

Prince George's County, Maryland
Wage Determination Board
Annual Meeting
VIA Zoom
(301)883-6255 TTY (301)883-5167 Fax (301)883-6464

Meeting Minutes
January 12, 2024

Attendees:

Joy Anderson, Wage Determination Board Member

Orlando Bonilla, Wage Determination Board Member

Jonathan Butler, Director, Office of Central Services (OCS)

Tisa J.D. Clark, Wage Determination Board Member

Demetrius Coffey, Compliance Analyst, (OCS)

Lino Cressotti, Wage Determination Board Member

Pamela Dickerson, Deputy Director, OCS

Cory Jefferson, Compliance Manager, OCS

Gaurav Mittal, Office of Information Technology

Rayann Otto-Anderson, Wage Determination Board Administrator, OCS

Bruk Solomon, Compliance Analyst, OCS

The Wage Determination Board meeting was called to order by Rayann Otto-Anderson, Wage Determination Board Administrator at 11:03 a.m. on Friday, January 12, 2024. Ms. Otto-Anderson called for introductions from the Prince George's County Wage Determination Board (the Board) and all County staff who were present. All were introduced.

Ms. Otto-Anderson provided a summary of the 2023 wage determination survey. She explained that 423 surveys were confirmed, as delivered to organizations on the mailing list, which represents active email addresses after several were rejected or blocked from delivery. While 423 surveys were successfully delivered, 619 responses were received: yielding 723 individual survey inputs to various classifications. She further explained that she anticipates the total number of surveys to be submitted in future years will increase, as additional awards are made, and more organizations participate in the wage survey. 586 Building construction surveys and 33 Highway construction surveys were submitted. 73 surveys were rejected.

Mr. Bonilla requested a copy of the survey data summary and Ms. Otto-Anderson stated that she would provide that information to the Board.

Ms. Otto-Anderson explained the presentation of the survey data sheet to the Board, stating that she separated the data into 2 sections: Classifications where new data was received and classifications where no new data was received. She then recognized how this was different from the information that was

presented in past years and turned to the Board for a discussion of the wage data presented for the Highway classifications.

Mr. Cressotti asked whether the rejected surveys had any impact on the decreases in rates for any of the classifications. Ms. Otto-Anderson explained that there was no way to quantify any impact of the rejected surveys since they were not included in the data analysis.

Ms. Clark expressed concern that fringe benefit rates were removed from some classifications; however, Ms. Otto-Anderson explained to the Board that this observation is exactly what the data showed last year and stated that the Board maintained the fringe rates and accepted any addition to the hourly rates.

Mr. Bonilla asked if the intent of listing all the proposed new Laborer classifications separately was to list them with the different rates or if they should all be the same rate. Ms. Otto-Anderson reminded the Board that they asked her to break out all identified Laborer classifications for which data was received, as the Board wanted the option of reviewing the Laborer rates individually to decide about each of the individual classifications prior to them being added to the Laborer (Skilled) classification as a group. She further explained that the Board wanted the opportunity to compare each individual Laborer (Skilled) classification rate to the full group of Laborer (Skilled) classifications to see where there were increases or decreases within the classifications. Ms. Clark also explained that her proposal for the comparison was based on the need to have sufficient data to understand which Laborers should fall under the Laborer (Skilled) category prior to deciding on the Laborer (Skilled) group rate.

Mr. Bonilla observed that all the proposed Laborer (Skilled) either stayed the same or increased, except for the concrete Finisher classification which decreased by \$.50. The Board discussed the options of having 2 or 3 Laborer (Skilled) classifications but decided on 2: Laborer (Skilled) and Laborer (Unskilled/Common). Mr. Cressotti made a motion to have 2 categories of Laborers and Ms. Clark seconded the motion. All were in favor.

