

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Amardeep Gill

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 12:35 PM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am a resident of CD 1. I urge you Los Angeles City Council to enact strong RIGHT OF RECALL and WORKER RETENTION policies to make sure workers can return to work when they are safely able to. As someone who's parents owned a small biz the right to re-call makes sense it will help save biz time and money to re-hire new workers and re-train workers. Also this will help provide security work laid of workers in this time. This makes sense in getting our local economy moving and getting people back to work once we get through this crisis. Please vote yes.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Kristen Schwarz  
**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 12:39 PM  
**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15  
**Comments for Public Posting:** Council MUST protect workers by passing right of retention - some of LA's tourist industries are going to see lay-offs over 90%. Those workers deserve to return without predatory employer manipulation.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** David Quattrocchi

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 12:43 PM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** Protect tenants with an indefinite full rent moratorium with fundraising assistance available to those who cannot pay it back within 6 months; provide job assistance for those laid off or fired during the next few months; provide all safety assistance including gloves and N95 masks for workers of grocery, drug retail, and food delivery with complete medical coverage for infected workers; cover sick leave for any workers sick or tending to sick loved ones during the pandemic; require retail food stores to dedicate one hour of customer business exclusively to the elderly and the disabled. And do this all with compassion and complete forgiveness in the name of humanity and love for your constituents who rely on you to assist in timely and helpful ways during crises such as this one.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Elizabeth Isralowitz  
**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 12:49 PM  
**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** I wish to speak on items 1-5, item 15 and public comment. I am speaking from the Los Angeles tenants union, Wilshire center Koreatown neighborhood council a resident of CD 13 and a worker in CD 14. I ask the council ammend items 1-5 to meet the requests of the Healthy LA coalition and the LA Tenants Union. I ask for a complete eviction moratorium for all evictions and the enactment of a renters right to council. To do this I request the city council hold an additional emergency meeting no later than March 30th to meet the April 1st rent deadline. Working though the weekend may not be ideal but is what many of us must do to make it by. The residents of Los Angeles call on you to use imenant domain to open all state, government agency, and city owned residential buildings and lots to immediate use as affordable housing and/or resource for the unhoused and unemployed. This includes immediate use if the 200 vacant homes owned by CalTrans and an end to the harassment of those reclaiming their rightful homes. The people of Los Angeles immediately call for all privately owned vacant residential units, many of which are owned by large corporations that have been bleeding our residents for years, to be used to house the unhoused and housing insecure who are ready to transition independent housing. After which these units should continue to be made available to these individuals at a rate to be negotiated with residents and local support agencies. I also ask that as we continue into this recession like none any of us have experienced before you authorize a roll back of all rent increases over the past 5 years of more than a cumulative 10% . On item 15 I completely support the cities acquisition of Hillside Villa. For the record I would like to divulge I am not a renter, I am homeowner and at one time a landlord, and a public school teacher I worked two jobs to save to purchase my home. But I support people of this city the majority of whom are renters and are struggling. If this all sounds extreme to landlords be aware renters hold the numbers and in numbers there is power. I believe protections should be given to small rental owners but we should not be bailing out corporate developers and landlords. Finally, I ask that the city council and the city attorney's office place a moratorium on all Los Angeles city planning approvals of discretionary and non-discretionary projects until a system of teleconferencing is in place or the crisis

has subsided and NCs are conducting regular meetings.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** hodan

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 01:08 PM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** Restaurants and other businesses are lobbying hard for exemptions to LA's emergency paid sick leave ordinance. Workers MUST be able to stay home when they are sick. Workers need 80 additional hours of paid sick leave with no carve-outs and no exemptions!  
We need a #HealthyLA

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Louie Ryan

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 12:59 PM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Los Angeles City Councilmembers, On behalf of the thousands of restaurants in the City of Los Angeles, I would like to express our strong opposition to motion 72J and 72KK regarding the establishment of a citywide “just cause termination” policy that would cripple restaurants long-term ability to function during and after the COVID-19 crisis. The coronavirus poses unprecedented challenges to this nation- and Los Angeles in particular- and while we applaud the Mayor’s executive efforts to minimize its impact and keep Angelenos safe, the government ordered closure of restaurant dining rooms has forced restaurants to either adjust their business model by providing meals through takeout or delivery only or shutting down completely. As currently written, motion 72J fails to take into account the manner in which restaurants operate, and the fact that restaurants that remain open during the current crisis do so with many costs and challenges. Compliance with the City and County Department of Public Health orders have forced restaurants to make unplanned, and unfortunate adjustments to operations and staffing levels. If motion 72J were to pass, the unwarranted consequences would be immediate and severe. Adding insult to injury, to say the least. Under such a mandate, restaurants would be forced to keep staff on payroll (even though the restaurant has had its revenue cut by government closure) based on seniority rather than need, such as chefs and cooks. This would undoubtedly lead to a much higher rate of restaurant closures, loss of employment, and forgone tax revenue to the city. Motion 72J not only hurts existing restaurants, it hinders the possibility of new ownership (once the crisis clears) by way of the “workers retentions policy” which requires that new ownership offer previous employees the first positions that become available at the establishment based on seniority. Understanding that the restaurant industry operates with low margins on a good day and dwindling cash flow in the midst of this public health crisis, it is misguided to place additional barriers for those who could potentially enter the restaurant community for a job. The restaurant community is heavily regulated by the State and County Department of Public Health and already abides by all employee hygiene and sanitary requirements. Motion 72J imposes redundant and unnecessary requirements such as the need for employers to provide a 15-minute break every 4 hours given that

the CA Department of Industrial Relations provides all employees with a 10-minute break every 4 hours. Such practices are already in place and all employees who handle food are required to possess a CA Food Handlers Card, providing an additional layer of training and compliance. Food safety has always been our business- nothing is more important to a restaurant. Angeles restaurants is- and should continue to be- driven by public health officials at the County Department of Public Health. They are not calling for this and we work collaboratively with those experts on a regular basis. For these reasons, we urge a NO vote on motion 72J and 72KK as they can have a detrimental impact to the entire restaurant industry in the City of Los Angeles. Sincerely, Louie Ryan



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Gina Palencar

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 01:29 PM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** I urge City Council to enact a strong right of recall and worker retention policy that includes protections against retaliation. Workers should be able to return to work when they are safely able to! Many workers have been at their jobs for their entire careers. They deserve to come back to work as soon as it is safe. This should be the case even if companies go bankrupt and/or are sold during the crisis. Please don't leave Angelenos without the ability to get back on their feet after this crisis is over. I support the Healthy LA platform.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Adam Perry Lang  
**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 01:26 PM  
**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** My name is Adam Perry Lang, I own APL, a restaurant in Hollywood My number one priority right now is to support and provide for my employees and feeding the public, including those who are in a compromised position and in need of assistance. I'm also being forward thinking and want to ensure that my employees will have a job to come back to once the COVID-19 crisis passes. I also want to support all the businesses we depend on, and in turn depend on us, we are a tight web. I'm currently working very hard with skeleton crew of 5 people to provide for the community. I currently have no way to pay past their reduced salaries and our cost of goods...all other costs have been put on hold just to keep the business operational and provide for the community. I ask that you strongly oppose Item 20-0147-S39. This will bankrupt me and every other restaurant, bar and retail store in Los Angeles. As a small business, few of us can afford to pay 2 weeks severance for every employee, we were shut down by the City and don't have those types of reserves. We also ask that you please oppose Motions 20-0147-S15 and 20-0147-S42. Both motions will make it harder to bring our employees back as soon as possible. Although these rules may be applicable to other businesses...independent restaurants like mine would struggle and be unable to reopen if this ordinance took effect. Please understand this will affect both restaurant employees and small business owners. Again, My number one priority is to support and provide for every one of my employees but I also want to ensure that they will have a job to come back to once the COVID-19 crisis passes.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Zaid

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 01:23 PM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** I have been a small business owner in LA since 1984, employing many people through the decades, currently 32. Some how, with tremendous efforts we have made it through earthquakes, riots, fires & recessions. However this ordinance will be absolutely devastating to small businesses that are already suffering tremendously. If this proposed ordinance passes we will not be able to open our doors again. Leaving another 32 plus myself unemployed. Small businesses are the back bone of our economy, therefore this proposed ordinance will do far more damage than good, since small businesses are vital to restoring our local economy.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Nancy Hoffman Vanyek

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 01:21 PM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** I represent the Greater San Fernando Valley Chamber of Commerce, an organization that represents businesses that employ over 80,000 workers. We are in opposition of the conditions under the Right to Recall measure. This ordinance would make it impossible to run a business, not just during the public health and economic crisis, but indefinitely. We need the City of Los Angeles to develop policies and programs to support a robust economy by encouraging job creation and opportunities. As an organization that runs a job training program that improves employee quality and retention, we know firsthand that companies do not want to lose their experienced employees, but have had to make difficult decisions during this crisis. This decision should continue to lie in their hands only. When they are able, we know they will want to rehire their former employees as it is quicker and cheaper to hire back experienced workers than train new ones. As businesses throughout Los Angeles are suffering during this crisis, some of which have already shuttered permanently, the City must act to ensure their survival instead of imposing burdensome rules and regulations that hamper how they run their business.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Reghan Alexander

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 01:21 PM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** This motion will make it harder to bring our employees back as soon as possible. Although these rules may be applicable to other businesses, independent restaurants like mine would struggle and be unable to reopen if this ordinance took effect. Please oppose!!!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Steve Margaroni

