



University of South Florida

Digital Commons @ University of South Florida

Center for Economic Development Research
(CEDR) Collection

Community and Campus Partnerships

January 2004

Estimate of contract workers affected by Hillsborough County's potential living wage ordinance

University of South Florida. Center for Economic Development Research

Hillsborough County (Fla.). Department of Health and Social Services

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/cedr>

Recommended Citation

University of South Florida. Center for Economic Development Research and Hillsborough County (Fla.). Department of Health and Social Services, "Estimate of contract workers affected by Hillsborough County's potential living wage ordinance" (2004). *Center for Economic Development Research (CEDR) Collection*. 43.

<https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/cedr/43>

This Text is brought to you for free and open access by the Community and Campus Partnerships at Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. It has been accepted for inclusion in Center for Economic Development Research (CEDR) Collection by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. For more information, please contact scholarcommons@usf.edu.

Estimate of Contract Workers Affected by Hillsborough County's Potential Living Wage Ordinance

Prepared for
Hillsborough County Department of Health and Social Services

by the
CENTER FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH
College of Business Administration



1101 Channelside Dr., 2nd Floor N., Tampa, Florida 33602
Office: (813) 905-5854 or Fax: (813) 905-5856

February 2004

Preface

In order to study the impacts of a potential “living wage” ordinance, the Hillsborough County Department of Health and Social Services initially commissioned the Center for Economic Development Research (CEDR) to perform three tasks. After completion of the first task, a fourth task was added. The four tasks are: (1) quantitatively summarize findings from available post-enactment studies of living wage ordinances and policies, (2) review available pre-enactment studies of living wage ordinances and policies for methodologies that might usefully supplement REMI Policy Insight® economic modeling software, (3) estimate, by industry code, the number of Hillsborough County’s contracted workers that would be affected by a potential living wage ordinance, and (4) use the REMI Policy Insight® economic model to estimate the economic impacts of the potential living wage ordinance in terms of jobs, wage and salary disbursements, and output (sales) on the Hillsborough County economy.

The first task was completed on December 12, 2003 when CEDR delivered its report, “Summary of Selected Post-Enactment Living Wage Studies,” to the Hillsborough County Department of Health and Social Services. The second task was completed on January 8, 2004 upon delivery of its report, “Review of Selected Pre-Enactment Living Wage Studies,” also to the Hillsborough County Department of Health and Social Services. These reports are available for download from CEDR’s Internet site at <http://cedr.coba.usf.edu>.

This report is in fulfillment of the third task.

The Center for Economic Development Research initiates and conducts innovative research on economic development. The Center’s education programs are designed to cultivate excellence in regional development. Our information system serves to enhance development efforts at the University of South Florida, its College of Business, and throughout the Tampa Bay region.

Robert Anderson, Dean, College of Business Administration (COBA), USF
Dennis Colie, Director, Center for Economic Development Research (CEDR), COBA, USF
Dave Sobush, Research Associate, CEDR, COBA, USF, Economist and Principal Investigator
Revised February 16, 2004

Executive Summary

Methodology

CEDR employed a modified Schutz-Nissen approach to estimate the number of workers affected and the wage bill increase due to a potential “living wage” ordinance. This method involves comparing annualized dollar values of contracts, industry averages of annual output per worker, and Census Bureau data on wage distributions by industry to five scenarios for a “living wage” ordinance.

Scenarios Analyzed

CEDR analyzed five scenarios for a “living wage” ordinance. The scenarios varied on the dollar value of service and construction contracts included, as well as by the wages required under each scenario. **Table 1E** summarizes the five scenarios.

Table 1E – Summary of Potential “Living Wage” Ordinance Scenarios

Scenario	Dollar Value of Contract	Wage with Health Care Benefits	Wage without Health Care Benefits
1	≥\$100,000	\$7.33/Hour	\$ 9.33/Hour
2	≥ \$25,000	\$9.97/Hour	\$11.97/Hour
3	≥ \$50,000	\$9.97/Hour	\$11.97/Hour
4	≥\$100,000	\$9.97/Hour	\$11.97/Hour
5	≥ \$50,000	\$7.33/Hour	\$ 9.33/Hour

Affected Workers

The estimated number of affected workers (expressed by worker equivalents) ranges from 357.17 under Scenario 1 (\$7.33/hr, assuming all workers have health care coverage) to 1,235.29 under Scenario 2 (\$11.97/hr, assuming no workers have health care coverage). These estimates represent 12.56% and 41.38%, respectively, of the estimated total worker equivalents working on county contracts covered by their scenario. This range, reported *a priori* to selection of a single scenario, represents the high and low estimates from all scenarios.

Wage Bill Increase

The estimated total wage bill increase ranges from \$762,097 under Scenario 1 (\$7.33/hr, assuming all workers have health care coverage) to \$8,855,322 under Scenario 2 (\$11.97/hr, assuming no workers have health care coverage). These estimates represent 0.30% and 3.41%, respectively, of the annualized dollar values of contracts covered by their scenario. This range, reported *a priori* to selection of a single scenario, represents the high and low estimates from all scenarios.

Introduction

In order to estimate the annual economic impacts of a “living wage” ordinance on the Hillsborough County economy, the Hillsborough County Department of Health and Social Services contracted CEDR to use the REMI *Policy Insight*® economic software. Subsequently, the same organization contracted CEDR to estimate the wage and salary disbursement (by industry) inputs to the REMI model. The purpose of this report is to estimate those inputs.

The Hillsborough County Living Wage Task Force is the motivation for this research. On October 15, 2003, the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) authorized creation of the task force to study the impact of adopting a “living wage” ordinance in the County. The task force identified “core variables” for a potential ordinance. The task force’s “core variables” are reproduced in **Appendix A**. The task force also created five scenarios, shown in **Appendix B**, for economic analysis by CEDR.

Methodology

We use a modified Schutz – Nissen approach to make our estimate. Nissen obtains county contracts and uses contract titles as a guide to the type of contract, because he only includes service contracts.¹ He assigned each service contract an industry code (SIC) and yearly cost. He uses Dun & Bradstreet’s “Disclosure” data files to verify a contracting firm’s SIC. He converts yearly costs into employment estimates based on Census data on the number of employees in Miami-Dade County per \$100,000 of sales, i.e. the county’s contract cost equals the firm’s sales for a particular contract. Then, he again uses Census data to estimate the percentage of workers who are paid less than a specified “living wage” level.

Schutz uses a procedure very similar to the Nissen methodology.² He obtains county contracting data from Orange County and sends the data to Dun & Bradstreet. Dun & Bradstreet return to Professor Schutz information about each contractor’s total employment, sales and industry (SIC) code. He then estimates the number of contractors’ employees currently working at less than a specified “living wage” using Census data.

To generate the estimates of workers affected by a potential “living wage” ordinance, CEDR modified the Schutz-Nissen approach as follows. Using contract data provided by Hillsborough County and the most recently available version of the Florida Agency for Workforce Innovation’s Enhanced Quarterly Unemployment Insurance (EQUI) database, we determine industry (SIC) codes for each contractor. Next, we compare REMI tables of industry annual output per job to the dollar value of the contracts. By dividing the annualized value of a firm’s Hillsborough County contracts (the contracts’ “output”) by the industry’s output per job, we estimate the number of employees who work on county contracts during a year.

¹ Nissen, Bruce. *The Impact of a Living Wage Ordinance on Miami-Dade County*. October 1998.

² Schutz, Eric, Susan Orr, and Sherry Ambrose. *A Living Wage in Orange County: Arguments and Research*. Undated.

Having estimated the total number of employees working on County contracts, we then estimate the number of these employees who earn less than a potential “living wage,” and the average wage of these workers. To do so, we use the Census Bureau’s 5-Percent Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) database. PUMS data files contain records for a sample of households with information on the characteristics of each unit and each person in it, including wage and salary income, weeks and hours per week worked, and industry of employment for year 1999.

We query the PUMS database to determine the percentage of workers, by industry, who earn less than the potential “living wage.” This percentage is applied to the number of workers in each applicable industry working on County contracts to estimate the number of employees affected by a potential “living wage” ordinance. We query the PUMS database a second time to determine the average pre-enactment wages of the affected workers. We then multiply the number of affected workers by the difference between the average pre-enactment wage and the potential “living wage” to estimate the post-enactment wage bill increase. The wage bill increase by industry group will form the inputs for the REMI model to determine the economic impact.

Chart 1 displays the methodology used to estimate the number of workers affected by and the wage bill increase due to a potential “living wage” ordinance. The text color refers to the source of data: **blue** text refers to the PUMS database, **red** text refers to REMI data.

Chart 1 – Methodology for Estimating Workers Affected and Wage Bill Increase Due to Potential “Living Wage” Ordinance (LWO)

$$\begin{array}{l}
 \text{Contract Values} \div \frac{\text{Output Worker}}{\text{Worker}} = \text{Workers Working On County Contracts} \\
 \\
 \text{Workers Working On County Contracts} \times \frac{\% \text{ of Workers Earning Less Than Target Living Wage}}{\text{Living Wage}} = \text{\# of Workers Affected by LWO} \\
 \\
 \text{\# of Workers Affected by LWO} \times (\text{Target Living Wage} - \text{Average Hourly Wage}) = \text{Total Hourly Wage Bill Increase for Workers Affected by LWO} \\
 \\
 \text{Total Hourly Wage Bill Increase for Workers Affected by LWO} \times \frac{40 \text{ hours}}{\text{Week}} \times \frac{52 \text{ Weeks}}{\text{Year}} = \text{Total Hourly Wage Bill Increase for Workers Affected by LWO}
 \end{array}$$

Determination of Industry Codes

The contract data supplied by Hillsborough County’s Purchasing Department included, for each of the 559 contracts, the dollar value of the contract, the contract title, vendor name, vendor address, and vendor ID number. The vendor ID number - the vendors’ tax ID number - was the primary key used in querying the State of Florida’s Enhanced Quarterly Unemployment Insurance (EQUI) database. We queried the EQUI database to determine Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes of the vendors.³ The first “pass” resulted in successful matches of 394 contracts’ vendor ID numbers (70.48% of the total). Subsequently, we manually searched through the EQUI database by vendor name and address for SIC codes. This process netted an additional 53 contracts’ worth of SIC codes (9.48% of the total). Using the ArcView® Business Analyst software, we determined the SIC codes for an additional 47 contracts (8.41% of the total). Two other databases owned by USF – Dun & Bradstreet and ReferenceUSA – were consulted, resulting in 33 contracts’ worth of SIC codes (5.90% of the total). These four steps accounted for 527 (94.28%) of the SIC codes determined. The remaining 32 (5.72%) were assigned SIC codes based on the contract name, and if possible, telephone contact with representatives of the vendor.

Table 1 displays, by method, the number of vendors’ SIC codes determined, and their respective percentage of the total contracts.⁴

Table 1 – Method Of SIC Code Determination

Method	Amount	% of Total
EQUI	394	70.48%
EQUI Manual	53	9.48%
ArcView Business Analyst	47	8.41%
Business Directories	33	5.90%
Assigned	32	5.72%
Total	559	100.00%

Appendix C contains a list of the contracts assigned SIC codes, the vendors’ names, the value of the contract, the SIC code assigned, and a description of that SIC code.

Annualization of Contract Dollar Values

In order to develop useful inputs into the REMI software, we annualized the dollar values of county contracts. For Blanket Purchase Orders (BPOs), we subtracted the effective date of the contract from the expiration date of the contract to determine the number of days the contract is in effect. We divided this result by 365 to determine the number of years the contract is in effect. The face contract value – the total dollar value of the contract – was divided by the number of years the contract is in effect to determine

³ The Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) is a system developed by the U.S. government to classify industries.

