MEMORANDUM

To:	Council President Tim Burgess Councilmember Nick Licata via City Budget Director Ben Noble
From:	Fred Podesta, FAS Director
Date:	Sept. 1, 2014
Subject:	Report on monitoring and enforcement of wage and labor conditions on Office of Housing-funded projects and select City-funded public works projects

---

As part of the 2014 budget, the City Council issued Ordinance 124253 to direct increased monitoring and enforcement for wage and labor conditions, including wage theft violations for projects funded by the Office of Housing (OH), as well as City procurement and public works projects. The ordinance appropriated two positions for the Department of Finance and Administrative Services (FAS), City Purchasing and Contracting Services (CPCS) and directed FAS to report back on Sept. 1, 2014, summarizing resulting activities.

I am pleased to transmit FAS' report on our monitoring and enforcement efforts spanning Sept. 1, 2013, through July 15, 2014. As the report reflects, changes funded by the ordinance increased oversight and proved effective at finding situations early, resolving them with less conflict and minimizing risk. FAS appreciated the assistance of OH staff in this effort.

Thank you for your review and consideration of this report. Please do not hesitate to let me know if you have any questions.

Department of Finance and Administrative Services
700 Fifth Avenue, 52nd Floor
P.O. Box 94689
Seattle, Washington 98124-4689

Tel (206) 386-0041
Fax (206)684-7898
Hearing Impaired use the Washington Relay Service (7-1-1)
http://www.seattle.gov/FAS

September 1, 2014

Summary
In September 2013, the City Council issued Ordinance 124253 to direct increased monitoring and enforcement for wage and labor conditions, including wage theft violations for projects funded by the Office of Housing (OH), as well as City procurement and public works projects. The ordinance appropriated two positions for the Department of Finance and Administrative Services (FAS), City Purchasing and Contracting Services (CPCS) and directed FAS to report back on Sept. 1, 2014, summarizing resulting activities.

Changes funded by the ordinance increased oversight and proved effective at finding situations early, resolving them with less conflict and minimizing risk. While monitoring of OH-funded projects continued to find underpayments, there are early indications to suggest it is less common than in previous years. The new monitoring added for the selected City public works projects found no violations. Monitoring on the selected City service contracts found one contractor with little knowledge of prevailing wage standards, confirming the need to improve education and continue monitoring such contracts. Changes made as a result of the new resources included:

- Increased on-site Spanish-speaking FAS enforcement staff for OH projects and City of Seattle public works contracts.
- Implementation of new online certified payroll software called LCP Tracker. This has proved very effective. City contracts are now imposing this on newly executed public works contracts, including the Elliott Bay Seawall. FAS is modifying some of the existing high-risk service contracts to incorporate that requirement as well. OH is conducting a pilot on an OH project with construction starting in August 2014 and OH is modifying future policy to add this requirement on all future OH-funded projects.

Definition
FAS defines wage theft as any underpayment whether deliberate or inadvertent, as does City ordinance.

Background
Current research suggests a growing incidence of wage theft across the country. The most egregious are purposeful thefts, most commonly theft from undocumented workers in the construction trades or service industry. Seattle has been no exception. Around the country, the greatest risks of systematic worker exploitations are in the residential construction industry, particularly when performed by small contractors with a less-educated and/or immigrant workforce (See Appendix 1).

City of Seattle Office of Housing (OH) programs that fund residential development are not immune to contractors allowing or subcontractors executing such practices. OH funds for low-income housing development are administered through the Administrative and Financial Plan approved by City Council. OH awards loans to borrowers, including nonprofit and for-profit housing developers. Through an award, OH lends funds to developers to develop low-income housing, typically providing 25 percent of the project's financing of the total residential cost. In turn, developers typically contract with prime contractors to build the project. OH loan documents require the developer and all contractors working on the project to pay residential prevailing wage as established by the State of Washington, Department of Labor and Industries (L&I). There is no direct contract relationship between OH and the construction contractors. OH's interest in the projects is secured through loan documents between OH and the nonprofit or for-profit developer.

In 2006, a handful of wage violations were brought to OH's attention and FAS was engaged to monitor payment of wages. In 2012 several accusations of extraordinary wage claims were found by the City's diligent monitoring efforts.

