5.

Broward County Commission Public Hearing

Meeting Date: 10/09/2012

Department: County Attorney

Information

Requested Action

MOTION TO CONSIDER enactment of an Ordinance, the title of which is as follows: (Continued from August 28, 2012)

AN ORDINANCE OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA, CREATING CHAPTER 20½ OF THE BROWARD COUNTY CODE OF ORDINANCES ("CODE") TO PROHIBIT WAGE THEFT; PROVIDING FOR AN ADMINISTRATIVE COMPLAINT, ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES FOR WAGE THEFT CLAIMS; PROVIDING FOR ENFORCEMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE ORDERS IN A COURT OF COMPETENT JURISDICTION; AND PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

(Sponsored by Vice-Mayor Kristin Jacobs)

Why Action is Necessary

A Resolution directing the County Administrator to publish notice of public hearing to consider enactment of the Ordinance was adopted by the Board of County Commissioners at its Commission meeting of June 12, 2012.

What Action Accomplishes

Amends the Code to prohibit wage theft and provide for administrative procedures for wage theft claims.

Is this Action Goal Related

Previous Action Taken

Summary Explanation/Background

This Ordinance was drafted at the direction of the Board on June 12, 2012. It substantially tracks Miami-Dade County's wage theft Ordinance that was enacted in 2010. It would create an administrative claim for wage theft in excess of \$60. Any claim not resolved voluntarily would be referred to a County hearing officer, who would issue a final order finding in favor of the employee or the employer.

Prevailing employees would be awarded damages equal to three times the unpaid wages, and

1 of 2 10/5/2012 9:05 PM

would be entitled to recover attorney's fees and costs. If an employee prevails, the employer would also be required to reimburse the County for its administrative costs and the hearing officer costs. The draft includes a provision allowing the County and the employer to recover expenses incurred in connection with a frivolous wage theft claim.

At the Board's direction, a focus group meeting was held on July 24, 2012, to enable interested persons to provide their input regarding the proposed Ordinance. Attached hereto as Exhibit 3 is a memorandum summarizing the input received. In response to one public comment, the Office of the County Attorney recommends that the change referenced on Exhibit 4 attached hereto be made to clarify that wage theft claims must be based on work performed within the geographic boundaries of Broward County.

This item was previously set for the August 28, 2012, public hearing but was rescheduled for October 9, 2012, pursuant to the Board's direction at its Commission meeting of August 21, 2012.

Fiscal Impact

Fiscal Impact/Cost Summary:

Fiscal Impact Statement by Office of Management and Budget attached as Exhibit 2.

Attachments

Exhibit 1 - Copy of Proposed Ordinance

Exhibit 2 - Copy of Fiscal Impact Statement

Exhibit 3 - Copy of Memorandum from the Office of the County Attorney

Exhibit 4 - Copy of Proposed Amendment

Additional Material - Information

2 of 2 10/5/2012 9:05 PM

PROPOSED

	ı	ı
	•	Į
		ı
		ı
-	•	

2

4

5

7

8

10

11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19

2021

22

2324

Coding:

ORDINANCE NO. 2012-

ORDINANCE OF THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA, CREATING CHAPTER 201/2 OF THE BROWARD COUNTY CODE OF ORDINANCES ("CODE") TO PROHIBIT WAGE **PROVIDING** THEFT: **FOR** ΑN COMPLAINT, **ADMINISTRATIVE** HEARING ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES FOR WAGE **PROVIDING** CLAIMS; FOR **ENFORCEMENT** ADMINISTRATIVE **ORDERS** IN Α COURT COMPETENT JURISDICTION: AND PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

(Sponsored by Vice-Mayor Kristin Jacobs)

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners finds that the underpayment or nonpayment of wages earned by persons working in the County harms the public health, safety, and welfare,

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA:

Section 1. Chapter 20½ of the Broward County Code of Ordinances is hereby created to read as follows:

[UNDERLINING OMITTED]

Chapter 20½. Wage Theft.