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 01:16 PM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** I'm Steve Margaroni CEO/President of Psomas headquartered in Los Angeles We are a Professional Engineering service firm providing 'essential' services to the public and private markets. This ordinance reduces our ability to be flexible and will hinder our ability to services to our clients (like you The City of LA). Imposing a seniority recall system doesn't allow us to rehire the needed employees when the time comes. For example, do you want us to bring back the pipeline designer to work on your bridge design that impacts public safety. Also, the ordinance does address the issue of 'qualified' but it will force us, the individuals, our clients and the courts in determining who is 'qualified. Since we already comply with all the state and federal laws regarding non-discrimination we don't understand the purpose of this. It will cause us to think really, really hard about hiring anyone since we don't want to get involved in those sorts of claims. I'm sure professional service organizations like ours are not what you intended for the ordinance and we therefore request a waiver for 'essential service' firms like ours or opposition this ordinance. Thank you for your leadership during these difficult times.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Joseph C

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 01:15 PM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** Councilmembers, I appreciate what you are doing but rushing something like S15 is a mistake and it will absolutely hurt small businesses in all of the ways that VICA has indicated in their public comments. In the event that you must act, please limit the time frame to no more than six months and remove the shameless handout to the plaintiff's bar (e.g. the punitive damages). Also, there should be a waiver provision allowed. Remember, sometimes things that we do to help have unintended consequences. This will not help workers and will certainly hurt our small businesses.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Lauren Ahkiam

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 12:24 PM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** Los Angeles City Council must enact strong RIGHT OF RECALL and WORKER RETENTION policies to make sure workers can return to work when they are safely able to. Many workers have been at their jobs for their entire careers. They deserve to come back to work as soon as it is safe.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Juan Vasquez

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 12:02 PM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am a constituent from the 8th District and more than ever our city council needs to step up to protect working families. A lot of my neighbors have been laid off. We want to be called back to our jobs and go back to the ways things used to be as soon as possible. We deserve paid sick time off, we can not afford to be sick and make others sick.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Heather Sperling

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 12:07 PM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hello -- I am a business owner in Silver Lake, Los Angeles. Items 2 and 4 will cripple the small businesses that most need support at this time. I want to be clear that, as the owner of a local restaurant that employees a diverse, beloved staff of 48 people, The proposed ordinances will definitively end up hurting our employees more than they would help them, because of the damage they would wreak on the healthy operation of our business. Item 2, worker retention Both motions will make it harder to bring our employees back as soon as possible. Although these rules may be applicable to other businesses, these rules ARE NOT PRODUCTIVE OR RELEVANT to independent restaurants like mine. We would struggle and be unable to reopen or operate healthily if this ordinance took effect. Small business operators like me and my peers MUST be allowed to operate using their best judgement. Policies like these are destructive to existing businesses and act as deterrents to future small businesses opening in our area. Item 4, Regarding the two weeks of sick pay: Businesses will never be able to reopen if we are forced to pay a 2 week severance to every single employee because we were shut down by the City of Los Angeles! No small business has the liquidity to pay this type of compensation when there is no cash flow coming in, and nearly all restaurants are already shouldering massive debt from the start-up costs of their operations. This employee payout would force us to take on debt from which we would never recover. We would likely be forced to close--and then our 48 beloved staff members would be permanently out of work.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Marlene Montanez

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 11:56 AM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** Workers in my community need jobs more than ever and once the pandemic passes my community in South Central will be the worst hit. We need to have a right to recall. We need good jobs and a right to return to the jobs that fired us due to the epidemic.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Janel Bailey, LA Black Worker Center

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 11:38 AM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** As a lifelong worker advocate and now director of the Los Angeles Black Worker Center, where we organize and advocate for the rights, health & safety of Black workers, I urge the council to pass this right to recall today. Since the COVID crisis has taken hold of our economy, Black workers are losing hours, getting sent home, and getting laid off from their jobs faster than our services can keep pace with. Given the reality of the Black jobs crisis, in which more than half of Black workers are unemployed and underemployed, Black workers were already in a dangerous position. The reality of the COVID crisis is further devastating our communities, and it will undoubtedly have longer term effects for us than other communities. The "right to recall" means that Black workers and their families will have a chance to at least return to normal once our economy begins to heal. With the resources we hope the city council and county will access to support Angelenos, we must see Black workers share in that prosperity with the right to return to their jobs. We are in a moment where ideas previously considered impossible, are now very possible. Let's not empower any bad actors in our communities to take advantage of this crisis as a moment to get rid of Black workers, undocumented workers or any disadvantaged workers.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Christina

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 11:19 AM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** Right of Recall Ordinance As an employer I am concerned that this ordinance would require employers to rehire under performing employees. As a non-profit this could pose potential employment issues. Please reconsider this ordinance for private and public employers who do not have a CBA or MOU in effect.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Kevin Ciavarra

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 10:52 AM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** March 26, 2020 The Honorable Nury Martinez Los Angeles City Council President 200 N Spring Street, Suite 470 Los Angeles, CA 90012 SUBJECT: Right to Recall Workers Ordinance; (Council File: 20-0147-s15) - OPPOSE Dear Council President Martinez, First I want to commend the work and dedication by the Los Angeles City Council to slow the spread of COVID-19 and the efforts to provide relief for residents and businesses. While we appreciate the City Council withdrawing its efforts to impose a policy in which workers would be discharged in order of seniority, I have sincere concerns with the proposed Right to Recall Workers ordinance, especially at a time when many businesses are struggling to survive. The proposed Right to Recall ordinance would present additional challenges for businesses during this economic crisis, eliminating flexibility that businesses need to survive, preserve jobs and remain in their communities over the long term. Requiring businesses to recall employees based on seniority would make operating a business impossible during this public health and economic crisis. This requirement would undoubtedly worsen staffing needs, as businesses would be required to wait 10 days after a recall offer has been made to an employee before being able to offer the position to another worker. Requiring a recall based on seniority also hurts newer skilled workers who were hired for moderate to high-level jobs prior to the COVID-19 crisis as they would remain without a job. Several young workers who are just starting their careers would continue to find themselves unable to afford rent, food and other essentials. Some business owners have already made tough business decisions due to the financial crisis caused by COVID-19. Creating a rebuttable presumption for any termination which occurred on or after March 4, 2020 would mean any business that has already made an economic decision would be subject to lawsuits. This is clearly a just cause termination ordinance as business owners would need to go to court to prove a worker was terminated for cause, which means high legal expenses for employers. At a time when many businesses are facing financial hardships, opening the door to lawsuits would contradict efforts to provide relief for businesses. Moreover, this ordinance has a no waiver section, which means that no settlements can be met, no separation agreements for

consideration can be entered into and all disciplinary terminations will end in litigation. This will cost local businesses millions of dollars as most Employment Practice Liability Insurance have a \$25,000 deductible per claim. The two-year effective date of this ordinance is excessive and could go well beyond this crisis. We would recommend the ordinance be effective until December 31, 2020 to be consistent with the other urgency clauses being considered by the City Council. Existing laws prevent discrimination of all types and with a wide myriad of classes, which are protected. So long as companies comply with those important societal laws there should be no reason to dispense with the time-honored doctrine of “at-will employment” and permitting employment decisions to be based on the legitimate business judgment of a business owner. Furthermore, there are numerous businesses that are deemed essential during this crisis that should be exempted. The 10-day wait to fill a position in hospitals could mean the difference between life and death for many Angelenos. There is also no public policy argument for including a collective bargaining exemption for non-essential businesses. This is not required by law and should be removed. Consequently, including punitive damages for violation of this ordinance is just overkill and will overburden businesses in their recovery. As businesses throughout Los Angeles are suffering during this crisis, some of which have already shuttered permanently, the City must act to ensure their survival. We urge you to oppose the proposed Right to Recall Workers ordinance; and oppose any policy that seeks to preempt a company’s own business judgment, and simultaneously binds the hands of employers during this most troubling and unprecedented crisis. Thank you for your consideration on this issue.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Robin L Kellogg

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 09:41 AM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** As the Chair of The North Valley Regional Chamber of Commerce and on behalf of my board, I urge the Council to vote against the ordinances that would dictate how businesses react to this crisis.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Colin Diaz  
**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 08:46 AM  
**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** Good Morning, The Culver City Chamber of Commerce, as a neighbor to the City of Los Angeles, is very concerned about the City Council's following proposed articles that will be voted on today. We understand that the decisions made in the City of Los Angeles often set precedence for the region. We want you to do so in a responsible and thoughtful way: · Article 4-72J-A to Chapter XX of the Los Angeles Municipal Code re: Recall of Laid Off Workers due to COVID-19; · Article 5-72HH to Chapter XX of the Los Angeles Municipal Code: Requiring employers within the City that are not already doing so to provide all employees with paid sick leave in order to achieve two weeks (10 days) of COVID-19-related paid leave to the extent permitted by law Trying to impose public civil service rules on the private sector is not only nonsensical, but is also a model that will not work. Furthermore, it is shameful that in a time that has impacted so many negatively, particularly the business community, Council would deem this as the right time to try and force the private sector to run their business a certain way. Instead, City Council should be focused on laying the foundation to support businesses and help them get through this time so that they can get back on their feet and employ the great people of our region. Put measures and aid in place that will stimulate the business economy and lead to more jobs and more income flowing to the people of the region. Please do not pass these articles. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Nicole Zalazer

