



LKM #13
10-19-21

HOTELS
HERE

SUNNYSIDE
↓

FANCY CREDIT
E BURNED
YANK

ALBERT HARROW
4975 E HARVEY
FRESNO CA 93727
559-452-1242

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

2015 E. Shields Avenue, Suite 100
FRESNO, CA 93726
(559) 243-8234
TDD (559) 488-4066



October 22, 2009

Mr. Al Harroll
4975 E. Harvey Ave.
Fresno, CA 93727

Dear Mr. Harroll,

In response to your request, the Caltrans Environmental Engineering Unit initiated a traffic noise investigation at your resident location of 4975 E. Harvey Ave., Fresno, CA 93727.

The purpose of this investigation was to address your concerns about freeway traffic noise.

Your residence is located in Fresno, west of Willow Avenue and approximately 300 feet north from State Route (SR) 180 centerline. E. Harvey Ave is at grade and SR-180 is approximately 30 feet below grade. Observations revealed that the prevailing noise originates from SR-180 and not from the local street traffic.

Noise monitoring took place during the late-afternoon hours on September 30, 2009. The measured noise level is 66.5 dBA-Leq, which approaches the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Noise Abatement Criteria of 67 dBA-Leq. Records of these readings will be retained for use in future project development process.

In the past, Caltrans evaluated, planned, designed, programmed, funded, and implemented retrofit noise abatement for existing freeways/highways as part of the Caltrans Noise Abatement Program (HB311).

With the passing of California Senate Bill 45 of 1997, responsibility for programming and funding many regional transportation improvements, including retrofit noise abatement projects, shifted to Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs).

Since traffic noise appears to approach 67 dBA-Leq (h) along E. Harvey Ave, we recommend you contact the Council of Fresno County Governments located at ~~2100 Tulare Street, Suite 601~~, Fresno, CA 93721 Phone (559) 233-4148. Due to the existing noise levels, the Council of Fresno County Governments may nominate a sound barrier adjacent to E. Harvey for programming and funding.

2035 TULARE

In the future, if Caltrans proposes any significant changes, expansions, or modifications to State Route 168 adjacent to E. Harvey Avenue, Caltrans will conduct a noise study as required by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

If you have any questions related to our noise investigation, please contact me at (559) 243-8234 or Cris Timofei at (559) 243-8225.

233-4148
TONY BOREN

x-104
MR Braden
1-23-20

Sincerely,

Ken J. Romero, P.E., Chief
Environmental Engineering Branch
cc: File, Council of Fresno County
Governments & Gloria Rodriguez



2238

Instrument:		2238
Application:		BZ7126 version 1.1
Start Time:		09/30/2009 02:47:27 PM
End Time:		09/30/2009 03:02:30 PM
Elapsed Time:		0:15:03
Bandwidth:		Broad band
Detector 1/2	RMS	Peak
Range:		30.0-110.0 dB

TIME

	Time	Frequency
Detector 1:	F	A
Detector 2:	Peak	C
Statistic	F	A

Criterion Level:		100.0 dB
Threshold:		0.0 dB
Exchange Rate		3 and 4
Exposure Time:		7:30:00
Peaks Over:		140.0 dB

Instrument Serial Number:		2231629
Microphone Serial Number:		2230917
Input:		Microphone
Windscreen Correction:		Off
S. I. Correction:		Frontal

Calibration Time:		10/20/2008 10:53:45 AM
Calibration Level:		93.9 dB
Sensitivity:		-30.7 dB
Microphone:		2230917

030.M26

	Start time	End time	Elapsed time	Overload [%]	LAeq [dB]	LAI Max [dB]	LAI Min [dB]
Value				0.0	66.5	---	---
Time	02:47:27 PM	03:02:30 PM	0:15:03				
Date	09/30/2009	09/30/2009					



County of Fresno

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SUPERVISOR HENRY PEREA - DISTRICT THREE

TEST OCT-2009 - ? 2:45 P.M.