Sec. 201/2-1. Declaration of Policy.

It is hereby declared to be the policy of Broward County in the exercise of its police power for the public safety, health, and general welfare, to prevent wage theft. Eliminating the underpayment or nonpayment of wages earned by persons working in the County serves the public by promoting economic security and dignity for those working in the County; by promoting business and economic development through the

Words in struck-through type are deletions from existing text. Words in underscored type are additions.

2

elimination of unfair economic competition by unscrupulous businesses that do not pay or that underpay their employees; and by relieving the burden on the public to subsidize unscrupulous employers whose employees are forced to rely on public assistance because of unpaid or underpaid wages.

Sec. 201/2-2. Definitions. For purposes of this chapter:

- (a) *Employ*. The meaning of "employ," including as used in the terms employing or employment, shall include to suffer or permit to work.
- (b) *Employee* shall mean a natural person who performs work within the geographic boundaries of Broward County while being employed by an employer, but shall not include any bona fide independent contractor.
- (c) *Employer* means any natural person or entity employing an employee, except such term does not include:
 - (1) The United States or a corporation wholly owned by the government of the United States;
 - (2) The State of Florida;
 - (3) Broward County; or
 - (4) Any Indian Tribe.
- (d) *Independent contractor* shall have the same meaning as in the Internal Revenue Code and implementing federal regulations.
- (e) Liquidated damages shall mean twice the amount a respondent employer is found to have unlawfully failed to pay the complainant employee. Where an employee is awarded treble damages for wage theft violations, the treble damages are comprised of such liquidated damages awarded in addition to back wages in order to

compensate for the economic losses suffered by reason of the employee not receiving his or her wage at the time it was due.

- (f) Reasonable time shall be presumed to be no later than fourteen (14) calendar days from the date on which the work is performed unless the employer has established, by policy or practice, a pay schedule whereby employees earn and are consistently paid wages according to regularly recurring pay periods, in which case such pay schedule shall govern.
 - (g) Threshold amount shall mean sixty dollars (\$60.00).
- (h) Wage rate shall mean any form of monetary compensation which the employee agreed to accept in exchange for performing work for the employer, whether daily, hourly, or by the piece, but in all cases shall be equal to no less than the highest applicable rate established by operation of any federal, state, or local law.
- Sec. 20½-3. Wage Theft Violations. A wage theft violation occurs when an employer fails to pay any portion of wages due to an employee, according to the wage rate applicable to that employee, within a reasonable time from the date on which that employee performed the work for which those wages were compensation. Such violation shall entitle an employee, upon a finding by a Hearing Officer appointed by Broward County that an employer has unlawfully failed to pay wages, to receive back wages in addition to liquidated damages from that employer.

Sec. 201/2-4. Procedures for Wage Theft Claims.

- (a) Filing wage theft complaints.
- (1) Complaints alleging wage theft may be considered under this chapter only if the employee alleges a wage theft violation equal to or exceeding the threshold amount.

Coding:

Words in struck-through type are deletions from existing text. Words in underscored type are additions.

- (2) Either of the following may file a written, signed complaint with the County pursuant to the procedures established by the County Administrator pursuant to Administrative Rule:
 - a. An employee aggrieved by a wage theft action prohibited by this article; or
 - b. Any entity a member of which is an employee aggrieved by a violation of this article.
- (3) A signed complaint for wage theft must be filed with the County in the manner prescribed by Administrative Rule no later than one (1) year after the last date upon which the complainant employee performed the work for a respondent employer with regard to which the employee alleges a violation of this article has occurred ("filing deadline"). If the alleged wage theft violation is ongoing at the time of the filing of the complaint, the complaint may also seek recovery of amounts that accrue after the filing of the complaint.
- (4) The complaint shall set forth the facts upon which it is based with sufficient specificity to identify the respondent employer(s) and for the County to determine both that an allegation of wage theft has been made and that the threshold amount has been met.
- (b) Respondent.
- (1) Upon the filing of any complaint, the County shall promptly determine whether the complaint alleges wage theft, names at least one (1) respondent employer, and meets the threshold amount. The duty of the County in determining whether a complaint meets those criteria is limited

to receiving the complaint and comparing the information provided therein to the criteria required herein. This determination is a ministerial act and may not be based on further investigation or the exercise of independent judgment.