⁴ This total, 559, includes 2 contracts with the Hillsborough County Sheriff’s Office (HCSO) and 6 contracts with volunteer fire departments (VFDs). These 8 contracts were excluded from our analysis. HCSO employees will be examined in a future analysis, and VFDs, by definition, do not pay wages.

the annualized dollar value of the contract. In no case was the face value of the contract divided by a number less than 1.00, i.e., multiplied.

Other contracts, known as Purchase Orders (POs), have no effective or expiration date assigned to them. Instead, a posting date is given for each contract. We assume uniform distribution of the face dollar value throughout 2003.

Output per Worker Ratios

The Nissen and Schutz studies cited previously used industry ratios of sales per employee to estimate the number of employees working on contracts. We created tables of industry output per worker using REMI baseline data. In economic parlance, output equals sales adjusted for inventory levels. The majority of firms analyzed are classified as either construction or service-providing establishments, and firms of this nature typically do not carry substantive inventories, if any. Therefore, output is an appropriate measurement by which to measure economic contributions. Additionally, our ratios of industry output per worker are based on Hillsborough County data, providing regional specificity to our analysis. We then divide the annualized contract value by the industry-appropriate output per worker ratio to estimate the number of workers required by each contract.

Appendix D contains the output per worker values used throughout this report.

Hillsborough County occasionally contracts with other governmental organizations. However, the regional Economic Accounts of the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA) only provide output data for private industries. Because the BEA data is the source of the output data in the REMI model, output per worker is not available for these governmental organizations. Therefore, in order to apply output per worker ratios to the annualized value of inter-governmental contracts, we reclassified the SIC of the government vendor according to the contract title.

Appendix E lists the government vendor contracts and their reclassified SIC codes.

Wage Distributions and Average Wages

Having estimated the total number of employees working on each contract, we estimate the percentage of workers, by industry, earning less than the target “living wage” and the average hourly wages of those workers. To do so, we query the Census Bureau’s 5-Percent Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) database for the 2000 decennial census. The PUMS record for an individual contains data on industry of employment, weeks worked in 1999, hours per week worked in 1999, and wage income for 1999. We exclude all workers whose average hourly wages were calculated at less than \$5.15/hour. The federal minimum wage of \$5.15/hour went into effect September 1, 1997. Aside from errors with the 2000 Census, workers calculated to earn less than that wage can be classified as sole proprietors or “shadow” workers, those workers who accept wages offered at less than the minimum wage. In either case, these workers would not likely be affected by a “living wage” ordinance and were therefore excluded from this analysis. We extract workers by Super-Public Use Microdata Area code (Super-PUMA)

to develop regional specificity for our analysis. We select industry-specific individual worker records from the smallest geographic region that provides a sample size greater than 1,000.

Appendix F describes the geographic regions of interest and their corresponding Super-PUMA codes.

For each worker, we divide 1999 wage income by 1999 weeks worked and divide that result by 1999 hours worked per week to determine 1999 hourly wage income. From the sample, we determine the percentage of workers earning less than the target “living wage” and the 1999 average hourly wage of those workers.

Appendix G describes, by industry, the sample size, geographic area, wage distribution ratios, and average hourly wages of workers earning less than the targeted “living wage.”

Estimation of REMI Inputs

For each of the 5 scenarios, we estimate number of workers that would be affected by a “living wage” ordinance and the annual wage bill increase required to raise the average wages of these workers to that of the target “living wage.” The number of workers affected equals the total number of workers working on County contracts multiplied by the percentage of workers earning less than the target “living wage.” The annual wage bill increase equals the number of workers affected by the “living wage” under each scenario multiplied by the difference between the target “living wage” and the average hourly wage of these workers, multiplied by a factor of 2080 (52 weeks/year X 40hours/week).

Although the wage data extracted from the PUMS database is for year 1999, we do not inflate the wages. To do so would assume that wages have moved in lockstep with inflation since that year and no worker earns the minimum \$5.15 wage any longer. Therefore, our estimates of workers affected can be considered biased upward, and our estimates of the average wages of the affected workers biased downward.

Table 2 displays the variables for each scenario, and the estimates of wage bill increases that will serve as the REMI inputs. Note that each scenario is divided into two sub-scenarios. One set of sub scenarios assumes all workers have health benefits, and the other set assumes no workers have health benefits, thus producing a range of estimates for input into the REMI model.

Table 2 – Summary of Scenarios and Estimates

Scenario	Minimum Contract	Targeted Hourly Wage	% of Workers with Health Care Benefits	Total Annualized Value of Contracts	Worker Equivalents	Affected Workers as Expressed by Worker Equivalents	Total Wage Bill Increase Due to Contracts
1a	\$ 100,000	\$ 7.33	100%	\$ 251,719,960	2,844.76	357.17	\$ 762,097
1b	\$ 100,000	\$ 9.33	0%	\$ 251,719,960	2,844.76	718.24	\$ 3,035,226
2a	\$ 25,000	\$ 9.97	100%	\$ 259,697,990	2,985.22	889.10	\$ 4,333,780
2b	\$ 25,000	\$ 11.97	0%	\$ 259,697,990	2,985.22	1,235.29	\$ 8,855,322
3a	\$ 50,000	\$ 9.97	100%	\$ 256,811,887	2,936.53	872.21	\$ 4,247,909
3b	\$ 50,000	\$ 11.97	0%	\$ 256,811,887	2,936.53	1,212.38	\$ 8,685,003
4a	\$ 100,000	\$ 9.97	100%	\$ 251,719,960	2,844.76	841.03	\$ 4,089,490
4b	\$ 100,000	\$ 11.97	0%	\$ 251,719,960	2,844.76	1,170.10	\$ 8,370,517
5a	\$ 50,000	\$ 7.33	100%	\$ 256,811,887	2,936.53	371.12	\$ 792,967
5b	\$ 50,000	\$ 9.33	0%	\$ 256,811,887	2,936.53	745.74	\$ 3,154,030

Table 3 provides comparisons for each of the sub-scenarios with respect to the total annualized dollar value of contracts and the total number of workers performing County contracts.

Table 3 – Percentage Comparisons

Scenario	Minimum Contract	Hourly Wage	% of Workers with Health Care Benefits	Workers Affected as a % of Worker Equivalents	Total Wage Bill Increase as a % of Total Annualized Value of Contracts
1a	\$ 100,000	\$ 7.33	100%	12.56%	0.30%
1b	\$ 100,000	\$ 9.33	0%	25.25%	1.21%
2a	\$ 25,000	\$ 9.97	100%	29.78%	1.67%
2b	\$ 25,000	\$ 11.97	0%	41.38%	3.41%
3a	\$ 50,000	\$ 9.97	100%	29.70%	1.65%
3b	\$ 50,000	\$ 11.97	0%	41.29%	3.38%
4a	\$ 100,000	\$ 9.97	100%	29.56%	1.62%
4b	\$ 100,000	\$ 11.97	0%	41.13%	3.33%
5a	\$ 50,000	\$ 7.33	100%	12.64%	0.31%
5b	\$ 50,000	\$ 9.33	0%	25.40%	1.23%

Industry Results – Scenario 1

Scenario 1 calls for a “living wage” calculated at \$7.33/hour for employees that have health benefits and at \$9.33/hour for employees that do not have health benefits. The scenario requires companies with contracts of \$100,000 or more to pay their full- and part-time employees the “living wage” only for the hours they perform work on the County contract. This scenario covers \$251,719,960 in annualized value of contracts, and 2,844.76 annual worker equivalents. Major industry group Construction (SIC 15/16/17) contributes the largest amounts towards these totals, with \$89,263,789 of annualized contract value and 847.06 worker equivalents.

Table 1a reports the estimated number of contractors’ employees, by major industry group, that would be affected by the potential ordinance, and the corresponding annual wage bill increase. We assume, in this sub-scenario, that all employees receive health benefits from their employers.

Table 1a – Estimates for Sub-scenario 1a

Major Industry Group	Total Annualized Value of Contracts	2-Digit SIC	Output per Worker	Worker Equivalents	% Earning Less Than \$7.33/hour	Affected Workers as Expressed by Worker Equivalents	Mean Wage of Affected Workers	Total Annual Wage Bill Increase
Agricultural Services	\$ 1,002,709	07	\$ 32,582	30.77	12.61%	3.88	\$ 6.34	\$ 8,010
Educational Services	\$ 328,343	82	\$ 37,688	8.71	11.98%	1.04	\$ 6.24	\$ 2,370
Eating and Drinking Places	\$ 3,839,116	58	\$ 38,469	99.80	32.54%	32.48	\$ 6.19	\$ 76,879
Local and Suburban Transit and Interurban Highway Passenger Transportation	\$ 232,500	41	\$ 38,662	6.01	10.05%	0.60	\$ 6.41	\$ 1,157
Non-Profit Organizations	\$ 15,792,831	83/84/85	\$ 38,849	406.52	21.96%	89.27	\$ 6.22	\$ 206,336
Personal Services	\$ 319,621	72	\$ 45,612	7.01	12.21%	0.86	\$ 6.37	\$ 1,715
Amusement and Recreation	\$ 131,551	79	\$ 46,282	2.84	16.28%	0.46	\$ 6.36	\$ 938
Rest of Retail	\$ 3,102,256	52/55/57/59	\$ 55,762	55.63	21.05%	11.71	\$ 6.27	\$ 25,841
Medical Services	\$ 12,731,064	80	\$ 64,801	196.46	10.12%	19.87	\$ 6.30	\$ 42,380
Miscellaneous Business Services	\$ 6,572,154	73	\$ 67,035	98.04	13.31%	13.05	\$ 6.37	\$ 25,935
Miscellaneous Professional Services	\$ 65,619,594	81/87/89/99	\$ 81,950	800.73	6.08%	48.67	\$ 6.36	\$ 98,083
Construction	\$ 89,263,789	15/16/17	\$ 105,381	847.06	11.86%	100.47	\$ 6.38	\$ 198,785
Insurance	\$ 2,654,047	63/64	\$ 112,713	23.55	4.28%	1.01	\$ 6.42	\$ 1,909
Trucking	\$ 16,189,505	42	\$ 112,788	143.54	9.56%	13.72	\$ 6.38	\$ 27,010
Other Transport	\$ 398,907	47	\$ 132,894	3.00	11.39%	0.34	\$ 6.35	\$ 695
Wholesale Trade	\$ 3,113,912	50	\$ 145,308	21.43	10.23%	2.19	\$ 6.29	\$ 4,725
Credit and Finance	\$ 2,337,574	67	\$ 174,395	13.40	5.68%	0.76	\$ 6.51	\$ 1,296
Instruments	\$ 998,632	38	\$ 276,370	3.61	10.26%	0.37	\$ 6.41	\$ 712
Communication	\$ 519,000	48	\$ 293,982	1.77	3.93%	0.07	\$ 6.35	\$ 141
Food	\$ 16,809,211	54	\$ 321,017	52.36	28.47%	14.91	\$ 6.23	\$ 34,096
Real Estate	\$ 538,157	65	\$ 340,256	1.58	9.18%	0.15	\$ 6.29	\$ 315
Public Utilities	\$ 9,225,487	49	\$ 440,808	20.93	6.10%	1.28	\$ 6.29	\$ 2,766
Totals	\$ 251,719,960			2,844.76		357.17		\$ 762,097

Under the provisions of Sub-scenario 1a, we estimate 357.17 workers (as expressed by worker equivalents) would receive a wage increase. We estimate the annual wage bill increase attributed to these workers at \$762,097. The greatest amount of affected workers, 100.47, is attributed to major industry group Construction. Major industry group Communication (SIC 48) contributes the fewest workers to the total – 0.07. Major industry group Non-Profit Organizations (SIC 83/84/86) contributes the greatest share of the annual wage bill increase, \$206,336. Major industry group Communication contributes the smallest share of the annual wage bill increase, \$141.