January 27, 2009

CALL COMPLET 9-24-09
9:30 AM TO KEN REMARCO CAL-TRANC
FOR SOUND WALL STUDIE

Tony Boren
Executive Director
Fresno COG
2035 Tulare Street, #201
Fresno, CA 93721

233-4148 2-11-09 9:30 AM IN WORKSHOP 2-17-09

Dear Mr. Boren:

2-19-09 10:00 AM CALL BACK

Today my office received a call from Mr. Albert Harrow, a Fresno County District 3 resident. Mr. Harrow lives at 4975 East Harvey, Fresno, CA 93727. He said there is no sound wall along freeway 180 between Willow and Winery. Mr. Harrow reports that the noise pollution from the freeway is greatly decreasing the quality of life for residents in that neighborhood. Mr. Harrow would like to see a sound wall go up in his neighborhood.

2:00

My understanding is that your office facilitates sound wall requests between neighborhoods and the State of California. I would greatly appreciate your help in the facilitation of this particular request.

Please copy my office on any correspondence you have concerning the matter. Please let me know if you have any questions. You may reach me at (559) 488-3663.

Respectfully,

Henry Perea
Supervisor, District 3
Board of Supervisors
County of Fresno

CAL-TRANC CELL 903-3867

GLOREA RODRIGAS

444-2409 THUR. 8:45 AM

CALL BACK 2-26-09 8:45 AM

2-27-09

LAST CALL NO ANSWER 9:15 AM → 3-5-09

Ken Remarco
8225 CELL
243-8165
SOUND WALL STUDIE ?

NOISE SAQ / DIST-6 GOV. /

CALL BACK 7:00 AM



County of Fresno

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SUPERVISOR HENRY PEREA – DISTRICT THREE

January 27, 2009

Albert Harrow
4975 East Harvey
Fresno, CA 93727

Dear Mr. Harrow:

Thank you for contacting my office about the noise pollution your neighborhood experiences due to a lack of a sound wall along freeway 180 between Willow and Winery. The Fresno County Council of Governments facilitates these requests between neighborhoods and the State of California. I have sent the enclosed letter to the Executive Director at the Fresno County Council of Governments for that facilitation.

Please feel free to contact my office at (559) 488-3663 if I may be of further assistance to you.

Respectfully,

Henry Perea
Supervisor, District 3
Board of Supervisors
County of Fresno

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

4545 N. WEST AVE.
P.O. BOX 12616
FRESNO, CA 93778-2616

TDD: (559) 488-4066
FAX: (559) 488-4253



(559) 445-6132

July 13, 1999

06-Fre 180 PM R60.9/65.6
06-368000

Dear Interested Party:

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is proposing several design updates to the proposed Route 180 Freeway from Route 168 to Fowler Avenue in Fresno County. Some of the proposed updates include constructing a 6-lane freeway and adding auxiliary lanes (instead of 4-lane) to meet traffic demand, and acquiring additional right-of-way for utility easements and some local street widening associated with the freeway project.

The original Environmental Studies for Route 180 were completed in 1995. Caltrans is currently evaluating the original environmental document for the proposed project and studying the effects the design updates may have on the environment.

Our records show that you are a property owner in the project vicinity. This letter is to inform you that Caltrans will have a public open house on Wednesday, July 28, 1999 from 4:00 to 8:00 p.m. in the Fancher Creek Elementary School cafeteria at 5948 E. Tulare Avenue, Fresno. Caltrans staff will be available at the open house to provide information, discuss your concerns, and answer your questions regarding the project. If you have any questions, please call Vickie Traxler at (559) 445-6132.

Para mas información sobre este proyecto llame en Español a José Ruano a (559) 488-4023, o en Ingles a Vickie Traxler a (559) 445-6132.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Donald Hunsaker".

Donald Hunsaker, Chief
Central Sierra Environmental Analysis Branch

Item #13
10-19-2021



County of Fresno Essential Services Worker

The holder of this card has been identified as an essential employee of the County of Fresno. As such, he/she is conducting essential services necessary to the health, safety and welfare of the public as identified by the State of California and the County of Fresno.

Please allow him/her prompt passage to his/her place of work, service location, or home.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jean M. Rousseau', is written over a horizontal line.