OH Policy Evaluation and Modifications (Exhibit 3)
In response to the wage claims that arose in late 2012, then Mayor Michael McGinn appointed the Wage Monitoring and Compliance Task Force to recommend changes to reduce wage theft risk. The task force included staff from OH and FAS, labor representatives, community advocates and associations, and housing developers. The task force considered almost 30 ideas. Recommendations listed below are divided into two categories: those for immediate pursuit and those that came out of the task force review that were not recommended, but will be held for further

consideration after assessing the progress made by the immediate work. Those recommended by the task force include the following and implementation is underway (Exhibit 2):

- Continue field enforcement, field interviews and monitoring.
- Continue to use retainage as a check point for compliance.
- Continue policy for every contractor to submit to FAS their first and last certified payrolls.
- Expand and require all contractors file online certified payroll reports as a condition of loan payment.
- Increase signage that a contractor must post about worker rights at construction sites.
- Increase on-site FAS field enforcement.
- Require workers to "clock-in" and "clock-out."
- Develop a "Best Practices Site Procedures" guideline.
- Continue pre-construction meetings with the borrower, general contractor, architect and major subcontractors.
- Continue policy to require intents and affidavits.
- Continue borrower review of wage documentation with emphasis at pre-construction meetings.
- Develop a women- and minority-owned business (WMBE) program approach.
- Include wage rate education in weekly safety meetings.

The task force determined that other suggested changes required legal or feasibility review, lacked task force consensus, or posed legal complications in particular for OH projects. The following measures could be included in a "Phase 2" if the recommendations above prove insufficient to prevent wage abuses:

- Publicize "repeat offenders"
- Use of third party construction reviewers
- Require apprenticeship utilization
- Priority (or local) Hire
- Debarment
- Monetary penalties
- Training and support for contractors

Effectiveness of Changes to Monitoring
Most of the immediate implementation items are now underway (Exhibit 2). Early evidence suggests that the City's policy is reducing wage violations or thefts. More time is needed for full evaluation; however, we feel confident that the additional on-site monitoring provides the most effective deterrent for wage violations and we are pleased that developers and many prime contractors are working diligently with the City to raise awareness and end these practices.

City-issued Contracts
As directed and resourced by City Council in the 2013 ordinance, CPCS now monitors City-issued contracts as well. We selected 27 contracts for monitoring, using the profile from our Wage Theft Characteristics study (Appendix 1). FAS/CPCS conducted the study to help identify the City contracts at greatest risk so monitoring and enforcement could be prioritized accordingly.

We found public works contracts to be in compliance. The only issues were routine questions of classification. As with our Seawall Project Labor Agreement, these classification issues are largely jurisdictional concerns for union trades. They are common on public works for all agencies but are less visible absent worksite field monitoring.

For purchased service contracts, CPCS selected the high-risk contract trades of janitorial and groundskeeping for our early monitoring work. As a result of field monitoring, we confirmed that compliance remains incomplete. Companies holding the contracts that were monitored are less experienced and unaware of wage responsibilities. Our 2014 strategy is increasing one-on-one education and technical assistance for such firms, increasing prevailing wage paper submittals, requiring online tracking, and hosting education workshops for all firms. During 2015, we would then be ready to utilize some of our standard contract provisions to do enforcement, such as restitution, withholding City payments to the contractor, deficient performance ratings and/or contract termination.

Results of Monitoring Efforts on OH-funded Projects (Exhibit 1)
This chart compares the activity and enforcement visits as well as violations or underpayments found in previous years to that found in this past year. Given significantly increased on-site monitoring, there are fewer projects with underpayments. As noted above, although early, it appears to support the effect of the additional resources provided as well as the efforts of Walsh Construction and other primes and developers committed to the outcomes.

Office of Housing Projects	Sept. 1, 2013 to July 15, 2014	All Previous Years (2007 through August 2013)
Number of projects	10	26
Projects with underpayments	5	21
Projects without underpayments	5	5
Number of worker interviews	247	432
Number of workers underpaid	37	258
Total restitution dollars paid	$74,238	$204,555

Compliance and Enforcement from Sept. 1, 2013 to July 15, 2014 (Exhibit 1)
CPCS monitored 10 OH projects, 21 public works projects and six purchased service blanket contracts:

Sept. 1, 2013 to July 15, 2014	Office of Housing	Public Works	Purchasing
Number of projects	10	21	6
Projects with underpayments	5	0	1
Projects without underpayments	5	21	5
Number of worker interviews	247	193	9
Number of workers underpaid	37	0	One non-compliant firm; CPCS is educating and rebidding.
Total restitution dollars paid	$74,238*	0	

**Approximately $49,000 of this total appears to be not a wage violation, but was caused by confusion between all parties around commercial or residential wages on one OH-funded project, the Josephinum.*

The increased enforcement performed during this past year evidences:

- Underpayments were discovered by on-site interviews and monitoring.
- No public works contracts had underpayments. One contractor paid lesser wages using traditional classifications; L&I made a post-work determination to increase.
- Purchasing Services uses small contractors with less experience in prevailing wages; one contractor used an awkward non-compliant pay structure. Education is an appropriate next step; CPCS has offered one-on-one assistance and two compliance workshops.
- Five OH-funded projects had underpayments in the past 12 months. All contractors completed restitution payments to workers. Two cases in particular have demonstrated potential criminal wage-theft incidents and are being further investigated. One project was referred for criminal investigation to the Seattle Police Department with an individual awaiting trial. OH and FAS find that the increased monitoring and enforcement are valuable for managing these underpayment risks and potential for wage theft.
- OH and FAS believe there are strategies used by some contractors to avoid prevailing wages and these shift as they are exposed by enforcement. Identifying these helps pinpoint risks to watch for during monitoring. These strategies have included: (1) bringing in out-of-state workers who can move quickly in and out of the area; (2) using vulnerable workers, including undocumented immigrant workers who may not understand their rights; (3) improperly listing workers as “apprentices” eligible for significantly lower rates of pay; (4) improperly classifying all workers as “owner-operators” to avoid prevailing wage. OH and FAS are working to better their systems to document such activity so as to provide adequate evidence of suspected wage-theft activities. If necessary, suspected wage-theft activities are referred to the Seattle Police Department for further investigation.

Exhibit 1: Detailed OH Findings

Projects Completed Prior to August 2013							
Project Number	**Project Name**	**Cost**	**Interview Count**	**Workers w/restitution**	**Restitution Amount**	**Status**	**Comment**
OH#2007-001	Jubilee House		18	unknown	$4,541.27	Closed	No information about # of workers receiving restitution
OH#2007-002	Woodland Park Ave Apts		19	28	$2,198.63	Closed	
OH#2007-003	Rainier Housing		29	12	$10,111.83	Closed	
OH#2007-004	Kenyon Housing (DAVIS-BACON)		12	0	$0.00	Closed	
OH#2007-005	Holden St Housing		23	25	$14,179.77	Closed	
OH#2007-006	Westlake II		25	15	$5,833.08	Closed	
OH#2008-001	Lake City Court Apartments		25	9	$8,226.53	Closed	Misclassification of Electronic Technicians and were initially paid at the Residential Electrician rate.
OH#2008-002	Sea Mar Family Rental		15	6	$5,854.41	Closed	Failure to pay overtime and discrepancies between the sign-in sheet and payroll.
OH#2008-003	Samaki Commons (DAVIS-BACON)		0	0	$0.00	Closed	
OH#2008-004	Douglas Apartments		24	4	$1,205.88	Closed	Misclassification and number of hours reported.
OH#2008-005	Brierwood Group Housing		9	1	$753.18	Closed	Enderis Company Inc. failure to pay one employee for hours worked.
OH#2009-001	Bakhita Gardens		12	7	$7,455.27	Closed	Misclassification of drywall workers as laborers.
OH#2009-002	New Beginnings		5	7	$3,216.73	Closed	Misclassification of drywall workers as laborers.
OH#2009-003	Cascade		16	20	$27,654.87	Closed	Misclassification of drywall tapers as carpenters and laborers by West Coast Drywall.
OH#2009-004	First & Cedar		15	2	$2,324.71	Closed	Underpayment of drywall workers.
OH#2009-005	Meridian Manor		8	1	$478.50	Closed	Failure to pay the correct overtime rate to employees working over 8 hours per day without a 4-10 Agreement.
OH#2009-006	Claremont		0	19	$10,597.89	Closed	Underpayments from Metier Construction, Shamrock Landscaping and Painters Unlimited. Workers for Shamrock reported being paid fixed rate instead of prevailing wage per hour.
OH#2010-001	LIHI University Apartments		60	24	$27,421.97	Closed	Underpayments and misclassification of work performed by employees of Inland Waterproofing Services LLC.
OH#2010-002	Avalon Apartments		36	12	$6,420.35	Closed	Underpayment of overtime and apprentice rates of several employees of Seattle Drywall LLC.
OH#2010-003	Gethsemane		14	0	$0.00	Closed	
OH#2011-001	Jackson St Apartments		20	26	$15,241.44	Closed	Underpayment of hours/days that were working at the site.
OH#2011-002	12th & Jefferson		8	11	$14,576.13	Closed	Underpayment of two drywall workers.
OH#2011-003	Sunset House		3	0	$0.00	Pending	
OH#2011-004	Williams Apartments		13	0	$0.00	Closed	
OH#2011-005	Aurora Supportive Housing		8	16	$32,528.66	Closed	Underpayment of wages and overtime. Alleged illegal activity at job site. Unable to confirm.
OH#2011-006	Ballard Nyer Urness House		15	13	$3,733.91	Closed	Underpayment of 13 employees of Norogachi Construction.
Count	**26**		**432**	**258**	**$204,555.01**		
	Average		**16.6**	**9.9**	**$7,867.50**		

Projects Between Aug 2013 and July 2014							
Project Number	**Project Name**	**Cost**	**Interview Count**	**Workers w/restitution**	**Restitution Amount**	**Status**	**Comment**
OH#2011-007	Impact Family Village	$11,206,032	31	4	$1,073.38	Completed	Underpayments of 4 drywall workers.
	CLOSED PROJECT						
OH#2012-001	CHS Aurora Thunderbird	$5,970,273	23	11	$12,397.78	Completed	Underpayment of 8 workers, checks with insufficient funds, alleged kickback to foreman. Pending trial.
	CLOSED PROJECT						Underpayment to 3 workers for $381.94.

