



OFFICE OF THE BRONX BOROUGH PRESIDENT
The Bronx County Building
851 Grand Concourse
Bronx, New York 10451

Ruben Diaz Jr.
BOROUGH PRESIDENT

TEL: 718-590-3500
FAX: 718-590-3537

**EXPANDED TESTIMONY OF BRONX BOROUGH PRESIDENT
RUBEN DIAZ JR.
BEFORE THE CITY COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON CONTRACTS
MAY 12, 2011**

The historian James Truslow Adams defined the idea of the "American Dream" as “a land in which life should be better and richer and fuller for every man, with opportunity for each according to ability or achievement.”ⁱ Inherent in this vision is the idea that if you are willing to work you will have opportunity to make a better life for yourself and your family. The “Fair Wages for New Yorkers” Act will help restore that promise, and we need it now more than ever.

As I noted in my State of the Borough address in February, we have tremendous income inequality in this city, which is not just a local problem but a national cause of concern. The middle class, both locally and nationally, are working harder and earning less. Economic policy should facilitate upward mobility, not expand the masses of working poor. However, tax dollars and other City resources are instead being used to facilitate low wage job creation. As noted by Daron Acemoglu, Professor of Applied Economics, at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, these jobs are problematic because “(e)quality of *opportunity* [is harder] to achieve in an unequal society . . . poverty not only causes low standards of living and poor health but damages both individuals and society by preventing those at the bottom from *realising their*

potential, . . . because they are unable to obtain a decent quality of education to prepare them for competition in the labour market.”ⁱⁱ How can we improve educational achievement and performance when more and more working people are falling into poverty? Our children will not realize their full potential if their parents spent more time at work than at home. Few New Yorkers will realize their potential if they have to work two jobs just to pay their rent. How can New Yorkers pursue the American Dream when they are forced to seek out food pantries instead??

Work More & Earn Less

The **Fiscal Policy Institute** recently reported that:

- The bottom 90 percent of city income earners make 34.5 percent of all *money* made in the city.ⁱⁱⁱ
- In fact, New York is the most polarized city by income in the country. The top one percent of earners account for nearly 45 percent of the city’s total income.^{iv}
- The same study noted that between 1990 and 2007, hourly wages in this city actually fell almost nine percent; at the same time average annual salary and bonuses on Wall Street doubled.^v
- Since 1990, real wages for low-wage New York City workers have declined nearly eight percent over the past 20 years, even as their educational attainment has risen.^{vi}

Moreover, the cost of living in New York continues to rise, resulting in a large number of “working poor.” For example, the cost of a monthly MetroCard is \$104, or ten percent of the pretax monthly income of someone employed in a minimum wage job, assuming they are working at least 35 hours each week. Two million people in the five boroughs rely on food stamps to live.^{vii} The City’s poverty rate was 21.3 percent in 2009, meaning that roughly 1.8 million of our neighbors are living below the poverty line.^{viii} A recent analysis of prices by the *New York Post* found that rent has risen five percent and prices for a sampling of New Yorkers’ common purchases have jumped about 14 percent in one year.^{ix}

But the poverty rate does not tell the whole story; the **Center for an Urban Future** recently found that in New York City, 31 percent of all adults are earning less than \$11.54 an hour, or \$24,003 a year, (hereafter “low wage jobs”).^x These numbers are more pronounced in the outer-boroughs: 42 percent of Bronx workers over the age of 18 are employed in low-wage jobs.^{xi} Similarly, Queens has 34 percent of the adult workforce in low-wage positions, followed by Brooklyn at 32 percent, then Staten Island at 23 percent, and lastly Manhattan at 22 percent.^{xii} Conversely, **Wider Opportunities for Women (“WOW”)** released a report in March noting that a single worker needs an income of \$30,012 a year – or just above \$14 an hour – to cover basic expenses and save for retirement and emergencies.^{xiii} This is almost three times the 2010 national poverty level of \$10,830 for a single person, and almost twice the federal minimum wage of \$7.25.^{xiv}

What is a Living Wage?