Table 1b reports the estimated number of contractors’ employees, by major industry group, that would be affected by the potential ordinance, and the corresponding annual wage bill increase. We assume, in this case, that no employees receive health benefits from their employers.

Table 1b – Estimates for Sub-scenario 1b

Major Industry Group	Total Annualized Value of Contracts	2-Digit SIC	Output per Worker	Worker Equivalents	% Earning less than \$9.33/hour	Affected Workers as Expressed by Worker Equivalents	Mean Wage of Affected Workers	Total Wage Bill Increase
Agricultural Services	\$ 1,002,709	07	\$ 32,582	30.77	24.98%	7.69	\$ 7.31	\$ 32,232
Educational Services	\$ 328,343	82	\$ 37,688	8.71	22.61%	1.97	\$ 7.27	\$ 8,423
Eating and Drinking Places Local and Suburban Transit and Interurban Highway Passenger Transportation	\$ 3,839,116	58	\$ 38,469	99.80	53.38%	53.27	\$ 6.97	\$ 261,138
Non-Profit Organizations	\$ 232,500	41	\$ 38,662	6.01	21.45%	1.29	\$ 7.43	\$ 5,089
Personal Services	\$ 15,792,831	83/84/85	\$ 38,849	406.52	41.77%	169.78	\$ 7.18	\$ 758,405
Amusement and Recreation	\$ 319,621	72	\$ 45,612	7.01	23.73%	1.66	\$ 7.30	\$ 7,015
Rest of Retail	\$ 131,551	79	\$ 46,282	2.84	29.76%	0.85	\$ 7.23	\$ 3,704
Medical Services	\$ 3,102,256	52/55/57/59	\$ 55,762	55.63	37.20%	20.70	\$ 7.16	\$ 93,450
Miscellaneous Business Services	\$ 12,731,064	80	\$ 64,801	196.46	21.93%	43.08	\$ 7.36	\$ 176,318
Miscellaneous Professional Services	\$ 6,572,154	73	\$ 67,035	98.04	26.62%	26.10	\$ 7.32	\$ 109,066
Construction	\$ 65,619,594	81/87/89/99	\$ 81,950	800.73	13.53%	108.32	\$ 7.44	\$ 426,067
Insurance	\$ 89,263,789	15/16/17	\$ 105,381	847.06	24.86%	210.56	\$ 7.38	\$ 853,487
Trucking	\$ 2,654,047	63/64	\$ 112,713	23.55	12.75%	3.00	\$ 7.74	\$ 9,951
Other Transport	\$ 16,189,505	42	\$ 112,788	143.54	22.24%	31.93	\$ 7.47	\$ 123,451
Wholesale Trade	\$ 398,907	47	\$ 132,894	3.00	22.68%	0.68	\$ 7.32	\$ 2,843
Credit and Finance	\$ 3,113,912	50	\$ 145,308	21.43	23.22%	4.98	\$ 7.42	\$ 19,800
Instruments	\$ 2,337,574	67	\$ 174,395	13.40	17.24%	2.31	\$ 7.76	\$ 7,545
Communication	\$ 998,632	38	\$ 276,370	3.61	22.18%	0.80	\$ 7.41	\$ 3,198
Food	\$ 519,000	48	\$ 293,982	1.77	11.14%	0.20	\$ 7.58	\$ 717
Real Estate	\$ 16,809,211	54	\$ 321,017	52.36	48.68%	25.49	\$ 7.07	\$ 120,047
Public Utilities	\$ 538,157	65	\$ 340,256	1.58	20.48%	0.32	\$ 7.41	\$ 1,293
	\$ 9,225,487	49	\$ 440,808	20.93	15.57%	3.26	\$ 7.56	\$ 11,986
Totals	\$ 251,719,960			2,844.76		718.24		\$ 3,035,226

Under the provisions of Sub-scenario 1a, we estimate 718.24 workers (as expressed by worker equivalents) would receive a wage increase. We estimate the annual wage bill increase attributed to these workers at \$3,035,226. The greatest amount of affected workers, 210.56, is attributed to major industry group Construction. Major industry group Communication (SIC 48) contributes the fewest workers to the total – 0.20. Major industry group Construction contributes the greatest share of the annual wage bill increase, \$853,487. Major industry group Communication contributes the smallest share of the annual wage bill increase, \$717.

Industry Results – Scenario 2

Scenario 2 calls for a “living wage” calculated at \$9.97/hour for employees that have health benefits and at \$11.97/hour for employees that do not have health benefits. The scenario requires companies with contracts of \$25,000 or more to pay their full- and part-time employees the “living wage” only for the hours they perform work on the County contract. This scenario covers \$259,697,990 in annualized value of contracts, and 2,985.22 annual worker equivalents. Major industry group Construction contributes

the largest amounts towards these totals, with \$89,889,231 of annualized contract value and 852.99 worker equivalents.

Table 2a reports the estimated number of contractors' employees, by major industry group, that would be affected by the potential ordinance, and the corresponding annual wage bill increase. We assume, in this sub-scenario, that all employees receive health benefits from their employers.

Table 2a - Estimates for Sub-scenario 2a

Major Industry Group	Total Annualized Value of Contracts	2-Digit SIC	Output per Worker	Worker Equivalents	% Earning less than \$9.97/hour	Affected Workers as Expressed by Worker Equivalents	Mean Wage of Affected Workers	Total Wage Bill Increase
Agricultural Services	\$ 1,332,320	07	\$ 32,582	40.89	29.24%	11.96	\$ 7.65	\$ 57,749
Educational Services	\$ 388,102	82	\$ 37,688	10.30	25.43%	2.62	\$ 7.53	\$ 13,274
Eating and Drinking Places	\$ 3,839,116	58	\$ 38,469	99.80	58.78%	58.66	\$ 7.21	\$ 336,161
Local and Suburban Transit and Interurban Highway Passenger Transportation	\$ 397,500	41	\$ 38,662	10.28	26.76%	2.75	\$ 7.87	\$ 12,042
Non-Profit Organizations	\$ 18,175,066	83/84/85	\$ 38,849	467.84	45.73%	213.92	\$ 7.39	\$ 1,146,796
Personal Services	\$ 503,318	72	\$ 45,612	11.03	27.38%	3.02	\$ 7.61	\$ 14,840
Amusement and Recreation	\$ 131,551	79	\$ 46,282	2.84	33.88%	0.96	\$ 7.51	\$ 4,920
Rest of Retail	\$ 3,166,196	52/55/57/59	\$ 55,762	56.78	42.30%	24.02	\$ 7.46	\$ 125,635
Medical Services	\$ 13,783,947	80	\$ 64,801	212.71	26.77%	56.94	\$ 7.74	\$ 264,645
Miscellaneous Business Services	\$ 7,242,407	73	\$ 67,035	108.04	31.58%	34.12	\$ 7.68	\$ 162,504
Miscellaneous Professional Services	\$ 67,350,100	81/87/89/99	\$ 81,950	821.84	15.84%	130.17	\$ 7.75	\$ 601,294
Construction	\$ 89,889,231	15/16/17	\$ 105,381	852.99	30.89%	263.53	\$ 7.81	\$ 1,181,424
Insurance	\$ 2,654,047	63/64	\$ 112,713	23.55	17.04%	4.01	\$ 8.21	\$ 14,658
Trucking	\$ 16,322,770	42	\$ 112,788	144.72	25.95%	37.56	\$ 7.78	\$ 171,100
Motion Pictures	\$ 36,500	78	\$ 114,385	0.32	26.56%	0.08	\$ 7.73	\$ 394
Automotive Repair and Services	\$ 53,643	75	\$ 123,047	0.44	39.63%	0.17	\$ 7.59	\$ 857
Other Transport	\$ 495,907	47	\$ 132,894	3.73	26.55%	0.99	\$ 7.65	\$ 4,773
Printing	\$ 34,974	27	\$ 141,122	0.25	30.00%	0.07	\$ 7.68	\$ 355
Wholesale Trade	\$ 3,264,658	50	\$ 145,308	22.47	28.42%	6.39	\$ 7.82	\$ 28,561
Credit and Finance	\$ 2,377,574	61/67	\$ 174,395	13.63	22.93%	3.13	\$ 8.22	\$ 11,366
Instruments	\$ 998,632	38	\$ 276,370	3.61	27.01%	0.98	\$ 7.81	\$ 4,390
Communication	\$ 637,576	48	\$ 293,982	2.17	14.41%	0.31	\$ 8.04	\$ 1,257
Food	\$ 16,809,211	54	\$ 321,017	52.36	54.11%	28.33	\$ 7.32	\$ 156,065
Real Estate	\$ 538,157	65	\$ 340,256	1.58	23.71%	0.38	\$ 7.71	\$ 1,763
Public Utilities	\$ 9,275,487	49	\$ 440,808	21.04	19.17%	4.03	\$ 7.95	\$ 16,960
Totals	\$ 259,697,990			2,985.22		889.10		\$ 4,333,780

Under the provisions of Sub-scenario 2a, we estimate 889.10 workers (as expressed by worker equivalents) would receive a wage increase. We estimate the annual wage bill increase attributed to these workers at \$4,333,780. The greatest amount of affected workers, 263.53, is attributed to major industry group Construction. Major industry group Printing (SIC 27) contributes the fewest workers to the total – 0.07. Major industry group Construction contributes the greatest share of the annual wage bill increase, \$1,181,424. Major industry group Printing contributes the smallest share of the annual wage bill increase, \$355.

Table 2b reports the estimated number of contractors' employees, by major industry group, that would be affected by the potential ordinance, and the corresponding annual wage bill increase. We assume, in this sub-scenario, that no employees receive health benefits from their employers.

