



### **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

The following attachments respond to questions raised by the Council and provide general information on the City's paid leave law:

1. TABLE: Side-by-Side Comparison of Paid Sick Leave Laws
2. City & State Enforcement Models
3. Employment Standards Enforcement Overview
4. Education, Outreach, & Community Partnerships
5. Equity Impact Statement from the Office of Equity & Human Rights (OEHR)
6. Summary of Primary Changes in TMC 18.10 "Paid Leave"
7. Council questions on Paid Sick Leave
8. TABLE: Employment Standards Case Data



**ATTACHMENT 1: SIDE-BY-SIDE COMPARISON OF PAID SICK LEAVE LAWS**

An overview of the differences between existing City and State paid sick leave laws is captured in the following table.

<b>Provision</b>	<b>City of Tacoma</b>	<b>Statewide Initiative 1433</b>
<b>Effective Date</b>	February 1, 2015	January 1, 2018
<b>Accrual rate</b>	Minimum of 1 hour for every 40 worked	Minimum of 1 hour for every 40 worked
<b>Accrual annual limit</b>	24 hours per year	Law sets no limit on accrual
<b>Carry over annual limit</b>	24 hours	40 hours
<b>Annual limit on use</b>	40 hours	Law sets no limit on use
<b>When does employee become eligible to use accrued time?</b>	180 <sup>th</sup> day after hire	90 <sup>th</sup> calendar day after hire
<b>Reasons for use</b>	Various reasons related to health, safety, and some kinds of family care	Differences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I-1433 does not include bereavement</li> <li>• School closures by public official are not covered by I-1433 unless for health reasons</li> <li>• I-1433 does include siblings and grandchildren as covered family members</li> </ul>
<b>Rehires &amp; leave balances</b>	Must reinstate paid leave benefits when rehired within six months and within the same benefit year	Must reinstate when rehired within 12 months
<b>Payout of unused leave</b>	Not required	Not required
<b>Can employers require employees to provide documentation when using leave?</b>	Yes, but must currently accept a personal statement	For absences exceeding three days, “if not an unreasonable burden”



<p><b>Employees exempted</b></p>	<p>City ordinance exempts government employers and employees covered by work study agreements.</p>	<p>Salaried workers and outside salespersons are exempted: The law uses the state’s minimum wage definition of employee, which has broad exemptions for workers “employed in a bona fide executive, administrative, or professional capacity” (e.g., Overtime-exempt/salaried employees) or classified as an “outside salesperson.” Specifically does apply to “individual providers” (defined by RCW 74.39A.240(s)) paid by the state.</p>
<p><b>Enforcement</b></p>	<p><b>Workplace-wide investigations.</b> Workplace-wide investigations are conducted unless the allegations are specific to an individual worker (most commonly retaliation). Non-disclosure of witness identity is offered in workplace wide investigations when a complainant or witness fears harm to personal property (e.g., lost job or wages). TMC 18.10 directs staff to “conciliate and settle by agreement any alleged violation or failures to comply.” Settlement agreement has been used to resolve all cases to date. Remedies include restoration of hours/wages owed to all employees at the worksite. The City has the authority to assess civil penalties. There is also authority to revoke business license in egregious situations. No right to private action.</p>	<p><b>Individual Investigations.</b> L&amp;I conducts individual investigations on behalf of the worker who comes forward to file a complaint. Remedies include restoration of hours/wages owed to individual complainants. Non-disclosure of the complainant’s identity is not offered. L&amp;I also utilizes settlement agreements as a tool for resolving cases. Private action and/or workplace wide investigations are available options, but they are uncommon.</p>
<p><b>CBA Waiver</b></p>	<p>City code allows employees to explicitly waive their right to paid leave in a Collective Bargaining Agreement.</p>	<p>I-1433 does not include mention of a CBA waiver. I-1433 does not permit “any agreement between such employee and the employer allowing the employee to receive less than what is due” under state law. This language could limit the City’s ability to retain 100% of its flexible policy options.</p>



**ATTACHMENT 2: CITY & STATE ENFORCEMENT MODELS**

Data from actual cases demonstrated that workplace wide investigations (the City’s current enforcement model) returned thirty-six (36) times the amount of wages/paid sick leave hours that would have been collected by the state if they worked the same caseload. Workplace-wide enforcement also provided remedies to roughly thirty (30) times as many workers than individual investigations would have during the period analyzed.