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 08:55 AM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hello Councilmember I write on behalf of fellow entrepreneurs and business owners operating in the City of LA as well as my companies, 1-800-GOT-JUNK?, You Move Me & HazAwayToday.com, about the LA City Council's COVID proposal. The sick leave requirements and other proposed actions are overreaching and go well beyond federal law. The City Council is imposing new costs on small businesses that are already crippled and trying to figure a way to open or remain open, as we are (essential activities), against all odds. We have immediately seen a 45% drop in sales and revenue, which was worse than the Great Recession, and that drop happened gradually over two years. If you impose this, and it is retroactive, meaning, even though people are on unemployment and have a federal check coming their way, they'll be paid a lump sum for sick leave just to rehire them (via a CARES Act loan). So they will (a) be overcompensated because they won't repay the unemployment and the fed grant will more than cover the difference and (b) will have to come up with even more money just to try and put this business back together. This crisis has already cost my Los Angeles businesses \$300K just in the last few weeks. And the employees won't have any sick leave to use because you already made them use it up! So they'll be right back in the position you're hoping that they avoid. They'll be worse off. Or we will be when we grant them more leave in the future. Or have to shut the businesses down because we do not have enough people or have to pay them significantly more to entice them to want to work. Please get rid of the retroactive part and make it track federal law. I get trying to take care of the working people. They're getting screwed, they're getting hit hard (not as hard as small business -we're financing the shutdown with every penny we have and a lot we don't), and deserve to be made whole. We didn't need to give grants to Boeing, Carnival, American Airlines, etc. We didn't want that. We're not being made whole for our suffering. We're going to lose every penny of liquidity we have and have to go into debt to move forward. Small business is not the enemy that we're being treated as. We're not Scrooge McDuck swimming in gold coins. We're people who are mentally ill enough to try and create things that we think people want or need. Now we're being punished for that beyond the uncompensated economic taking that

the shut down orders constitute. All this is going to accomplish is that businesses on the fence will just give up, rehire nobody, and use the CARES Act money to buy out of personal guarantees and declare BK. The sick leave liability will end up being personal under the state law – assuming it is legal to change the law after the fact. So, yes, the employment bar will be thankful. They get to add insult to injury and shake us down for that money on the way to BK court – when it reopens. I have no idea why you wouldn't just line this up with the Federal law – it requires sick leave 100% of pay if you're sick, 2/3 for caretaker, and it is reimbursed through tax credits. We're just a conduit. Same with wages. We can get these CARES Act SBA loans, pay people to do nothing (stores are still forced closed), pay people the SAME 2 weeks' pay that they would get but (a) use a forgivable loan to do it or (b) offset it against federal employer side taxes in future payrolls. What you guys are doing is conjuring up a significant impediment to restarting businesses and subjecting even failing businesses to a bonus personal liability for having the audacity to ever employ people, invest money, and take risks. We have put our life savings into our businesses. Businesses are trying to grow it to make our investments back. That probably never happens. This ordinance will kill any chance we have. Our employees want to come back to work. They love their jobs, we have low turnover. They'll be hosed. They will not be gaining experience and leadership. They'll be on their couches. Please reconsider this draconian measure. Nicole Zalazar / HR Director 1-800-GOT-JUNK?

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Martin Breidsprecher

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 08:56 AM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am writing you this morning to urge you to vote NO on all three ordinances being discussed in today's emergency meeting. All three of these ordinances impose unrecoverable costs and hardships to the Los Angeles business community that will have long term implications not only for our businesses but also for the Los Angeles region.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Raychel Hedge

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 08:59 AM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hello Councilmember I write on behalf of fellow employees and business owners operating in the City of LA as well as my companies, 1-800-GOT-JUNK?, You Move Me & HazAwayToday.com, about the LA City Council's COVID proposal. The sick leave requirements and other proposed actions are overreaching and go well beyond federal law. The City Council is imposing new costs on small businesses that are already crippled and trying to figure a way to open or remain open, as we are (essential activities), against all odds. We have immediately seen a 45% drop in sales and revenue, which was worse than the Great Recession, and that drop happened gradually over two years. If you impose this, and it is retroactive, meaning, even though people are on unemployment and have a federal check coming their way, they'll be paid a lump sum for sick leave just to rehire them (via a CARES Act loan). So they will (a) be overcompensated because they won't repay the unemployment and the fed grant will more than cover the difference and (b) will have to come up with even more money just to try and put this business back together. This crisis has already cost my Los Angeles businesses \$300K just in the last few weeks. And the employees won't have any sick leave to use because you already made them use it up! So they'll be right back in the position you're hoping that they avoid. They'll be worse off. Or we will be when we grant them more leave in the future. Or have to shut the businesses down because we do not have enough people or have to pay them significantly more to entice them to want to work. Please get rid of the retroactive part and make it track federal law. I get trying to take care of the working people. They're getting screwed, they're getting hit hard (not as hard as small business -we're financing the shutdown with every penny we have and a lot we don't), and deserve to be made whole. We didn't need to give grants to Boeing, Carnival, American Airlines, etc. We didn't want that. We're not being made whole for our suffering. We're going to lose every penny of liquidity we have and have to go into debt to move forward. Small business is not the enemy that we're being treated as. We're not Scrooge McDuck swimming in gold coins. We're people who are mentally ill enough to try and create things that we think people want or need. Now we're being punished for that beyond the uncompensated economic taking that

the shut down orders constitute. All this is going to accomplish is that businesses on the fence will just give up, rehire nobody, and use the CARES Act money to buy out of personal guarantees and declare BK. The sick leave liability will end up being personal under the state law – assuming it is legal to change the law after the fact. So, yes, the employment bar will be thankful. They get to add insult to injury and shake us down for that money on the way to BK court – when it reopens. I have no idea why you wouldn't just line this up with the Federal law – it requires sick leave 100% of pay if you're sick, 2/3 for caretaker, and it is reimbursed through tax credits. We're just a conduit. Same with wages. We can get these CARES Act SBA loans, pay people to do nothing (stores are still forced closed), pay people the SAME 2 weeks' pay that they would get but (a) use a forgivable loan to do it or (b) offset it against federal employer side taxes in future payrolls. What you guys are doing is conjuring up a significant impediment to restarting businesses and subjecting even failing businesses to a bonus personal liability for having the audacity to ever employ people, invest money, and take risks. We have put our life savings into our businesses. Businesses are trying to grow it to make our investments back. That probably never happens. This ordinance will kill any chance we have. Our employees want to come back to work. They love their jobs, we have low turnover. They'll be hosed. They will not be gaining experience and leadership. They'll be on their couches. Please reconsider this draconian measure. Raychel Hedge, Controller

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Drew Boyles

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 08:25 AM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hello Councilmember, I write on behalf of fellow entrepreneurs and business owners operating in the City of LA as well as my companies, 1-800-GOT-JUNK?, You Move Me & HazAwayToday.com, about the LA City Council's COVID proposal. The sick leave requirements and other proposed actions are overreaching and go well beyond federal law. The City Council is imposing new costs on small businesses that are already crippled and trying to figure a way to open or remain open, as we are (essential activities), against all odds. We have immediately seen a 45% drop in sales and revenue, which was worse than the Great Recession, and that drop happened gradually over two years. If you impose this, and it is retroactive, meaning, even though people are on unemployment and have a federal check coming their way, they'll be paid a lump sum for sick leave just to rehire them (via a CARES Act loan). So they will (a) be overcompensated because they won't repay the unemployment and the fed grant will more than cover the difference and (b) will have to come up with even more money just to try and put this business back together. This crisis has already cost my Los Angeles businesses \$300K just in the last few weeks. And the employees won't have any sick leave to use because you already made them use it up! So they'll be right back in the position you're hoping that they avoid. They'll be worse off. Or we will be when we grant them more leave in the future. Or have to shut the businesses down because we do not have enough people or have to pay them significantly more to entice them to want to work. Please get rid of the retroactive part and make it track federal law. I get trying to take care of the working people. They're getting screwed, they're getting hit hard (not as hard as small business -we're financing the shutdown with every penny we have and a lot we don't), and deserve to be made whole. We didn't need to give grants to Boeing, Carnival, American Airlines, etc. We didn't want that. We're not being made whole for our suffering. We're going to lose every penny of liquidity we have and have to go into debt to move forward. Small business is not the enemy that we're being treated as. We're not Scrooge McDuck swimming in gold coins. We're people who are mentally ill enough to try and create things that we think people want or need. Now we're being punished for that beyond the uncompensated economic taking that

the shut down orders constitute. All this is going to accomplish is that businesses on the fence will just give up, rehire nobody, and use the CARES Act money to buy out of personal guarantees and declare BK. The sick leave liability will end up being personal under the state law – assuming it is legal to change the law after the fact. So, yes, the employment bar will be thankful. They get to add insult to injury and shake us down for that money on the way to BK court – when it reopens. I have no idea why you wouldn't just line this up with the Federal law – it requires sick leave 100% of pay if you're sick, 2/3 for caretaker, and it is reimbursed through tax credits. We're just a conduit. Same with wages. We can get these CARES Act SBA loans, pay people to do nothing (stores are still forced closed), pay people the SAME 2 weeks' pay that they would get but (a) use a forgivable loan to do it or (b) offset it against federal employer side taxes in future payrolls. What you guys are doing is conjuring up a significant impediment to restarting businesses and subjecting even failing businesses to a bonus personal liability for having the audacity to ever employ people, invest money, and take risks. We have put our life savings into our businesses. Businesses are trying to grow it to make our investments back. That probably never happens. This ordinance will kill any chance we have. Our employees want to come back to work. They love their jobs, we have low turnover. They'll be hosed. They will not be gaining experience and leadership. They'll be on their couches. Please reconsider this draconian measure.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Heidi Weis  
**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 08:26 AM  
**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hello Councilmember, I write on behalf of fellow entrepreneurs and business owners operating in the City of LA as well as my companies, 1-800-GOT-JUNK?, You Move Me & HazAwayToday.com, about the LA City Council's COVID proposal. The sick leave requirements and other proposed actions are overreaching and go well beyond federal law. The City Council is imposing new costs on small businesses that are already crippled and trying to figure a way to open or remain open, as we are (essential activities), against all odds. We have immediately seen a 45% drop in sales and revenue, which was worse than the Great Recession, and that drop happened gradually over two years. If you impose this, and it is retroactive, meaning, even though people are on unemployment and have a federal check coming their way, they'll be paid a lump sum for sick leave just to rehire them (via a CARES Act loan). So they will (a) be overcompensated because they won't repay the unemployment and the fed grant will more than cover the difference and (b) will have to come up with even more money just to try and put this business back together. This crisis has already cost my Los Angeles businesses \$300K just in the last few weeks. And the employees won't have any sick leave to use because you already made them use it up! So they'll be right back in the position you're hoping that they avoid. They'll be worse off. Or we will be when we grant them more leave in the future. Or have to shut the businesses down because we do not have enough people or have to pay them significantly more to entice them to want to work. Please get rid of the retroactive part and make it track federal law. I get trying to take care of the working people. They're getting screwed, they're getting hit hard (not as hard as small business -we're financing the shutdown with every penny we have and a lot we don't), and deserve to be made whole. We didn't need to give grants to Boeing, Carnival, American Airlines, etc. We didn't want that. We're not being made whole for our suffering. We're going to lose every penny of liquidity we have and have to go into debt to move forward. Small business is not the enemy that we're being treated as. We're not Scrooge McDuck swimming in gold coins. We're people who are mentally ill enough to try and create things that we think people want or need. Now we're being punished for that beyond the uncompensated economic taking that