The Board agreed that they would adopt the following proposed Building Laborer (Skilled) classifications in Laborer (Skilled) at an hourly rate of \$29.47 with the fringe rate of \$9.10:

- Air Tool Operator
- Asphalt Paver
- Asphalt Raker
- Concrete Tender
- Concrete/Cement Finisher
- Flagger
- Form Setter
- Luteman
- Pipelayer
- Roller
- Skid Steer
- Tamper

Ms. Otto-Anderson recognized, Jonathan Butler, Director, Office of Central Services and requested his introduction to the Board. Mr. Butler introduced himself and thanked the Board for their hard work.

Cory Jefferson, Compliance Manager, asked whether the Board would like to see a breakout of the 10 classifications adopted by the Board each year. Mr. Cressotti advised that with the classifications adopted

under Laborer (Skilled), there won't be a need to show each individual Laborer (Skilled) subclassification; however, he explained that in the survey, each Laborer (Skilled) classification would be needed separately.

Ms. Otto-Anderson highlighted several classifications where the data showed an increase in the hourly rate, decreases in the hourly rate and the removal of the fringe rates. Ms. Clark made a motion to increase the hourly rate and disallow the fringe decrease resulting in the data. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cressotti.

Mr. Bonilla made a motion to accept the Highway rates as proposed including the changes made above. The motion was seconded by Ms. Clark seconded the motion.

Ms. Otto-Anderson presented the data for Building construction explaining that the combined Laborer (Skilled) rates being proposed is \$28.10 and \$9.01.

Mr. Bonilla stated that he needed to leave the meeting at 12:30 p.m.; however, he stated that since there isn't a change in the Laborer (Skilled) classification from last year, he would like to state his concurrence with the proposed rates. Mr. Bonilla made a motion to have 2 classifications under Laborer (Skilled) for Building: Laborer (Skilled) and Laborer (Unskilled/Common). The motion was seconded by Ms. Clark. All were in favor.

Ms. Clark made a motion to accept the proposed rates for Building determination with the same changes on the Highway determination, including the changes made to disallow any decreases in the fringe rates, accept the increases in hourly rates and accept the proposed additions to the Laborer (Skilled) classification. Mr. Cressotti seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Ms. Anderson asked how the Laborer (Skilled) rates were determined and Ms. Otto-Anderson explained that the Laborer (Skilled) rate is the combination of all the Laborer (Skilled) rates combined and based on the formula used to calculate those rates.

Mr. Cressotti made a motion to retain the Iron Worker (Reinforcing) hourly and fringe rates at the same level as the previous year. The motion was seconded by Ms. Clark. All were in favor.

Ms. Clark made a motion to accept the increase of the Drill Rig and Electrician and to disallow the rate decrease for the Truck Driver. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bonilla. All were in favor.

Ms. Otto-Anderson stated that the new classifications adopted into Laborer (Skilled) would be:

- Air Tool Operator
- Asphalt Paver
- Asphalt Raker
- Concrete Tender
- Finisher (Concrete/Cement)
- Flagger
- Hazardous Material Handler
- Luteman
- Pipelayer
- Skidsteer
- Tamper

Mr. Bonilla made the motion to adopt the proposed rates with the above changes by the Board. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cressotti.

Ms. Otto-Anderson presented the comparison reports and asked for the Board to discuss. The Board discussed the format of the determination and Ms. Otto-Anderson stated that she would forward all changes to the Board for review prior to submitting them to the newspapers of record for publishing. She stated that the State of Maryland minimum was increased to \$15 per hour and that the Mason Tender rate is currently at \$15.40 per hour which could be a concern for the Board. Mr. Cressotti asked if the County has a living wage and Ms. Otto-Anderson explained that the County's Livable Wage is currently \$16.60 per hour.

Mr. Jefferson explained that the Office of Law recognizes all contracts to be service contracts, in response to Ms. Clark's concern that a Mason Tender on a County construction contract would be paid less than the Livable Wage. Mr. Jefferson stated that the new Livable Wage rate is sent to all service contractors and County government agency heads annually around March of each year and becomes effective, annually, on July 1.