Jean M. Rousseau, County Administrative Officer

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 2021
FRESNO COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS – MEETING

PRESENTER
GLOVER, HOWARD, SHOP STEWARD, BARGAINING UNIT 39

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION (3 MINUTES)

- 1.) REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION ON SCOPE OF ESSENTIAL WORKER; REDEFINE AND BROADEN SCOPE AND DEFINITIONS.
- 2.) REQUEST ESSENTIAL WORKER PAY WITHIN HAZARDOUS WORKSITES/AREAS, 2020.
 - A.) ON-SITE HAZARDOUS ESSENTIAL WORKER CONDITIONS (HAZARDOUS WORKER PAY DIFFERENTIAL; REQUEST: \$3,000.00 PER ON-SITE HAZARDOUS WORKER ESSENTIAL PERSONS; - HAZARDOUS WORKER PAY FOR SERVICES PERFORMED IN CRITICAL, SENSITIVE, AND HEALTH/SAFETY WORK SITE AREAS.
SUBJECT PERIOD; 03/2020 – 12/30/2020.
 - B.) ~~REMOTE / OFF-SITE / WORK FROM HOME ESSENTIAL WORKER CONDITIONS;
REQUEST: OPTION: \$750.00 – 1,000.00 PER PERSON, ESSENTIAL WORKER PAY FOR SERVICE IN NON CRITICAL, NON SENSITIVE, HEALTH/SAFETY WORK SITE AREAS.
SUBJECT PERIOD; 03/2020 – 12/30/2020.~~

PROPOSED REDEFINITION OF TERM – ESSENTIAL WORKER(S) TO REFLECT MORE ACCURATE WORKER WORKSITE CONDITIONS, STATED AS FOLLOWS:

- 1.) CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE ESSENTIAL WORKER(S): ON-SITE/ON-CALL/ ON PREMISES ESSENTIAL IN-PERSON WORKER STAFF;

*HIGH-RISK (ESSENTIAL WORKER BADGE, HAZARDOUS STANDARD ISSUED WORKSITE EQUIPMENT:

STANDARD EQUIPMENT: - PPE; SURGICAL MASK, FACE SHIELD, N95 LEVEL RESPIRATOR, SANITATION SUPPLIES, HAND SANITIZER, SANITARY WIPES FOR DIRECT HANDLING OF SURFACES AND EQUIPMENT.

2.) **GENERAL ESSENTIAL WORKER: OFF-SITE REMOTE AT-HOME WORKER STAFF; *N/A-ZERO WORKSITE RISK**

OFF-SITE ESSENTIAL WORKER STAFF; *NO-RISK (NO ISSUANCE OF COUNTY OF FRESNO (ESSENTIAL WORKER BADGE), NO ISSUANCE OF HAZARDOUS EQUIPMENT; ESSENTIAL WORKERS MAY WORK EITHER AT HOME OR REMOTE LOCATION. GENERAL ESSENTIAL WORKERS WHO WORK FROM HOME AND REMOTE LOCATIONS ARE NOT REQUIRED TO USE PPE AND SUBMIT TO TEMPERATURE CHECKS DUE TO WORK WHICH WILL BE PERFORMED IN LOW RISK WORK CONDITIONS, E.G., AT HOME.

CHECKLIST FOR CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE ESSENTIAL WORKER(S) 2020:
LISTED AS FOLLOWS:

- **PPE**
- **SURGICAL MASK, (LIMITED EFFICACY; 75%**
- **FACE SHIELD,**
- **3M N95 LEVEL RESPIRATOR, (EFFICACY; 95%)**
- **ALCOHOL BASE - SANITATION SUPPLIES**
- **HAND SANITIZER**
- **SANITARY WIPES FOR DIRECT HANDLING**
- **OF SURFACES AND EQUIPMENT.**

Common questions

Who is considered to be essential worker during the COVID-19 pandemic?

Essential (critical infrastructure) workers include health care personnel and employees in other essential workplaces (e.g., first responders and grocery store workers reports); Dec 11, 2020

<https://www.cbsnews.com/news/oxnard-california-hazard-pay-stimulus-american-rescue-plan/>
Most companies haven't given essential workers pandemic "hazard pay." One city is changing that.
BY IRINA IVANOVA

UPDATED ON: JUNE 9, 2021 / 8:27 AM / MONEYWATCH

Although large employers have sung the praises of the retail, grocery, health care, delivery and other workers deemed "essential" during the pandemic, they've generally resisted raising the pay of this mostly low-wage workforce.

Oxnard, California, is trying to buck that trend. The city of 200,000 is giving a \$1,000 bonus to every essential worker who was employed at least three months during the health crisis. About 1,700 workers will receive the "gratitude pay," according to the United Food and Commercial Workers Local 770, which represents about 450 affected workers.

