Tuesday April 26, 2016

The Wellstone Community Center 179 Robie St. E., St. Paul, MN 55107 Room 272

Present Ann Clowser Steve Cohen Hilario Deleon Perez Jim Frisco JoAnn Hawkins Robert Kasper Farhio Khalif Marfa Malcolm Pat Mancini James McClean Wintana Melekin Tabitha Mitchell Joanne Mullen Ted Natus Maureen O'Connell Stefan Pomrenke Lenny Russo **Erica Sanders** Lisa Stratton Michelle Thom **Rick Varco Daniel Yang** JaPaul Harris Co-Chair Rose Roach Co-Chair Matt Kramer Co Chair

<u>Absent</u> Autumn Amadou-Blegen Alex Bajwa David Burley Eric Foster <u>Staff</u> Dana Bailey Libby Kantner Jessica Kingston SuChann Yang

- I. Welcome
 - A. Called to order at 6:07pm
- II. Review and approval of minutes from previous meeting (vote)
 - A. On section item VI.c, omit the dashed section
 - "Should state: Sick time may be used for employee's and family's_mental or physical illness, need for medical diagnosis or preventative care
 - B. Approved minutes
- III. Questions
 - A. No questions were received
- IV. Review Timeline
 - A. Items still to be cover: Exemptions, Enforcement, Education, Conditions of Use, and Review
 - B. May 17th is the presentation of recommendations to the HREEO Commission. All were encouraged to be in attendance at the presentation.
 - C. There will be 3 tentative dates offered for public input:
 - 1. May 17th at the HREEO Commission presentation
 - 2. Open St. Paul on the stpaul.gov website
 - 3. At the 3^{rd} public hearing TBD
- V. Consensus items:
 - A. Employees may begin using ESST 90 calendar days after employment
 - B. The maximum number of ESST hours an employee can earn in each year (calendar or fiscal, whatever time period the employer uses) is capped at 48 hours
 - C. Sick time may be used for an employee's and family member's mental or physical illness, need for medical diagnosis or preventative care
 - D. Safe time may be used when an employee and family member is a victim of domestic abuse, sexual assault, or stalking
 - E. Employers are not required to pay out unused ESST upon separation from employment
- VI. Continued discussion of accrual and usage
 - A. Sick and safe time increment
 - 1. Discussion on using Minneapolis's language
 - 2. **VOTE** Usage: employees may use paid sick time in increments consistent with current business/payroll practices, as defined by industry standards or existing employer policy
 - a. Yes: 25
 - b. No: 0

B. Definition of Family Member

- 1. Family means a child, adult child, spouse, sibling, parent, mother-in-law, father-in-law, grandchild, grandparent or step-parent. "Child" includes a biological child, step-child, foster child or adopted child. Any individual related by blood or affinity whose close association with the employee is the equivalent of a family relationship.
- 2. **VOTE** Agree upon definition of Family as stated above:
 - a. Yes: 25
 - b. No: 2
- C. Total Accrual and/or Usage Cap
 - 1. Usage: Employees may use paid sick time in increments consistent with current business/payroll practices, as defined by industry standards or existing employer policy.
 - a. Discussion on WESA's definition that allows you to use what you have accrued. *Will do a follow-up with the city attorney to better understand WESA's statement and how usage and accrual/usage cap works.

D. Carryover

- 1. Discussion on maximum bank of hours being capped at 48 hours or 80 hours.
- 2. VOTE: Maximum bank of hours, 48 or 80
 - a. 48 hours: 3
 - b. 80 hours: 16
 - c. Abstain: 5
 - *Consensus on 80

VII. Exemption

- A. VOTE: Small firms should be exempt from offering their employees ESST
 - 1. Yes: 10
 - 2. No : 12
 - 3. Abstain: 1
- B. VOTE: Small firms should be exempt from offering their employees ESST
 - 1. Strongly Agree: 6
 - 2. Agree: 4
 - 3. Neutral: 2
 - 4. Disagree: 6
 - 5. Strongly Disagree: 8
- C. Discussion on why or why not small firms should be exempt

REVOTE: Small firms should be exempt from offering their employees ESST

- 1. Strongly Agree: 3
- 2. Agree: 7
- 3. Neutral:1
- 4. Disagree: 11
- 5. Strongly Disagree: 3
 *No consensus if small firms should be exempt from offering their employees ESST

- D. Employers employing family members should not be exempt from offering ESST
 - 1. Discussion on treating family business the same as a business and holding it to the same standard.
 - 2. **VOTE**: Employers employing family members should not be exempt from offering ESST and should offer ESST.
 - a. Yes: 25
 - b. No: 0

*Consensus that family business should be treated the same as a business and offer ESST

- E. Start-up Business
 - 1. Discussion on adopting Minneapolis's language that allows all small business (24 employees or less) to have a 6 month period to adopt the provision of ESST
 - 2. **VOTE**:
 - a. Yes: 25
 - b. No: 0
 - 3. Discussion on allowing a ramp-up time for small businesses (24 employees or less) to have a grace period for current and future business. **VOTE:** on allowing business to have a grace period for future businesses to establish ESST policy
 - a. Yes: 15
 - b. No: 10

*Consensus on allowing a grace period for future businesses to establish ESST

- 4. Discussion on grace period length. *Tabled until next meeting
- F. Employers/Employees for whom their company is not located within the City of Saint Paul
 - 1. Discussion that this item is not needed because the city and the employer would need to form some type of nexus in order to provide ESST.
- VIII. Meeting was adjourned at 8:30pm