The federal definition of a “living wage,” the same definition that is called for in the **“Fair Wages for New Yorkers” Act**, guarantees that workers in large development projects receiving public subsidies are paid at least \$10.00 an hour, including benefits, and \$11.50 an hour without benefits. More broadly, “(i)t is a wage level that offers workers the ability to support families to maintain self respect and to have both the means and the leisure to participate in the civic life of the nation.”^{xv}

The Living Wage is Already Here

Per the **National Law Employment Project**, since 2005, New York City has made wage requirements part of its large taxpayer-subsidized development projects.^{xvi} These include:

- The Greenpoint-Williamsburg waterfront residential redevelopment, where the city required prevailing wages for building service workers.^{xvii}

- The Willets Point retail and entertainment development project, where the city required prevailing wages for building service workers.^{xviii}
- The Coney Island redevelopment, where the city agreed to require prevailing wages for building service, hotel and construction workers, and a living wage preference for retail workers.^{xix}

All of these requirements apply to workers at the subsidized sites, regardless of whether they are employed by service contractors or business tenants.^{xx} New York has begun to institutionalize this approach to development.^{xxi} In 2007, the New York State Legislature made prevailing wages for building service workers a requirement for most new apartment, co-op and condo construction financed under New York City’s “421-a” housing tax abatement program.^{xxii} These requirements have not deterred developers from moving forward with projects.^{xxiii} A reported 29 firms have responded to the request for proposal (RFP) for the Willet’s Point project, which includes the same requirements.^{xxiv} Most recently, Governor Andrew Cuomo included a provision in the New York State budget that requires wage parity for home health aides. Now organizations providing Medicaid services in New York City, as well as Westchester, Nassau, and Suffolk counties, are required to compensate their home health aides using the living wage of that area.

Return on Investment for the Tax Payer

It is the responsibility of elected officials to use taxpayer dollars in a manner that leads to the best Return on Investment (“R.O.I.”) for those same taxpayers. Yet, our City’s current subsidy policies prioritize the R.O.I. for developers. Developers receive millions of dollars in tax breaks and subsidies from New York City. Per the **Fiscal Policy Institute**: “every year, New York City spends well over \$2 billion through a variety of programs in the name of economic development and job creation.”^{xxv} (See Table 1) For example, real property tax expenditures

provided through the as-of-right Industrial and Commercial Assistance Program totaled \$623 million in FY 2011.^{xxvi} Similarly, New York City reports that discretionary economic development projects under the aegis of the New York City **Economic Development Corporation (EDC)** and the New York City **Industrial Development Agency (IDA)** received property, sales and mortgage recording tax breaks worth approximately \$241.7 million in 2010.^{xxvii}

Table 1^{xxviii}

Annual NYC Economic Development Tax Expenditures

Millions of dollars

Real Property Tax	\$1,111.3
Industrial & Commercial Incentive Program	\$568.0
Other Commercial & Industrial Exemptions	\$26.4
Industrial Development Agency	\$181.5
Economic Development Corporation	\$12.2
Urban Development Corporation--Commercial	\$217.8
Battery Park City Authority--Commercial	\$95.5
Teleport, Port Authority	\$9.9
NYC Personal and Business Income, Sales and Mortgage Recording Taxes	\$1,238.3
Business Income and Excise Tax Expenditures	\$841.0
--Business and Investment Capital Tax Limitation	324.0
--Insurance Corporation Non-Taxation	276.0
--Other (Energy Cost Savings Program, Film Producton, etc.)	241.0
Sales Tax Expenditures ## UNK	
--Fuel sold to airlines \$120.0	
Unincorporated Business Tax Credit on NYC Personal Income Tax	\$135.6
IDA Tax Expenditures (other than Real Property Tax)	\$41.7
--Mortgage Recording Tax Exemption and PILOT Savings	\$32.2
--Sales Tax Exemption	\$2.8
--Energy Tax Savings	\$0.6
--Tax Exempt Bond Savings on NYC Personal Income Tax	\$6.0
Unincorporated Business Tax--Exemption for Carried Interest	\$100.0
GRAND TOTAL, all NYC economic development tax expenditures	\$2,349.6

Moreover, EDC reports that companies receiving EDC or IDA benefits employed approximately 152,000 workers in FY 2010, about 42,000 more than employed by those companies at the time subsidies were initially provided.^{xxix}

If paying \$10 per hour after receiving the extensive benefits these firms have requested repeatedly from the City makes a project unprofitable; then these projects are poor investments of our tax dollars.