"It was very scary, not knowing who was going to be sick, if someone was going to be sick," said Lucy Gilbertson, a deli worker at supermarket Vons and Local 770 member. "Now I feel like we didn't just work through the pandemic and risk our lives for nothing."

Two dozen California cities have passed local laws mandating companies give their frontline workers "hazard pay" raises during the pandemic. But Oxnard won't require employers to pony up their own funds. Instead, the city is putting about \$2.5 million of federal funding from the American Recovery Plan toward the bonuses.

Using federal money means workers could get the funds quicker and would protect Oxnard from employer lawsuits that typically accompany city-mandated minimum-wage hikes, the city's housing director, Emilio Ramirez, explained in a presentation last month. Oxnard's city council voted for the plan unanimously. The lone Republican on the council said he was comfortable with the raises because they would come out of federal funding, according to the Washington Post.

More states could follow

At least two states are gearing up to follow Oxnard's lead. **Connecticut Governor Ned Lamont has proposed allocating \$22.5 million in federal funds toward bonuses for nursing-home employees and frontline state employees. Grocery and fast-food workers in the state are calling for a share of the funds as well.**

The Kansas legislature also is considering a bill to boost pay with the federal funds, for frontline workers making less than \$25 an hour. "Despite all of the reasons for Kansans to feel hopeful that the end of the pandemic is in sight, essential businesses and employees are near the end of their rope," the bill's sponsor, Minority Leader Dinah Sykes, wrote in an editorial.

Worker advocates describe the American Rescue Plan as the last, best chance for local politicians to give raises to workers who've been overlooked by both Congress and their employers.

The U.S. Department of Treasury recently said: **that states and cities were allowed to use federal aid to offer essential workers higher pay, noting that they "have and will bear the greatest health risks because of their service in critical infrastructure sectors."**

"Moral indignity"

Since the coronavirus pandemic broke out, confining many Americans to their homes, the workers who have sustained them — preparing and delivering food, staffing health care facilities or cleaning buildings — have seen an outpouring of public gratitude. What they haven't seen is more generous paychecks.

"It's a moral indignity in this country," Molly Kinder, a fellow at the Brookings Institution, told CBS MoneyWatch. "Most high-paid workers have been able to work from home through this pandemic, and most frontline workers have not had that luxury. They've been putting their families' lives at risk," she said.

Essential workers are overwhelmingly low-paid: About half of the 44 million workers earning less than \$15 an hour, or about \$30,000 a year, are in "essential" occupations, Kinder's research shows. And while many of these workers received temporary pay bumps in the first few months of the pandemic, those raises petered out early on.

Meanwhile, large grocery stores and retailers raked in record profits and repurchased millions of dollars in stock, boosting income for their shareholders and executives.

"By and large, those companies were not passing money down to the employees," Kinder said. "Even when risks are elevated and there's so much public goodwill toward these workers, only a minority of employers stepped up and really meaningfully increased hazard pay."

And when employers were forced to raise pay, some fought such increases tooth and nail. The California Grocers Association has sued a number of California cities that imposed to impose minimum-pay hikes. Kroger, the nation's largest supermarket chain, said earlier this year it would close two Long Beach, California, supermarkets rather than pay higher wages mandated by the city.

The California Grocers' Association did not respond to a request for comment.

Corporate welfare?

Still, while many people view higher pay for frontline workers as a necessity, some say that using taxpayer funds for raises sends the wrong message to reluctant employers.

"Using federal funds instead of requiring businesses to raise wages is another example of corporate welfare," one worker posted on Facebook, in response to Local 770's announcement of the Oxnard deal. "How do we ask for higher wages during the next contract if big business got municipalities to pick up the tab this time?"

Another worker from Los Angeles wrote, "Congratulations! Now do my store next. We all feel forgotten at the store I work at."

Brookings' Kinder sees back pay for frontline workers as a necessary "down payment" for raising the federal minimum wage, which remains stuck at \$7.25 and was last raised in 2009.

"I look at this as a societal decision: Are we going to do more than just applaud?" she said. "If we come out of this situation, and not only did these workers not get a pay bump when their lives are at risk ... and we don't raise the minimum wage overall, then we have absolutely squandered this opportunity."