- (2) Upon making such determination, the County shall serve the complaint and a written notice on each respondent charged with the commission of wage theft, setting forth the allegations, rights, and obligations of the parties including, but not limited to, the right to a due process hearing on the matter before a Hearing Officer and that the respondent may be responsible for the costs of the Hearing Examiner and other enforcement costs. Such service shall be by certified mail.
- (3) Each respondent shall file an answer to the complaint with the County not later than twenty (20) days after receipt of the complaint and the written notice referenced above.
- (c) Hearing before Hearing Officer.
- (1) Within thirty (30) days after the service of the Complaint on the respondent, or within ten (10) days after the County determines that any conciliation efforts (as referenced below) will not result in resolution of the dispute, whichever is later, the County shall appoint a Hearing Officer that it deems to be qualified to hear wage theft matters. In conducting any hearing to determine whether a violation of this chapter has occurred, the Hearing Officer shall have the authority to administer oaths, issue subpoenas, compel the production of evidence, and receive evidence. The Hearing Officer shall have the authority to consolidate two (2) or more

complaints into a single hearing where such complaints name the same respondent(s) and involve sufficiently similar allegations of fact to justify consolidation. The final determination of the Hearing Officer in wage theft matters is subject to appeal in a court of competent jurisdiction.

- (2) All parties shall appear at the hearing in person, with or without counsel, and may submit evidence, cross-examine witnesses, obtain issuance of subpoenas, and otherwise be heard. Testimony taken at the hearing shall be under oath and a transcript shall be made available at cost to any interested party.
- (3) Discovery shall be permitted upon motion of any party and shall proceed in the manner provided by the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure.
- (4) The Hearing Officer may direct that the parties submit a pre-hearing statement addressing the issues of law and fact that will be involved in such hearing, identify the witnesses that will testify, and provide a list of all documents or other types of exhibits that will be submitted.
- (5) Upon the conclusion of the hearing, an adjudicative final order shall be issued and served upon the parties setting forth written findings of fact and conclusions of law.
- (6) Subject to paragraph (7) immediately below, in any proceeding under this chapter, the burden of proof by a preponderance of the evidence rests upon the complainant.
- (7) When the following three (3) conditions are met:

- a. By operation of some other statute or regulation, a respondent employer has an obligation to keep records of an employee's hours worked and/or records of compensation provided to an employee;
- b. Such records are imprecise, inadequate, or do not exist; and
- c. A complainant employee presents sufficient evidence to show, as a matter of just and reasonable inference, the amount of work done or the extent of work done or what compensation is due for the work done;

then the burden of imprecision falls on the respondent whose obligation it was to keep accurate records, and the respondent must come forward with evidence of the precise amount of work performed or with evidence to negate the reasonableness of the inference to be drawn from the complainant's evidence. If the respondent fails to meet this burden, the Hearing Officer may award approximate damages based on the complainant's evidence.

- (d) Subpoenas.
- (1) Any party may request that a subpoena be issued by the Hearing Officer. Witnesses summoned by subpoena shall be entitled to the same witness and mileage fees as are witnesses in proceedings in the County Court of Broward County, Florida. Fees payable to a witness summoned by subpoena issued at the request of a party shall be paid by that party.
- (2) Within ten (10) days after service of a subpoena upon any person, such person may petition the Hearing Officer to revoke or modify the subpoena. The Hearing Officer shall grant the petition if he or she finds that the

subpoena requires appearance or attendance at an unreasonable time or place, that it requires production of evidence which does not relate to the matter, that it does not describe with sufficient particularity the evidence to be produced, that compliance would be unduly onerous, or for other good reason.