R.O.I. for the taxpayer means creating jobs that expand the tax base, reduce reliance on food stamps and other government assistance, grow the middle class and expand the purchasing power of those that live in New York City. Yet these projects generate millions for the developers and only low-wage jobs for city residents:

- ***The Bronx Gateway Mall*** (approximately \$10 million in New York City subsidies). FPI estimates that as of spring 2010 about 1,300 workers were employed in the mall, that the average starting wage for non-managerial workers was \$8.80 an hour, and that median wages were \$10.20 an hour.^{xxx}
- **The BJ's at Gateway Center is ranked within "the top three successful BJ stores nationally."**^{xxx1}
- The success of the **Target at the Gateway** mall has led to a third Bronx Target heading to the East Bronx, which is part of a proposed 300,000-square-foot mall at nearby Brush and Lafayette Aves off the Hutchinson Expressway. Final plans for the \$35 million project are not complete.^{xxxii}
- **Fresh Direct** (\$2 million in subsidies for its warehouse in Long Island City). According to FY2010 city reports, the company had 1,657 employees, with 63 percent earning less than \$25,000 per year. Of these employees, about 1,200 were warehouse workers, for whom starting wages were reported frequently to be the minimum wage.^{xxxiii}
- **Yankee Stadium** (nearly \$50 million in tax breaks, \$326 in city capital improvements, and more than \$1.2 billion in tax-exempt financing). FPI estimates that as of spring 2010 there were about 3,400 jobs at the stadium, that the average starting wage for non-managerial workers was \$9.19 an hour, and that median wages were \$10.50 an hour.^{xxxiv}

Their analysis found that the top five non-managerial jobs created at the three case study projects (Bronx Gateway Mall, Fresh Direct and Yankee Stadium) all paid very low wages:^{xxxv}

- Concession food and beverage workers, starting wage \$8.75 an hour;
- Warehouse workers, starting wage \$7.25 an hour;
- Retail salespersons, starting wage \$8.09 an hour;
- Security guards, starting wage \$9.53 an hour; and
- Cashiers, starting wage \$7.44 an hour.

The report concludes: “without a significant change in subsidy policy, future New York City-supported projects will likely continue to mirror this pattern of subsidizing businesses that create low-wage jobs.”^{xxxvi} Generally, developers that receive such large public subsidies are as far from small business as possible; and the tenants from such development tend to be major retail and hotel chains.^{xxxvii} Subsidy recipients can well afford to pay living wages even without the subsidies.^{xxxviii} The “Fair Wages for New Yorkers” Act specifically excludes small businesses.

Firms like Target will continue to serve the 8.5 million residents of this city because it’s a prime market. The purpose of the Fair Wages for New Yorkers Act is to ensure that when these firms come and request assistance, that they do right by the people they employ. Let us be clear, the Related Co. would have gone through with their retail mall in the Kingsbridge Armory if the “Fair Wages for New Yorkers” Act were in fact the law.

But the Mayor killed the project just as he has attempted to kill this bill. Only now he has released alleged findings of a draft report which purports to show that this bill will do serious damage to our economy. This study is so flawed it is unbelievable that the City would present it as evidence against a living wage mandate. First, the study bases the majority of its findings on

statistical models that measure the effect of applying Intro 251 to the City's new Industrial and Commercial Abatement Program. The Fair Wages for New Yorkers Act, however, would not apply to the ICAP which we have confirmed with legal counsel for the City Council. As a result, almost every finding in the report does not apply to Intro 251 or 251-a. Based on this fact alone the study is worthless.