<https://www.natlawreview.com/article/california-municipalities-mandate-hazard-pay-essential-workers>

October 14, 2021
Volume XI, Number 287
National Law Review

California Municipalities Mandate Hazard Pay for Essential Workers
Monday, March 1, 2021

While significant ink was spilled last summer evaluating whether Congress would pass the HEROES Act – House Democrats' \$3 trillion COVID-19 relief bill, the federal government was ultimately unable to implement an aid package that included, among other provisions, mandated “hazard pay” for essential workers. In response, several local and municipal governments have taken up the call and have recently implemented laws to require additional wage premiums for employees in the grocery and pharmacy industries. Unsurprisingly, these local initiatives have gained significant traction in California.

On January 22, the City of Long Beach implemented the Hero Pay for Front-Line Grocery Workers Ordinance (which expires in May 2021). The ordinance requires certain grocery stores to pay hourly employees \$4 per hour on top of their regular rates of pay. The law applies to grocery stores with 300 or more workers nationwide and at least 15 workers per store in the City of Long Beach, and includes anti-retaliation and posting requirements, as well as provisions affording employees the right to file a civil action for violations of the ordinance.

On January 27, the City Council of Montebello passed the Premium Pay for Grocery and Drug Store Workers Ordinance, which went into effect immediately and expires in six months. Under the ordinance, grocery stores and retail pharmacies that employ 300 workers nationwide and at least 15 workers per location in the City of Montebello must pay nonmanagerial employees premium pay of \$4 for each hour worked. The ordinance further prohibits employers from reducing an employee's pay in response to the enhanced premiums required by the law or from otherwise retaliating against employees who avail themselves of the law's protections.

On February 2, the City Council of Oakland passed the Grocery Worker Hazard Pay Emergency Ordinance, which requires that large grocery stores in Oakland pay hourly workers an additional \$5 per hour for every hour worked. This hazard pay mandate applies to all grocery stores that employ 500 or more workers nationwide, and includes posting and notice requirements, as well as anti-retaliation provisions prohibiting employers from taking adverse actions against employees who exercise rights under the ordinance.

On February 10, the City Council of Coachella passed the Premium Pay for Agricultural, Grocery, Restaurant, and Retail Pharmacy Workers Ordinance, requiring employers in the agricultural, grocery, restaurant and retail pharmacy spaces to provide employees of these entities who work in Coachella an additional \$4 per hour for every hour worked. The law applies to those covered entities that employ at least 300 workers nationally and more than five employees per location in Coachella. It also prohibits employers from reducing worker pay to offset the law's enhanced pay requirements, prohibits retaliation, mandates the posting of notices, and includes a private right of action for aggrieved employees.

These ordinances, which have been viewed as a boon for certain essential workers, have been met with stiff opposition by employers. For example, Kroger – one of the largest grocery store operators in the country – announced the closing of two stores in Long Beach as a direct response to that city's Hero Pay ordinance. In addition, the California Grocers Association has filed federal lawsuits against the cities of Montebello, Long Beach and Oakland, challenging the constitutionality of the local ordinances and arguing that the laws are preempted by the National Labor Relations Act. Whether these business closures and lawsuits ultimately affect the viability of these local laws remains to be seen. But, for now, covered employers must ensure that their pay practices comply with the enhanced wage requirements mandated by these California ordinances. And, as California is often a harbinger of things to come on the employment law front, employers nationwide should be on the alert for similar ordinances in jurisdictions where they do business.

© 2021 Foley & Lardner LLP

National Law Review, Volume XI, Number 60

PRINTER-FRIENDLY EMAIL THIS ARTICLE DOWNLOAD PDF REPRINTS & PERMISSIONS
RELATED LEGAL HEADLINES

California Issues More Expansive Vaccine Mandate for Health Care Workers

By

Elizabeth H. Murphy

New California Law Imposes Harsh Penalties for Employers Committing Intentional Wage Theft

By

Erika Ingram

California Becomes First State to Ban Piece Rate Pay for Garment Workers

By

David Prager

Cal/OSHA to California Employers: Get It Right or Pay the Price

By

Michael T. Taylor

TRENDING LEGAL ANALYSIS

FTC Issues Notice of Penalty Offenses to Over 700 Retailers: Companies Now on "...