**Comparison of City & State Enforcement Outcomes**

*Figures based on actual Tacoma case data from February 1, 2016 – July, 28 2017*

	# of Workers receiving owed wages or leave	Value of wages/leave returned to workers
<b>Workplace Wide Enforcement</b>	595	\$168,927
<b>Individual Enforcement</b>	20	\$4,672

*Investigations restoring the rights of the complainant only (State Model) resulted in roughly 3% of the impact of workplace-wide investigations.*

**When individual investigations are used, it can be less expensive for an employer to remain non-compliant.** The \$4,672 that employers would have paid if the City conducted individual investigations is much less than the cost of complete compliance with the law (\$168,927).

**As striking as these figures are, the actual variance between State- and City-led enforcement may be even greater.** The figures used in the analysis assume that the state receives the same volume of complaints as the City. Historically, this has not been the case. L&I indicated that they received just two (2) minimum wage complaints within all Tacoma zip codes in a 12-month period. By comparison, the City of Tacoma received 42 complaints in the first 12 months of enforcement; roughly half (52%) included an alleged minimum wage violation.

**Academic papers indicate that trust is an essential piece of effective enforcement,** particularly in a complaint-based system like Tacoma’s. Complaint-based investigations rely on a witness being willing to come forward and report violations. We have worked strategically to build this kind of trust with workers. In addition to conducting workplace-wide investigations and offering confidentiality to witnesses, we work with local community partners to reach those who are most likely to be working in lower wage, non-benefitted positions. We seek one-on-one contacts in the community to build relationships with workers.

**In 2017, federal statements related to immigration have created additional barriers to trust** at all levels of government. The City’s rules explicitly indicate that questions will not be asked about a witness’s documentation or right to work, providing a level of security for groups known nationally to be at higher risk for workplace wage violations. Currently, we have a bilingual staff member that allows the City to conduct direct outreach to Spanish-speaking workers and business owners. Academic findings indicate that this work to build trust will increase workers’ willingness to report violations when they take place.

**An Issue of Equity.** Complaint-based systems of enforcement can reflect inequities and result in decreased protections for the most vulnerable workers. Initiating a workplace wide investigation when a complaint is received can restore the rights of precariously-employed workers who may not otherwise come forward.



**ATTACHMENT 3: EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS ENFORCEMENT OVERVIEW**

**EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS OVERVIEW**  
*Enforcement totals through July 2017*

Employees receiving owed Leave/Wages	Total Value of Recovered Leave/Wages	Paid Leave Hours Recovered	Value of Recovered Paid Leave Hours	Back pay recovered for Minimum Wage
595	\$168,927	8,890	\$158,557	\$10,371

*NOTE: Does not include impacts resulting from voluntary compliance.*

**Employment Standards Case Snapshot**  
*Totals through July 2017*

	Notifications Received	Closed: No Jurisdiction	Resolved: Courtesy Letter	Resolved: Withdrawn	Resolved: No Violation	Resolved: Settlement Agreement
<b>Total</b>	<b>61</b>	5	7	6	7	27
<b>Total Resolved</b>	<b>52</b>					
<b>Total In Process</b>	<b>9</b>					

*Of the 61 notifications, roughly 52% were PL only, 25% were PL&MW, and 23% were MW only.*