Table 2b - Estimates for Sub-scenario 2b

Major Industry Group	Total Annualized Value of Contracts	2-Digit SIC	Output per Worker	Worker Equivalents	% Earning less than \$11.97/hour	Affected Workers as Expressed by Worker Equivalents	Mean Wage of Affected Workers	Total Wage Bill Increase
Agricultural Services	\$ 1,332,320	07	\$ 32,582	40.89	41.11%	16.81	\$ 8.56	\$ 119,162
Educational Services	\$ 388,102	82	\$ 37,688	10.30	38.05%	3.92	\$ 8.66	\$ 27,016
Eating and Drinking Places	\$ 3,839,116	58	\$ 38,469	99.80	72.49%	72.34	\$ 7.88	\$ 614,800
Local and Suburban Transit and Interurban Highway Passenger Transportation	\$ 397,500	41	\$ 38,662	10.28	39.32%	4.04	\$ 8.81	\$ 26,601
Non-Profit Organizations	\$ 18,175,066	83/84/85	\$ 38,849	467.84	59.28%	277.32	\$ 8.18	\$ 2,183,338
Personal Services	\$ 503,318	72	\$ 45,612	11.03	39.34%	4.34	\$ 8.59	\$ 30,559
Amusement and Recreation	\$ 131,551	79	\$ 46,282	2.84	47.63%	1.35	\$ 8.47	\$ 9,845
Rest of Retail	\$ 3,166,196	52/55/57/59	\$ 55,762	56.78	55.02%	31.24	\$ 8.25	\$ 241,958
Medical Services	\$ 13,783,947	80	\$ 64,801	212.71	38.96%	82.88	\$ 8.69	\$ 565,410
Miscellaneous Business Services	\$ 7,242,407	73	\$ 67,035	108.04	44.16%	47.71	\$ 8.57	\$ 337,765
Miscellaneous Professional Services	\$ 67,350,100	81/87/89/99	\$ 81,950	821.84	23.63%	194.20	\$ 8.74	\$ 1,302,923
Construction	\$ 89,889,231	15/16/17	\$ 105,381	852.99	44.32%	378.03	\$ 8.73	\$ 2,547,839
Insurance	\$ 2,654,047	63/64	\$ 112,713	23.55	29.79%	7.01	\$ 9.40	\$ 37,554
Trucking	\$ 16,322,770	42	\$ 112,788	144.72	37.46%	54.22	\$ 8.76	\$ 362,101
Motion Pictures	\$ 36,500	78	\$ 114,385	0.32	38.08%	0.12	\$ 8.67	\$ 834
Automotive Repair and Services	\$ 53,643	75	\$ 123,047	0.44	53.75%	0.23	\$ 8.44	\$ 1,720
Other Transport	\$ 495,907	47	\$ 132,894	3.73	38.12%	1.42	\$ 8.61	\$ 9,952
Printing	\$ 34,974	27	\$ 141,122	0.25	41.73%	0.10	\$ 8.57	\$ 731
Wholesale Trade	\$ 3,264,658	50	\$ 145,308	22.47	40.47%	9.09	\$ 8.74	\$ 61,148
Credit and Finance	\$ 2,377,574	61/67	\$ 174,395	13.63	39.02%	5.32	\$ 9.32	\$ 29,323
Instruments	\$ 998,632	38	\$ 276,370	3.61	39.05%	1.41	\$ 8.75	\$ 9,449
Communication	\$ 637,576	48	\$ 293,982	2.17	22.28%	0.48	\$ 9.05	\$ 2,935
Food	\$ 16,809,211	54	\$ 321,017	52.36	66.70%	34.93	\$ 7.97	\$ 290,372
Real Estate	\$ 538,157	65	\$ 340,256	1.58	33.61%	0.53	\$ 8.63	\$ 3,695
Public Utilities	\$ 9,275,487	49	\$ 440,808	21.04	29.53%	6.21	\$ 9.01	\$ 38,291
Totals	\$ 259,697,990			2,985.22		1,235.29		\$ 8,855,322

Under the provisions of Sub-scenario 2b, we estimate 1,235.29 workers (as expressed by worker equivalents) would receive a wage increase. We estimate the annual wage bill increase attributed to these workers at \$8,855,322. The greatest amount of affected workers, 378.03, is attributed to major industry group Construction. Major industry group Printing contributes the fewest workers to the total – 0.10. Major industry group Construction contributes the greatest share of the annual wage bill increase, \$2,547,839. Major industry group Printing contributes the smallest share of the annual wage bill increase, \$731.

Industry Results – Scenario 3

Scenario 3 calls for a “living wage” calculated at \$9.97/hour for employees that have health benefits and at \$11.97/hour for employees that do not have health benefits. The scenario requires companies with contracts of \$50,000 or more to pay their full- and part-time employees the “living wage” only for the hours they perform work on the County contract. This scenario covers \$256,811,887 in annualized value of contracts, and 2,936.53 annual worker equivalents. Major industry group Construction contributes the largest amounts towards these totals, with \$89,533,574 of annualized contract value and 849.62 worker equivalents.

Table 3a reports the estimated number of contractors’ employees, by major industry group, that would be affected by the potential ordinance, and the corresponding annual wage bill increase. We assume, in this sub-scenario, that all employees receive health benefits from their employers.

Table 3a - Estimates for Sub-scenario 3a

Major Industry Group	Total Annualized Value of Contracts	2-Digit SIC	Output per Worker	Worker Equivalents	% Earning less than \$9.97/hour	Affected Workers as Expressed by Worker Equivalents	Mean Wage of Affected Workers	Total Wage Bill Increase
Agricultural Services	\$ 1,301,000	07	\$ 32,582	39.93	29.24%	11.68	\$ 7.65	\$ 56,391
Educational Services	\$ 328,343	82	\$ 37,688	8.71	25.43%	2.22	\$ 7.53	\$ 11,230
Eating and Drinking Places	\$ 3,839,116	58	\$ 38,469	99.80	58.78%	58.66	\$ 7.21	\$ 336,161
Local and Suburban Transit and Interurban Highway Passenger Transportation	\$ 357,500	41	\$ 38,662	9.25	26.76%	2.47	\$ 7.87	\$ 10,830
Non-Profit Organizations	\$ 17,349,987	83/84/85	\$ 38,849	446.60	45.73%	204.21	\$ 7.39	\$ 1,094,736
Personal Services	\$ 419,518	72	\$ 45,612	9.20	27.38%	2.52	\$ 7.61	\$ 12,369
Amusement and Recreation	\$ 131,551	79	\$ 46,282	2.84	33.88%	0.96	\$ 7.51	\$ 4,920
Rest of Retail	\$ 3,102,256	52/55/57/59	\$ 55,762	55.63	42.30%	23.53	\$ 7.46	\$ 123,098
Medical Services	\$ 13,456,976	80	\$ 64,801	207.67	26.77%	55.59	\$ 7.74	\$ 258,367
Miscellaneous Business Services	\$ 6,986,732	73	\$ 67,035	104.23	31.58%	32.91	\$ 7.68	\$ 156,767
Miscellaneous Professional Services	\$ 66,856,478	81/87/89/99	\$ 81,950	815.82	15.84%	129.22	\$ 7.75	\$ 596,887
Construction	\$ 89,533,574	15/16/17	\$ 105,381	849.62	30.89%	262.49	\$ 7.81	\$ 1,176,750
Insurance	\$ 2,654,047	63/64	\$ 112,713	23.55	17.04%	4.01	\$ 8.21	\$ 14,658
Trucking	\$ 16,189,505	42	\$ 112,788	143.54	25.95%	37.25	\$ 7.78	\$ 169,703
Automotive Repair and Services	\$ 53,643	75	\$ 123,047	0.44	39.63%	0.17	\$ 7.59	\$ 857
Other Transport	\$ 455,907	47	\$ 132,894	3.43	26.55%	0.91	\$ 7.65	\$ 4,388
Wholesale Trade	\$ 3,228,832	50	\$ 145,308	22.22	28.42%	6.32	\$ 7.82	\$ 28,248
Credit and Finance	\$ 2,337,574	61/67	\$ 174,395	13.40	22.93%	3.07	\$ 8.22	\$ 11,175
Instruments	\$ 998,632	38	\$ 276,370	3.61	27.01%	0.98	\$ 7.81	\$ 4,390
Communication	\$ 607,861	48	\$ 293,982	2.07	14.41%	0.30	\$ 8.04	\$ 1,198
Food	\$ 16,809,211	54	\$ 321,017	52.36	54.11%	28.33	\$ 7.32	\$ 156,065
Real Estate	\$ 538,157	65	\$ 340,256	1.58	23.71%	0.38	\$ 7.71	\$ 1,763
Public Utilities	\$ 9,275,487	49	\$ 440,808	21.04	19.17%	4.03	\$ 7.95	\$ 16,960
Totals	\$ 256,811,887			2,936.53		872.21		\$ 4,247,909

Under the provisions of Sub-scenario 3a, we estimate 872.21 workers (as expressed by worker equivalents) would receive a wage increase. We estimate the annual wage bill increase attributed to these workers at \$4,247,909. The greatest amount of affected workers, 262.49, is attributed to major industry group Construction. Major industry group Automobile Repair and Services (SIC 75) contributes the fewest workers to the total – 0.17. Major industry group Construction contributes the greatest share of the annual wage bill increase, \$1,176,750. Major industry group Automobile Repair and Services contributes the smallest share of the annual wage bill increase, \$857.

Table 3b reports the estimated number of contractors’ employees, by major industry group, that would be affected by the potential ordinance, and the corresponding annual wage bill increase. We assume, in this sub-scenario, that no employees receive health benefits from their employers.

Table 3b - Estimates for Sub-scenario 3b

Major Industry Group	Total Annualized Value of Contracts	2-Digit SIC	Output per Worker	Worker Equivalents	% Earning less than \$11.97/hour	Affected Workers as Expressed by Worker Equivalents	Mean Wage of Affected Workers	Total Wage Bill Increase
Agricultural Services	\$ 1,301,000	07	\$ 32,582	39.93	41.11%	16.42	\$ 8.56	\$ 116,361
Educational Services	\$ 328,343	82	\$ 37,688	8.71	38.05%	3.32	\$ 8.66	\$ 22,856
Eating and Drinking Places	\$ 3,839,116	58	\$ 38,469	99.80	72.49%	72.34	\$ 7.88	\$ 614,800
Local and Suburban Transit and Interurban Highway Passenger Transportation	\$ 357,500	41	\$ 38,662	9.25	39.32%	3.64	\$ 8.81	\$ 23,924
Non-Profit Organizations	\$ 17,349,987	83/84/85	\$ 38,849	446.60	59.28%	264.73	\$ 8.18	\$ 2,084,223
Personal Services	\$ 419,518	72	\$ 45,612	9.20	39.34%	3.62	\$ 8.59	\$ 25,471
Amusement and Recreation	\$ 131,551	79	\$ 46,282	2.84	47.63%	1.35	\$ 8.47	\$ 9,845
Rest of Retail	\$ 3,102,256	52/55/57/59	\$ 55,762	55.63	55.02%	30.61	\$ 8.25	\$ 237,072
Medical Services	\$ 13,456,976	80	\$ 64,801	207.67	38.96%	80.92	\$ 8.69	\$ 551,998
Miscellaneous Business Services	\$ 6,986,732	73	\$ 67,035	104.23	44.16%	46.03	\$ 8.57	\$ 325,841
Miscellaneous Professional Services	\$ 66,856,478	81/87/89/99	\$ 81,950	815.82	23.63%	192.78	\$ 8.74	\$ 1,293,374
Construction	\$ 89,533,574	15/16/17	\$ 105,381	849.62	44.32%	376.54	\$ 8.73	\$ 2,537,758
Insurance	\$ 2,654,047	63/64	\$ 112,713	23.55	29.79%	7.01	\$ 9.40	\$ 37,554
Trucking	\$ 16,189,505	42	\$ 112,788	143.54	37.46%	53.77	\$ 8.76	\$ 359,145
Automotive Repair and Services	\$ 53,643	75	\$ 123,047	0.44	53.75%	0.23	\$ 8.44	\$ 1,720
Other Transport	\$ 455,907	47	\$ 132,894	3.43	38.12%	1.31	\$ 8.61	\$ 9,150
Wholesale Trade	\$ 3,228,832	50	\$ 145,308	22.22	40.47%	8.99	\$ 8.74	\$ 60,476
Credit and Finance	\$ 2,337,574	61/67	\$ 174,395	13.40	39.02%	5.23	\$ 9.32	\$ 28,830
Instruments	\$ 998,632	38	\$ 276,370	3.61	39.05%	1.41	\$ 8.75	\$ 9,449
Communication	\$ 607,861	48	\$ 293,982	2.07	22.28%	0.46	\$ 9.05	\$ 2,798
Food	\$ 16,809,211	54	\$ 321,017	52.36	66.70%	34.93	\$ 7.97	\$ 290,372
Real Estate	\$ 538,157	65	\$ 340,256	1.58	33.61%	0.53	\$ 8.63	\$ 3,695
Public Utilities	\$ 9,275,487	49	\$ 440,808	21.04	29.53%	6.21	\$ 9.01	\$ 38,291
Totals	\$ 256,811,887			2,936.53		1,212.38		\$ 8,685,003

Under the provisions of Sub-scenario 3b, we estimate 1,212.38 workers (as expressed by worker equivalents) would receive a wage increase. We estimate the annual wage bill increase attributed to these workers at \$8,685,003. The greatest amount of affected workers, 376.54, is attributed to major industry group Construction. Major

industry group Automobile Repair and Services contributes the fewest workers to the total – 0.23. Major industry group Construction contributes the greatest share of the annual wage bill increase, \$2,537,758. Major industry group Automobile Repair and Services contributes the smallest share of the annual wage bill increase, \$1,720.