- (3) In the case of refusal to obey a subpoena, the Hearing Officer or any party may seek enforcement of a subpoena issued under the authority of this chapter by filing a petition for enforcement in a court of competent jurisdiction. In such enforcement proceeding, the court may award to the prevailing party all or part of the costs and attorney's fees incurred in obtaining the enforcement order as authorized by the Florida Rules of Civil Procedures.
- (4) Any person who willfully fails or neglects to attend and testify or to answer any lawful inquiry or to produce records, documents, or other evidence, if in his or her power to do so, may be fined by a court of competent jurisdiction, not more than five hundred dollars (\$500.00) or imprisoned not more than sixty (60) days or both.
- (5) Any person who makes or causes to be made any false entry or false statement of fact in any report, account, record, or other document submitted to the Hearing Officer pursuant to its subpoena or other order, or who willfully mutilates, alters, or by any other means falsifies any documentary evidence, may be fined by in a court of competent jurisdiction, not more than five hundred dollars (\$500.00) or imprisoned not more than sixty (60) days or both.

- (e) Applicability of Florida Rules of Civil Procedure.
- (1) The provisions of Rule 1.090, Florida Rules of Civil Procedure, shall govern the computation of any period of time prescribed or allowed by this chapter or by rules, regulations, or orders adopted pursuant to this chapter.
- (2) All papers or pleadings required by this chapter to be served may be served by certified mail or in accordance with Rule 1.080, Florida Rules of Civil Procedure.
- (f) Conciliation.
- (1) It is the policy of the County to encourage conciliation of charges. The County will work with the parties in an attempt to conciliate. If possible, a written conciliation agreement resolving the dispute between the complainant and the respondent shall be executed prior to the referral of the matter to a Hearing Officer.
- (2) Any conciliation agreement shall be between the respondent and the complainant.
- (3) Whenever a party believes that the other party has breached a conciliation agreement, the aggrieved party may file a civil action in a court of competent jurisdiction for enforcement of such agreement.
- (4) Nothing said or done in the course of attempting conciliation under this chapter may be used as evidence in any subsequent proceeding under this chapter or otherwise without the written consent of the parties to the underlying charge of violation.

- (g) Representation by Non-lawyer Advocate. Any person may be represented by counsel in any proceeding under this chapter. Any party, including corporate entities, as an alternative to counsel, may be represented by a non-lawyer advocate authorized by that party, except where such representation is prohibited by law or disallowed by the Hearing Officer for good cause.
 - (h) Enforcement by private persons or by the State of Florida.
 - (1) Enforcement by private persons. If during the pendency of a wage theft violation complaint but prior to the issuance of a final decision by a Hearing Officer, a complainant employee brings a private action in his or her own right, whether under state law, federal law, or both, in any state or federal court to seek unpaid wages based upon the same facts and allegations as the complainant employee's complaint to the County, or affirmatively or by consent opts to participate in any such litigation, that complainant employee's complaint of wage theft shall be deemed withdrawn with respect to any respondent employer named as a defendant in such court action. This section shall be interpreted narrowly so as to leave unaffected any cumulative rights which were not the subject of a complaint employee's complaint.
 - (2) Enforcement by the State of Florida. If at any time during the pendency of a complaint of wage theft, the Hearing Officer becomes aware of an enforcement action by the Florida Attorney General or other body of the State of Florida based on wage violations involving the same facts as the complainant employee's complaint to the County, the Hearing Officer shall dismiss, without prejudice, the complainant employee's complaint with

respect to the respondent or respondents named in such State enforcement action.

Sec. 20½-5. Enforcement of Wage Theft Violations.