As you may already know, this report was organized and authored primarily by an economist that has written 27 prior reports claiming living wage and minimum wage laws result in job losses and has a national reputation for producing academically flawed reports which is why the Bloomberg administration hired this consultant in the first place. Mr. Neumark's living wage research has also been extensively criticized by academics in the field as being seriously flawed including the methodology that utilized in the EDC study.^{xxxix} A follow-up study by Neumark and Adams produced results suggesting that business-assistance living wage ordinances reduce employment among affected workers by an implausible 91 percent. University of California economists critiquing this finding concluded that the Neumark/Adams estimates are faulty and "do not provide a sound basis for policy."^{xl}

More recently, Neumark's minimum wage research has been shown to be based on faulty methods which, when corrected, refute his conclusion that recent minimum wage increases have led to job losses. In a new study, University of California and University of Massachusetts economists examine the same datasets that Neumark uses in many of his wage analyses, but they incorporate controls for the critical state and regional economic differences that Neumark fails to include. They find that when accounting sufficiently for economic shocks and long-term growth differences across states, the negative employment effects claimed by Neumark disappear.^{xli} *The British Journal of Industrial Relations* in 2009 published an extensive review of minimum-wage

research. Referring to a 2007 minimum wage literature review co-authored by Neumark that surveyed many of the same studies, the authors criticize the discrepancy between Neumark’s “subjective narrative review” and the actual findings of the studies he examined.^{xlii}

In this case, he produced exactly what the Mayor wanted; a report that is not worth the paper is printed on. The EDC report is based on Intro 251, not the current or final version of bill, Intro 251-a. Credible research shows, however, that the benefits of a “living wage” ordinance, which would require employees at subsidized developments to receive \$10 per hour with benefits and \$11.50 per hour without, are real and considerable. Instead of looking at the impact of already existing living wage laws in New York City, such as the prevailing wage requirements, EDC prefers to release a study with inherent inconsistencies. They claim this bill will have little impact on worker income, yet it will dissuade real estate developers, particularly retail, from coming to New York.

However, the growth of the local retail industry is a driving force for these jobs; the **Fiscal Policy Institute** December 2008 report “Low Wages, No Bargain: Retail Jobs in NYC” found more low-wage workers in New York City are employed in retail than in any other single sector of the New York economy. In regards to their wages:

- Three in five retail workers earn an hourly wage of \$13 or less, and 44 percent earn less than \$10 an hour.
- From 2000 to 2007, retail jobs grew seven times faster than total private sector employment growth.
- Nearly ten percent of the city’s private sector-employees work in the retail industry and the sector has expanded rapidly in recent years.

The concentration of low-wage jobs in retail and the sector’s fast growth locally suggests these projects are poor choices for public subsidy without a Living Wage component.

Why We Need Change

We have seen more than **\$11 billion in development in the Bronx over the past decade**, including millions of dollars of New York City tax breaks, and yet we remain the county with the highest poverty rates in the nation. The “**Fair Wages for New Yorkers**” Act will ensure that, when developers seek heavy taxpayer subsidies, the jobs they create pay their employees a “living wage.” EDC’s subsidy policy should require an industry by industry analysis to identify and distinguish between competitors and recruit those firms that are “high wage-high productivity” employers vs. “low wage-low productivity.” New York City has a densely populated area of 8.5 million people with strong infrastructure; service providers and developers should want to service this market.

Job Growth Does Not Have To Come at the Expense of Job Quality

As of December 2010, the National Employment Law Project counts 123 different Living Wage Ordinance nationally; including six of the U.S.’s ten most populous cities and 12 of the top 25.^{xliii} Moreover, the **Center for American Progress**, reviewed 15 cities (including Los Angeles, Philadelphia and Hartford) that have Living Wage laws in place and found wage standards had no negative effect on employment levels, local business climate, or a city’s ability to attract investment.^{xliv} **Their analysis found no evidence that Living Wage laws reduce employment or economic development across industries and firm types general typically covered by these laws.**^{xlv} Specifically, there is no loss of employment in low-wage services, retail, restaurants, hotels, manufacturing, back office, wholesale, and big-box retail businesses.^{xlvi} These findings show that a living wage law is unlikely to have any harmful effects on a city’s economy.^{xlvii} Furthermore, seventeen states (plus Washington, D.C.) have minimum wage rates set higher than the federal minimum wage, as of January 1, 2011. There are ten states (AZ, CO,

FL, MO, MT, NV, OH, OR, VT, and WA) that have minimum wages that are linked to a consumer price index.^{xlviii} As a result of this linkage, the minimum wages in these states are normally increased each year, generally around January 1st.