the shut down orders constitute. All this is going to accomplish is that businesses on the fence will just give up, rehire nobody, and use the CARES Act money to buy out of personal guarantees and declare BK. The sick leave liability will end up being personal under the state law – assuming it is legal to change the law after the fact. So, yes, the employment bar will be thankful. They get to add insult to injury and shake us down for that money on the way to BK court – when it reopens. I have no idea why you wouldn't just line this up with the Federal law – it requires sick leave 100% of pay if you're sick, 2/3 for caretaker, and it is reimbursed through tax credits. We're just a conduit. Same with wages. We can get these CARES Act SBA loans, pay people to do nothing (stores are still forced closed), pay people the SAME 2 weeks' pay that they would get but (a) use a forgivable loan to do it or (b) offset it against federal employer side taxes in future payrolls. What you guys are doing is conjuring up a significant impediment to restarting businesses and subjecting even failing businesses to a bonus personal liability for having the audacity to ever employ people, invest money, and take risks. We have put our life savings into our businesses. Businesses are trying to grow it to make our investments back. That probably never happens. This ordinance will kill any chance we have. Our employees want to come back to work. They love their jobs, we have low turnover. They'll be hosed. They will not be gaining experience and leadership. They'll be on their couches. Please reconsider this draconian measure.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Rick Vogel  
**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 08:26 AM  
**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15  
**Comments for Public Posting:** Urge the Council to vote NO on the Right of Recall draft ordinance.



March 27, 2020

The Honorable Nury Martinez  
President, Los Angeles City Council  
City Hall  
200 North Spring Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Re: Item #2: COVID-19 Citywide Worker Retention and Right of Recall Ordinances

Dear Council President Martinez,

On behalf of the Related Companies, I am writing today to urge a no vote on the Citywide Worker Retention and Right of Recall Ordinances.

We are incredibly sympathetic to the issues the City Council is working hard to address with these packages of emergency ordinances designed to protect workers in these fragile times. We share the concerns expressed by the Council in trying to find solutions to the issues we are all grappling with during these unprecedented circumstances. But, in seeking quick solutions, we fear that there may be unintended consequences that end up doing more harm than good for the very people we are all working hard to protect.

Specifically, regarding the Right of Recall proposed ordinance, we are gravely concerned about the impacts of this ordinance as written. The rebuttable presumption that all workers who are terminated after a date certain are being laid off without cause is a seriously flawed approach. It does not allow employers to make responsible decisions about employees who may need to be terminated for important and grave reasons – like criminal activity, sexual harassment or behaviors leading to unsafe work environments. As written, employers managing employees like these would have to go to court to prove these circumstances at great cost to the employer and with serious consequences for the court system.

In addition, in the case of many construction projects still providing jobs and much needed economic support in these times, there are already meaningful worker protections built into development agreements, project labor agreements, and other negotiated community benefits agreements. Those terms should be honored and at the very least, if an ordinance like this were to move forward, we believe previously negotiated worker retention programs should be honored and those projects should be exempted from this ordinance.

We urge your no vote on this proposed ordinance as presented and hope that you will consider the amendment and issues suggested above. Thank you for your continued efforts on behalf of all Angelenos and for the Council's leadership during this crisis.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Richard H. Vogel".

Richard H. Vogel  
Senior Vice President  
Related Urban

CC: All Members of the Los Angeles City Council  
The Honorable Eric Garcetti, Mayor  
The Honorable Mike Feuer, City Attorney

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Rick Weis  
**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 08:27 AM  
**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hello Councilmember, I write on behalf of fellow entrepreneurs and business owners operating in the City of LA as well as my companies, 1-800-GOT-JUNK?, You Move Me & HazAwayToday.com, about the LA City Council's COVID proposal. The sick leave requirements and other proposed actions are overreaching and go well beyond federal law. The City Council is imposing new costs on small businesses that are already crippled and trying to figure a way to open or remain open, as we are (essential activities), against all odds. We have immediately seen a 45% drop in sales and revenue, which was worse than the Great Recession, and that drop happened gradually over two years. If you impose this, and it is retroactive, meaning, even though people are on unemployment and have a federal check coming their way, they'll be paid a lump sum for sick leave just to rehire them (via a CARES Act loan). So they will (a) be overcompensated because they won't repay the unemployment and the fed grant will more than cover the difference and (b) will have to come up with even more money just to try and put this business back together. This crisis has already cost my Los Angeles businesses \$300K just in the last few weeks. And the employees won't have any sick leave to use because you already made them use it up! So they'll be right back in the position you're hoping that they avoid. They'll be worse off. Or we will be when we grant them more leave in the future. Or have to shut the businesses down because we do not have enough people or have to pay them significantly more to entice them to want to work. Please get rid of the retroactive part and make it track federal law. I get trying to take care of the working people. They're getting screwed, they're getting hit hard (not as hard as small business -we're financing the shutdown with every penny we have and a lot we don't), and deserve to be made whole. We didn't need to give grants to Boeing, Carnival, American Airlines, etc. We didn't want that. We're not being made whole for our suffering. We're going to lose every penny of liquidity we have and have to go into debt to move forward. Small business is not the enemy that we're being treated as. We're not Scrooge McDuck swimming in gold coins. We're people who are mentally ill enough to try and create things that we think people want or need. Now we're being punished for that beyond the uncompensated economic taking that

the shut down orders constitute. All this is going to accomplish is that businesses on the fence will just give up, rehire nobody, and use the CARES Act money to buy out of personal guarantees and declare BK. The sick leave liability will end up being personal under the state law – assuming it is legal to change the law after the fact. So, yes, the employment bar will be thankful. They get to add insult to injury and shake us down for that money on the way to BK court – when it reopens. I have no idea why you wouldn't just line this up with the Federal law – it requires sick leave 100% of pay if you're sick, 2/3 for caretaker, and it is reimbursed through tax credits. We're just a conduit. Same with wages. We can get these CARES Act SBA loans, pay people to do nothing (stores are still forced closed), pay people the SAME 2 weeks' pay that they would get but (a) use a forgivable loan to do it or (b) offset it against federal employer side taxes in future payrolls. What you guys are doing is conjuring up a significant impediment to restarting businesses and subjecting even failing businesses to a bonus personal liability for having the audacity to ever employ people, invest money, and take risks. We have put our life savings into our businesses. Businesses are trying to grow it to make our investments back. That probably never happens. This ordinance will kill any chance we have. Our employees want to come back to work. They love their jobs, we have low turnover. They'll be hosed. They will not be gaining experience and leadership. They'll be on their couches. Please reconsider this draconian measure.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** JoAnn May  
**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 08:27 AM  
**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hello Councilmember, I write on behalf of fellow entrepreneurs and business owners operating in the City of LA as well as my companies, 1-800-GOT-JUNK?, You Move Me & HazAwayToday.com, about the LA City Council's COVID proposal. The sick leave requirements and other proposed actions are overreaching and go well beyond federal law. The City Council is imposing new costs on small businesses that are already crippled and trying to figure a way to open or remain open, as we are (essential activities), against all odds. We have immediately seen a 45% drop in sales and revenue, which was worse than the Great Recession, and that drop happened gradually over two years. If you impose this, and it is retroactive, meaning, even though people are on unemployment and have a federal check coming their way, they'll be paid a lump sum for sick leave just to rehire them (via a CARES Act loan). So they will (a) be overcompensated because they won't repay the unemployment and the fed grant will more than cover the difference and (b) will have to come up with even more money just to try and put this business back together. This crisis has already cost my Los Angeles businesses \$300K just in the last few weeks. And the employees won't have any sick leave to use because you already made them use it up! So they'll be right back in the position you're hoping that they avoid. They'll be worse off. Or we will be when we grant them more leave in the future. Or have to shut the businesses down because we do not have enough people or have to pay them significantly more to entice them to want to work. Please get rid of the retroactive part and make it track federal law. I get trying to take care of the working people. They're getting screwed, they're getting hit hard (not as hard as small business -we're financing the shutdown with every penny we have and a lot we don't), and deserve to be made whole. We didn't need to give grants to Boeing, Carnival, American Airlines, etc. We didn't want that. We're not being made whole for our suffering. We're going to lose every penny of liquidity we have and have to go into debt to move forward. Small business is not the enemy that we're being treated as. We're not Scrooge McDuck swimming in gold coins. We're people who are mentally ill enough to try and create things that we think people want or need. Now we're being punished for that beyond the uncompensated economic taking that

