
From:
Sent: Monday, June 16, 2014 12:00 AM
To: Wage Policy
Subject: Raise the minimum wage to \$15

Dear Sirs,

\$10.10 an hour is a ridiculously low wage for the metro area. It forces worker on to public assistance. Shame on your board for offering workers a poverty wage.

\$15.00 per hour would be a better start. DO you want people to be able to afford to buy things and pay taxes, or does that not enter into your deliberations.

Please be alert this the 21st century and not the 19th!

With regrets,

From:
Sent: Monday, June 23, 2014 12:25 PM
To: Wage Policy
Cc:
Subject: RE: Minimum Wage Policy

Good Morning;

Reference the Rules for the minimum wage policy for non-trade labor services contracts. We have a couple of questions.....

1. Under the addendum – covered services it states under passenger related security services
 - Escorts
 - Catering Security
 - Passenger Aircraft Security
 - Fireguards
 - Terminal Security
 - Traffic Security
 -

But does not cover any cargo related security services such as warehouse security, yellow line guards, or cargo screening service that are all non-trade labor services. Does your policy extend to these services?

2. How is this policy going to be enforced? For example we have existing contracts with cargo handlers and air carriers and they refuse to pay the increase what recourse do we have?
3. Can we continue to pay the same wage until the end of the contract?

Look forward to your response.

Regards,

From:
Sent: Monday, July 07, 2014 9:08 AM
To: Wage Policy
Cc:
Subject: Clarification: Rules for Implementation of Minimum Wage Policy for non-Trade Labor Service Contracts
Attachments: RULES FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF MINIMUM WAGE POLICY FOR NON-TRADE LABOR SERVICE CONTRACTS.pdf
Importance: High

To Whom It May Concern,

Can you please provide clarification on the new "Rules for Implementation of Minimum Wage Policy for non-Trade Labor Service Contracts".

According to the PANYNJ website, it states the following:

Effective July 31, 2014, wages for workers performing Covered Services shall be increased \$1.00 per hour for all such workers earning \$9.00 per hour less

However, the attached Airport Manager's Bulletin #2014-06, dated for June 16, 2014 and issued by Huntley Lawrence, Acting GM at JFK states the following:

The rules propose to implement the policy effective July 31, 2014, for non-trade workers performing certain "Covered Services" with an increase in hourly wage by \$1 per hour for all workers earning less than \$9 per hour.

Please clarify if the new rules and the \$1.00 per hour increase is for workers earning less \$9.00 (\$8.99 or less)

OR

Is the \$1.00 per hour increase in wages for workers currently earning \$9.00 or less (workers earning \$9.00 must be increased to \$10.00 per hour as of July 31, 2014)

I thank you in advance for your assistance and timely response.

TO: Patrick Foye, Executive Director
Deborah Gramiccioni, Deputy Executive Director
The Port Authority of New York and New Jersey

FROM:

DATE: July 11, 2014

RE: Proposed Rules for Implementation of Minimum Wage Policy for Non-Trade
Labor Service Contracts at LGA, JFK and EWR

United appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey's (Port Authority) Proposed Rules for Implementation of Minimum Wage Policy for Non-Trade Labor Service Contracts at LaGuardia Airport, John F. Kennedy International Airport and Newark Liberty International Airport (the Policy). We respectfully submit the following.

As one of the largest employers in the state of New Jersey, and the creator of more than 13,000 direct jobs and tens of thousands of indirect jobs in the region, United has always supported fair wages. United pays 100 percent of its employees covered by the Policy at a higher wage than the minimum the Policy requires, and provides robust health and retirement benefits, as well as flight privileges, to those employees. United will take steps to ensure that the minimum wage for the very few of its own employees at Port Authority facilities not covered by the Policy is at the same level as that of those who are covered. As to the wage policy of our vendors, all of United's contracts typically stipulate that its vendors must abide by applicable local, state and federal laws and regulations. If the Policy becomes effective, and assuming it is validly issued, the vendors would be required to comply with the Policy or they would be in violation of their contracts with us.