Living Wage Mandates Positively Impact Employers

As more cities and municipalities pass wage standards and living wage laws the evidence mounts that business owners and developers reap the benefits in the form of decreases in absenteeism, reductions in turnover, reduced training and recruitment costs, and productivity gains; specifically, existing employees become more productive reducing replacement costs. Tucson, Arizona, is one of the best examples of how wage standards are a best practice for employers.^{xlix} It is unique in that it has both a LWO and a voluntary living wage program.¹ Subsequent research on the effects of the Tucson experiment found two-thirds (66 percent) of contractors that support the LWO reported an improvement in worker morale and a reduction in employee turnover since the LWO was passed.^{li} Slightly more than half (56 percent) experienced a decrease in absenteeism. They also noted increases in productivity (44 percent), a reduction in accidents (22 percent) and theft (22 percent), as well as a decrease in the number of overtime hours they paid employees (11 percent). Furthermore, a majority of the companies belonging to the GBP supported the continuation of the city's LWO, suggesting most participants view the two approaches as complementary rather than antithetical.^{lii}

We have seen this phenomenon manifest locally, Cooperative Home Care Associates, a New York employer of 450 workers, has dropped their turnover rate to 20 percent compared to the 60 percent industry average because they were paying their workers 20 percent above the industry average as well as providing health benefits, training, and compensation for travel time to see clients.^{liii}

Living Wage Laws Lead to More Efficient Public Contracting

In Fiscal Year 2010, New York City procured almost \$17 billion worth of supplies, services and construction through almost 56,000 transactions.^{liv} Consequently, concerns have risen over the impact of the Fair Wages for New Yorkers Act on the City's contracting process. Research has shown "that firms tend to absorb the wage increase mainly through efficiency gains, specifically through lower rates of turnover and vacancies, leading to increased employment stability, and thus raising both employee morale and productivity."^{lv} For example, two studies on the impact of Living Wage laws in Baltimore found:

- The cost increase to the city after the living wage ordinance went into effect (1.2% for the contracts examined) was less than the rate of inflation over this period;
- Workers interviewed for one of the studies reported no change in employment levels at their workplaces in response to the wage increases;
- There was a small decrease-concentrated among smaller firms-in the number of bids per contract after the ordinance went into effect; this small decline, however, did not appear to lower competitiveness or raise contract costs;
- Interviews and case studies with affected employers suggests some absorption of labor cost increases through efficiency gains, particularly lower turnover;
- While there is evidence that the ordinance raised wages for those at the bottom of the wage scale, the affected group appears to be small.

Furthermore, as noted earlier, New York already has a living wage in city contracting in the form of prevailing wage requirements for construction jobs. The prevailing wage law was met with similar opposition, as was vetoed by then Mayor Giuliani claiming "This bill, while purporting to help low-wage employees, would in reality do little to provide long-term economic betterment even for the narrow class of workers covered by its provisions."^{lvi} In reality, New York continued to see a demand from developers to build in the city. A review of these requirements, as well as those in other states, by the Economic Policy Institute concludes:

“An overwhelming preponderance of the literature shows that prevailing wage regulations have no effect one way or the other on the cost to government of contracted public works projects. And as studies of the question become more and more sophisticated, this finding becomes stronger, and is reinforced with evidence that prevailing wage laws also help to reduce occupational injuries and fatalities, increase the pool of skilled construction workers, and actually enhance state tax revenues.”^{lvii}

Benefits to the Workers are Beyond the Direct Salary Increases

Requiring Living Wages as part of the New York City subsidy policy is intended to promote self-sufficiency and less government dependency. Roberts Pollin’s research continues to show higher wages will mean lower government subsidies, including Medicaid, food stamps, and the EITC^{lviii}. The living wage and EITC are complimentary to one another. At the local level, the “advantage of an EITC over a Living Wage is that the EITC brings more outside funds into the metropolitan area . . . Moreover, from a policy standpoint, the EITC target[s] the neediest population: all of its benefits go to low-income families, and none of the EITC income is taken into account in determining the recipient’s eligibility for other means-tested benefits.”^{lix} Eighty to ninety percent of the workers who receive Living Wage increases are adults well into their career.^{lx} The overwhelming majority come from families living below a basic budget line.^{lxi} The primary strength of wage standard is that it rewards work directly, in people’s paychecks.^{lxii} Consequently, it increases motivation and self-respect among workers, which in turn results in higher productivity and lower absenteeism.^{lxiii} In addition, wage standards do not impose increased burdens on government budgets.