**Impacts on the rise**

At the time of the GPFC presentation, City of Tacoma employment standards investigations had resulted in just over \$38,000 worth of owed wages/leave being returned to 287 workers. Those numbers have increased greatly, with \$168,927 being returned to 595 workers as of July 2017. While the program is still in its infancy and case volumes at maturity remain unknown, increases in the amounts being returned to workers are predicted over time for two reasons:

1. **The first reason is purely mathematical.** Many employers found in violation have been failing to follow the law since February 1, 2016. As the number of months in violation increases, the amount of back pay or leave owed to workers will also increase.
2. **Trust is an essential piece of effective enforcement.** As mentioned in Attachment 1, Complaint-based investigations rely on a witness being willing to come forward and report violations. Academic sources indicate that both trust and case volumes build over time. City staff are working with community partners to strategically to build this kind of trust with workers.



**ATTACHMENT 4: EDUCATION, OUTREACH, & COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS**

**EDUCATION & SUPPORT:**  
*Employer & Worker Inquiries through June 2017*

Paid Leave	Minimum Wage	Total
957	121	1078

*NOTE: Only includes contacts received by phone, email, TF311. Does not capture outreach/education efforts.*

**COMMUNITY PRESENTATIONS & OUTREACH EVENTS**  
*2015 - Present*

62

**WE HAVE NOT DONE THIS WORK ALONE**

Community Partnerships have been essential to outreach, education, and trust building efforts. In the course of this work, we have relied deeply on local collaboration. In addition to utilizing a number of advertising outlets, we partnered with more than 164 community organizations and local businesses on public education. Tacoma’s innovative, community-based approach to outreach and trust building is a key part of what led to Tacoma becoming a national model for paid sick leave implementation.

The threat of civil penalties or the possibility of job loss can make it difficult for businesses with questions to come forward. By working with trade organizations and business leaders, staff have been building a positive reputation within the business community and sharing the word that Tacoma’s employment standards hotline offers one-on-one support for employers.





**ATTACHMENT 5: Equity Impact Statement from the Office of Equity & Human Rights (OEHR)**

The City of Tacoma is committed to equitable service delivery to all residents and supporting human rights and opportunities for everyone to achieve their full potential. The City's Employment Standards' workplace wide enforcement model is an exemplary standard of what can be achieved when making purposeful and intentional equitable decisions. While individual complaint based investigations are vital and serve their purpose, work place wide investigation provides the City of Tacoma another alternative: the ability to reach everyone in the workplace and not limit service to only the few who bring a complaint forward. Individual complaint-based models tend to serve only those who are trusting of government and have a clear understanding of the law. Tacoma's model addresses the institutional inequities for those who do not feel empowered to expect and/or request what is permitted to them by law.

By retaining the current workplace wide enforcement model, the City is able to both protect and serve underrepresented individuals (those who specifically complain) and be able to identify and eliminate underlying drivers within Tacoma that perpetuate racial and socio-economic inequity. The City's Office of Equity and Human Rights (OEHR) is committed to assisting all departments as they develop sustainable methods to build capacity in achieving equitable outcomes and services. The critical test of equitable service delivery is that services are designed in a way that works for the public in its entirety, not just a certain few. Workplace wide enforcement of work standards helps to create a work environment free of discrimination and assists in the OEHR's enforcement of Tacoma Municipal Code 1.29.



## **ATTACHMENT 6: SUMMARY OF PRIMARY CHANGES IN TMC 18.10 “PAID LEAVE”**

### **Chapter Title**

- Chapter title changed to “Paid Sick Leave” to align with state law and to avoid confusion with paid family leave and other kinds of time off.