Industry Results – Scenario 4

Scenario 4 calls for a “living wage” calculated at \$9.97/hour for employees that have health benefits and at \$11.97/hour for employees that do not have health benefits. The scenario requires companies with contracts of \$100,000 or more to pay their full- and part-time employees the “living wage” only for the hours they perform work on the County contract. This scenario covers \$251,719,960 in annualized value of contracts, and 2,844.76 annual worker equivalents. Major industry group Construction contributes the largest amounts towards these totals, with \$89,263,789 of annualized contract value and 847.06 worker equivalents.

Table 4a reports the estimated number of contractors’ employees, by major industry group, that would be affected by the potential ordinance, and the corresponding annual wage bill increase. We assume, in this sub-scenario, that all employees receive health benefits from their employers.

Table 4a - Estimates for Sub-scenario 4a

Major Industry Group	Total Annualized Value of Contracts	2-Digit SIC	Output per Worker	Worker Equivalents	% Earning less than \$9.97/hour	Affected Workers as Expressed by Worker Equivalents	Mean Wage of Affected Workers	Total Wage Bill Increase
Agricultural Services	\$ 1,002,709	07	\$ 32,582	30.77	29.24%	9.00	\$ 7.65	\$ 43,462
Educational Services	\$ 328,343	82	\$ 37,688	8.71	25.43%	2.22	\$ 7.53	\$ 11,230
Eating and Drinking Places	\$ 3,839,116	58	\$ 38,469	99.80	58.78%	58.66	\$ 7.21	\$ 336,161
Local and Suburban Transit and Interurban Highway Passenger Transportation	\$ 232,500	41	\$ 38,662	6.01	26.76%	1.61	\$ 7.87	\$ 7,043
Non-Profit Organizations	\$ 15,792,831	83/84/85	\$ 38,849	406.52	45.73%	185.89	\$ 7.39	\$ 996,484
Personal Services	\$ 319,621	72	\$ 45,612	7.01	27.38%	1.92	\$ 7.61	\$ 9,424
Amusement and Recreation	\$ 131,551	79	\$ 46,282	2.84	33.88%	0.96	\$ 7.51	\$ 4,920
Rest of Retail	\$ 3,102,256	52/55/57/59	\$ 55,762	55.63	42.30%	23.53	\$ 7.46	\$ 123,098
Medical Services	\$ 12,731,064	80	\$ 64,801	196.46	26.77%	52.59	\$ 7.74	\$ 244,430
Miscellaneous Business Services	\$ 6,572,154	73	\$ 67,035	98.04	31.58%	30.96	\$ 7.68	\$ 147,465
Miscellaneous Professional Services	\$ 65,619,594	81/87/89/99	\$ 81,950	800.73	15.84%	126.83	\$ 7.75	\$ 585,845
Construction	\$ 89,263,789	15/16/17	\$ 105,381	847.06	30.89%	261.70	\$ 7.81	\$ 1,173,204
Insurance	\$ 2,654,047	63/64	\$ 112,713	23.55	17.04%	4.01	\$ 8.21	\$ 14,658
Trucking	\$ 16,189,505	42	\$ 112,788	143.54	25.95%	37.25	\$ 7.78	\$ 169,703
Other Transport	\$ 398,907	47	\$ 132,894	3.00	26.55%	0.80	\$ 7.65	\$ 3,839
Wholesale Trade	\$ 3,113,912	50	\$ 145,308	21.43	28.42%	6.09	\$ 7.82	\$ 27,243
Credit and Finance	\$ 2,337,574	61/67	\$ 174,395	13.40	22.93%	3.07	\$ 8.22	\$ 11,175
Instruments	\$ 998,632	38	\$ 276,370	3.61	27.01%	0.98	\$ 7.81	\$ 4,390
Communication	\$ 519,000	48	\$ 293,982	1.77	14.41%	0.25	\$ 8.04	\$ 1,023
Food	\$ 16,809,211	54	\$ 321,017	52.36	54.11%	28.33	\$ 7.32	\$ 156,065
Real Estate	\$ 538,157	65	\$ 340,256	1.58	23.71%	0.38	\$ 7.71	\$ 1,763
Public Utilities	\$ 9,225,487	49	\$ 440,808	20.93	19.17%	4.01	\$ 7.95	\$ 16,868
Totals	\$ 251,719,960			2,844.76		841.03		\$ 4,089,490

Under the provisions of Sub-scenario 4a, we estimate 841.03 workers (as expressed by worker equivalents) would receive a wage increase. We estimate the annual wage bill increase attributed to these workers at \$4,089,490. The greatest amount of affected workers, 261.70, is attributed to major industry group Construction. Major industry group Communication contributes the fewest workers to the total – 0.25. Major industry group Construction contributes the greatest share of the annual wage bill increase, \$1,173,204. Major industry group Communication contributes the smallest share of the annual wage bill increase, \$1,023.

Table 4b reports the estimated number of contractors’ employees, by major industry group, that would be affected by the potential ordinance, and the corresponding annual wage bill increase. We assume, in this sub-scenario, that no employees receive health benefits from their employers.

Table 4b - Estimates for Sub-scenario 4b

Major Industry Group	Total Annualized Value of Contracts	2-Digit SIC	Output per Worker	Worker Equivalents	% Earning less than \$11.97/hour	Affected Workers as Expressed by Worker Equivalents	Mean Wage of Affected Workers	Total Wage Bill Increase
Agricultural Services	\$ 1,002,709	07	\$ 32,582	30.77	41.11%	12.65	\$ 8.56	\$ 89,682
Educational Services	\$ 328,343	82	\$ 37,688	8.71	38.05%	3.32	\$ 8.66	\$ 22,856
Eating and Drinking Places	\$ 3,839,116	58	\$ 38,469	99.80	72.49%	72.34	\$ 7.88	\$ 614,800
Local and Suburban Transit and Interurban Highway Passenger Transportation	\$ 232,500	41	\$ 38,662	6.01	39.32%	2.36	\$ 8.81	\$ 15,559
Non-Profit Organizations	\$ 15,792,831	83/84/85	\$ 38,849	406.52	59.28%	240.97	\$ 8.18	\$ 1,897,165
Personal Services	\$ 319,621	72	\$ 45,612	7.01	39.34%	2.76	\$ 8.59	\$ 19,406
Amusement and Recreation	\$ 131,551	79	\$ 46,282	2.84	47.63%	1.35	\$ 8.47	\$ 9,845
Rest of Retail	\$ 3,102,256	52/55/57/59	\$ 55,762	55.63	55.02%	30.61	\$ 8.25	\$ 237,072
Medical Services	\$ 12,731,064	80	\$ 64,801	196.46	38.96%	76.55	\$ 8.69	\$ 522,222
Miscellaneous Business Services	\$ 6,572,154	73	\$ 67,035	98.04	44.16%	43.30	\$ 8.57	\$ 306,507
Miscellaneous Professional Services	\$ 65,619,594	81/87/89/99	\$ 81,950	800.73	23.63%	189.21	\$ 8.74	\$ 1,269,445
Construction	\$ 89,263,789	15/16/17	\$ 105,381	847.06	44.32%	375.40	\$ 8.73	\$ 2,530,111
Insurance	\$ 2,654,047	63/64	\$ 112,713	23.55	29.79%	7.01	\$ 9.40	\$ 37,554
Trucking	\$ 16,189,505	42	\$ 112,788	143.54	37.46%	53.77	\$ 8.76	\$ 359,145
Other Transport	\$ 398,907	47	\$ 132,894	3.00	38.12%	1.14	\$ 8.61	\$ 8,006
Wholesale Trade	\$ 3,113,912	50	\$ 145,308	21.43	40.47%	8.67	\$ 8.74	\$ 58,324
Credit and Finance	\$ 2,337,574	61/67	\$ 174,395	13.40	39.02%	5.23	\$ 9.32	\$ 28,830
Instruments	\$ 998,632	38	\$ 276,370	3.61	39.05%	1.41	\$ 8.75	\$ 9,449
Communication	\$ 519,000	48	\$ 293,982	1.77	22.28%	0.39	\$ 9.05	\$ 2,389
Food	\$ 16,809,211	54	\$ 321,017	52.36	66.70%	34.93	\$ 7.97	\$ 290,372
Real Estate	\$ 538,157	65	\$ 340,256	1.58	33.61%	0.53	\$ 8.63	\$ 3,695
Public Utilities	\$ 9,225,487	49	\$ 440,808	20.93	29.53%	6.18	\$ 9.01	\$ 38,085
Totals	\$ 251,719,960			2,844.76		1,170.10		\$ 8,370,517

Under the provisions of Sub-scenario 4b, we estimate 1,170.10 workers (as expressed by worker equivalents) would receive a wage increase. We estimate the annual wage bill increase attributed to these workers at \$8,370,517. The greatest amount of affected workers, 375.40, is attributed to major industry group Construction. Major industry group Communication contributes the fewest workers to the total – 0.39. Major

industry group Construction contributes the greatest share of the annual wage bill increase, \$2,530,111. Major industry group Communication contributes the smallest share of the annual wage bill increase, \$2,389.

Industry Results – Scenario 5

Scenario 5 calls for a “living wage” calculated at \$7.33/hour for employees that have health benefits and at \$9.33/hour for employees that do not have health benefits. The scenario requires companies with contracts of \$50,000 or more to pay their full- and part-time employees the “living wage” only for the hours they perform work on the County contract. This scenario covers \$256,811,887 in annualized value of contracts, and 2,936.53 annual worker equivalents. Major industry group Construction contributes the largest amounts towards these totals, with \$89,263,789 of annualized contract value and 847.06 worker equivalents.

Table 5a reports the estimated number of contractors’ employees, by major industry group, that would be affected by the potential ordinance, and the corresponding annual wage bill increase. We assume, in this sub-scenario, that all employees receive health benefits from their employers.