Project Number	Project Name	Cost	Interview Count	Workers w/restitution	Restitution Amount	Status	Comment
OH#2013-001	The Josephinum	$820,248	22	5	$49,000.00	Completed	Renovation project. Underpayment to 5 workers. An attempt to improperly pay the lower apprentice wage to 5 workers was found. *Note: A substantial portion of this restitution amount is also attributable to an increase of wage rates from residential to commercial. It is unclear that the developer or the prime understood that commercial prevailing wages applied.
		$1,922,000					No violations; work contracted directly with owner
	ACTIVE PROJECT	$19,544					No violations; work contracted directly by owner
OH#2013-002	Artspace	$10,358,792	34	5	$442.55	Completed	Underpayment/ misclassification to 5 workers. An attempt to improperly call them apprentices and pay them the lower wages was found.
	IN CLOSING PROCESS						
OH#2013-005	Rainier Court III	$7,351,969	38	12	$11,324.76	Completed	Misclassification of 11 workers as owner operators. State law only allows 3 such owners and all must work independently. These 11 all had a supervisor.
	ACTIVE PROJECT						Misclassification of 1 worker, restitution for $1,724.76
OH#2011-008	DESC Delridge	$8,142,911	30	0	$0.00	n/a	No violations
	IN CLOSING PROCESS						
OH#2013-003	12th Ave Arts	$11,774,538	28	0	$0.00	n/a	No violations
	ACTIVE PROJECT						
OH#2013-004	Compass on Dexter	$12,982,985	14	0	$0.00	n/a	No violations
	ACTIVE PROJECT						
OH#2013-007	Caroline W	$4,200,000	12	0	$0.00	n/a	No violations
	ACTIVE PROJECT						
OH#2014-002	Santos Place	$1,500,000	15	0	$0.00	n/a	No violations
	IN CLOSING PROCESS						
Count	**10**		**247**	**37**	**$74,238.47**		
	Average		**24.7**	**3.7**	**$7,423.85**		

Projects Not Included

Project Number	Project Name	Cost	Interview Count	Workers w/restitution	Restitution Amount	Status	Comment
OH#2014-001	The Sylvia's Place	$10,992,539	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Project has not started
OH#2014-004	Parker Apartments	TBA	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Project has not started
OH#2014-005	Interbay	TBA	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Project has not started
OH#2014-003	Hirabayashi Place	$17,344,384	1	0	n/a	n/a	First site visit on July 29, 2014, found that sign-in sheets and posters were missing at the site.
OH#2013-006	The Julie	$416,698	3	0	n/a	n/a	Small renovation project not included in analysis

Exhibit 2: Wage Monitoring & Compliance Task Force Recommendation progress

Strategy	Status – Office of Housing Project Enforcement Recommendation Implementation
Continue field enforcement, field interviews and monitoring.	Continue.
Continue withholding retainage as a check point for compliance.	Continue.
Continue policy for every contractor to submit to FAS their certified payrolls for the first and last payrolls.	Continue.
Expand and require all contractors file online certified payroll reports as a condition of loan payment.	OH piloting first project in August 2014. OH is also revising its policies to enact on all future projects.
Increase signage that a contractor must post about worker rights at construction sites.	Signage drafted and going through City approval processes.
Increase on-site FAS field enforcement.	Complete. Doubled FAS staffing on OH projects to 1.5 FTE; added 1.5 FTE for City-issued contracts. Staff are hired, trained and on-site.
Require workers to "clock-in" and "clock-out."	OH is redesigning sign-out sheets. One project has tested electronic helmet sign-in/sign-out tags.
Develop a "Best Practices Site Procedures" guideline.	FAS drafting.
Continue pre-construction meetings with borrower, general contractor, architect and major subcontractors.	Continue.
Continue policy to require intents and affidavits.	Continue.
Continue borrower review of wage documentation with emphasis at pre-construction meetings.	Continue.
Develop a women- and minority-owned business (WMBE) program approach.	FAS added support resources for OH.
OH/FAS attend at least one safety meeting at the beginning of drywall and framing to discuss wage rights directly with workers.	FAS drafting handout information for safety meetings.

City of Seattle
Department of Finance and Administrative Services

Wage Theft Characteristics: Strategies for Targeted Enforcement

Table of Contents

Department of Finance and Administrative Services
700 Fifth Avenue, 41st Floor
P.O. Box 94687
Seattle, Washington 98124-4689

Brett Hilyer (TES)
FAS: Contract Analyst
Telephone: (206) 386-4123
Brett.Hilyer@Seattle.gov

This report was conducted by FAS-CPCS to identify priorities for on-site wage monitoring on City of Seattle contracts.