### **18.10.10 – Definitions**

- Clarifications of existing terms.
- Updates to align with state law, including:
  1. Sibling & Grandchild added to definition of family
  2. Government employers are not exempt from definition of employer
  3. Align hourly rate of pay with State regulations

### **18.10.020 – Accrual**

Edits have been made to create alignment with State law:

- Removed 24 hour cap on accrual
- Adapted Premium Pay Program requirements to meet state requirements
- Accrued leave will be reinstated for employees rehired within 12 months
- Frontloading language aligned with State rules

### **18.10.030 – Use**

- Various edits made to add greater clarity.
- Language related to shifts of indeterminate length was moved from the rules to TMC 18.10.
- Various edits have been made to create alignment with State law, including:
  1. Employees are eligible to use their leave 90 days after hire.
  2. Employees can carry over of up to 40 hours of leave to a subsequent year.
  3. Leave can be used in the case of all health-related worksite closures.
  4. Employers can require documentation for absences exceeding 3 days.
  5. Increment of use will be guided by State WAC.

### **18.10.040 – Retaliation Prohibited**

No amendments were made.

### **18.10.050 – Notice & Posting**

Minor edits to provide clarity and align with enforcement practices.





**18.10.060 – Employer Responsibilities**

- Gives investigators the ability to request witness names and contact information.
- Language related to successor employer was moved from the rules to TMC 18.10.

**18.10.070 – Enforcement**

- Continues to mandate efforts to conciliate and settle by agreement before filing a charge when an employer has failed to comply due to reasonable cause, but provides the ability to file a charge immediate for more egregious offenses, such as willful, repeat violators.
- Adds State language related to investigative authority.
- Minor edits to provide clarity and align with current enforcement practices.

**18.10.080 – Effective Date**

Effective date would be set by the Ordinance itself and not within the code.

**18.10.090 – Waiver**

This section is written to allow waivers to be used whenever permitted by state law while retaining existing conditions for these waivers.

**18.10.100 – Severability**

No amendments.



**ATTACHMENT 7: COUNCIL QUESTIONS ON PAID SICK LEAVE**

Two questions were received related to budget:

- **“Articles suggest and staff suggested that our City rules enforce 36 times the regular enforcement (Per Tacoma Weekly Article) is the office self sustaining? What is the cost to our current effort?”**
- **“I would like to know what was predicted (and allocated) by way of costs for enforcement and as we passed these rules and where we are in actual expenditures and predicted future expenditures based on current staffing. This might be something that most appropriately comes from our Budget Director.”** (Received in June)

\$700,000 was budgeted in the 2017/2018 biennium for enforcement and education of the minimum wage and paid sick leave laws (see table below for detail).

The program was not designed to be self-sustaining. While enforcement efforts through July 2017 yielded \$168,927 worth of remedies, these remedies were paid directly to employees in the form of back wages or banked hours of paid leave available for future use. TMC Title 18 “Minimum Employment Standards” contains language that directs staff to “conciliate and settle by agreement” any alleged violation of the City’s paid sick leave and minimum wage laws. We have used this method to resolve all substantiated cases to date and have assessed no civil penalties or fines payable to the City. In addition to TMC Title 18’s focus on settlement by agreement, there are also broad permissions for the Finance Director to waive or reduce civil penalties.

	2017	2018	Biennium	Actual BTD Expenses	Anticipated Future Expenses
2.5 FTE's	250,000	250,000	500,000	105,000	395,000
- Program Manager					
- Investigator					
- Customer Service Rep (.5 shared with T&L)					
Advertising/Outreach	20,000	20,000	40,000	2,000	33,000
Professional Services	80,000	80,000	160,000		6,000
- Translation Services					6,000
- Possible Contracted Outreach Services					TBD
- Possible Contracted Investigation Services					TBD
	350,000	350,000	700,000		

Advertising/Outreach

Advertising/outreach costs are associated with notification and education related to the paid leave law and the annual change in minimum wage, notification of rules hearings, employer information sessions, and translation and printing of brochures and posters, all of which will hit the last half of the year in 2017.

Professional Services

While this program is in its infancy stage, we cannot predict future case load. Rather than hire two permanent investigators on staff, we set aside dollars to potentially contract for additional services if needed. In addition, we recently learned about Seattle’s success with contracted community outreach to particularly vulnerable workers which we plan to explore in 2018 once we have a better idea of other professional services needs.