- (a) Order Issued. At the conclusion of a hearing, the Hearing Officer shall issue a final written order stating whether the wage theft violation has been established by a preponderance of the evidence. If such violation has been so established, the final written order shall:
 - (1) Require the employer to pay wage restitution to the affected employee in an amount equal to three (3) times the amount of back wages that the respondent employer is found to have unlawfully failed to pay the complainant employee; this treble damage amount shall include the back wages in addition to liquidated damages as compensation for the economic losses suffered by reason of the employee not receiving his or her wage at the time it was due;
 - (2) Require the employer to reimburse the employee for any reasonable costs and attorney's fees incurred by the employee in connection with the administrative hearing; and
 - (3) Require the employer to pay to the Board of County Commissioners an assessment of costs in an amount not to exceed actual administrative processing costs and the cost of the hearing.
- (b) Failure to Comply with Order. If any respondent employer fails to comply with the Hearing Officer's final written order within thirty (30) days after issuance of the order, interest shall accrue on all amounts due and owing the employee and the County with interest commencing as of the date of the order. Such interest shall accrue at the

applicable rate for court judgments in Florida. Additionally, the employee or the County may file an appropriate action in a court of competent jurisdiction to enforce compliance with any applicable portion of the order. If the employee or the County files and prevails in such action, the employee or the County, as applicable, shall be entitled to recover its reasonable court costs and attorney's fees from the employer.

(c) Cumulative Rights Preserved. Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to limit, preclude, or in any way abrogate the cumulative rights or remedies available to employees at common law or by statute including, but not limited to, rights related to the violation of overtime, minimum wage, living wage, prevailing wage, or equal pay laws.

Sec. 20½-6. Penalty for Filing a Frivolous Complaint. If a Hearing Officer determines that any wage theft complaint submitted to the County was without any basis in law or fact, the Hearing Officer shall issue an order requiring the complainant, or the entity filing the complaint on behalf of its member, where applicable, to reimburse, within thirty (30) days of the order: (1) the County for all administrative costs incurred by the County in connection with such complaint; and (2) each respondent employer named in the complaint for all reasonable costs and attorney's fees incurred by the employer in connection with the complaint. If such reimbursement is not timely made, the County or the employer may file an appropriate action in a court of competent jurisdiction to obtain such reimbursement.

Section 2. <u>SEVERABILITY</u>.

If any portion of this Ordinance is determined by any Court to be invalid, the invalid portion shall be stricken, and such striking shall not affect the validity of the remainder of this Ordinance. If any Court determines that this Ordinance, or any portion hereof, cannot be legally applied to any individual(s), group(s), entity(ies), property(ies),

or circumstance(s), such determination shall not affect the applicability hereof to any other individual, group, entity, property, or circumstance.

Section 3. <u>INCLUSION IN CODE</u>.

It is the intention of the Board of County Commissioners that the provisions of this Ordinance shall become and be made a part of the Broward County Code; and that the sections of this Ordinance may be renumbered or relettered and the word "ordinance" may be changed to "section," "article," or such other appropriate word or phrase in order to accomplish such intentions.

Section 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Ordinance shall become effective as provided by law.

ENACTED

FILED WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

EFFECTIVE



AJM/mm Wage Theft Ordinance.doc 06/21/12 12-420

Coding:

Words in struck-through type are deletions from existing text. Words in underscored type are additions.



EXHIBIT 2

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

115 S. Andrews Avenue, Room 404 • Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301 • 954-357-6345 • FAX 954-357-6364

MEMORANDUM

June 25, 2012

TO:

Board of County Commissioners

FROM:

Kayla Olsen, Director

Office of Management and Budget

SUBJECT:

Fiscal Impact Statement Re: Proposed Ordinance Creating Chapter 20 ½ of the Broward County Code

of Ordinances, Relating to Wage Theft

Summary

This proposed ordinance creates Chapter 20 ½ of the Broward County Code of Ordinances relating to wage theft. The ordinance provides a way for employees of any organization in Broward County (except for those exempted by the ordinance, including the Federal Government, the State of Florida, and Broward County) to file a complaint and receive an administrative hearing for wage theft claims. The ordinance also provides for enforcement of administrative orders in a court of law. The ordinance requires Broward County to appoint a Hearing Officer to investigate such claims. At the conclusion of a hearing, the Hearing Officer issues a final written order stating whether the wage theft violation has been established based on the evidence. If such violation has been established, the final written order requires the employer to pay wage restitution to the affected employee in an amount equal to three times the amount of back wages that the employer is found to have unlawfully failed to pay; requires the employer to reimburse the employee for any reasonable costs and attorney's fees; and requires the employer to pay to the Board of County Commissioners an assessment of costs in an amount not to exceed actual administrative processing costs and the cost of the hearing.

Fiscal Impact

Based on a review of the wage theft program in Miami-Dade County, the fiscal impact to Broward County is estimated to be approximately \$175,000 per year. This cost assumes funding for two FTEs (\$140,000) to run the program and operating costs of approximately (\$35,000) assuming one hearing per month to pay for hearing officers, court reporters and certified mailings. Revenue may be received if the employers lose their case(s) and are required to pay for the associated administrative processing costs and the cost of the hearings, however, it is impossible to determine the amount at this time.

KO:



Joni Armstrong Coffey County Attorney





OFFICE OF THE COUNTY ATTORNEY 115 S. Andrews Avenue, Suite 423 Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301

954-357-7600 • FAX 954-357-7641

MEMORANDUM

TO:

Board of County Commissioners

FROM:

Joni Armstrong Coffey, County Attorney

DATE:

July 26, 2012

RE:

Proposed Wage Theft Ordinance to be Considered at the August 28, 2012,

Public Hearing

CAO Files: 12-026 & 12-420

At the Board's direction, this Office conducted a meeting on July 24 to permit members of the public to provide comments on the proposed Wage Theft Ordinance. Pursuant to the Board's direction on June 26, we have prepared, and attach hereto, a summary of the public input received.

JAC/AJM/mm Attachment

c: Bertha Henry, County Administrator

Evan Lukic, County Auditor



OFFICE OF THE COUNTY ATTORNEY 115 S. Andrews Avenue, Suite 423 Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301

954-357-7600 • FAX 954-357-7641

MEMORANDUM

TO:

Joni Armstrong Coffey, County Attorney Andrew J. Meyers, Chief Appellate Counsel

FROM:

Damaris Y. Henlon, Assistant County Attorney

DATE:

July 25, 2012

RE:

Proposed Wage Theft Ordinance Meeting

CAO File: 12-420

As directed by the Board of County Commissioners, at its commission meeting on June 12, the County Attorney's Office facilitated a public meeting on July 24, to allow interested persons to provide input regarding the proposed Wage Theft Ordinance. Notice of the meeting was posted. Approximately fifteen people attended the meeting. Participants included small business representatives, activists, consultants, and representatives from various Broward County business groups. The participants generally fell into two categories: labor advocates and business supporters. Each group's primary points are summarized below.

Points Raised By Business Advocates:

- The ordinance is unnecessary, duplicative, and costly because workers are already protected by state and federal laws. If there are any workers who are not covered by federal or state laws, the ordinance should be drafted in a way that covers only those workers so as not to be duplicative. The duplicative protections may result in claims being brought in multiple venues.
- Jurisdictional issues are unclear. For example, it is unclear whether the proposed ordinance would apply in a situation where the business is located in one county, the work took place in another, and the employee lives in a third county.
- Broward County should not be exempt from the ordinance if it is enforced against Broward businesses.
- The name of the proposed ordinance is inflammatory. "Wage Recovery" would be a more accurate title.
- This proposed ordinance is an attack against all small businesses when only a few bad actors are at play. Extreme bad actors will not be stopped by an ordinance, and most employers who will be caught by the ordinance will have made an honest mistake. These mistakes would be better addressed through educational efforts such

as a requirement that employers complete a wage workshop or webinar as part of renewing their business license or before bidding on county contracts, or annual workshops to teach small business owners about wage laws.