Purpose and Scope

In recent years, wage theft has been recognized as a growing problem for American workers, especially those working in "blue collar" jobs and in low-wage industries. Of particular concern is the noticeable increase in reports of wage theft in the construction industry. Wage theft can take a variety of forms, which may be difficult to detect if regulators are not vigilant, including illegal deductions, "shorting" of hours, mandatory overtime, denial of earned benefits, paying employees below the mandatory minimum wage and employer retaliation against employees who issue complaints about unfair treatment in the workplace. It is the purpose of this report to detail the various types of wage theft, to look at the prevalence of each kind and the cost to both workers and to society, and to examine the common characteristics of wage theft both of employers and employees so that public agencies can use this information to determine which workers are most vulnerable to wage theft and where it is most common. Particular emphasis will be placed on the construction industry, with the intent that regulators and monitoring agencies may use this information to target enforcement efforts on those workers and sectors of the construction industry that have shown the greatest vulnerability to non-payment of due wages by employers and thus may be subject to compliance review.

Legal Background

There is no single all-encompassing definition of wage theft, but rather it is a cluster of actions that employers may use to deny workers their right to full compensation for work performed. Wage theft most commonly takes the form of one of the following illegal actions by employers: (1) Workers are not paid the legally required minimum wage; (2) Workers are not paid the prevailing wage (in cases where the Davis-Bacon Act applies); (3) Workers are not paid for all hours worked; (4) Workers are not paid the legally required overtime rate for employees who work more than 40 hours in one week; (5) Workers are not paid at all by employers; (6) Workers are misclassified by employers as independent contractors to avoid paying full compensation; (7) Workers do not receive their final paycheck. All types of wage theft are illegal under local, state and federal law, regardless of the form that it takes.

The relevant pieces of legislation here include the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (FLSA), which establishes that employers must pay workers no less than the federally mandated minimum wage and must pay at least time-and-one-half wages for any employee who works over 40 hours in one work week. In addition, the Davis-Bacon Act of 1931 (amended in 2002) requires employers to pay their contractors or subcontractors the relevant prevailing wage rate for projects with federal funding. At the local level, there are additional laws strengthening the enforcement mechanisms against theft of wages. In 2009, the Washington State Legislature passed House Bill 3145, which amended RCW 49.48.082 to include penalties for perpetrators of wage theft of at least ten thousand dollars or ten percent of the total amount of unpaid wages, whichever is greater, plus interest accrued. Locally, Section 12A.08.060 of the Seattle municipal code was amended in 2011 to provide a legal definition for "wage theft" as failure to complete a promised payment to employees after services rendered, with the intent to avoid payment.

Department of Finance and Administrative Services
700 Fifth Avenue, 41st Floor
P.O. Box 94687
Seattle, Washington 98124-4689

Tel (206) 386-0041
Fax (206)684-7898
Hearing Impaired use the Washington Relay Service (7-1-1)
http://www.seattle.gov/FAS

Prevalence of Wage Theft

Wage theft is, by definition, illegal, and as we have seen, mechanisms do exist for wage enforcement at all levels of government. However, there is growing evidence that non-payment of wages for services rendered has been rising rapidly in the U.S. over the last decade. The most comprehensive research on wage theft in the U.S. was conducted by the National Employment Law Project (NELP) and published in 2009. This study surveyed workers in low-wage workers in the three largest American cities (New York City, Los Angeles and Chicago). Among its findings, the study reported that over two-thirds (68 percent) of surveyed workers had experienced some form of wage theft during the previous work week. One-fourth of surveyed workers had been paid less than the mandatory minimum wage in the previous work week. Three-fourths of surveyed workers who had worked over forty hours in the previous work week did not receive overtime pay as mandated by the FLSA. Seventy percent of workers who worked additional hours beyond their shifts did not receive any compensation for this extra time. Forty-three percent of workers who complained about working conditions experienced illegal retaliation from their employer during the previous work week.

Cost of Wage Theft

When it occurs, wage theft is not trivial in its impact on workers or on society at large. Among workers in the NELP study who reported minimum wage violations, fully sixty percent of workers were underpaid by at least one dollar per hour. Among those workers who reported overtime violations, the amount of unpaid overtime was averaged at eleven hours a week. Half of workers who experienced an injury on the job were victims of illegal employer retaliation when the injury was reported and half of injured workers were forced to pay for medical costs themselves or through their personal health insurance (only six percent of surveyed workers had on-the-job medical expenses paid by workers' compensation insurance).

Among those workers who experienced wage theft, the average loss of income per worker was $51 (out of $339 of average weekly income). For a full-time worker, this amounts to an average annual loss of $2,634 out of $17,616, or 15 percent of total annual earnings. The NELP study estimates that over one million workers in the three cities surveyed experienced some form of wage theft in any given work week. This amounts to a total loss for low-wage workers of over $56.4 million every week because of denial of due wages and benefits by employers. This would amount to a loss of almost three billion dollars annually for these three metropolitan areas alone. In addition to this, at the national level, it is estimated that at least $19 billion is collectively stolen from U.S. workers every year just from non-payment of overtime wages.