- **“The Hospitality Association is curious what our timeline is for the administrative rule-making process, given the state's autumn timeline.”** (Received in June)

State law was finalized with voter approval of I-1433. In August, we plan to present an amendment to the City’s Paid Leave code (TMC 18.10) for Council’s consideration that would align City and State laws.

In stakeholder meetings, the state has indicated that they plan to finalize their administrative rules in October. If the Council amends TMC 18.10 in August, staff plans to conduct the City’s administrative rules process in November. Timing our rules process directly after the State’s will allow us to give the business community as much notice and support as possible while they update their sick leave policies for 2018. Delaying City processes further would have a damaging effect on our ability to conduct education and outreach.

- **“One of the things that was a little frustrating about the (GPFC) presentation was the fact we seemed to be consistently comparing 12 month state numbers with 18 month city numbers. Can you provide a true comparison for like time periods? Can you also provide data on how mature the state rules are for the period we are comparing (how long have they been in place).”**  
(Received in June)

**Additional information:**

This table is being provided to clarify statements on the number of minimum wage complaints received by the two agencies.

**Minimum Wage complaints received in 12-month period**

<b>State L&amp;I</b>	2
<b>City of Tacoma</b>	22

*State complaints are for all Tacoma zip codes.*

*Some of city complaints included allegations related to both minimum wage and paid leave.*

**Original response:**

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to clarify some of the timelines that were included in the GPFC presentation. The comparison data that was presented (graphic below) was based on a 13-month period. This data was compiled prior to formulating a recommendation for GPFC consideration. It’s an awkward length of time, but thirteen months was all the data available at that time. All of the data comes from City investigations. It compares what we collected for the individual worker who complained verses what we recovered for all workers throughout the company after opening a case.



The data was intended to highlight the impact of workplace wide investigation (City model) vs investigation of only an individual workers complaint (State model). We hope to update this comparison data before this topic goes before the full Council (**NOTE: The table below was from the GPFC presentation and is now out of date; updated data is included in Attachment 2).**

**Enforcement Outcomes: Individual v. Workplace Wide**

Workplace wide investigations provided remedies to 25 times more workers than individual investigations (State Model) would have.

	# of Workers receiving owed wages or leave	Value of wages/leave returned to workers
Workplace Wide	257	\$33,144
Individual Enforcement	11	\$1,444

Figures taken from actual Tacoma case data from Feb 2016 – Feb 2017

During the presentation, I shared that L&I had notified us previously that they received just two minimum wage complaints in Tacoma zip codes in the 2015 Fiscal Year. This information was not intended to be a direct comparison; it was only meant to demonstrate that the number of complaints we had in 13 months may have been lower if we did not offer confidentiality to witnesses. The state has been enforcing a minimum wage law for more than 50 years, although it has changed over time (<http://www.lni.wa.gov/WorkplaceRights/Wages/Minimum/History/>).

The GPFC memo also included City of Tacoma’s total enforcement numbers to date. I apologize for any confusion based on difference between the 13-month research timeframe and the 15-month time period of our overall program data.

- **“Will you please provide any information you have on rate of case load and anticipated case load as the rules become more completely understood (something that should be greatly helped by the consistency of rules due to the statewide adoption of the initiatives).”** (Received in June)

Sick leave laws are very new in most jurisdictions across the country, but we can draw some information on violation rates from other types of employment standards, such as minimum wage. In an October 2015 paper by the UCLA Center for Labor Research and Education, the authors state that:

*“Cities cannot expect a high volume of complaints immediately. During the first few years of implementation, a low volume of complaints may stem from workers’ lack of knowledge about the new law or their rights or the risks in filing a complaint. It takes time to build the trust necessary for effective enforcement. Trust grows by developing strong relationships with worker and community groups... and creating a track record of successfully winning back wages for workers.”* (Paper: [Enforcing City Minimum Wage Laws in California](#))

This aligns with the experience of our peers in San Francisco, which have the oldest paid sick leave program in the nation: “Initial education might result in a surge but, there is nothing like word of mouth -- of successful complaints that OLSE adjudicates and/or helps to settle -- that motivates other workers to then come forward.” After building community trust, complaint volumes may plateau. Seattle has contracted for community outreach to particularly vulnerable worker groups, and reports that their case volumes remain



steady, with 84 new paid sick leave investigations in 2015 and 86 in 2016. Seattle’s law took effect in September 2012.