the shut down orders constitute. All this is going to accomplish is that businesses on the fence will just give up, rehire nobody, and use the CARES Act money to buy out of personal guarantees and declare BK. The sick leave liability will end up being personal under the state law – assuming it is legal to change the law after the fact. So, yes, the employment bar will be thankful. They get to add insult to injury and shake us down for that money on the way to BK court – when it reopens. I have no idea why you wouldn't just line this up with the Federal law – it requires sick leave 100% of pay if you're sick, 2/3 for caretaker, and it is reimbursed through tax credits. We're just a conduit. Same with wages. We can get these CARES Act SBA loans, pay people to do nothing (stores are still forced closed), pay people the SAME 2 weeks' pay that they would get but (a) use a forgivable loan to do it or (b) offset it against federal employer side taxes in future payrolls. What you guys are doing is conjuring up a significant impediment to restarting businesses and subjecting even failing businesses to a bonus personal liability for having the audacity to ever employ people, invest money, and take risks. We have put our life savings into our businesses. Businesses are trying to grow it to make our investments back. That probably never happens. This ordinance will kill any chance we have. Our employees want to come back to work. They love their jobs, we have low turnover. They'll be hosed. They will not be gaining experience and leadership. They'll be on their couches. Please reconsider this draconian measure.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Trevonte Yarbrough  
**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 08:31 AM  
**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hello Councilmember, I write on behalf of fellow entrepreneurs and business owners operating in the City of LA as well as my companies, 1-800-GOT-JUNK?, You Move Me & HazAwayToday.com, about the LA City Council's COVID proposal. The sick leave requirements and other proposed actions are overreaching and go well beyond federal law. The City Council is imposing new costs on small businesses that are already crippled and trying to figure a way to open or remain open, as we are (essential activities), against all odds. We have immediately seen a 45% drop in sales and revenue, which was worse than the Great Recession, and that drop happened gradually over two years. If you impose this, and it is retroactive, meaning, even though people are on unemployment and have a federal check coming their way, they'll be paid a lump sum for sick leave just to rehire them (via a CARES Act loan). So they will (a) be overcompensated because they won't repay the unemployment and the fed grant will more than cover the difference and (b) will have to come up with even more money just to try and put this business back together. This crisis has already cost my Los Angeles businesses \$300K just in the last few weeks. And the employees won't have any sick leave to use because you already made them use it up! So they'll be right back in the position you're hoping that they avoid. They'll be worse off. Or we will be when we grant them more leave in the future. Or have to shut the businesses down because we do not have enough people or have to pay them significantly more to entice them to want to work. Please get rid of the retroactive part and make it track federal law. I get trying to take care of the working people. They're getting screwed, they're getting hit hard (not as hard as small business -we're financing the shutdown with every penny we have and a lot we don't), and deserve to be made whole. We didn't need to give grants to Boeing, Carnival, American Airlines, etc. We didn't want that. We're not being made whole for our suffering. We're going to lose every penny of liquidity we have and have to go into debt to move forward. Small business is not the enemy that we're being treated as. We're not Scrooge McDuck swimming in gold coins. We're people who are mentally ill enough to try and create things that we think people want or need. Now we're being punished for that beyond the uncompensated economic taking that

the shut down orders constitute. All this is going to accomplish is that businesses on the fence will just give up, rehire nobody, and use the CARES Act money to buy out of personal guarantees and declare BK. The sick leave liability will end up being personal under the state law – assuming it is legal to change the law after the fact. So, yes, the employment bar will be thankful. They get to add insult to injury and shake us down for that money on the way to BK court – when it reopens. I have no idea why you wouldn't just line this up with the Federal law – it requires sick leave 100% of pay if you're sick, 2/3 for caretaker, and it is reimbursed through tax credits. We're just a conduit. Same with wages. We can get these CARES Act SBA loans, pay people to do nothing (stores are still forced closed), pay people the SAME 2 weeks' pay that they would get but (a) use a forgivable loan to do it or (b) offset it against federal employer side taxes in future payrolls. What you guys are doing is conjuring up a significant impediment to restarting businesses and subjecting even failing businesses to a bonus personal liability for having the audacity to ever employ people, invest money, and take risks. We have put our life savings into our businesses. Businesses are trying to grow it to make our investments back. That probably never happens. This ordinance will kill any chance we have. Our employees want to come back to work. They love their jobs, we have low turnover. They'll be hosed. They will not be gaining experience and leadership. They'll be on their couches. Please reconsider this draconian measure.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 08:02 AM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** a restaurant owner impacted by the CITY mandated closure. There is no way we could have kept employees on payroll after closing . It was not our choice to lay off staff. There is no money to pay sick leave. There is no money period. In which world do you live??? YOU will drive almost every single bar or restaurant into bankruptcy with this. During this time you cannot put all the responsibility on the small business owners. The government is supposed to be the safety net NOT the business. And what happened to CA law of AT WILL EMOLOYMENT? Please do not pass this .

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 08:36 AM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** The idea is noble, but I would hope it would be obvious to the Council and the City Attorney that such an ordinance would be unconstitutional and would result in needless litigation and wasted resources. As a law professor serving three Southern California universities, I think any constitutional law lawyer would agree that this is Con Law 101. Again, noble effort, but not the right approach.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jaime Garcia

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 08:36 AM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** The Hospital Association of Southern California represents over 30 hospitals in the City of Los Angeles writes in opposition of the Right of Recall motion. ALL hospitals are presently working diligently to rapidly expand their capacity by an additional 40 percent per Governor Gavin Newsom's directive in order to prepare for the surge of patients seeking medical treatment due to CORVID-19 pandemic. Accomplishing this directive requires a series of steps that include, but not limited to deployment of temporary tent(s) outside a hospital, purchasing additional supplies, equipment acquisition; and recruitment of additional healthcare workers to support the expanded operation. This motion will simply penalize hospitals. It will penalize hospitals for steps they've taken to comply with the Governor's emergency declaration once the surge is declared to have subsided and hospitals retract to their normal operation. While this motion was introduced with best of intentions, the financial consequence for hospitals, where approximately 40 percent currently operate in the red, is significant and the lack of a financial analyses by the City further warrant that this item not be approved by the City Council. I respectfully request you vote "NO" on this item. Thank you, Jaime Garcia Regional Vice President - Los Angeles Region Hospital Association of Southern CA

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jane Zighelboim Awni

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 08:37 AM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** Today small business owners, like myself are concerned if we will still have a business in the next 30days and you are trying to pass laws that create a tremendous burden us. Ordinances 20-0147-S15,20-0147-S35, 20-0147-S42 and 20-0147-S39 will pose far greater damage then benefit to the community at large, given that small businesses like mine are vital to restoring our local economy. If passed they will decimate small businesses including mine, that employees 32 Californians including my husband and myself. More sick leave sounds great, although who will pay for it?Businesses are trying to stay alive and do not need any additional expenses that would be detrimental.We oppose these measures and we ask at a minimum you put a moratorium on this for the next 90 days until we can see how things are due to Covid-19. More of the business community needs to be part of the decision making process. Please vote no on the two aforementioned proposed ordinances and give small businesses a well deserved chance.If you vote in favor of these proposed ordinances, know that many of us will never be able to open again.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 10:38 AM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** The City should not be mandating employee practices when business had no responsibility for the mandated closures. Since there is no help to businesses from the City, why add to the business burden? Businesses are closing and this will make it even harder for them to recover. A business that is not operating should be excluded from this legislation.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Gregory Bell

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 10:43 AM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Mayor Garcetti and Distinguished Council Members, I am writing you this email on behalf of the Conga Room at LA LIVE. Many of your are friends of the Conga Room, having visited many times over the years. We look forward to more visits and better times ahead in the near future. In the interim, during this unparalleled time of crisis in our country, state county and beautiful City of Los Angeles, we are writing you in opposition to the Right of Recall and Worker Retention ordinances being proposed today. Our business made the difficult decision to lay off its employees. Like so many others, the future is uncertain, and we are working thru the myriad of regulations and stimulus packages to see what, if any, we are eligible for, without a clear timeline for a reopening. When we do reopen, we should not be saddled with additional regulations effecting our hiring obligations and strategies. Rather we should be allowed to make business decisions based on need and ability, while maintaining flexibility. One must remember that prior to our sudden, necessary closure, unemployment was at historic lows making it difficult to find good, well trained, responsible employees. As businesses across our country have been forced to close, when we reopen we should be able to hire the "best of the best" as we, the business owner, decides. Additionally, there must be a more transparent and open process when dealing with the rights of business owners. While business owners by the millions are hunkered down at home taking care of themselves and their families, or sick, this is not the time to create new regulations. We urge you to schedule a meeting of stakeholders and have a transparent dialogue with us before taking any action. We have been a model company and employer for years, and value our employees and are very attentive to their rights, but this is not the time to address these matters. We appreciate the leadership Mayor Garcetti and this Council has shown and will continue to show during this crisis and we hope the public/private partnership in particular how it relates to new, retroactive regulations, will be address democratically, with appropriate public feedback and commentary. We urge a "no" vote of the all new proposed regulations, especially the Right of Recall and Worker Retention ordinance. Warmly and respectfully, The Conga Room Gregory Bell



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Dickey's Barbecue Pit

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 09:35 AM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** March 26, 2020 The Honorable Nury Martinez Los Angeles City Council President 200 N Spring Street, Suite 470 Los Angeles, CA 90012 SUBJECT: Right to Recall Workers Ordinance; (Council File: 20-0147-s15) - OPPOSE Dear Council President Martinez, Dickey's Barbecue Pit commends the work and dedication by the Los Angeles City Council to slow the spread of COVID-19 and the efforts to provide relief for residents and businesses. While we appreciate the City Council withdrawing its efforts to impose a policy in which workers would be discharged in order of seniority, we still have concerns with the proposed Right to Recall Workers ordinance, especially at a time when many businesses are struggling to survive. The Right to Recall Workers Ordinance would:

- Require businesses that have discharged employees to recall employees based on seniority rather than skills, competence, specific employer needs or legitimate pay scale considerations.
- Require a 10-day waiting period after a business has recalled an employee in which the employee would need to accept or decline the offer.
- Create a rebuttable presumption that any termination which occurred on or after March 4, 2020, was due to a non-disciplinary action.
- Not provide exemptions for first responders, creating a disastrous effect on Los Angeles' ability to combat COVID-19.
- Provide an exemption for Collective Bargaining Agreement.
- Make businesses responsible for damages suffered by the discharged employee.
- Be in effect until March 4, 2022.