Wage theft is not only a detriment to workers but also to governments through revenue lost to income taxes, workers' compensation taxes and social security deductions. Although no research has been conducted on total revenue lost nationally, a Massachusetts study found that from 2001-2003, $152 million of tax revenue was lost to that state because of worker misclassification alone and $82 to $142 million was lost in uncollected unemployment insurance taxes.

Characteristics of Wage Theft

The total cost of wage theft on workers and taxpayers is difficult to quantify, because illegal non-payment of due wages or benefits takes a variety of forms that can be concealed by unscrupulous employers. For regulators, it is often difficult to assess which areas are most vulnerable to this illegal exploitation because data compiled by the federal and various state Wage and Hour Divisions (WHDs) rely on self-reporting by agencies and on official complaints lodged by workers. As we have seen however, a substantial portion of the low-wage workforce fears retaliation by employers if they report wage violations, and such fears are not unfounded: 43% of surveyed workers who reported a wage or working condition complaint experienced some form of illegal retaliation from their superiors.

I. Industry Characteristics

The construction industry as a whole is routinely cited as one of the most vulnerable areas of employment for wage and hour violations. Kimberley Bobo, one of the nation's leading experts on the problem of wage theft (if not the foremost expert), states that workers' centers (which collect data on wage theft and other workplace abuses) routinely deal with complaints from the construction industry, and that this sector is notorious for some of the worst abuses, such as employee misclassification and total non-payment of wages.

According to the NELP survey (the only national data available), workers in "general construction" (including residential, commercial and public works) had a minimum wage violation rate of 10.5 percent, an overtime violation rate of 66.1 percent, an off-the-clock violation rate of 65.5 percent and a meal break violation rate of 56.7 percent.

On the state level, the Oregon Department of Labor's Wage and Hour Division reports that while construction made up only four percent of Oregon's workforce, it accounted for 18 percent of total wage and hour claims between July 2010 and June 2011. This accounts for 0.3 percent of the industry's workforce in that state. A large number of wage claims involved specialty trades like drywall installers who often subcontract work to smaller firms.

A New York study conducted in 2007 found that the most egregious violations of wage and hour laws were concentrated in residential construction, with over 20 percent of workers being paid "off the books," and another 16 percent being misclassified as independent contractors. It is estimated that as many as 50,000 construction workers in New York City are misclassified as independent contractors or are paid "off the books," while another study from Cornell found this to be numbered at 45,000 workers (paying workers "off the books" involves workers being paid in cash, without proper documentation of hours worked or wages paid).

A survey from Austin, Texas found that 20 percent of construction workers were denied payment altogether, that half of construction workers were not paid due overtime for hours worked, that 76 percent had no health insurance policy and 76 percent had no sick leave.

II. Employer Characteristics

Wage and hour violations do not only vary by industry, but by also by common attributes of the companies that commit them. One very common indicator is payment type. There is a demonstrable correlation between wage and hour violations and payment types other than hourly wages (such as "piece rates" or payment based on production benchmarks). Workers surveyed in the NELP study who were paid an hourly rate had much lower rates of violations (15 percent) than those paid an irregular or non-hourly rate (46 percent). Payment by "piece rate" was also associated with a greater number of wage and hour violations.

Violation rates also varied according to the method by which employees were paid. Workers paid by company check experienced half the rate of violations compared to those paid in cash. Among those paid in cash, 93 percent of workers were not provided an itemized statement of earnings and deductions, which is required by law. Overall, workers paid an hourly rate and by company check had a violation rate one-fourth (12 percent) of those workers who were not paid an hourly rate and were also paid in cash (48 percent). Payment type and method are therefore strong indicators of the potential for wage theft among employers.

Company size has also been strongly associated with wage and hour violations. According to the NELP data, workers at companies with less than 100 employees experienced a minimum wage violation rate nearly double (29 percent) that of workers at companies with over 100 employees (15 percent). This association also holds for meal break violations, where three-quarters of workers at larger companies (as defined above) experienced a meal break violation compared to 64 percent of workers at smaller companies. This association also has implications for more serious issues such as worker safety. The New York State Occupational Safety and Health Administration found that in 2007 there were 22 construction fatalities, half of which occurred among workers at small construction firms.

Other than payment type, payment method and company size, certain other characteristics of an employer can be correlated with minimum wage violation rates. Among companies where employers offered health insurance to workers in the previous year, 12.9 percent of workers experienced a minimum wage violation rate, compared to 28.9 percent of workers in companies that did not offer their workers health insurance in the same period. Similarly, workers at companies that provided sick leave and paid vacation to employees experienced much lower rates of minimum wage violations (12.1 percent) compared to workers at firms that did not provide these benefits (27.9 percent). Finally, workers at companies who were offered a raise by their employers in the previous twelve months had much lower rates of minimum wage violations (13.7 percent) than workers who were not offered a raise in the same period (31.8 percent). These same indicators also correlated to overtime violation and off-the-clock violation rates, though the difference was much less compared to minimum wage violations. Meal break violations barely correlated at all to whether or not these benefits were offered to employees and the correlations between them are not statistically significant.

