



[www.gangfree.org](http://www.gangfree.org)

**Gang Alternatives Program**

309 W. Opp Street  
Wilmington, CA 90744

888-293-9323

May 24, 2016

Councilmember Curren D. Price, Jr.  
Chair, Economic Development Committee  
200 N. Spring Street  
Room 395  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re. Council File 14-1371

Dear Councilmember Price,

For years the nonprofit Gang Alternatives Program (GAP) has provided its employees with five days of sick time and health insurance. We are prepared to increase that to six days, and we support the LA City Council's proposed change in principle. Our policy allows employees to take a single sick day at any time with appropriate notification of at least one hour before the start of an employee's work day. Appropriate notification requires only that HR or a manager be informed of the need to take the day, not any information on the nature of the need or illness.

The use of two or more consecutive sick days requires a release from a doctor or other appropriate medical professional certifying that an employee is fit to return to work. Since employees are provided with health insurance, they have access to health care and management through Kaiser Permanente, and we provide this to protect them, keep them healthy, and insure that they are fit to work after an illness. This release assures us that the employee will not be harmed by returning to work and also prevents ill employees from returning to work at the peril of other employees. This is an important management tool to protect employees and the company from unnecessary liability and risk.

As currently announced, the Los Angeles City Council approved a measure which we support in principle with one important exception. In City Council File No. 14-1371, item 3.g states

*"An employer shall provide paid sick days upon the oral or written request of an employee for themselves or a family member, as defined by State law, or for any individual related by blood or affinity whose close association with the employee is the equivalent of a family relationship; no documentation is required."*

The vagueness and uncertainty of this statement regarding "no documentation is required" is troublesome. If it refers in any way or can be inferred in any way by legal counsel to eliminate the ability of an employer to require verification of fitness to return to work or precludes an employer's ability to verify that an employee's return does not pose a risk to other employees or to the company, then it is bad law and needs to be changed before being finalized. If it simply refers to documentation on the legitimacy of an affinity or family relationship, then it should be specifically articulated and not left as a dangling requirement to a condition that starts with employee requests and ends with personal relationships.

The ability to manage employee safety and business liability is key to our success as a nonprofit entity. We cannot raise prices or add charges like for-profit businesses can. We urge the City Council and the City Attorney to affirm the right of an employer to manage employees and liability by clarifying this troubling phrase.

I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,