- Provisions should be put in place to protect employers from frivolous or invalid claims.
- The ordinance may result in employers paying unsubstantiated claims in order to avoid potential negative impact should the employer seek future County contracts.
- The ordinance will have a chilling effect on bringing new businesses to Broward County.
- There is no evidence to demonstrate that wage theft in Broward County is widespread enough to warrant an ordinance given the existence of federal and state laws.
- The business community has not had enough time to gather data and review this ordinance and requests more time to ensure that the County reaches a correct result in determining whether to enact the proposed ordinance.

Points Raised By Labor Advocates:

- The ordinance would protect honest businesses from being undercut by unscrupulous competitors that, without the ordinance, would not pay required wages.
- Whistleblower protections ought to be added to the ordinance.
- Language addressing a signed release stating that employers have paid any wages owed would protect employers and forestall concerns about potential unscrupulous employees "double dipping" by bringing the same claim in another venue after resolution at the County level.
- Language can also be added to clarify that the ordinance applies only to work done in Broward County.

Please let me know if you require further information regarding the July 24 public meeting.

Damaris Y. Henloh
Assistant County Attorney

DYH/mm

BROWARD COUNTY COMMISSION PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ORDINANCE

FYHIRII 7

Proposed By	Office of the County Attorney	Date _10/09/12
Subject of Ordinance	Wage Theft	Ordinance # if existing
On Page 3, Line 14, after	er the word "employee":	
	•	
insert:		1
in connection with work	performed within the geographic boundari	es of Broward County
es t		
. Alexander and the second sec		
Proposed Amendment	Adopted	Not Adopted By Board

Items # 5

2:00 p.m.
Public Hearing
OCTOBER 9, 2012

SUBMITTED BY

CITY OF LIGHTHOUSE POINT



City of Lighthouse Point, Florida e-

e-mail: fschorr@lighthousepoint.com

2200 N.E. 38th Street / P.O. Box 5100 / Lighthouse 201ht, 05133064 PM 3: 45ebsite: www.lighthousepoint.com

Phone (954) 943-6500 Fax (954) 784-3446

Fred Schorr Mayor

October 1, 2012

VIA EMAIL (bhenry@broward.org) and US Mail

Ms. Bertha Henry County Administrator Broward County, Florida 115 S. Andrews Avenue, Room 409 Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301

RE: City of Lighthouse Point/Proposed Wage Theft Ordinance

Dear Ms. Henry:

A copy of your September 20, 2012, correspondence to the Broward League of Cities has been forwarded to the City of Lighthouse Point. In your letter, you request feedback on the proposed Broward County Wage Theft Ordinance.

As Mayor of Lighthouse Point, I would urge the County not to proceed with the ordinance. Initially, the County is exempting itself. This unequivocally demonstrates that there are existing sufficient avenues for recourse for persons who feel aggrieved by a wage dispute, so there is no need for the Ordinance. Any recourse that is good enough for County employees is surely good enough for municipal employees.

The Ordinance will create unknown costs, consequences and liabilities on employers within the County, and in particular for municipalities. Again, there is no need to be exposed to these issues since remedies already exist for wage dispute claims.

Finally, this is not a subject matter for which the Broward County Charter provides that a County ordinance would prevail over a municipal ordinance. Should this ordinance be adopted by the County Commission, I will propose an ordinance in Lighthouse Point to exempt the City from the ordinance. The rationale for such will simply be that remedies already exist for a wage dispute so that it is not necessary for the City to expose itself to the uncertainties of this ordinance.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide this response to you.

Sincerely,

CITY OF LIGHTOUSE POINT, FLORIDA

Fred Schorr Mayor

CC: Members of the City Commission Broward League of Cities