III. Employee Characteristics

The risk of wage theft can also be determined by the characteristics of the workers themselves. The gender, ethnicity, education level and immigration status of an employee are all strong indicators that these employees may be targeted for wage and hour violations by employers. Male workers experienced noticeably lower violation rates than female workers did (19.5 percent versus 30.2 percent). White workers were much less likely to experience a violation (7.8 percent) than Latina or Latino workers (32.8 percent), Asians (15.1 percent) and African Americans (19.1 percent). Workers without a high school diploma or GED were more likely to experience a violation (32.9 percent) than their counterparts who have a high school level education (23.1 percent) or than those who had some college or greater education experience (18.8 percent).

Employees that were not born in the U.S. were almost twice as likely to experience a violation (31.1 percent) than their U.S.-born counterparts (15.6 percent). Unauthorized immigrants had one of the highest reported rates of wage and hour violations (37.6). Authorized immigrants, while noticeably better off, still experienced above average rates of violations (25.7 percent). Violations between the sexes among U.S.-born workers did not vary considerably (14.9 percent for men; 16.1 percent for women), but among foreign-born workers a significant difference emerged between genders (21.9 percent for men; 37.4 percent for women). English proficiency does seem to play a role here, with fluent speakers experiencing a noticeably lower violation rate (23.7 percent) than that of their non-fluent counterparts (32.6 percent). The highest violation rates were experienced by foreign-born women (37.4 percent) and foreign-born workers with less than a high school diploma or GED in education (37.2). Two factors which did not have statistically significant associations with higher violation rates were employee age and number of years living in the U.S. The differences in demographics we have considered are associated with incidents of minimum wage violations, but do not correlate strongly with other types of wage theft, such as overtime, meal break or off-the-clock violations.

Conclusion

Wage theft is not a single, monolithic phenomenon of workplace exploitation. Instead, it is a range of behaviors that employers engage in order to avoid paying employees their due compensation for work performed. It may take the form of paying workers less than the legal minimum wage, of denying them meal breaks or overtime pay, of misclassifying workers as independent contractors, or of illegally deducting money from their paychecks (with the risk of employer retaliation against employees that report such actions). Employees are generally too intimidated to complain about unfair working conditions or may be ignorant of their legal rights. All industries are affected by this problem, which has been increasing in recent years at the same time that enforcement by public agencies has been declining. Limited resources can be maximized in the fight against disenfranchisement of workers by focusing on those employers that are more likely to exploit workers and those employees most likely to be exploited. Women, minorities and foreign-born workers are the most vulnerable to some form of wage theft, while smaller companies, those that do not provide benefits or pay their employees a non-hourly rate or by cash are more likely to engage in this practice. Within the construction industry, residential construction and specialty trades that utilize subcontractors are the most common offenders.

Appendix

TABLE 1: Bureau of Labor Statistics Household Data on Employed Persons by Occupation, Gender, Race and Ethnicity[1]

Occupation	Women	African American	Asian	Hispanic
Assemblers & Fabricators	38.4%	15.8%	6.9%	19.3%
Carpenters	1.6%	4.2%	1.9%	29.0%
Carpet/Tile Inst.	2.2%	8.8%	0.4%	37.8%
Cement/Concrete/Terrazzo	2.7%	5.8%	3.1%	53.3%
Drywall/Ceiling/Tapers	0.3%	2.7%	0.0%	62.0%
Electricians	1.8%	6.0%	2.3%	14.8%
Constr./Bldg. Inspectors	7.8%	5.5%	2.1%	7.7%
General Maint. & Repair	2.2%	8.4%	3.2%	19.4%
Helpers	4.5%	12.1%	1.3%	38.4%
Heating/AC Mechanics	1.6%	7.1%	3.2%	16.2%
Highway Maint. Workers	1.5%	11.0%	0.1%	12.4%
Iron/Steel Workers	2.8%	6.5%	0.0%	15.8%
Laborers	2.9%	8.4%	2.0%	41.2%
Machinists	3.8%	4.5%	4.9%	11.7%
Masons	0.1%	5.8%	0.3%	43.2%
Metal and Plastic Workers	19.5%	14.4%	6.6%	26.0%
Mining Machine Operators	0.3%	3.8%	0.0%	17.2%
Operating/Prod. Supervisors	19.5%	9.4%	5.8%	13.9%
Operating Engineers	1.3%	6.0%	0.2%	17.1%
Other Extraction Workers	4.5%	5.6%	1.0%	26.2%
Painters/Maintenance	5.5%	5.5%	2.0%	42.6%
Plumbers/Pipe/Steamfitters	1.3%	6.6%	1.5%	20.9%
Power-line Installers/Repair	2.4%	7.8%	0.3%	7.9%
Precision Inst./Equip. Repair	16.0%	9.1%	1.1%	13.3%
Roofers	1.5%	7.0%	0.5%	45.1%
Sheet Metal Workers	4.6%	3.2%	1.7%	12.1%
Telecom. Repair & Installers	4.8%	11.2%	1.9%	15.7%
Vehicle/Equip. Service Tech.	1.0%	5.4%	2.0%	17.3%
Welding/Soldering/Brazing	4.8%	8.7%	2.6%	23.0%