The number of complaints received seems more closely tied to worker trust than the prevalence of non-compliance. San Francisco reports that they have experienced a notable decrease in all employment standards complaints (they have seven employment standards laws) since the change in federal administration and the dialogue around immigration issues, indicating to them that worker trust among some vulnerable worker populations is a significant driver of workload in their office.

Our particular rate of case load did show an initial spike during the first months of implementation, but has overall been consistent (**NOTE: table has been updated since the original response was drafted to include June, July, and partial August data**):

Month	Notifications Received
January 2016	1
February	9
March	3
April	7
May	4
June	0
July	0
August	2
September	4
October	4
November	4
December	2
January 2017	2
February	4
March	3
April	4
May	2
June	3
July	3
Aug (to date)	3



- **“In the presentation you mentioned one organization that, by your description, seemed to be in open defiance of the program(s). Along the same lines, please provide the result numbers separated out to include (1) aggregated results culminating from complaint driven investigations and (2) results from the investigation into a reluctant participant.”** (Received in June)

Thank you for asking about complaint driven investigations verses investigations with reluctant participants. I understood the “reluctant participants” to be workers who may not have initiated a complaint. In our cases that were not initiated by an employee, we have worked directly with the employer to get information and find a resolution to the case by settlement agreement. Worker interviews would only be used in cases where disputed facts could not be resolved by agreement with evidence presented by the employer; we have not had any cases where that was necessary to date. Please let me know if I misunderstood the question.

- **“Additionally, it would be helpful to know whether the results of complaint-driven investigations determined willful non-compliance or lack of understanding.”** (Received in June)

The Paid Leave Ordinance directs staff to attempt to “conciliate and settle by agreement, any alleged violations or failures to comply.” We have successfully used the settlement agreement process to resolve all substantiated cases to date. The settlement agreement process does not include findings, and it focuses on what needs to be changed rather than why the violation has occurred. Because of this, we are unable to sort case data based on employer motivation or intent.

- **“I would also like to see a totality of all investigations (individually sans identifying information that might be protected such as company name and employee names) and the results. For example: Case 1289; 90 employees; no violation OR case 1392; 5 employees; back pay in the amount of \$500 paid to 2 employees or some such accounting.”** (Received in June)

Thank you for your patience while I pulled data on individual investigations. I hope I captured everything you were looking for in the attached spreadsheet (**NOTE: This spreadsheet data can be found in Attachment 9**). It has been updated to include case information through yesterday, so totals will be different from the comparison chart that was presented to GPFC. You’ll note that we have ten cases currently open, with final outcomes pending. I also included information on how the case was opened (e.g., worker complaint, peer-to-peer complaint, etc) in case that information is of interest.



**ATTACHMENT 8: EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS CASE DATA (through July 2017)**

**KEY**  
 CMP = Complainant  
 EE = Employees  
 Notice = Workplace Poster  
 Notification = Info on Paid Leave Hours Accrued  
 MW = Minimum Wage  
 Peer-to-Peer = Business Complainant  
 PL = Paid Leave  
 W/D = Withdrawn  
 \* = Case is open  
 \*\* = Workplace size is a new data point as of 2016, and complete data is not available.

