

**SOUTH OF MARKET PROJECT AREA COMMITTEE
1035 Folsom Street, San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 487-2166 Fax 487-2169**

**HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE
Friday, September 10, 1999 9:30 AM**

Members present: Jim Berk, Antoinetta Stadlman, Ira Sandler, Edwin Jocson and Charles Range

Members absent: Dr. Warner

Guests: Karl Kramer and Michael Goldberg

Agency staff: Bill Carney

PAC staff: Jerry Clark

Agenda Item 1. Introductions, Roll Call (12:13 PM)

A quorum is present.

Agenda Item 2. Approval of August Minutes (12:15 PM)

Motion: " *To approve August Human Services minutes*"

Vote: Yes: 5

No: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion Passes

Agenda Item 7. Living Wage Coalition by Karl Kramer (12:16)

Businesses and organizations to pay \$11.00 hour or \$9.00 hour for home health aides plus benefits if the contract is through city funding. Since Redevelopment Agency services have had no increase in wages since 1996, it would affect some of their contracts. The RA has about \$1,000,000 in service contracts in the SOMA. **Mr. Sandler** asked the difference between this plan and who is participating and for a Profit Organization doing business in the city. **Mr. Kramer** stated that this program would affect city workers and any agency, organization, or business that has a contract with the city.

Mr. Range stated that most non-profits do not receive full funding from the City. Non-profits have to get their funding from many sources. If one source is from the City and the others are not, do I have to pay all of my employees the same, even if the contracts do not all come from the City. **Mr. Kramer** stated that it is the contract that comes from the City that will come under the living wage ordinance. If the non-profit cannot afford the cost of the ordinance then a waiver may be obtained to offset the loss. **Mr. Sandler** stated that a bigger part of the problem is that government cannot force a business to raise wages or a company to cap wages that raise costs around us. **Mr. Range** said that if there is a push for a living wage, a contractor puts the project in his profit and loss. A nonprofit cannot do this. They must put it in their costs. This will also cause a two-tier system. Could this cause bad feelings among employees that know that one person makes \$11.00 under one contract and another makes \$8.00 an hour under another project. **Mr. Range** also stated that the City is a business and as such should look at its policies like a business.

Ms. Stadlman stated that she felt it was inappropriate that this issue had even come before the PAC or one of its Committees. She said that this was one of these “bigger picture” political issues that belongs at the Board of Supervisors or some other forum, not here.

Jerry Clark stated that the city has a parity wage law. A woman making \$17.78 per hour as a nurse should make the same as a man in a male dominated field like bus driver or train operator, under this law. Will this affect that or bypass that.

Mr. Sandler stated that when you talk about this issue on a one to one basis, the light on it is not as bright and changes when you’re talking about changing the living conditions of 40,000 individuals. You get a different feeling on what’s right.

Ms. Stadlman stated that her main problem with the Living Wage campaign was that it applied only to 501c3 nonprofits and those private businesses that had contracts with the City, and this in essence created a two-tiered work-force, as well as made the nonprofits even less competitive with private industry than they are now. **Ms. Stadlman** went on to say that she had no problem with the basic premise of the Living Wage campaign, but that the overall minimum wage ought to be \$10-\$15 per hour. She also stated that even if this happened, nothing would be truly effective unless there was also a maximum income level set and enforced, as the absurd costs of living in San Francisco were primarily the fault of companies in Silicon Valley and their like, who paid large numbers of such vast salaries that the effect was to distort the entire local economy to the disadvantage of everyone else. **Ms. Stadlman** concluded by saying the real problem was the basic weakness inherent in our form of government that made such regulation of private business impossible, but to compel a tiny portion of the economy (nonprofit and city contractors) to comply with a radically more expensive set of rules would do little to correct the overall problem of working people being able to afford living in the City.

This information in the handout and **Mr. Kramer’s** attendance at the General PAC may be of help in understanding this issue more clearly.

Agenda Item 4. Filipino-American Development Foundation (12: 56 PM)

Pass on this Item

Agenda Item 5. Youth Center Proposal (12:57 AM)

Pass on this Item

Agenda Item 6. Bessie Carmichael/Park (12:57 PM)

Pass on this Item

Agenda Item 3. Review of Goals and Objectives (12:58 PM)

Making services available to all those who need it and let those services be known in the community. Childcare for example, how to advertise services that exist and let SOMAC families know they’re available. No other discussion on the Goals and Objectives.

Meeting Ended (1:03 AM)

Submitted by
Jerry Clark
Assistant Administrator

Reviewed by
Ann Grogan
Executive Administrator