By

Hunton Andrews Kurth

Reminder – Medicare Part D Notices due October 15, 2021

By

Nelson Mullins

Governor Newsom Signs Bill Allowing for Virtual Administrative Hearings

By

Ogletree, Deakins, Nash, Smoak & Stewart, P.C.

Ninth Edition of GHS Includes Revisions to Chapter 2.1 (Explosives) and Decision...

By

Bergeson & Campbell, P.C.

ABOUT THIS AUTHOR

James M. Nicholas, Foley Lardner Law Firm, Labor and Employment Litigation Attorney

James M. Nicholas

Partner

Jim Nicholas is a partner and litigation attorney with Foley & Lardner LLP. Mr. Nicholas focuses his practice on federal and state labor and employment issues, including employee classification, wage and hour, leaves of absence, discrimination and harassment, wrongful termination, and the enforcement of noncompetition and nondisclosure agreements. His work for employers also extends to litigation, representing clients before federal and state courts in cases involving claims for wage and hour violations, discrimination and harassment, breach of contract, defamation,...

jnicholas@foley.com
617-226-3125
www.foley.com
www.foley.com/blogs/

<https://www.heraldnet.com/news/covid-premium-pay-will-soon-reach-snohomish-county-employees/>

CORONAVIRUS OUTBREAK

Essential workers to receive up to \$1,250 starting Sept. 22

Over 1,900 in Snohomish County will get the bonuses for their frontline work during the pandemic.

By Joseph Thompson

Tuesday, September 7, 2021 1:30am LOCAL NEWS CORONAVIRUS OUTBREAK

EVERETT — About 2,000 Snohomish County employees are to begin receiving pay bumps as recognition for their frontline work during the pandemic.

Earlier this summer, county Executive Dave Somers announced a plan to use \$2.5 million of federal relief money for bonus payments of up to \$1,250 for the county's essential workers during the pandemic. In late July, the County Council unanimously approved the criteria to determine which employees will receive the extra pay.

Initial estimates indicated about 1,500 workers — like sheriff's deputies, corrections officers, road crew workers, human services specialists and park rangers — would qualify.

Now, 1,914 county workers are to be eligible for the bonus pay, Executive Director Ken Klein said in an email. The first round of payments will go out on Sept. 22.

The majority of those employees come from law and justice agencies like the Snohomish County Sheriff's Office, the Prosecuting Attorney's Office and the Office of Public Defense, as well as the Public Works and Human Services departments, county spokesperson Kent Patton said.

Starting Sept. 22, eligible employees exempt from the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) will receive two payments of \$625, spread over two pay periods. FLSA non-exempt employees will receive an extra \$8 per hour (or \$12 per hour for overtime) for every hour worked, until they reach \$1,250.

To qualify, staff must have worked for at least six months between March 23, 2020, and July 5, 2021, with some time spent at the office and in a department that interacted with the public. Both part-time and full-time employees qualify, as long as they worked at least 20 hours per week.

The County Council also set aside another \$150,000 to give premium pay to Snohomish Health District staff, though it's unclear how many qualify.

In total, Snohomish County received about \$160 million from the American Rescue Plan Act. Premium pay is one of many uses of federal funds that local governments are encouraged to consider.

On Sept. 22, the council is to hold a public hearing for an amendment that stretches the window of time in which staff can receive the bonuses, so qualifying staff on military leave will have an opportunity to earn premium pay.

The amendment applies to “a dozen or so” county staff, Patton said.

Joey Thompson: 425-339-3449; jthompson@heraldnet.com. Twitter: @byjoeythompson.

<https://www.americanactionforum.org/insight/state-and-local-hazard-pay/>

Insight

March 18, 2021

State and Local Hazard Pay
Isabel Soto

Executive Summary

President Biden recently proposed giving essential workers “back hazard pay,” and while he provided few details around who would be eligible, how much they would receive, and who would pay, previous proposals from House Democrats as well as state and local hazard pay laws can indicate what form a federal plan could take.

House Democrats proposed last year giving a \$13 per hour raise to certain medical professionals along with other essential or front-line employees, such as pharmacists and grocery-store clerks, funded by \$200 billion from the federal government.