Conclusion

We cannot continue doing business as usual. We must make change and we will move forward with this bill.

We are committed to working with all those that have raised honest concerns about this bill. The final version of the “Fair Wages for New Yorkers” Act will be inclusive; so that affordable housing can continue to be built in this city and that small businesses are protected.

But there is no more time to wait. Our bill currently has 30 City Council co-sponsors, as well as the support of dozens of other unions, community organizations and civic activists. All of us agree on one thing: when billionaire developers beg for taxpayer handouts to make their projects work, they must do better by the people they hire. We can no longer tolerate developers picking the pockets of the taxpayer in order to create poverty wage jobs. The “Fair Wages for New Yorkers” Act will change the way we do business in this City. There is no more time to wait.

ⁱ John Truslow Adam, The Epic of America (2nd ed., Greenwood Press, 1931), p. 405

ⁱⁱ http://www.economist.com/economics/by-invitation/guest-contributions/economic_power_begets_political_power/print

ⁱⁱⁱ Fiscal Policy Institute Report, Grow Together or Pull Further Apart? Income Concentration Trends in New York, (December 13, 2010).

^{iv} Id.

^v Id.

^{vi} Fiscal Policy Institute Report, Top Ten Reasons A Living Wage Makes Sense for New York City, (May 5, 2011).

^{vii} LWN Y Talking Points

^{viii} Id.

^{ix} Isabel Vincent and Melissa Klein, New York Post, May 2, 2011.

http://www.nypost.com/p/news/local/big_apple_gets_price_clubbed_BYF1ApF3oI3i4CuiQbDEoM

^x Jonathan Bowles and David Giles, New York by the Numbers, Center for an Urban Future, Volume 2, Issue 5. (December 2009).

^{xi} Id.

^{xii} Id.

^{xiii} Wider Opportunities for Women, Coming Up Short Wages, Public Assistance, and Economic Security Across America, (Spring 2011) pg 3.

^{xiv} New York Times, Many Low-Wage Jobs Seen as Failing to Meet Basic Needs (March 31, 2011)

^{xv} Lawrence Glickman A Living Wage, (1997) pg 66.

^{xvi} National Employment Law Project, Living Wage Standards for Taxpayer-Funded Development Projects: A National Trend, (May 2010).

^{xvii} Id.

^{xviii} Id.

^{xix} Id.

^{xx} Id.

^{xxi} Id.

^{xxii} Id.

^{xxiii} Id.

^{xxiv} Id.

^{xxv} Fiscal Policy Institute, Good Jobs New York National Employment Law Project, (February 2011) pg 1.

^{xxvi} Id. at 3.

^{xxvii} Id.

^{xxviii} James Parrot, Oversight: The feasibility of requiring a unified economic development budget as a reporting requirement, Fiscal Policy Institute, (April 27, 2010) pg 1.

^{xxix} Id. at 4.

^{xxx} Id at 5.

^{xxxi} Data provided directly by BJ's Wholesale Club to the Bronx Overall Economic Development Corporation.

^{xxxii} Bob Kappstatter, On Target for E. Bronx, Third Nonunion Store, New York Daily News, (March 31, 2011).

^{xxxiii} FPI, Good Jobs New York National Employment Law Project, at 5.

^{xxxiv} Id.

^{xxxv} Id. at 6.

^{xxxvi} Id. at 3

^{xxxvii} Finding by the Tarpinian Group – BP Talking Points.

^{xxxviii} Id.

