

**LIVING WAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES**

for

Monday, October 10, 2011

**Location:** Room 15 – City Hall, 735 Anacapa St., Santa Barbara, California

- I. Roll Call:     John Goodman     Joey Corazza                       Allen Williams  
                          Richard Flacks     Larry C. Lee, Chair                       Gabe Dominocielo  
                          Anna Kokotovic
- II. Call to order: **5:05 P.M.**
- III. Public comment: **Mark an Executive Director with Pueblo was present and said he heard there might be changes to the Living Wage Ordinance and was there to learn about the work of the committee.**
- IV. Review and approval of July 11, 2011, meeting minutes: **Approved unanimously as is.**
- V. Receive a report from Dr. Flacks regarding his efforts to interest colleagues from UCSB to take up study of the Living Wage Ordinance: **When the offer was made in July, UCSB was not in session. He said there appears to be some interest and received one response within 24-hours of posting a request. He will send the committee updates as new applicants apply.**
- VI. Discussion of New & Updated Living Wage Forms: **Presented the updated Living Wage Certification form and the Living Wage Payroll Certification form. Received positive feedback on the new and updated forms.**
- VII. Discuss the actual intent and purpose of the scorecard:  
**The discussion included:**
- 1. Each member would have their scorecard available to council at anytime.**
  - 2. It would be used to identify areas that need improvement so that resources are wisely allocated.**
  - 3. It would be used as the framework for developing future reports to council. Council could use it as a snap shot on the program and to make decisions.**
  - 4. It is a functional tool for organizing your own insights that would be aggregated through discussion to generate one scorecard for the committee. Three of the members present supported including individual member scores because showing the individual and aggregate scores will provide council**

with complete information and highlight hot issues where there is not a clear consensus such as a category having an aggregate score of 3 where 3 members rated it a 5 and three a 1.

**One member was concerned about the focus on statistical analysis. Some things do not lend themselves to statistical analysis**

**No motion was made under this topic.**

VIII. Discuss how the opinions and interests of the committee members are to be reflected in the scorecard

**Each individual should come to the meetings prepared to discuss the categories and arrive an aggregate consensus score. The card would be used as a framework for discussions. For example, at the next meeting we will be discussing enforcement and need staff to provide ...**

**There was much discussion on the meaning of the categories but no consensus was reached. A case was made that it was important to have common definitions so that everyone is on the same page while others felt that it would take too long to develop definitions by consensus. There was general support to develop and clarify categories without scoring or define first and evaluate second.**

**ACTION ITEM: At the next regularly scheduled meeting, each member should have their scorecard categories defined and be prepared to discuss their category meanings.**

**No motion was made under this topic.**

IX. Discussion and review of each member's scorecard (i.e., categories, narratives, and scoring methodology)

**Some the topics discussed including:**

- 1. Developing a spreadsheet that shows individuals scores as well as an average score for each category. If a category had an average score of a 3 with 3 members rating it a 5 and 3 rating it a 1, it would show this category as a hot topic.**
- 2. Defining the categories out of order because we have data from the committee's previous report, which may be helpful in developing operational definitions.**
- 3. Including the negative impacts of the Living Wage Ordinance such as how many people lost their jobs and the monetary impact due to employers paying higher wages.**
- 4. Concerns amount of time it could take to define each category by consensus and that the committee could be inadvertently restricting itself. The scorecard concept was presented in November 2010 and the committee is still developing the card. It was noted that the November scorecard was from one member's perspective and the scorecard under discussion will represent the whole committee.**

5. The importance of getting the scorecard started even if it is impact at first.
6. Defining what is to be measured or the measurement criteria and how you would measure it for each category to create operational definitions.
7. Meeting more frequently to complete the committee's work.

A subcommittee was authorized to provide a report to the committee on the non-payment of living wages. Gabe and Alan were appointed to the subcommittee.

**ACTION ITEM:** Staff to start recording meetings.

**STATUS:** A digital recorder has been ordered.

A special meeting was requested and approved for 5:30 P.M. on Monday, October 24 to hear a report from the subcommittee on Living Wage Enforcement Problems.

- X. Start to work on content of some of the categories of the scorecard.

**ACTION ITEM:** Staff to bring reports to the next regularly scheduled meeting on the types of data that they are collecting on the Living Wage program.

**ACTION ITEM:** Committee should consider having staff reports as a standing agenda item.

No motion was made on this topic.

- XI. Adjourn: **7:00 P.M.**