.3	11.24	6.6
2018	December 31	12.75	8.5	11.88	5.7
2019	December 31	13.75	7.8	12.48	5.0
2020	December 31	14.50	5.4	12.81	2.7
2021	July 1	15.00	3.4	12.91	0.8

Table 16 Industries Affected by Minimum Wage Increases in New York

Table 7	Percent of covered workforce	Percent of all workers getting a raise	Percent of industry's workers getting a raise
A. Private, for-profit sector	72.5	82.8	41.9
Agriculture, fishing, forestry, hunting, and mining	0.4	0.6	62.8
Construction	4.4	4.2	34.4
Non-durable manufacturing	2.6	2.8	38.8
Food Manufacturing	0.6	0.9	50.1
Durable manufacturing	3.7	3.1	30.8
Wholesale trade	2.3	2.0	32.7
Retail trade	10.9	17.2	57.7
Grocery stores	2.3	4.2	67.8
Transportation, warehousing, and utilities	3.6	3.9	40.3
Information	2.8	1.5	19.7
Finance, insurance, and real estate	7.6	4.1	19.6
Professional services	6.6	2.9	16.1
Administrative services	3.3	4.5	49.5
Employment services	0.5	0.5	41.4
Building services	0.9	1.3	54.7
Educational services	2.7	2.6	34.8
Health and social assistance	10.4	12.1	42.4
Ambulatory care	4.3	5.6	48.2
Hospitals	3.1	2.0	23.6
Residential care	1.6	2.0	46.0
Social assistance	0.8	1.3	57.8
Child day care services	0.7	1.2	65.7
Arts, entertainment, and recreation	1.5	1.9	47.2
Accommodation	1.0	1.4	52.0
Restaurants	6.1	13.3	79.7
Other services	2.5	4.8	69.0
Personal services	1.4	3.1	79.7
B. Private, nonprofit sector (selected industries)	11.2	9.6	31.3
Educational services	2.5	1.8	26.0
Health and social assistance	4.5	4.0	32.4
Ambulatory care	0.6	0.6	37.0
Hospitals	1.8	0.8	16.0
Residential care	0.8	1.0	50.4
Social assistance	1.0	1.1	39.1
Child day care services	0.3	0.5	51.8
Other services	1.7	1.7	35.0
Personal services	0.1	0.1	65.6
Religious organizations	0.6	0.7	44.4
Civic and social organizations	0.8	0.7	32.1
C. State and local government	14.6	7.6	19.1
Local government	9.9	5.4	20.1
State government	4.7	2.2	16.9
D. All New York workers	100.0	100.0	36.6

Table 17 Cumulative Change in Operating Costs for Selected Industries in New York, 2021

Table 8	Percent change in payroll costs in 2021	Labor cost percent of operating costs in 2016	Percent change in operating costs in 2021
All industries	3.3	22.1	0.7
Nondurable manufacturing	3.9	6.9	0.3
Food manufacturing	7.6	10.7	0.8
Wholesale trade	2.7	6.2	0.2
Retail trade	8.1	10.8	0.9
Grocery stores	14.1	12.2	1.7
Administrative services and waste management	6.0	61.1	3.7
Health care and social assistance	3.6	48.4	1.8
Ambulatory care	5.4	52.9	2.9
Hospitals	1.2	44.1	0.5
Residential care	5.9	52.2	3.1
Restaurants	23.1	30.7	7.1
Other Services	12.8	33.8	4.3

Table 18 Upcoming Changes to Minimum Wage in Alberta, 2016 – 2018

Table 9

Type of employee	October 1, 2016	October 1, 2017	October 1, 2018
Most employees – General minimum wage	\$12.20/hour	\$13.60/hour	\$15/hour
Liquor servers (as of Oct. 1, 2016 the liquor server rate was eliminated)	\$12.20/hour	\$13.60/hour	\$15/hour
Salespersons (including land agents and certain professionals)	\$486/week	\$542/week	\$598/week
Domestic employees (living in their employer's home)	\$2,316/month	\$2,582/month	\$2,848/month

List of Figures

Contents

Figure 1 York University’s Wall of Wages 27

Figure 2 York University’s Wall of Wages