The proposed Right to Recall ordinance would present additional challenges for businesses during this economic crisis, eliminating flexibility that businesses need to survive, preserve jobs and remain in their communities over the long term. Requiring businesses to recall employees based on seniority would make operating a business impossible during this public health and economic crisis. This requirement would undoubtedly worsen staffing needs, as businesses would be required to wait 10 days after a recall offer has been made to an employee before being able to offer the position to another worker. Requiring a recall based on seniority also hurts newer skilled workers who were hired for moderate to high-level jobs prior to the COVID-19 crisis as they would remain without a job. Several young workers who are just starting their careers would continue to find themselves unable to afford

rent, food and other essentials. Some business owners have already made tough business decisions due to the financial crisis caused by COVID-19. Creating a rebuttable presumption for any termination which occurred on or after March 4, 2020 would mean any business that has already made an economic decision would be subject to lawsuits. This is clearly a just cause termination ordinance as business owners would need to go to court to prove a worker was terminated for cause, which means high legal expenses for employers. At a time when many businesses are facing financial hardships, opening the door to lawsuits would contradict efforts to provide relief for businesses. Moreover, this ordinance has a no waiver section, which means that no settlements can be met, no separation agreements for consideration can be entered into and all disciplinary terminations will end in litigation. This will cost local businesses millions of dollars as most Employment Practice Liability Insurance have a \$25,000 deductible per claim. The two-year effective date of this ordinance is excessive and could go well beyond this crisis. We would recommend the ordinance be effective until December 31, 2020 to be consistent with the other urgency clauses being considered by the City Council. Existing laws prevent discrimination of all types and with a wide myriad of classes, which are protected. So long as companies comply with those important societal laws there should be no reason to dispense with the time-honored doctrine of “at-will employment” and permitting employment decisions to be based on the legitimate business judgment of a business owner. Furthermore, there are numerous businesses that are deemed essential during this crisis that should be exempted. The 10-day wait to fill a position in hospitals could mean the difference between life and death for many Angelenos. There is also no public policy argument for including a collective bargaining exemption for non-essential businesses. This is not required by law and should be removed. Consequently, including punitive damages for violation of this ordinance is just overkill and will overburden businesses in their recovery. As businesses throughout Los Angeles are suffering during this crisis, some of which have already shuttered permanently, the City must act to ensure their survival. We urge you to oppose the proposed Right to Recall Workers ordinance; and oppose any policy that seeks to preempt a company’s own business judgment, and simultaneously binds the hands of employers during this most trou

March 26, 2020

The Honorable Nury Martinez  
Los Angeles City Council President  
200 N Spring Street, Suite 470  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

**SUBJECT: Right to Recall Workers Ordinance; (Council File: 20-0147-s15) - OPPOSE**

Dear Council President Martinez,

Dickey's Barbecue Pit commends the work and dedication by the Los Angeles City Council to slow the spread of COVID-19 and the efforts to provide relief for residents and businesses.

While we appreciate the City Council withdrawing its efforts to impose a policy in which workers would be discharged in order of seniority, we still have concerns with the proposed Right to Recall Workers ordinance, especially at a time when many businesses are struggling to survive.

The Right to Recall Workers Ordinance would:

- Require businesses that have discharged employees to recall employees based on seniority rather than skills, competence, specific employer needs or legitimate pay scale considerations.
- Require a 10-day waiting period after a business has recalled an employee in which the employee would need to accept or decline the offer.
- Create a rebuttable presumption that any termination which occurred on or after March 4, 2020, was due to a non-disciplinary action.
- Not provide exemptions for first responders, creating a disastrous effect on Los Angeles' ability to combat COVID-19.
- Provide an exemption for Collective Bargaining Agreement.
- Make businesses responsible for damages suffered by the discharged employee.
- Be in effect until March 4, 2022.

The proposed Right to Recall ordinance would present additional challenges for businesses during this economic crisis, eliminating flexibility that businesses need to survive, preserve jobs and remain in their communities over the long term.

Requiring businesses to recall employees based on seniority would make operating a business impossible during this public health and economic crisis. This requirement would undoubtedly worsen staffing needs, as businesses would be required to wait 10 days after a recall offer has been made to an employee before being able to offer the position to another worker. Requiring a recall based on seniority also hurts newer skilled workers who were hired for moderate to high-level jobs prior to the COVID-19 crisis as they would remain without a job. Several young workers who are just starting their careers would continue to find themselves unable to afford rent, food and other essentials.

Some business owners have already made tough business decisions due to the financial crisis caused by COVID-19. Creating a rebuttable presumption for any termination which occurred on or after March 4, 2020 would mean any business that has already made an economic decision would be subject to lawsuits. This is clearly a just cause termination ordinance as business owners would need to go to court to prove a worker was terminated for cause, which means high legal expenses for employers.

At a time when many businesses are facing financial hardships, opening the door to lawsuits would contradict efforts to provide relief for businesses. Moreover, this ordinance has a no waiver section, which means that no settlements can be met, no separation agreements for consideration can be entered into and all disciplinary terminations will end in litigation. This will cost local businesses millions of dollars as most Employment Practice Liability Insurance have a \$25,000 deductible per claim.

The two-year effective date of this ordinance is excessive and could go well beyond this crisis. We would recommend the ordinance be effective until December 31, 2020 to be consistent with the other urgency clauses being considered by the City Council. Existing laws prevent discrimination of all types and with a wide myriad of classes, which are protected. So long as companies comply with those important societal laws there should be no reason to dispense with the time-honored doctrine of “at-will employment” and permitting employment decisions to be based on the legitimate business judgment of a business owner.

Furthermore, there are numerous businesses that are deemed essential during this crisis that should be exempted. The 10-day wait to fill a position in hospitals could mean the difference between life and death for many Angelenos. There is also no public policy argument for including a collective bargaining exemption for non-essential businesses. This is not required by law and should be removed.

Consequently, including punitive damages for violation of this ordinance is just overkill and will overburden businesses in their recovery. As businesses throughout Los Angeles are suffering during this crisis, some of which have already shuttered permanently, the City must act to ensure their survival.

We urge you to oppose the proposed Right to Recall Workers ordinance; and oppose any policy that seeks to preempt a company’s own business judgment, and simultaneously binds the hands of employers during this most troubling and unprecedented crisis.

Thank you for your consideration on this issue.

Todd Schwartz  
Owner/Operator  
Dickey’s Barbecue Pit

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Sarah Wiltfong  
**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 10:47 AM  
**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15  
**Comments for Public Posting:** We are writing to you to on behalf of BizFed, the Los Angeles County Business Federation. We are an alliance of over 190 business organizations who represent 400,000 employers with 3.5 million employees in Los Angeles County to express our STRONG opposition to the Right of Recall and the Citywide Right of Retention emergency ordinances. Attached is our formal letter.

The Honorable Nury Martinez  
Los Angeles City Council President  
200 N Spring Street, Suite 470  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

**SUBJECT: Right to Recall and Right of Retention Workers Ordinances; (Council File: 20-0147-s15) - OPPOSE**

Dear Council President Martinez,

We are writing to you to on behalf of BizFed, the Los Angeles County Business Federation. We are an alliance of over 190 business organizations who represent 400,000 employers with 3.5 million employees in Los Angeles County to express our STRONG opposition to the Right of Recall and the Citywide Right of Retention emergency ordinances.

While we commend the Los Angeles City Council for their efforts to address the COVID-19 pandemic, the above ordinances would only worsen the current economic crisis and provide additional burdens for the job-providers already struggling to survive.

Requiring businesses to recall employees based on seniority over merit would undoubtedly worsen staffing needs, as there are a variety of reasons why an employer may choose to hire one person over another. In addition, requiring businesses to wait 10 days after a recall offer has been made to an employee before being able to offer the position to another worker not only can that cause significant delay for businesses who are trying to recover from a significant downturn, a two week wait period can be the difference between and mortgage payment and a car payment for other employees ready to work.

In addition, creating a rebuttable presumption for any termination which occurred on or after March 4, 2020 would mean any business that has already made an economic decision would be subject to lawsuits. This ordinance has a no waiver section, which means that no settlements can be met, no separation agreements for consideration can be entered into and all disciplinary terminations will end in litigation.

Furthermore, the effective date of the Right of Recall ordinance is excessive and could go well beyond this crisis. There is also no public policy argument why there is a collective bargaining exemption for non-essential businesses. If these ordinances are truly about protecting the economy in the wake of COVID-19, then the this should end after the crisis is over and businesses should be held accountable regardless if there is a collective bargaining agreement in place.

Now more than ever businesses need flexibility and should be empowered to keep their doors open instead of being burdened with different regulations. There are a myriad of reasons why employers may choose to lay off some workers over others and why they also may choose to rehire some over others. It's always a difficult decision based on the needs of the time, and that decision should be left up to the business owner, not LA City Council.