^{xxxix} Both Neumark's living wage research and his minimum wage research have been found to be seriously flawed. An examination of living wage studies that Neumark had co-authored with Scott Adams concluded that their findings were "neither methodologically sound nor statistically or substantively robust. In attempting to gauge the impact of business-assistance living wage ordinances across the country, Neumark and Adams used a data set that was inappropriate for the task and failed to correctly identify workers potentially covered by these laws. A critical replication of the Neumark/Adams study showed that the Neumark/Adams results did not hold up when the cities where living wage laws have been implemented for economic development assistance are identified in a more rigorous manner. Brenner, Mark, Jeannette Wicks-Lim, and Robert Pollin. 2008. "Detecting the Effects of Living Wage Laws: A Comment on Neumark and Adams," in *A Measure of Fairness: The Economics of Living Wages and Minimum Wages in the United States*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

^{xl} Fairris, David, and Michael Reich. 2005. "The Impacts of Living Wage Policies: Introduction to the Special Issue." *Industrial Relations* 44 (1): 1-13; Allegretto.

^{xli} Sylvia, Arindrajit Dube and Michael Reich. "Do Minimum Wages Really Reduce Teen Employment? Accounting for Heterogeneity and Selectivity in State Panel Data." Working Paper Series, Institute for Research on Labor and Employment, UC Berkeley: June 21, 2010 revision. <http://www.irle.berkeley.edu/workingpapers/166-08.pdf>.

^{xlii} Doucouliagos, Hristos, and T. D. Stanley. "Publication Selection Bias in Minimum-Wage Research? A Meta Regression Analysis," *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol. 47 (June 2009): 406-428.

^{xliii} National Employment Law Project, Local Living Wage Ordinances and Coverage, (December 2010). The cities are New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Philadelphia, San Antonio, San Jose, San Francisco, Detroit, Memphis, Baltimore, Boston, and Washington DC.

^{xliv} T. William Lester and Ken Jacobs, Creating Good Jobs in Our Communities, How Higher Wage Standards Affect Economic Development and Employment, Center for American Progress,

^{xliv} Id at 1.

^{xlvi} Id at 24-25.

^{xlvi} Id at 28.

^{xlvi} <http://www.dol.gov/whd/minwage/america.htm>

^{xlix} "In 1999, the city of Tucson, Arizona adopted a Living Wage Ordinance, the first ever passed in a right-to-work state. Months later, the city's newly elected Republican mayor proposed a Living Wage Club [subsequently renamed the Good Business Partnership (GBP) program] to encourage other local businesses in the city to voluntarily pay their workers a living wage. To join the club, a company must pledge to pay its workers a living wage in the following year (in addition to adopting other "best business practices," including flexible scheduling). The mayor's office recognizes each club member by giving it a special "Good Business Partnership" logo to be displayed on a company's window and letterhead and by listing the company's name on the mayor's website . . . The city's Chamber of Commerce has embraced the program as a reasonable alternative to the "mandated wage standards" set down by the city's LWO." Don Grant and Mary Nell Trautner, Employer Opinions on Living Wage Initiatives, *The Journal of Labor and Society*, Vol. 8, (September 2004) at 72.

^l Id. at 74.

^{li} Id. at 77.

^{lii} "Survey results indicate that virtually every worker (99.4%) was already being paid a living wage before their company joined the program. This suggests that companies participated in the GBP not with the intent of making real substantive changes to their pay structures, but to enhance their local image." Id. at 78.

^{liii} Richard Troxell, Looking Up At the Bottom Line, Plain View Press, (2010) at 221.

^{liv} <http://www.nyc.gov/html/mocs/html/research/research.shtml>

^{lv} Jared Bernstein, Higher Wages Lead to More Efficient Service Provision, The Economic Policy Institute, (2003)

-
- ^{lvi} Vivian Toy, Giuliani Vetoes a Bill to Make City Contractors Raise Wages, New York Times, (August 8, 1996).
- ^{lvii} Nooshin Mahalia Prevailing Wages and Government Contracting Costs: A review of the research, Economic Policy Institute, (July 3, 2008).
- ^{lviii} Robert Pollin, Economic Prospects Making the Federal Minimum Wage a Living Wage, New Labor Forum 16(2): 103–107, Spring 2007
- ^{lix} Douglass Williams and Richard Sander, An Empirical Analysis of the Proposed Los Angeles Living Wage Ordinance (Los Angeles: Fair Housing Institute, 2 Jan 1997) 9.
- ^{lx} Pollin at 106.
- ^{lxi} Id.
- ^{lxii} Id.
- ^{lxiii} Id.