[1] Bureau of Labor Statistics (2012)

TABLE 2: Immigrants and Workers without a High School Diploma in the Top 15 Most Prevalent Construction Occupations[2]

Occupation	Total	No High School Diploma	Immigrants
Construction Laborers	1,740,573	33%	35%
Carpenters	1,239,047	24%	26%
First-Line Supervisors	752,924	15%	13%
Electricians	545,263	7%	14%
Painters, Construction & Maint.	544,877	35%	43%
Plumbers/Pipe/Steamfitters	428,850	19%	17%
Misc. Constr. Equip Operators	285,692	22%	11%
Roofers	252,671	43%	39%
Brick/Block/Stone Masons	161,978	36%	35%
Drywall/Ceiling/Tapers	157,257	44%	46%
Carpet/Floor/Tile Inst. & Finish.	157,246	35%	43%
Highway Maint. Workers	98,058	17%	8%
Cement/Concrete/Terrazzo	72,926	39%	29%
Construction Helpers	67,832	35%	36%
Sheet Metal Workers	62,725	17%	12%

TABLE 3: Immigrants and Workers without a High School Diploma in the Top 15 Most Prevalent Non-Construction Trades in the Construction Industry[3]

Occupation	Total	No High School Diploma	Immigrants
Construction Managers	641,842	7%	11%
Misc. Managers	282,409	8%	11%
Heating/AC & Refrig. Mech./Inst.	274,107	13%	12%
Secretaries/Admin. Assistants	204,329	5%	6%
Driver/Sales & Truck Drivers	174,580	26%	12%
Welding/Soldering/Brazing	98,452	23%	19%
Chief Executives	90,599	4%	10%
Bookkeeping, Accounting, Audit	87,969	4%	8%
Cost Estimators	83,200	3%	7%
Sales Representatives	80,354	3%	6%
Civil Engineers	73,619	0%	18%
Heavy Vehicle Equip. Tech/Mech.	67,946	17%	13%
Accountants & Auditors	57,728	0%	8%
Office Clerks, General	46,315	5%	10%
First-Line Supervisors	36,928	5%	6%

[2] National Association of Home Builders (2013)
[3] *Ibid*.

Works Cited

Annette Bernhardt, Ruth Milkman, Nike Theodore, *et al*. Broken Laws, Unprotected Workers, Violations of Employment and Labor Laws in America's Cities. NELP. September, 2009.

Annette Bernhardt and Siobhán McGrath. Trends in Wage and Hour Enforcement by the U.S. Department of Labor, 1975-2004. Economic Policy Brief, No. 3. September, 2005.

Bureau of Labor Statistics. Household Data Annual Averages: 11. Employed Persons by Detailed Occupation, Sex, Race, and Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity. 2012.

Fiscal Policy Institute. Building Up New York, Tearing Down Job Quality. December, 2007.

Françoise Carré and Randall Wilson. The Social and Economic Costs of Employee Misclassification in Construction. Center for Social Policy, McCormack Graduate School of Policy Studies. University of Massachusetts Boston. December, 2009.

National Association of Home Builders (NAHB). Immigrant Workers in the Construction Labor Force. April, 2013

NELP. Winning Wage Justice: A Summary of Research on Wage and Hour Violations in the United States. July, 2013.

Oregon Center for Public Policy. In What Industries is Wage Theft Prevalent? February, 2012.

Robert W. Van Giezen. Test Surveys in the Construction Industry. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2012.

Ruth Milkman, Ana Luz González, Victor Narro, *et al*. Wage Theft and Workplace Violations in Los Angeles: The Failure of Employment and Labor Law for Low-Wage Workers. Institute for Research on Labor and Employment. UCLA, Los Angeles. 2010.

Susan Miloser. Picking Pockets for Profit: Wage Theft and the Fair Labor Standards Act. Washington & Lee School of Law. Spring, 2011.

Workers Defense Project. Building Austin, Building Injustice. June, 2009.

Workforce Strategies Initiative. Profiles of the Residential Construction Workforce and the Workers Defense Project. December, 2012.

Zach Schiller and Sarah DeCarlo. Investigating Wage Theft: A Survey of the States. Policy Matter Ohio. November, 2010.