We appreciate you considering our comments and we hope you will OPPOSE these two ordinances.

Sincerely,\



Sandy Sanchez  
BizFed Chair  
FivePoint



David Fleming  
BizFed Founding Chair



Tracy Hernandez  
BizFed Founding CEO  
IMPOWER, Inc.

## BizFed Association Members

Action Apartment Association  
Alhambra Chamber of Commerce  
American Beverage Association  
American Hotel & Lodging Association  
American Institute of Architects – Los Angeles  
Angeles Emeralds  
Apartment Association, California Southern Cities  
Apartment Association of Greater Los Angeles  
Arcadia Association of REALTORS  
AREAA North Los Angeles SFV SCV  
Asian Business Association  
Association of Club Executives  
Association of Independent Commercial Producers  
Azusa Chamber of Commerce  
Bell Gardens Chamber of Commerce  
Beverly Hills Bar Association  
Beverly Hills Chamber of Commerce  
BNI4SUCCESS  
Boyle Heights Chamber of Commerce  
Building Industry Association, LA / Ventura  
Building Industry Association, Baldyview  
Building Owners & Managers Association, Greater LA  
Burbank Association of REALTORS  
Burbank Chamber of Commerce  
Business & Industry Council for Emergency Planning & Preparedness  
Business Resource Group  
CA Natural Resources Producers Assoc  
CalAsian Chamber  
CalCFA  
California Apartment Association, Los Angeles  
California Asphalt Pavement Association  
California Association of Food Banks  
California Bankers Association  
California Bus Association  
California Business Roundtable  
California Cannabis Industry Association  
California Cleaners Association  
California Construction and Industry Materials Association  
California Contract Cities Association  
California Fashion Association  
California Gaming Association  
California Grocers Association  
California Hispanic Chamber of Commerce  
California Hotel & Lodging Association  
California Independent Oil Marketers Association  
California Independent Petroleum Association  
California Life Sciences Association  
California Manufacturers & Technology Association  
California Metals Coalition  
California Restaurant Association  
California Retailers Association  
California Small Business Alliance  
California Society of CPAs -Los Angeles Chapter  
California Sportfishing League  
California Trucking Association  
Californians for Balanced Energy Solutions  
Carson Chamber of Commerce  
Carson Dominguez Employers Alliance  
CDC Small Business Finance  
Central City Association  
Century City Chamber of Commerce  
Cerritos Regional Chamber of Commerce  
Citrus Valley Association of REALTORS  
Commercial Industrial Council/Chamber of Commerce  
Construction Industry Air Quality Coalition  
Construction Industry Coalition on Water

Quality  
Council on Trade and Investment for Filipino Americans  
Covina Chamber of Commerce  
Culver City Chamber of Commerce  
Downey Association of REALTORS  
Downey Chamber of Commerce  
Downtown Center Business Improvement District  
Downtown Long Beach Alliance  
El Monte/South El Monte Chamber  
El Segundo Chamber of Commerce  
Employers Group  
Engineering Contractor's Association  
EXP  
F.A.S.T. - Fixing Angelenos Stuck In Traffic  
FilmLA  
Friends of Hollywood Central Park  
Fur Information Council of America  
FuturePorts  
Gardena Valley Chamber of Commerce  
Gateway to LA  
Glendale Association of REALTORS  
Glendale Chamber of Commerce  
Glendora Chamber of Commerce  
Greater Antelope Valley Association of REALTORS  
Greater Lakewood Chamber of Commerce  
Greater Los Angeles African American Chamber  
Greater Los Angeles Association of REALTORS  
Greater Los Angeles New Car Dealers Association  
Harbor Trucking Association  
Historic Core Business Improvement District  
Hollywood Chamber of Commerce  
Hong Kong Trade Development Council  
Hospital Association of Southern California  
Hotel Association of Los Angeles  
Huntington Park Area Chamber of Commerce  
Independent Cities Association  
Industry Business Council +  
Inglewood Airport Area Chamber of Commerce  
Inland Empire Economic Partnership  
International Warehouse Logistics Association  
La Cañada Flintridge Chamber of Commerce  
L.A. County Medical Association  
L.A. Fashion District BID  
L.A. South Chamber of Commerce  
Lancaster Chamber of Commerce  
Larchmont Boulevard Association  
Latino Food Industry Association  
LAX Coastal Area Chamber of Commerce  
League of California Cities  
Long Beach Area Chamber of Commerce  
Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce  
Los Angeles County Board of Real Estate  
Los Angeles County Waste Management Association  
Los Angeles Gateway Chamber of Commerce  
Los Angeles Gay and Lesbian Chamber of Commerce  
Los Angeles Latino Chamber of Commerce  
Los Angeles Parking Association  
Marketplace Industry Association  
Motion Picture Association of America  
MoveLA a Project of Community  
NAIOP Southern California Chapter  
National Association of Royalty Owners  
National Association of Tobacco Outlets  
National Association of Women Business Owners  
National Association of Women Business Owners – Los Angeles

National Hispanic Medical Association  
National Latina Businesswomen  
Orange County Business Council  
Pacific Merchant Shipping Association  
Pacific Palisades Chamber of Commerce  
Panorama City Chamber of Commerce  
Paramount Chamber of Commerce  
Pasadena Chamber of Commerce  
Pasadena-Foothills Association of Realtors  
PhRMA  
Planned Parenthood Southern Affiliates of California  
Pomona Chamber of Commerce  
Propel L.A.  
Rancho Southeast Association of REALTORS  
Recording Industry Association of America  
Regional Black Chamber - San Fernando Valley  
Regional Hispanic Chamber of Commerce  
Regional Chamber of Commerce-San Gabriel Valley  
Rosemead Chamber of Commerce  
San Dimas Chamber of Commerce  
San Gabriel Chamber of Commerce  
San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership  
San Pedro Peninsula Chamber of Commerce  
Santa Clarita Valley Chamber of Commerce  
Santa Clarita Valley Economic Development Corp.  
Santa Monica Chamber of Commerce  
Sherman Oaks Chamber of Commerce  
South Bay Association of Chambers  
South Bay Association of REALTORS  
South Gate Chamber of Commerce  
Southern California Contractors Association  
Southern California Golf Association  
Southern California Grantmakers  
Southern California Leadership Council  
Southern California Minority Suppliers Development Council Inc. +  
Southern California Water Coalition  
Southland Regional Association of REALTORS  
Sunland-Tujunga Chamber of Commerce  
The Young Professionals at the Petroleum Club  
Torrance Area Chamber  
Town Hall Los Angeles  
Tri-Counties Association of REALTORS  
United Chambers San Fernando Valley & Region  
United States-Mexico Chamber  
Unmanned Autonomous Vehicle Systems Association  
US Green Building Council  
US Resiliency Council  
Valley Economic Alliance  
Valley Industry & Commerce Association  
Vernon Chamber of Commerce  
Vietnamese American Chamber of Commerce  
Warner Center Association  
West Hollywood Chamber of Commerce  
West Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce  
West San Gabriel Valley Association of REALTORS  
West Valley/Warner Center Association Chamber  
Western Manufactured Housing Association  
Western States Petroleum Association  
Westside Council of Chambers  
Westwood Community Council  
Westwood Village Rotary Club  
Whittier Chamber of Commerce  
Wilmington Chamber of Commerce  
World Trade Center Los Angeles  
Young Professionals in Energy - LA Chapt

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Patrick Spillane  
**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 10:22 AM  
**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15  
**Comments for Public Posting:** Please see attached letter for posting of public comment.





March 27, 2020

The Honorable Nury Martinez  
Los Angeles City Council President  
200 N Spring Street, Suite 470  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

**RE: “Worker Retention” and “Right of Recall” ordinance (Council File: 20-0147-s15)**

Dear Council President Martinez:

On behalf of IDS Real Estate Group, I am writing to respectfully ask that you oppose the proposed “Right of Recall” ordinance proposed by the City Attorney and make changes to the “Worker Retention” ordinance proposed by the City Attorney, in which such workers will be discharged in order of seniority and have a right of recall in order of seniority.

In these times of uncertainty, as businesses are forced to make increasingly difficult decisions, business owners require discretion to make the decisions they must in order to continue their business. Businesses are fighting to generate revenue that would allow them to stay open and not lay off their employees, but unfortunately it is increasingly difficult to do so. This policy does not give businesses flexibility and infringes on their ability to operate to keep their doors open. This policy will only lead to more business closures further reducing jobs.

We understand the need to protect employees and pledge to be a partner to continue working together to ensure as many workers are protected as possible. We want to make clear that this is the time to empower small and medium size businesses and ensure they can keep their doors open, not enact new regulations making it even more difficult to continue operations. Making this ordinance retroactive to March 4<sup>th</sup> only makes it more difficult for businesses to continue operations because they will not be subject to regulations that were not in place when they made difficult decisions to lay off employees based on immense financial burdens from this pandemic.

We would like to commend the Los Angeles City Council and your continued leadership in this time of uncertainty and global pandemic. The many challenges facing our City today are unprecedented and can only be mitigated through partnership and strong leadership. As businesses, from small to large, navigate this new normal and fight to keep their doors open, we urge the City Council to consider all stakeholders when implementing new regulations and ordinances.