Seattle’s targeted hazard-pay ordinance, which requires only grocery workers receive an extra \$4 an hour, and Maryland’s broad hazard-pay proposal, which would require all essential workers with income up to \$100,000 a year receive an extra \$3 an hour, mark the potential range of options for what a federal hazard pay requirement could look like.

On a national scale, Seattle’s proposal could cost employers up to \$12.4 billion over one year, and Maryland’s plan could cost employers up to \$238 billion over one year.

Introduction

President Biden recently put out a statement “calling on employers to meet their obligations to frontline essential workers and provide back hazard pay.” While the idea of “back” hazard pay is somewhat counterintuitive, as back pay would not encourage essential workers to stay at their jobs amid the COVID-19 pandemic, this is not the first time that policymakers have floated the idea of mandating national hazard pay. Congressional Democrats included hazard pay in their Health and Economic Recovery Omnibus Emergency Solutions (HEROES) Act in May, while Senator Mitt Romney introduced his own proposal the same month.

Since that initial burst of proposals, however, interest has waned at the federal level, yet states and municipalities have enacted a variety of hazard pay bills or ordinances. Because President Biden has not provided any details on his proposal for back hazard pay, it is worth exploring what states and cities have done in order to get a sense for how different eligibility criteria could affect cost and the number of affected workers at the national level.

The city of Seattle and Maryland provide useful examples. Seattle extended hazard pay to grocery store workers alone, while Maryland is proposing hazard pay for all essential workers. While examining these programs will not answer all questions about a federal program—who will pay, most obviously—they along with the congressional proposals can give a sense of what a proposal from the Biden Administration could look like.

Previous Federal Hazard Pay Proposals

In April 2020, Senate Democrats proposed the “Heroes Fund” plan, a hazard pay proposal that eventually became part of the HEROES Act, which passed the House in May 2020. **According to Senator Schumer, the plan would have covered a number of different medical professionals in addition to other workers in essential services such as truck drivers, pharmacists, and grocery store clerks. This proposal would have applied a flat-rate hazard pay increase of \$13 an hour paid for by \$200 billion in federal funding.** Employers would apply for grants to provide workers with the \$13 bonus. While the federal government would provide \$200 billion toward these grants, the American Action Forum estimates that the plan could cost up to \$673 billion.

Senator Romney introduced a different stand-alone hazard pay bill, Patriot Pay. The legislation would mandate that essential workers receive a \$12 an hour bonus, with a quarter covered by employers and three quarters paid by the federal government. Employers would receive a 75 percent refundable payroll tax credit for the additional pay, up to \$12 an hour.

While funding streams are different, both proposals would place a mandate on employers to provide support and fund the aid, at least partially, through grants or refundable tax credits.

As part of initial negotiations over the American Rescue Plan, the Biden Administration called for back hazard pay for frontline and essential workers, stating that the president would “call on CEOs and other business leaders to take action to meet these obligations.” Without any additional detail, this statement suggests the administration would like a national hazard pay system that would mandate employers increase pay. Given that call and subsequent language from the White House, the White House appears to prefer an employer mandate where business owners would be responsible for covering the cost of pay bonuses.

Previous Research and State-Level Variation

Previous American Action Forum research estimated the cost of nationalized hazard pay under the HEROES Act proposal and at different percent wage hourly increases. Since this proposal, many states have decided to pass their own legislation. In some cases states and local governments provide support to pay for costs; in others hazard pay is done through mandates on employers. Some states opted to leave hazard pay rules up to cities and counties, but 15 have enacted statewide hazard pay legislation. Each statewide policy varies in terms of who bears responsibility for costs, amount, duration, and eligibility. State-by-state hazard pay legislation and proposals can be found in the appendix.

Pay and Duration

One model being used by states has hazard pay provided over increments of weeks, months, or pay periods totaling between \$60 and \$300 a week. Other states opted for hourly increases between \$1 and \$10 or simply provided one-time supplemental payments (with the most generous example totaling \$2,000). Most statewide payments began between March and May 2020, aligning with the start and initial spike in COVID-19 cases and unemployment. Some of the legislation passed in the later months of 2020 were retroactively applied to earnings in March. Currently, end dates for enacted legislation mostly remain within 2020, with very few spilling into the early months of 2021. There are different options when it comes to who would cover the cost of hazard pay. In some cases the state provides funds to support their proposals, while in other examples hazard pay is merely mandated, meaning costs would fall on employers.