Mr. Cressotti made a motion stating that no classification should fall below the Prince George's County Livable Wage and should be set to automatically increase as the Livable Wage increases each year, in the future/next wage determination. Ms. Clark stated that she believes that no contractor on a County contract should be paid below what the County agrees is a Livable Wage and seconded the Mr. Cressotti's motion. All were in favor.

Mr. Cressotti asked for an update on payments to the wage monitoring consultants. Ms. Otto-Anderson provided an update stating that both consultants have been receiving payments, and while one of the consultants is up to date with payments and purchase orders, the other consultant still has some delinquent payments. Mr. Cressotti also asked if the contractors are currently working on the needed wage monitoring tasks and Ms. Otto-Anderson confirmed that the consultants have been monitoring assigned contracts.

Ms. Clark asked what actions will be taken to ensure that wage monitoring vendors are issued purchase orders and payments timely so that a repeat of the recent problems could be avoided in the future. Ms. Dickerson stated that while she will respond to the Board in writing, her office is working on a process to fix the issue and she will have more information to share later.

Ms. Otto-Anderson asked the Board for a recommendation regarding adding the County holidays to the wage determination. Ms. Anderson asked if the Board has a timeframe within which they need to respond and Mr. Jefferson explained that the Office of Central Services has followed up with the Office of Law several times regarding a response; however, to date they have not provided a response.

Antonio Hines, Integrated Logistics Services wage monitoring consultant began addressing his concern related to payments and purchase orders. Ms. Otto-Anderson asked Mr. Hines to pause until he is recognized by the Board. The Board confirmed their recognition and asked Mr. Hines to proceed with his public comment. Mr. Hines stated that they have been advised to not begin working until they receive a purchase order and indicated that he wanted to bring to the Board's attention that his company has been working on a few projects without purchase orders. He stated that if they cannot work then they cannot monitor, which is hurting the wage monitoring process and ultimately the workers.

Ms. Clark stated that once Ms. Dickerson provides her response to the Board's earlier question on this issue, the Board would be able to decide on how to proceed with this topic. Mr. Cressotti thanked Mr. Hines for his concerns and stated that his concern is that being 2 to 3 months behind is not good for the workers. Ms. Clark asked the Board to await Ms. Dickerson's response and indicated that the Board would respond

appropriately. Ms. Dickerson asked Mr. Hines to forward the information on the outstanding purchase orders to Ms. Otto-Anderson.

Ms. Otto-Anderson called for any additional discussions from the Board. Mr. Cressotti thanked Ms. Otto-Anderson and Gaurav Mittal for the work they did on the new Prevailing Wage System and made a motion for adjournment. Ms. Clark seconded the motion. All were in favor.

The meeting ended at 12:59 p.m.

Post Meeting Notes:

Following the meeting, the Board provided the following information regarding apprentice wages:

Generally, if an organization has a State of Maryland registered apprenticeship program, those program rates and standards would govern how apprentices are paid; however, if the organization does not have a registered apprenticeship program, and the apprentice is working on a Prince George's County project, the apprentice would be paid the Prince George's County prevailing wage rate.

Follow-up from Deputy Director, Pamela Dickerson:

Question: What actions will be taken to ensure that wage monitoring vendors are issued purchase orders and payment timely so that a repeat of the recent problems could be avoided in the future?

Response: The Office of Central Services has adopted a new process of accountability for wage monitoring program payables. A Compliance Unit representative has been assigned to be the focal point for receiving, reviewing, and submitting invoices to CIP for processing and payment. Compliance has also confirmed with the external agencies, DPW&T and DOE, that they have improved their internal processes for making invoice payments to our wage monitoring consultants.

As you're aware, new purchase orders must be issued from our financial system of record at the start of each fiscal year. I am looking at efficiencies and will be engaging with our procurement representatives to ensure that we are issuing purchase orders for wage monitoring consultants in the most expeditious manner possible. Please know that we are committed to ensuring that our wage monitoring program continues seamlessly for the benefit of all workers performing construction work in Prince George's County.