



LOS ANGELES AREA
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Date: 6/24/14

Submitted in Econ. Dev. Committee

Council File No: 13-0991

Item No.: 4

~~Category:~~ Communication from the Public

June 24th, 2014

Honorable Herb Wesson
President, Los Angeles City Council
200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: OPPOSE – Economic Incentive Policy for Hotel Development

Dear President Wesson:

While we applaud the City Council's efforts to create a comprehensive and impactful incentive policy to bring greater Hotel development to Los Angeles, we must raise a serious concern regarding one of the base requirements in the current policy proposal for any project to be considered for incentive. That provision is Card Check Neutrality.

Card Check Neutrality is an undemocratic process that takes the power away from employees to vote to decide if they want to unionize. Card Check Neutrality does not protect the worker as a traditional National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) election does by ensuring a secret ballot, but instead allows union supporters to intimidate and outright bully employees until they sign a card agreeing to collective bargaining. Many employees are coerced or misled into signing these authorization cards, often being falsely told that they are merely health insurance enrollment forms, non-binding "statements of interest," requests for an election, or even tax forms. There are no protections for the workers in this process at all to ensure that these intimidation tactics or uses of outright lies do not happen.

The Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce and business community at large do not believe that the City of Los Angeles should be jeopardizing the rights of workers to pave the way for unions to force collective bargaining on hotels. We respectfully ask the City Council to remove this provision before finalizing the Economic Incentive Policy for Hotel Development.

Sincerely,

Gary Toebben
President & CEO



Comments 6.24.2014 Economic Development Agenda No. 4-CF 13-0991 Hotel Incentives

Joyce Dillard <dillardjoyce@yahoo.com>

Tue, Jun 24, 2014 at 1:00 PM

Reply-To: Joyce Dillard <dillardjoyce@yahoo.com>

To: Richard Williams <Richard.Williams@lacity.org>, "The Honorable Curren Price Jr." <councilmember.price@lacity.org>

Per the Chief Legislative Analyst report, anticipated revenues will be from:

1. net-new sales tax
2. business tax
3. utility tax
4. other tax revenues

PFK Consulting report states:

Among the obvious tax revenues that can be expected to increase with the development of a hotel are transient occupancy taxes

TOT Transit Occupancy Taxes are designed to reduce debt. Missing is the analysis of that break point. Waivers are not taken into consideration.

Missing is the consistency with the General Plan and Framework Element. Specifically, Framework Element Policy No. 3.3.2 which is the monitoring aspect of CEQA for the General Plan. It reads:

3.3.2 Monitor population, development, and infrastructure and service capacities within the City and each community plan area, or other pertinent service area.

The results of this monitoring effort will be annually reported to the City Council and shall be used in part as a basis to:

- a. Determine the need and establish programs for infrastructure and public service investments to accommodate development in areas in which economic development is desired and for which growth is focused by the General Plan Framework Element.*
- b. Change or increase the development forecast within the City and/or community plan area as specified in Table 2-2 (see Chapter 2: Growth and Capacity) when it can be demonstrated that (1) transportation improvements have been implemented or funded that increase capacity and maintain the level of service, (2) demand management or behavioral changes have reduced traffic volumes and maintained or improved levels of service, and (3) the community character will not be significantly impacted by such increases.*

Such modifications shall be considered as amendments to Table 2-2 and depicted on the community plans.

c. Initiate a study to consider whether additional growth should be accommodated, when 75 percent of the forecast of any one or more category listed in Table 2-2 (see Chapter 2: Growth and Capacity) is attained within a community plan area. If a study is necessary, determine the level of growth that should be accommodated and correlate that level with the capital, facility, or service improvements and/or transportation demand reduction programs that are necessary to accommodate that level.

d. Consider regulating the type, location, and/or timing of development, when all of the preceding steps have been completed, additional infrastructure and services have been provided, and there remains inadequate public infrastructure or service to support land use development. (P42, P43)

Please deny any incentives without all information and anticipated liabilities.

Joyce Dillard
P.O. Box 31377
Los Angeles, CA 90031
Email: dillardjoyce@yahoo.com