United, however, again submits that the most appropriate way for the Port Authority to mandate that New York and New Jersey employers pay a minimum wage higher than current state and federal law is to seek state legislative authority to do so. This would ensure an equitable approach to addressing wage issues across industries and avoid the appearance of targeting one industry in particular. Instead, it appears that through the Policy the Port Authority is attempting to mandate a minimum wage and certain benefits through provisions in "new or amended agreements, permits and contracts, as a condition for such Contractors doing business at Port Authority facilities." We question the Port Authority's authority to impose these requirements pursuant to its enabling bi-state compact.

We also submit that the Port Authority should not see a financial windfall as a result of the requirements set forth in the Policy. The Port Authority levies fees on revenues that Airline Service Providers ("ASPs") earn for services they perform at Port Authority airports (Fees). Currently, the Port Authority receives approximately \$3 million annually as a result of these fees on United's contracts with ASPs. We estimate that the Port Authority would earn about \$300,000 annually in increased Fees as a result of the approximately \$12 million United would pay annually in higher costs as a result of the Policy. We suggest that the Port Authority, at a minimum, should waive the increased Fees resulting from the Policy.

United has special concern about the Port Authority's continued increases in the costs it imposes, which impact United's ability to continue to provide quality, secure jobs for its employees and its ability to effectively compete in the New Jersey and New York region.

Newark Airport is already at an estimated \$52 million annual competitive disadvantage to the New York airports due to the different rate-making methodology employed in the separate lease agreements for New York and New Jersey airports. The cost increase related to the Policy follows the \$24 million annual cost increase that the Port Authority began imposing this year on United (part of an estimated \$57 million annual cost increase being imposed on all Port Authority air carriers) as a result of the new Airport Rescue and Firefighting program.

We hope the Port Authority will carefully weigh and respond to the concerns we have outlined about the legal and economic policy impacts of the Policy and about the unreasonableness of our overall rates and charges. Thank you for your consideration.

From:
Sent: Monday, July 14, 2014 6:58 PM
To: Wage Policy
Subject: Public Comment

To Whom it May Concern:

This comment is being submitted on behalf of Gate Gourmet, Inc. ("Gate Gourmet"), a supplier of airline catering services to domestic and international airlines at LaGuardia, JFK, and Newark airports. The purpose of this comment is to seek clarification as to whether the proposed rules will apply to Gate Gourmet, as a lessee, permittee, contractor, or subcontractor to the airlines.

As a long standing employer at the LaGuardia, JFK, and Newark airports, Gate Gourmet has a vested interest in the minimum wage rules proposed by the Port Authority and would welcome the opportunity to provide this important benefit to our employees. We believe that increased wages will ensure that we are better positioned to provide safe and high quality products and services to our customers. However, as currently drafted, it is unclear whether our employees would benefit from the proposed increases.

Additionally, we respectfully suggest that the proposed rules require wage increases across the *entire* wage scale. The reason being that Gate Gourmet maintains progressive wage scales that are structured to reward and retain tenured employees by creating segmented pathways to more senior, more highly compensated employment at Gate Gourmet. Increasing wages at *only* the low end of the scale would compress our scale and may increase attrition.

As an interested and important supplier to the New York and New Jersey airports, we thank you for your consideration of these issues.

Sincerely,

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 16, 2014 3:13 PM
To: Wage Policy
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: PANYNJ Rules Minimum Wage

Good Afternoon,

Question for clarification:

Effective July 31, 2014 increase in hourly wage by \$1 per hour for all workers earning less than \$9 per hour.

*Is the purpose to increase all wages under \$9 to \$9? Example an employee at \$8.75 is he brought to \$9 or his wage is increased a \$1 to \$9.75?

*If have a collective bargaining agreement is that agreement also to be adjusted?

Warm Regards,