Table 5a - Estimates for Sub-scenario 5a

Major Industry Group	Total Annualized Value of Contracts	2-Digit SIC	Output per Worker	Worker Equivalents	% Earning less than \$7.33/hour	Affected Workers as Expressed by Worker Equivalents	Mean Wage of Affected Workers	Total Wage Bill Increase
Agricultural Services	\$ 1,301,000	07	\$ 32,582	39.93	12.61%	5.03	\$ 6.34	\$ 10,393
Educational Services	\$ 328,343	82	\$ 37,688	8.71	11.98%	1.04	\$ 6.24	\$ 2,370
Eating and Drinking Places	\$ 3,839,116	58	\$ 38,469	99.80	32.54%	32.48	\$ 6.19	\$ 76,879
Local and Suburban Transit and Interurban Highway Passenger Transportation	\$ 357,500	41	\$ 38,662	9.25	10.05%	0.93	\$ 6.41	\$ 1,778
Non-Profit Organizations	\$ 17,349,987	83/84/85	\$ 38,849	446.60	21.96%	98.07	\$ 6.22	\$ 226,681
Personal Services	\$ 419,518	72	\$ 45,612	9.20	12.21%	1.12	\$ 6.37	\$ 2,251
Amusement and Recreation	\$ 131,551	79	\$ 46,282	2.84	16.28%	0.46	\$ 6.36	\$ 938
Rest of Retail	\$ 3,102,256	52/55/57/59	\$ 55,762	55.63	21.05%	11.71	\$ 6.27	\$ 25,841
Medical Services	\$ 13,456,976	80	\$ 64,801	207.67	10.12%	21.01	\$ 6.30	\$ 44,797
Miscellaneous Business Services	\$ 6,986,732	73	\$ 67,035	104.23	13.31%	13.87	\$ 6.37	\$ 27,571
Miscellaneous Professional Services	\$ 66,856,478	81/87/89/99	\$ 81,950	815.82	6.08%	49.59	\$ 6.36	\$ 99,932
Construction	\$ 89,533,574	15/16/17	\$ 105,381	849.62	11.86%	100.77	\$ 6.38	\$ 199,386
Insurance	\$ 2,654,047	63/64	\$ 112,713	23.55	4.28%	1.01	\$ 6.42	\$ 1,909
Trucking	\$ 16,189,505	42	\$ 112,788	143.54	9.56%	13.72	\$ 6.38	\$ 27,010
Automobile Repair and Service	\$ 53,643	75	\$ 123,047	0.44	18.25%	0.08	\$ 6.30	\$ 170
Other Transport	\$ 455,907	47	\$ 132,894	3.43	11.39%	0.39	\$ 6.35	\$ 795
Wholesale Trade	\$ 3,228,832	50	\$ 145,308	22.22	10.23%	2.27	\$ 6.29	\$ 4,900
Credit and Finance	\$ 2,337,574	61/67	\$ 174,395	13.40	5.68%	0.76	\$ 6.51	\$ 1,296
Instruments	\$ 998,632	38	\$ 276,370	3.61	10.26%	0.37	\$ 6.41	\$ 712
Communication	\$ 607,861	48	\$ 293,982	2.07	3.93%	0.08	\$ 6.35	\$ 165
Food	\$ 16,809,211	54	\$ 321,017	52.36	28.47%	14.91	\$ 6.23	\$ 34,096
Real Estate	\$ 538,157	65	\$ 340,256	1.58	9.18%	0.15	\$ 6.29	\$ 315
Public Utilities	\$ 9,275,487	49	\$ 440,808	21.04	6.10%	1.28	\$ 6.29	\$ 2,781
Totals	\$ 256,811,887			2,936.53		371.12		\$ 792,967

Under the provisions of Sub-scenario 5a, we estimate 371.12 workers (as expressed by worker equivalents) would receive a wage increase. We estimate the annual wage bill increase attributed to these workers at \$792,967. The greatest amount of affected workers, 100.77, is attributed to major industry group Construction. Major industry groups Automobile Repair and Service and Communication contribute the fewest workers to the total – 0.08 each. Major industry group Construction contributes the greatest share of the annual wage bill increase, \$199,386. Major industry group Communication contributes the smallest share of the annual wage bill increase, \$165.

Table 5b reports the estimated number of contractors’ employees, by major industry group, that would be affected by the potential ordinance, and the corresponding annual wage bill increase. We assume, in this sub-scenario, that no employees receive health benefits from their employers.

Table 5b - Estimates for Sub-scenario 5b

Major Industry Group	Total Annualized Value of Contracts	2-Digit SIC	Output per Worker	Worker Equivalents	% Earning less than \$9.33/hour	Affected Workers as Expressed by Worker Equivalents	Mean Wage of Affected Workers	Total Wage Bill Increase
Agricultural Services	\$ 1,301,000	07	\$ 32,582	39.93	24.98%	9.98	\$ 7.31	\$ 41,820
Educational Services	\$ 328,343	82	\$ 37,688	8.71	22.61%	1.97	\$ 7.27	\$ 8,423
Eating and Drinking Places	\$ 3,839,116	58	\$ 38,469	99.80	53.38%	53.27	\$ 6.97	\$ 261,138
Local and Suburban Transit and Interurban Highway Passenger Transportation	\$ 357,500	41	\$ 38,662	9.25	21.45%	1.98	\$ 7.43	\$ 7,824
Non-Profit Organizations	\$ 17,349,987	83/84/85	\$ 38,849	446.60	41.77%	186.52	\$ 7.18	\$ 833,183
Personal Services	\$ 419,518	72	\$ 45,612	9.20	23.73%	2.18	\$ 7.30	\$ 9,207
Amusement and Recreation	\$ 131,551	79	\$ 46,282	2.84	29.76%	0.85	\$ 7.23	\$ 3,704
Rest of Retail	\$ 3,102,256	52/55/57/59	\$ 55,762	55.63	37.20%	20.70	\$ 7.16	\$ 93,450
Medical Services	\$ 13,456,976	80	\$ 64,801	207.67	21.93%	45.53	\$ 7.36	\$ 186,371
Miscellaneous Business Services	\$ 6,986,732	73	\$ 67,035	104.23	26.62%	27.74	\$ 7.32	\$ 115,946
Miscellaneous Professional Services	\$ 66,856,478	81/87/89/99	\$ 81,950	815.82	13.53%	110.36	\$ 7.44	\$ 434,098
Construction	\$ 89,533,574	15/16/17	\$ 105,381	849.62	24.86%	211.20	\$ 7.38	\$ 856,067
Insurance	\$ 2,654,047	63/64	\$ 112,713	23.55	12.75%	3.00	\$ 7.74	\$ 9,951
Trucking	\$ 16,189,505	42	\$ 112,788	143.54	22.24%	31.93	\$ 7.47	\$ 123,451
Automobile Repair and Service	\$ 53,643	75	\$ 123,047	0.44	34.21%	0.15	\$ 7.26	\$ 641
Other Transport	\$ 455,907	47	\$ 132,894	3.43	22.68%	0.78	\$ 7.32	\$ 3,249
Wholesale Trade	\$ 3,228,832	50	\$ 145,308	22.22	23.22%	5.16	\$ 7.42	\$ 20,530
Credit and Finance	\$ 2,337,574	61/67	\$ 174,395	13.40	17.24%	2.31	\$ 7.76	\$ 7,545
Instruments	\$ 998,632	38	\$ 276,370	3.61	22.18%	0.80	\$ 7.41	\$ 3,198
Communication	\$ 607,861	48	\$ 293,982	2.07	11.14%	0.23	\$ 7.58	\$ 840
Food	\$ 16,809,211	54	\$ 321,017	52.36	48.68%	25.49	\$ 7.07	\$ 120,047
Real Estate	\$ 538,157	65	\$ 340,256	1.58	20.48%	0.32	\$ 7.41	\$ 1,293
Public Utilities	\$ 9,275,487	49	\$ 440,808	21.04	15.57%	3.28	\$ 7.56	\$ 12,051
Totals	\$ 256,811,887			2,936.53		745.74		\$ 3,154,030

Under the provisions of Sub-scenario 5b, we estimate 745.74 workers (as expressed by worker equivalents) would receive a wage increase. We estimate the annual wage bill increase attributed to these workers at \$3,154,030. The greatest amount of affected workers, 211.20, is attributed to major industry group Construction. Major

industry group Automobile Repair and Service contributes the fewest workers to the total – 0.15 each. Major industry group Construction contributes the greatest share of the annual wage bill increase, \$856,067. Major industry group Automobile Repair and Service contributes the smallest share of the annual wage bill increase, \$641.

Appendix A – Core Variables

1. Living Wage to be calculated at \$7.33/hour for employees that have health benefits and at \$9.33 for employees that do not have health benefits.
2. Living Wage to be calculated at \$9.97/hour for employees that have health benefits and at \$11.97 for employees that do not have health benefits.
3. Full- and part-time employees of agencies that come under the BOCC budget authority.
4. Full- and part-time employees of agencies that do not come under the BOCC budget authority but historically have followed the BOCC salary schedule or are likely to be indirectly impacted by BOCC action and the pressures associated with competing for similar applicants/employees.
5. Full- and part-time employees of companies with County service and construction contracts of \$25,000 or more, and only for the hours that they are performing work on these contracts.
6. Full- and part-time employees of companies with County service and construction contracts of \$50, 000 or more, and only for the hours that they are performing work on these contracts.
7. Full- and part-time employees of companies with County service and construction contracts of \$100, 000 or more, and only for the hours that they are performing work on these contracts.
8. Companies that receive tax abatements (e.g., financial incentives for jobs created.)

Notes:

- a. Temporary employees are not included.
- b. Agencies under the BOCC budget authority are: County Administrator, County Attorney’s Office, Clerk of Circuit Court, Supervisor of Elections, Property Appraiser, Tax Collector, Sheriff, Environmental Protection Agency, Planning Commission, Law Library, Legislative Delegation, Soil and Water Conservation District, Civil Service Board, Victim Assistance.
- c. Agencies that do not come under the BOCC budget but historically have followed the BOCC salary schedule or are likely to be indirectly impacted by BOCC action and the pressures associated with competing for similar applicants/employees are: Public Transportation Commission, Expressway Authority, Sports Authority, Children’s Board, Arts Council, Aviation Authority, and Port Authority.

Appendix B – “Living Wage” Scenarios

Scenario 1

Living Wage to be calculated at \$7.33/hour for employees that have health benefits and at \$9.33 for employees that do not have health benefits. This scenario to include full- and part-time employees of:

- Agencies that come under the BOCC budget authority.
- Agencies that do not come under the BOCC budget authority but that historically have followed the BOCC salary schedule or are likely to be indirectly impacted by BOCC action.
- Companies with County service or construction contracts of \$100, 000 or more, and only for the hours that they are performing work on these contracts.
- Companies that receive tax abatements.

Scenario 2

Living Wage to be calculated at \$9.97/hour for employees that have health benefits and at \$11.97 for employees that do not have health benefits. This scenario to include full- and part-time employees of:

- Agencies that come under the BOCC budget authority.
- Agencies that do not come under the BOCC budget authority but that historically have followed the BOCC salary schedule or are likely to be indirectly impacted by BOCC action.
- Companies with County service or construction contracts of \$25,000 or more, and only for the hours that they are performing work on these contracts.
- Companies that receive tax abatements.

Scenario 3

Living Wage to be calculated at \$9.97/hour for employees that have health benefits and at \$11.97 for employees that do not have health benefits. This scenario to include full- and part-time employees of:

- Agencies that come under the BOCC budget authority.
- Agencies that do not come under the BOCC budget authority but that historically have followed the BOCC salary schedule or are likely to be indirectly impacted by BOCC action.
- Companies with County service or construction contracts of \$50, 000 or more, and only for the hours that they are performing work on these contracts.
- Companies that receive tax abatements.

Scenario 4

Living Wage to be calculated at \$9.97/hour for employees that have health benefits and at \$11.97 for employees that do not have health benefits. This scenario to include full- and part-time employees of:

- Agencies that come under the BOCC budget authority.
- Agencies that do not come under the BOCC budget authority but that historically have followed the BOCC salary schedule or are likely to be indirectly impacted by BOCC action.

- Companies with County service or construction contracts of \$100, 000 or more, and only for the hours that they are performing work on these contracts.
- Companies that receive tax abatements.