Eligibility

Across plans, eligible employees range from general frontline workers such as first responders and grocery store workers, to more specific groups represented by unions or working for particular companies. Connecticut, New Jersey, and New York's statewide legislation only applied to ShopRite employees. In Massachusetts, eligibility was limited to state health care workers represented by the union American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees. Similarly, Michigan offered payment only to correction officers represented by the Michigan Corrections Organization.

Seattle and Maryland

In order to illustrate the differences in scope and cost of different plans, this analysis looks at the hazard pay plan from the city of Seattle and the state of Maryland. While both plans, if applied nationally, would use an hourly increased pay structure, what makes them different is eligibility criteria, a consistently challenging aspect of any hazard pay plan.

In short, the Seattle ordinance mandates all grocery stores with over 500 workers provide their workers with hazard pay of \$4 an hour. The affected workers and the flat increase amount are clearly defined. This likely reduces administrative burden, but a flat rate also means all workers receive the same amount regardless of role or compensation level. Looking at the national level, legislation like this one could affect nearly 2 million workers and cost \$12.4 billion over one year. At the \$4 hazard pay level, grocery store worker would see between an 18 and 33 percent increase in wages. The Seattle Ordinance took effect February 3 and will continue "until the end of the COVID-19 civil emergency." The increased costs seem to have led to closures of some stores as a result of the ordinance coupled with dwindling profit margins. Taken to national scale, the Seattle hazard pay ordinance could total \$12.4 billion over one year.

Cost of Maryland Hazard Pay Proposal

Occupation Employment Hazard Pay Weekly Cost of \$3 Hazard Pay Annual Cost of \$3 Hazard Pay
Healthcare Practitioners and Technical Occupations 5,659,224 \$3.00 \$679,106,862 \$35,313,556,824
Healthcare Support 5,106,562 \$3.00 \$612,787,388 \$31,864,944,197
Protective Services 2,934,793 \$3.00 \$352,175,213 \$18,313,111,066
Food Preparation and Service- Related Occupations 8,015,786 \$3.00 \$961,894,375 \$50,018,507,510
Building and Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance 2,630,885 \$3.00 \$315,706,248 \$16,416,724,896
Transportation and Material Moving 9,361,426 \$3.00 \$1,123,371,169 \$58,415,300,798
Installation, Maintenance, and Repair 4,422,210 \$3.00 \$530,665,236 \$27,594,592,272
TOTAL 38 million \$4.6 billion \$238 billion

Estimates were made using detailed 2019 employment and wage data. Given job losses and reduction in hours, these numbers represent upper bound estimates.

As previous nationwide hazard pay proposals have not been as specifically targeted, it is unlikely that a federal plan would be limited to a single occupation. The much broader Maryland plan is more in line with Democrats' previously proposed HEROES Act plan that includes all essential workers.

The Maryland hazard pay proposal is far broader and more inclusive than most other state and local plans. Eligibility for this proposal largely follows the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency advisory list that had previously been used by the HEROES Act proposal. Not only would the proposal, on a national scale, cover over 14 industries or sectors totaling between 25 and 35 percent of the labor force, but according to the legislation text, the pay could be back dated to the start of the pandemic. Of course, the costs would be significantly higher compared to the Seattle plan given that there would be more eligible workers for likely a longer period of time. **Workers from eligible industries who make less than \$100,000 a year would receive \$3 an hour in hazard pay.** Taken to national scale, the Maryland hazard pay proposal could total \$238 billion over one year.

Conclusion

Hazard pay has gained renewed attention due to President Biden's support for a back hazard pay plan. While there are few details surrounding what form a nationwide hazard pay plan could take and no funding has been allocated to hazard pay, existing and recently proposed state and local legislation could offer a sense of scope and costs. As more time goes on, however, hazard pay becomes less likely to pass due to the [early 2021] existence of vaccines which encourage more individuals to now return to work. Furthermore, many large businesses have opted to implement broad hazard pay policies in order to support their workers and incentivize work. Small business hazard pay policies are less common. Where they exist, they may be considerably more ad hoc, and focused on perks like meals and childcare arrangements rather than bonus compensation. Encouraging businesses that can to provide hazard pay without a mandate would avoid unnecessary permanent business closures and avoid further exacerbating long-term unemployment.