Case	Type	Resolution Type	Impetus	# of CMP	# of CMP who received \$ remedy	Workplace Size**	#EE who Received \$ Remedy	# Banked Leave Hours Restored	Value of Restored Banked Leave	# Leave Hours Paid Out	Value of Hours Paid	Back Wages Paid	Total Financial Value of Remedy	Amount Paid to CMP	Other Remedy
1 200000000	PLMW	Settlement Agreement	Worker CMP	1	1	32	32	85	\$879			\$865	\$1,745	\$7	Policy change, Notice, Notification, Supervisor Training
2 200000010	PL	Courtesy Letter	Worker CMP	1		Unknown									NA
3 200000011	PLMW	No Case - No jurisdiction	Worker CMP	1		Unknown									NA
4 200000012	MW	No Violation	Worker CMP	1		Unknown									NA
5 200000020	PL	Settlement Agreement	Worker CMP	2	2	Unknown	124	228	\$4,424				\$4,424	\$71	Notice, Notification, Policy change
6 200000021	PLMW	Courtesy Letter	Worker CMP	1		Unknown									NA
7 200000022	MW	No Case - Untimely	Worker CMP	1		Unknown									NA
8 200000030	PLMW	Settlement Agreement	Worker CMP	1	1	8	8	38	\$393			\$660	\$1,053	\$184	Notice, Notification
9 200000031	MW	Settlement Agreement	Worker CMP	1	1	25	1					\$12	\$12	\$12	Notice, Notification
10 200000040	PLMW	Settlement Agreement	Worker CMP	2	2	5	4	22	\$228				\$228	\$114	Notice, Notification, Wage Monitoring, Training
11 200000050	PLMW	Settlement Agreement	Worker CMP	1	1	30	9	216	\$2,236				\$2,236	\$248	Notice, Notification, Policy change, Training
12 200000060	MW	Courtesy Letter	Worker CMP	1		Unknown									NA
13 200000061	MW	W/D - CMP non-responsive	Worker CMP	1		Unknown									NA
14 200000070	PL	W/D - CMP non-responsive	Worker CMP	1		1510									NA
15 200000071	PL	Settlement Agreement	Worker CMP	1		12									Notice,
16 200000072	PL	Settlement Agreement	Peer-to-Peer	0		20									Notice,
17 200000080	PL	Settlement Agreement	Peer-to-Peer	0		1	3	14	\$156				\$156	NA	Notice,
18 200000090	PL	W/D - CMP non-responsive	Worker CMP	1		1									NA
19 200000100	PLMW	Courtesy Letter	Worker CMP	1		Unknown									NA
20 200000101	PLMW	W/D - CMP non-responsive	Worker CMP	1		Unknown									NA
21 200000110	PL	W/D - CMP non-responsive	Worker CMP	1		10									NA
22 200000111	MW	No Case - No jurisdiction	Worker CMP	1		Unknown									NA
23 200000112	PLMW	Settlement Agreement	Worker CMP	1		5									Notice,
24 200000120	PLMW	Courtesy Letter	Worker CMP	1		45									NA
25 200000130	MW	CMP W/D to file w/ L&I	Worker CMP	1		1									NA
26 200000131	MW	No Violation	Worker CMP	1		50									NA
27 200000132	PL	No Violation	Worker CMP	1		25									NA
28 200000140	PL	Settlement Agreement	Worker CMP	1		12									Policy change
29 200000150	PLMW	Settlement Agreement	Anonymous CMP	1	Unknown	4	6			38	\$624		\$624	Unknown	Notice, Notification
30 200000160	PL	Settlement Agreement	Worker CMP	1		25									Policy change
31 200000161	PL	Settlement Agreement	Peer-to-Peer	0		15	19			315	\$3,519	\$108	\$3,627	NA	Notice,
32 200000170	PL	No Violation	Worker CMP	1		126									NA
33 200000180	PL	No Violation	Worker CMP	1		184									NA
34 200000190	PL	Settlement Agreement	Public Publication	0		17	20	45	\$540	337	\$5,999		\$6,539	NA	Notice, Notification, Training
35 200000200	PL	Settlement Agreement	Worker CMP	1	1	362	113	3745	\$86,704	116	\$2,727		\$89,431	\$1,128	Notice, Policy Changes, Training
36 200000210	PL	Settlement Agreement	Worker CMP	2		302									Policy change
37 200000220	PLMW	W/D - Duplicate	Peer-to-Peer	0		15									NA



(EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS CASE DATA, CONTINUED)

**KEY**  
 CMP = Complainant  
 EE = Employees  
 Notice = Workplace Poster  
 Notification = Info on Paid Leave Hours Accrued  
 MW = Minimum Wage  
 Peer-to-Peer = Business Complaint  
 PL = Paid Leave  
 W/D = Withdrawn  
 \* = Case is open  
 \*\* = Workplace size is a new data point as of 2016, and complete data is not available.

Case	Type	Resolution Type	Impetus	# of CMP	# of CMP who received \$ remedy	Workplace Size**	#EE who Received \$ Remedy	# Banked Leave Hours Restored	Value of Restored Banked Leave	# Leave Hours Paid Out	Value of Hours Paid	Back Wages Paid	Total Financial Value of Remedy	Amount Paid to CMP	Other Remedy
38	200000230	PLMW	Settlement Agreement	Worker CMP	1	1	6	13		145	\$1,634	\$623	\$2,257	\$191	Notice,
39	200000231	PL	Settlement Agreement	Worker CMP	1	1	17	18		423	\$10,244		\$10,244	\$616	Policy/CBA
40	200000232	PLMW	No Case - No jurisdiction	Worker CMP	1		Unknown								NA
41	200000250	PL	Settlement Agreement	Worker CMP	1	1	17	8	\$480	86	\$2,459		\$2,939	\$260	Notice,
42	200000260	MW	Settlement Agreement	Worker CMP	1	1	11	16				\$87	\$87	\$8	None except future compliance
43	200000270	PL	Settlement Agreement	Worker CMP	1	0	57	57	\$8,373	155	\$1,899	\$0	\$10,272	\$0	Notice,
44	200000280	PL	Settlement Agreement	Worker CMP	1	1	25	2		14	\$701		\$701	\$611	Policy change
45	200000281	PL	Settlement Agreement	Worker CMP	1	1	7	4	\$1,070	96	\$1,070		\$2,140	\$267	Notice, Notification,
46	200000291	MW	Settlement Agreement	Worker CMP	2	2	44	44				\$7,552	\$7,552	\$408	None except future compliance
47	200000292	PL	No Case - No jurisdiction	Worker CMP	1		Unknown								NA
48	200000300	PL	Settlement Agreement	Worker CMP	1	1	30	79	\$6,213	1443	\$15,986		\$22,199	\$397	Notification, Training
49	200000310	MW	No Violation	Worker CMP	1		14								NA
50	200000320	MW	Settlement Agreement	Worker CMP	1	1	Unknown	1				\$122	\$122	\$122	Future compliance
51	200000330	MW	Settlement Agreement	Worker CMP	1	1	20	14				\$341	\$341	\$27	None except future compliance
52	200000340	PL	No Violation	Worker CMP	1		Unknown								NA
53	200000360	MW	No Violation	Public	0		Unknown								Referred to Auditors:
54	200000201*	PL	NA - Open / Pending	Worker CMP	1		402								
55	200000240*	PL	NA - Open / Pending	Worker CMP	1		1510								Change in practices, Training
56	200000261*	PL	NA - Open / Pending	Worker CMP	1										
57	200000282*	PL	NA - Open / Pending	Worker CMP	1		50								
58	200000290*	PL	NA - Open / Pending	Worker CMP	1										
59	200000331*	PLMW	NA - Open / Pending	Worker CMP	1		18								
60	200000332*	PL	NA - Open / Pending	Worker CMP	1										
61	200000350*	PL	NA - Open / Pending	Worker CMP	1		5								
					59	20	5075	595	5722	\$111,696	3,168	\$46,861	\$10,371	\$168,927	\$4,672