Scenario 5

Living Wage to be calculated at \$7.33/hour for employees that have health benefits and at \$9.33 for employees that do not have health benefits. This scenario to include full- and part-time employees of:

- Agencies that come under the BOCC budget authority.
- Agencies that do not come under the BOCC budget authority but that historically have followed the BOCC salary schedule or are likely to be indirectly impacted by BOCC action.
- Companies with County service or construction contracts of \$50, 000 or more, and only for the hours that they are performing work on these contracts.
- Companies that receive tax abatements.

Appendix C – List of Vendors Assigned SIC Codes

Contract Title	Vendor Name	Annualized Value	SIC	SIC Description
FUNERAL SERVICES-INDIGENT BURIAL PROGRAM	JIMMIE JACKSON	\$ 24,966	7261	Funeral Service and Crematories
MEDICAL TRANSCRIPTION SERVICES	AVALON PROFESSIONAL GROUP INC	\$ 29,619	8099	Health and Allied Services, Not Elsewhere Classified
MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES FOR HEAD START	DANIELLA MAGLIONE	\$ 39,891	8049	Offices and Clinics of Health Practitioners, Not Elsewhere Classified
MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES FOR HEAD START	JOHN CANTRELL	\$ 39,891	8049	Offices and Clinics of Health Practitioners, Not Elsewhere Classified
TELEPHONE NOTIFICATION SYS (WATER DEPT)	SUNSHINE STATE ONE-CALL	\$ 42,152	7373	Computer Integrated Systems Design
ENERGY AUDIT - COURTS PROJECT	TERRY A THOMPSON -ENERGY MGMT CONSULTANT	\$ 49,664	8748	Business Consulting Services, Not Elsewhere Classified
MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES FOR HEAD START	CAROL J CHANEY	\$ 49,863	8049	Offices and Clinics of Health Practitioners, Not Elsewhere Classified
MEDICAL DIRECTOR	MICHAEL LOZANO, JR., M.D., F.A.C.E.P.	\$ 49,932	8011	Offices and Clinics of Doctors of Medicine
NURSING SERVICES FOR HEAD START CHILDREN	DEBRA RAWDAN	\$ 59,836	8049	Offices and Clinics of Health Practitioners, Not Elsewhere Classified
MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES FOR HEAD START	IDA DENISE LINDSEY	\$ 59,836	8049	Offices and Clinics of Health Practitioners, Not Elsewhere Classified
MISC ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES - SBE	JAN ABELL/KENNETH GARCIA PARTNERSHIP	\$ 99,863	8712	Architectural Services
PHARMACY BENEFITS MGMT SERVICES	MANAGED PHARMACY BENEFITS INC	\$ 107,353	6411	Insurance Agents, Brokers, and Service
HEARING MASTER SERVICES	JERRY DABKOWSKI	\$ 160,000	8748	Business Consulting Services, Not Elsewhere Classified
FIRE HYDRANT PAINTING SERVICES	3-VETS INC	\$ 196,200	1721	Painting and Paper Hanging
WILLOW OAKS @TEMPLE TERR-116 UNIT	BERESFORD & ASSOCIATES LTD	\$ 700,000	1522	General Contractors, Residential Buildings, Other than Single-Family
ACQUISITION & DEVELOP LAND-AFF HSG	HOUSING BY ST LAURENCE INC	\$ 540,000	1522	General Contractors, Residential Buildings, Other than Single-Family
TRANSPORTATION SERVICES	CITRUS CARS OF POLK COUNTY INC	\$ 38,940	5511	Motor Vehicle Dealers (New and Used)
WORKING WHEELS/CSBG	CITRUS CARS OF POLK COUNTY INC	\$ 25,000	5511	Motor Vehicle Dealers (New and Used)
ART IN PUBLIC PLACES	AUDREY FLACK MARCUS	\$ 75,000	7336	Commercial Art and Graphic Design
MEDICAL SERVICES	H STEWART SIDDALL MD	\$ 33,120	8011	Offices and Clinics of Doctors of Medicine
PROVISION OF REHABILITATION CARE/T1	EDWARD JAMES REID COUNSELING SVCS INC	\$ 50,000	8322	Individual and Family Social Services
CRIME STOPPERS	CRIME STOPPERS OF W CENTRAL FL	\$ 171,012	8399	Social Services, Not Elsewhere Classified
HOMELESS SERVICES	HOMELESS COALITION OF HILLSBOROUGH CTY	\$ 27,000	8399	Social Services, Not Elsewhere Classified
INFRARED PHOTOGRAPHY FOR ROOFS	INFRARED CONCEPTS CORPORATION	\$ 55,842	8734	Testing Laboratories
PROJECT MANAGEMENT TRAINING	TWIN STAR CONSULTING COMPANY	\$ 34,725	8742	Management Consulting Services
LAND USE HEARING OFFICER -2ND YEAR	JOHN A CRISLIP	\$ 50,000	8748	Business Consulting Services, Not Elsewhere Classified
2ND REL OF NEW CONTRACT FOR LUHO	MARGARET C TUSING	\$ 25,000	8748	Business Consulting Services, Not Elsewhere Classified
ANDERSON & WATERS #2003-36-R	STEVEN TRACZYK	\$ 28,300	8748	Business Consulting Services, Not Elsewhere Classified
VOLUNTEER SUPPORT FUNDS	CORK-KNIGHTS VOLUNTEER FIRE ASSOC INC	\$ 25,000	N/A	N/A
VOLUNTEER SUPPORT FUNDS	DOVER-TURKEY CREEK VFD	\$ 25,000	N/A	N/A
VOLUNTEER SUPPORT FUNDS	SPRINGHEAD VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPT	\$ 25,000	N/A	N/A
VOLUNTEER SUPPORT FUNDS	SUNDANCE VOLUNTEER FIRE ASSOCIATION INC	\$ 25,000	N/A	N/A

Appendix D – Hillsborough County Output per Worker by SIC

SIC	Output (Bil. 96\$)	Output (Bil. 03\$)	Employment (000s)	Output per Worker
01/02/07/08/09	\$0.344	\$0.368	11.307	\$32,582
82	\$0.320	\$0.343	9.093	\$37,688
58	\$1.243	\$1.331	34.604	\$38,469
41	\$0.020	\$0.021	0.554	\$38,662
83/84/86	\$0.715	\$0.766	19.710	\$38,849
72/76	\$0.628	\$0.673	14.745	\$45,612
79	\$0.546	\$0.585	12.634	\$46,282
52/53/55/56/57/59	\$3.968	\$4.249	76.207	\$55,762
80	\$2.593	\$2.777	42.853	\$64,801
73	\$9.775	\$10.468	156.163	\$67,035
81/87/89/99	\$3.849	\$4.122	50.299	\$81,950
15/16/17	\$3.741	\$4.006	38.018	\$105,381
42	\$0.915	\$0.980	8.688	\$112,788
44/46/47	\$0.700	\$0.750	5.641	\$132,894
50/51	\$5.288	\$5.663	38.973	\$145,308
61/62/67	\$2.130	\$2.281	13.08	\$174,395
38	\$0.184	\$0.197	0.713	\$276,370
48	\$3.108	\$3.328	11.322	\$293,982
54/20	\$1.220	\$1.307	4.070	\$321,017
65	\$5.711	\$6.116	17.975	\$340,256
49	\$1.574	\$1.686	3.824	\$440,808

Source: REMI version 5.4

Appendix E – Recoded SIC Codes of Government Vendors

Contract Title	Vendor Name	Annualized Value	Prior SIC	SIC Recode	SIC Recode Description
DIRECT INDEPENDENT LIVING SVCS PROG RD & MAINT	SELF RELIANCE INC	\$ 26,000	9121	8361	Residential Care
AGREEMENT - FY03 PROVISION OF	CITY OF TAMPA	\$ 373,310	9131	1611	Highway and Street Construction, Except Elevated Highways
AMBULANCE SERVICES	CITY OF TAMPA	\$ 75,000	9131	4119	Local Passenger Transportation, Not Elsewhere Classified
MEDICATIONS TITLE I DENTAL SVCS & CASE MGMT TITLE II	STATE OF FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH	\$ 178,026	9431	8099	Health and Allied Services, Not Elsewhere Classified
MEDICATION TITLE I AGREEMENT WITH STATE ATTORNEY	STATE OF FLORIDA	\$ 194,260	9512	8021	Offices and Clinics of Dentists Health and Allied Services, Not Elsewhere Classified
OUTPATIENT/AMBULATO RY MED TITLE II	STATE OF FLORIDA	\$ 178,026	9512	8099	Health and Allied Services, Not Elsewhere Classified
	STATE OF FLORIDA	\$ 62,500	9512	8111	Legal Services
	STATE OF FLORIDA	\$ 30,000	9512	8099	Health and Allied Services, Not Elsewhere Classified

Appendix F – Geographic Regions of Interest and Corresponding Super-PUMA Codes

<u>Geographic Region</u>	<u>Super-PUMAs</u>
Hillsborough County	12084-12085
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL MSA	12081-12085
Tampa Bay*	12081-12085, 12110,12140
Florida	12000-12999

* Defined as Hernando, Hillsborough, Manatee, Pasco, Pinellas, Polk, and Sarasota Counties

Appendix G – Description of PUMS Samples

Major Industry Group Agricultural Services	
Sample Source – Hillsborough County	
Total Records	3818
# Earning less than \$7.33	405
% Earning less than \$7.33	10.61%
Avg. Wage < \$7.33	\$6.35
# Earning less than \$9.33	849
% Earning less than \$9.33	22.24%
Avg. Wage < \$9.33	\$7.37
# Earning less than \$9.97	1014
% Earning less than \$9.97	26.56%
Avg. Wage < \$9.97	\$7.73
# Earning less than \$11.97	1454
% Earning less than \$11.97	38.08%
Avg. Wage < \$11.97	\$8.67

Major Industry Group Eating and Drinking Places	
Sample Source - Hillsborough County	
Total Records	1094
# Earning less than \$7.33	356
% Earning less than \$7.33	32.54%
Avg. Wage < \$7.33	\$6.19
# Earning less than \$9.33	584
% Earning less than \$9.33	53.38%
Avg. Wage < \$9.33	\$6.97
# Earning less than \$9.97	643
% Earning less than \$9.97	58.78%
Avg. Wage < \$9.97	\$7.21
# Earning less than \$11.97	793
% Earning less than \$11.97	72.49%
Avg. Wage < \$11.97	\$7.88

Major Industry Group Educational Services	
Sample Source - Hillsborough County	
Total Records	1703
# Earning less than \$7.33	204
% Earning less than \$7.33	11.98%
Avg. Wage < \$7.33	\$6.24
# Earning less than \$9.33	385
% Earning less than \$9.33	22.61%
Avg. Wage < \$9.33	\$7.27
# Earning less than \$9.97	433
% Earning less than \$9.97	25.43%
Avg. Wage < \$9.97	\$7.53
# Earning less than \$11.97	648
% Earning less than \$11.97	38.05%
Avg. Wage < \$11.97	\$8.66

Major Industry Group Local and Suburban Transit and Interurban Highway Passenger Transportation	
Sample Source - Hillsborough County	
Total Records	1035
# Earning less than \$7.33	104
% Earning less than \$7.33	10.05%
Avg. Wage < \$7.33	\$6.41
# Earning less than \$9.33	222
% Earning less than \$9.33	21.45%
Avg. Wage < \$9.33	\$7.43
# Earning less than \$9.97	277
% Earning less than \$9.97	26.76%
Avg. Wage < \$9.97	\$7.87
# Earning less than \$11.97	407
% Earning less than \$11.97	39.32%
Avg. Wage < \$11.97	\$8.81

Major Industry Group Non-Profit Organizations	
Sample Source - MSA	
Total Records	1439
# Earning less than \$7.33	316
% Earning less than \$7.33	21.96%
Avg. Wage < \$7.33	\$6.22
# Earning less than \$9.33	601
% Earning less than \$9.33	41.77%
Avg. Wage < \$9.33	\$7.18
# Earning less than \$9.97	658
% Earning less than \$9.97	45.73%
Avg. Wage < \$9.97	\$7.39
# Earning less than \$11.97	853
% Earning less than \$11.97	59.28%
Avg. Wage < \$11.97	\$8.18

Major Industry Group Amusement and Recreation	
Sample Source - Hillsborough County	
Total Records	3353
# Earning less than \$7.33	546
% Earning less than \$7.33	16.28%
Avg. Wage < \$7.33	\$6.36
# Earning less than \$9.33	998
% Earning less than \$9.33	29.76%
Avg. Wage < \$9.33	\$7.23
# Earning less than \$9.97	1136
% Earning less than \$9.97	33.88%
Avg. Wage < \$9.97	\$7.51
# Earning less than \$11.97	1597
% Earning less than \$11.97	47.63%
Avg. Wage < \$11.97	\$8.47

Major Industry Group Personal Services	
Sample Source - Hillsborough County	
Total Records	4858
# Earning less than \$7.33	593
% Earning less than \$7.33	12.21%
Avg. Wage < \$7.33	\$6.37
# Earning less than \$9.33	1153
% Earning less than \$9.33	23.73%
Avg. Wage < \$9.33	\$7.30
# Earning less than \$9.97	1330
% Earning less than \$9.97	27.38%
Avg. Wage < \$9.97	\$7.61
# Earning less than \$11.97	1911
% Earning less than \$11.97	39.34%
Avg. Wage < \$11.97	\$8.59

Major Industry Group Rest of Retail	
Sample Source - Hillsborough County	
Total Records	2532
# Earning less than \$7.33	533
% Earning less than \$7.33	21.05%
Avg. Wage < \$7.33	\$6.27
# Earning less than \$9.33	942
% Earning less than \$9.33	37.20%
Avg. Wage < \$9.33	\$7.16
# Earning less than \$9.97	1071
% Earning less than \$9.97	42.30%
Avg. Wage < \$9.97	\$7.46
# Earning less than \$11.97	1393
% Earning less than \$11.97	55.02%
Avg. Wage < \$11.97	\$8.25

Major Industry Group Medical Services	
Sample Source - Hillsborough County	
Total Records	2066
# Earning less than \$7.33	209
% Earning less than \$7.33	10.12%
Avg. Wage < \$7.33	\$6.30
# Earning less than \$9.33	453
% Earning less than \$9.33	21.93%
Avg. Wage < \$9.33	\$7.36
# Earning less than \$9.97	553
% Earning less than \$9.97	26.77%
Avg. Wage < \$9.97	\$7.74
# Earning less than \$11.97	805
% Earning less than \$11.97	38.96%
Avg. Wage < \$11.97	\$8.69

Major Industry Group Misc. Professional Services	
Sample Source - Hillsborough County	
Total Records	1168
# Earning less than \$7.33	71
% Earning less than \$7.33	6.08%
Avg. Wage < \$7.33	\$6.36
# Earning less than \$9.33	158
% Earning less than \$9.33	13.53%
Avg. Wage < \$9.33	\$7.44
# Earning less than \$9.97	185
% Earning less than \$9.97	15.84%
Avg. Wage < \$9.97	\$7.75
# Earning less than \$11.97	276
% Earning less than \$11.97	23.63%
Avg. Wage < \$11.97	\$8.74

Major Industry Group Misc. Business Services	
Sample Source - Hillsborough County	
Total Records	1653
# Earning less than \$7.33	220
% Earning less than \$7.33	13.31%
Avg. Wage < \$7.33	\$6.37
# Earning less than \$9.33	440
% Earning less than \$9.33	26.62%
Avg. Wage < \$9.33	\$7.32
# Earning less than \$9.97	522
% Earning less than \$9.97	31.58%
Avg. Wage < \$9.97	\$7.68
# Earning less than \$11.97	730
% Earning less than \$11.97	44.16%
Avg. Wage < \$11.97	\$8.57

Major Industry Group Construction	
Sample Source - Hillsborough County	
Total Records	1408
# Earning less than \$7.33	167
% Earning less than \$7.33	11.86%
Avg. Wage less than \$7.33	\$6.38
# Earning less than \$9.33	350
% Earning less than \$9.33	24.86%
Avg. Wage less than \$9.33	\$7.38
# Earning less than \$9.97	435
% Earning less than \$9.97	30.89%
Avg. Wage less than \$9.97	\$7.81
# Earning less than \$11.97	624
% Earning less than \$11.97	44.32%
Avg. Wage less than \$11.97	\$8.73

Major Industry Group Insurance	
Sample Source - MSA	
Total Records	1984
# Earning less than \$7.33	85
% Earning less than \$7.33	4.28%
Avg. Wage < \$7.33	\$6.42
# Earning less than \$9.33	253
% Earning less than \$9.33	12.75%
Avg. Wage < \$9.33	\$7.74
# Earning less than \$9.97	338
% Earning less than \$9.97	17.04%
Avg. Wage < \$9.97	\$8.21
# Earning less than \$11.97	591
% Earning less than \$11.97	29.79%
Avg. Wage < \$11.97	\$9.40

Major Industry Group Automobile Repair and Service	
Sample Source - MSA	
Total Records	2011
# Earning less than \$7.33	367
% Earning less than \$7.33	18.25%
Avg. Wage < \$7.33	\$6.30
# Earning less than \$9.33	688
% Earning less than \$9.33	34.21%
Avg. Wage < \$9.33	\$7.26
# Earning less than \$9.97	797
% Earning less than \$9.97	39.63%
Avg. Wage < \$9.97	\$7.59
# Earning less than \$11.97	1081
% Earning less than \$11.97	53.75%
Avg. Wage < \$11.97	\$8.44

Major Industry Group Trucking	
Sample Source - Tampa Bay	
Total Records	1025
# Earning less than \$7.33	98
% Earning less than \$7.33	9.56%
Avg. Wage < \$7.33	\$6.38
# Earning less than \$9.33	228
% Earning less than \$9.33	22.24%
Avg. Wage < \$9.33	\$7.47
# Earning less than \$9.97	266
% Earning less than \$9.97	25.95%
Avg. Wage < \$9.97	\$7.78
# Earning less than \$11.97	384
% Earning less than \$11.97	37.46%
Avg. Wage < \$11.97	\$8.76

Major Industry Group Other Transport	
Sample Source - Hillsborough County	
Total Records	2791
# Earning less than \$7.33	318
% Earning less than \$7.33	11.39%
Avg. Wage < \$7.33	\$6.35
# Earning less than \$9.33	633
% Earning less than \$9.33	22.68%
Avg. Wage < \$9.33	\$7.32
# Earning less than \$9.97	741
% Earning less than \$9.97	26.55%
Avg. Wage < \$9.97	\$7.65
# Earning less than \$11.97	1064
% Earning less than \$11.97	38.12%
Avg. Wage < \$11.97	\$8.61

Major Industry Group Wholesale Trade	
Sample Source - Hillsborough County	
Total Records	1154
# Earning less than \$7.33	118
% Earning less than \$7.33	10.23%
Avg. Wage < \$7.33	\$6.29
# Earning less than \$9.33	268
% Earning less than \$9.33	23.22%
Avg. Wage < \$9.33	\$7.42
# Earning less than \$9.97	328
% Earning less than \$9.97	28.42%
Avg. Wage < \$9.97	\$7.82
# Earning less than \$11.97	467
% Earning less than \$11.97	40.47%
Avg. Wage < \$11.97	\$8.74

Major Industry Group Instruments	
Sample Source - MSA	
Total Records	2525
# Earning less than \$7.33	259
% Earning less than \$7.33	10.26%
Avg. Wage < \$7.33	\$6.41
# Earning less than \$9.33	560
% Earning less than \$9.33	22.18%
Avg. Wage < \$9.33	\$7.41
# Earning less than \$9.97	682
% Earning less than \$9.97	27.01%
Avg. Wage < \$9.97	\$7.81
# Earning less than \$11.97	986
% Earning less than \$11.97	39.05%
Avg. Wage < \$11.97	\$8.75

Major Industry Group Credit and Finance	
Sample Source - Hillsborough County	
Total Records	1038
# Earning less than \$7.33	59
% Earning less than \$7.33	5.68%
Avg. Wage < \$7.33	\$6.51
# Earning less than \$9.33	179
% Earning less than \$9.33	17.24%
Avg. Wage < \$9.33	\$7.76
# Earning less than \$9.97	238
% Earning less than \$9.97	22.93%
Avg. Wage < \$9.97	\$8.22
# Earning less than \$11.97	405
% Earning less than \$11.97	39.02%
Avg. Wage < \$11.97	\$9.32

Major Industry Group Communication	
Sample Source - MSA	
Total Records	1221
# Earning less than \$7.33	48
% Earning less than \$7.33	3.93%
Avg. Wage < \$7.33	\$6.35
# Earning less than \$9.33	136
% Earning less than \$9.33	11.14%
Avg. Wage < \$9.33	\$7.58
# Earning less than \$9.97	176
% Earning less than \$9.97	14.41%
Avg. Wage < \$9.97	\$8.04
# Earning less than \$11.97	272
% Earning less than \$11.97	22.28%
Avg. Wage < \$11.97	\$9.05

Major Industry Group Food	
Sample Source - Hillsborough County	
Total Records	2652
# Earning less than \$7.33	755
% Earning less than \$7.33	28.47%
Avg. Wage < \$7.33	\$6.23
# Earning less than \$9.33	1291
% Earning less than \$9.33	48.68%
Avg. Wage < \$9.33	\$7.07
# Earning less than \$9.97	1435
% Earning less than \$9.97	54.11%
Avg. Wage < \$9.97	\$7.32
# Earning less than \$11.97	1769
% Earning less than \$11.97	66.70%
Avg. Wage < \$11.97	\$7.97

Major Industry Group Public Utilities	
Sample Source - Florida	
Total Records	4246
# Earning less than \$7.33	259
% Earning less than \$7.33	6.10%
Avg. Wage < \$7.33	\$6.29
# Earning less than \$9.33	661
% Earning less than \$9.33	15.57%
Avg. Wage < \$9.33	\$7.56
# Earning less than \$9.97	814
% Earning less than \$9.97	19.17%
Avg. Wage < \$9.97	\$7.95
# Earning less than \$11.97	1254
% Earning less than \$11.97	29.53%
Avg. Wage < \$11.97	\$9.01

Major Industry Group Real Estate	
Sample Source - Hillsborough County	
Total Records	2505
# Earning less than \$7.33	230
% Earning less than \$7.33	9.18%
Avg. Wage < \$7.33	\$6.29
# Earning less than \$9.33	513
% Earning less than \$9.33	20.48%
Avg. Wage < \$9.33	\$7.41
# Earning less than \$9.97	594
% Earning less than \$9.97	23.71%
Avg. Wage < \$9.97	\$7.71
# Earning less than \$11.97	842
% Earning less than \$11.97	33.61%
Avg. Wage < \$11.97	\$8.63