For these reasons, our organization strongly urges a no vote on the proposed “Right of Recall” ordinance as well as the “Worker Retention” ordinance. If you have questions please contact me. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Patrick D. Spillane  
Senior Vice President

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Greater LA African American Chamber of Commerce  
**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 07:29 AM  
**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15  
**Comments for Public Posting:** This ordinance is not just during the emergency but is permanent and is bad for business. We need to empower businesses at this time, not further regulate them.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Rod Spackman

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 07:46 AM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** As a company with several hundred small businesses (dealer owned stations) in the region, Chevron Corporation strongly opposes effort to alter current labor practices as we all work to respond to the national crisis.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Rod Spackman

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 07:51 AM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** As a company with several hundred small businesses (dealer owned stations) in the region, Chevron Corporation strongly opposes effort to alter current labor practices as we all work to respond to this national crisis.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jessica Ceballos y Campbell

**Date Submitted:** 03/26/2020 11:17 PM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hello, my name is Jessica Ceballos y Campbell and I am a mother, a tenant, an artist and arts administrator, and community organizer from and currently residing in Highland Park. I am writing to ask my city council to enact stronger protections for our community in response to COVID-19. Our families and vulnerable community members need immediate action to protect our health and our livelihoods. I urge my Councilmember Gil Cedillo and my entire LA City Council board to support motions to:

1. Enact a Strong Moratorium on Evictions related to both nonpayment of rent and the presence of unauthorized occupants and pets, as well as all “no cause” evictions. People should not have to go to court to prove the impact of coronavirus on them to counter an eviction filing. Nobody should be evicted during an emergency that requires people to shelter in place.
2. Have the City should work with the State and financial institutions to continue suspending mortgage payments for homeowners and landlords, and forgive rent obligations for the duration of the crisis, including a recovery period after the state of emergency is lifted.
3. Implement an immediate freeze on all residential and commercial rent increases and prohibit landlords from charging late fees.
4. Immediately supply dumpsters, showers, hand washing stations, bathrooms, vermin abatement, soap, and water to every informal settlement in Los Angeles.
5. Protect workers’ livelihoods by enacting “just cause,” “right of recall,” and “worker retention” policies to stop unscrupulous employers from unjustly terminating workers during this crisis, and to ensure that when it is safe to return to work, they still have jobs to return to.
6. Prioritize workplace health and safety, including mandated paid time for and access to hand-washing and sanitizing, provision of protective gear, and appropriate training for those still at work, especially grocery workers, food service workers, and delivery drivers.
7. Provide 14 days of paid sick leave to all workers and prohibit retaliation against those who take it. Workers must feel safe to stay home through their illness for the public’s safety.

Thank you in advance, as I trust that you will consider the best and safest interest of your constituents. Jessica Ceballos y Campbell

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jack Bulko

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 03:06 PM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** Recall should be based on "need driven by public demand" and not seniority. If I need a heart surgeon with less seniority than a foot surgeon, I don't care how much seniority the foot surgeon has. He can't help me. We don't need more layers of bureaucracy, especially Now. Business owners will instinctively do all they can to stay open, retain and hire employees and survive to work another day. The city can employ thousands of out of work people ,even on a temporary basis, in areas of desperate need like homelessness clean up, remote tutoring, neighborhood beautification, graffiti removal and much more. Small business is struggling to survive, maybe you should reduce our tax and regulatory burden so we can keep employees, pay our taxes, overhead, etc. Stop punitive policies NOW!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Alec Vandenberg

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 02:50 PM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hi my name is Alec and I am a USC student who lives in University Park. I'm writing to ensure that all workers in Los Angeles can return to their jobs when this terrible crisis ends without fear of retaliation or favoritism by their boss. As you have heard, workers at Mr. C and Chateau Marmont were terminated with no commitment to recall when business recovers. This is outrageous. And it is being replicated in workplaces all around Los Angeles. We cannot let this crisis be exploited to get rid of long time and loyal workers

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 02:47 PM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** Item #2 Hello I'm Correy, a current Undergraduate at USC. I'm here to ensure that all workers in Los Angeles can return to their jobs when this pandemic ends without fear of retaliation or favoritism by their boss. As you have heard, workers at Mr. C and Chateau Marmont were terminated with no commitment to recall when business recovers. This is outrageous. And it is being replicated in workplaces all around Los Angeles. We cannot let this crisis be exploited to get rid of long time and loyal workers. I am reaching out in hopes that you will think and act humanely and empathetically.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Ariella Amit

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 02:47 PM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hi my name is Ariella Amit and I am a USC student living in Los Angeles 90007. I'm here to ensure that all workers in Los Angeles can return to their jobs when this terrible crisis ends without fear of retaliation or favoritism by their boss. As you have heard, workers at Mr. C and Chateau Marmont were terminated with no commitment to recall when business recovers. This is outrageous. And it is being replicated in workplaces all around Los Angeles. We cannot let this crisis be exploited to get rid of long time and loyal workers.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Cristina Echiverri  
**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 01:52 PM  
**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** My name is Cristina Echiverri, I am a partner at Providence restaurant in Hollywood and Connie and Ted's in West Hollywood. At the time of the closure caused by the Covid-19 virus, we employed 200 crew members. Over the years between the 2 restaurants we have employed thousands. I am writing to ask for your help. I am part of a community of independent restaurateurs that fan out across our city, collectively we employ tens of thousands of Angelenos. As you know, restaurants run on very slim margins and thrive only if our dining rooms are full. This public health crisis caused a 50 to 60% drop in business in the weeks leading up to the closure, leaving us even more financially vulnerable. We know that once we reopen, business will be slow to return making it difficult to retain the number of employees that we had before closure. We will bring back as many workers as the business levels can support. Shouldn't we, as the owners of the business be given the latitude to decide what is best for our own businesses? Providence was able to weather the financial crisis of 2008 and we have been working furiously in recent days to be able to make it through this unforeseen pandemic. We survived in '08 by tightening our belts, working hard and watching every penny. What we are faced with now is far more insidious. This pandemic will have an impact on our economy long after Covid-19 has curtailed. We've been called into action to help flatten the curve of this pandemic by closing our doors and completely halting the ability for us to generate revenue. In order for the restaurant and hospitality industry in Los Angeles to come back anywhere near to where it was, we must first see travel start to pick up again. Hotels need to see higher occupancy rates, and conventions, theatre and sporting events must also ramp back up as these are all interdependent businesses. For all of this to happen and for business to return as before will require time. I think that the restaurants of Los Angeles will see their business slowly build back up. Therefore the city council must allow for the restaurants of Los Angeles to nurse their businesses back to health in a measured and prudent way. Imposing strictures on how we bring back our workers could well force many restaurants into bankruptcy.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Charles Carnow  
**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 01:54 PM  
**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** Honorable Councilmembers, I wanted to share with you statements from 3 workers at the Mr C. Hotel on Pico Blvd (in the City of LA) describing our urgent need for the Citywide Worker Retention Ordinance. They wanted to speak with you today and were on the call at 9:30 AM but are submitting these comments now that public comment has ended without their important testimony: - My name is Omar Marquez. I worked at Mr. C Beverly Hills Hotel as a room inspector for 7 years and on March 13th I was fired. I was prepared mentally for the hotel to cut my hours to 2-3 days per week because of the pandemic but I never expected that I would be part of the personnel terminated. All my plans, all my goals, just stopped. I was in the process of refinancing my home and that stopped. The government is quick to provide relief for businesses. I want to see the same relief for working families, for me and my family. I am here today to ask you to pass item 2, the Citywide Worker Retention Ordinance so that we can have our jobs back. Mi nombre es Raquel Lezama. Yo trabaje por 8 años como minibar attendant para el hotel Mr. C en Beverly Hills. Al escuchar que mi hotel me estaba corriendo me sorprendió mucho, no me lo esperaba. Me sentí triste y comencé a pensar cómo voy a pagar la renta, como voy a darle de comer a mis hijos. El mismo día que me corrieron, la escuela de mis hijos cerro. Tengo que ver como voy ahorrar cada día, por ejemplo en las mañanas estoy llevando a mis hijos a desayunar en la escuela para recibir toda la ayuda. Mis hijos preguntan ya no podemos ordenar pizza o ir al cine? Todos los planes cambiaron. Estoy preocupada por mi renta, mis gastos basicos. Soy madre soltera y pago \$1500 de renta y estoy preocupada porque el desempleo no va ser suficiente. Miembros del concilio necesitamos una ley de retención de trabajadores urgentemente. My name is Rosalia Rodriguez. I worked at Mr.C Beverly Hills Hotel doing multiple jobs. I've worked so hard to make profits for my hotel. I was always going out of my way to please my employer. I was in shock when I heard I was being terminated due to the CoronaVirus Pandemic. I thought to myself I'm not young anymore. It's not going to be easy to find another job. I'm a single mom and my daughter is in college. How am I going to be able to provide for her at this time? I will no longer be able to afford my health insurance. I was receiving treatments for my hand from an

injury at work. I have pain that comes and goes in my left hand. I've worked with my hand to the point it gets so swollen. I've sacrificed so much of my body to put my job first. It's enraging to know that I've given so much of my body for the hotel to treat me like this. I've put up with so much pain to put my job first but they didn't put me first. I don't know how I will pay for rent, utilities and food now. There is no way I can afford healthcare costs. I'm don't know how I will pay my rent, and bills. I want my job back after this crisis. I want my job back. That is why we and all workers in Los Angeles displaced by the crisis need the worker retention ordinance.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Marie Rumsey

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 01:47 PM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** • CCA opposes the Right to Recall, Worker Retention and Supplemental Sick Leave ordinances before you today because of the lack of process and the outsized financial impact they will have on businesses trying to survive during the COVID-19 pandemic. • Businesses have had about 1 day to evaluate these ordinances if they are even aware of them. • However, if the City Council does move forward with these items today, we ask that you consider the following amendments: • Change the definition of business to exclude entities who have been forced to shut down or greatly reduce operations because of necessary public health orders. Also exclude businesses that provide essential infrastructure and those with 100 employees or less. • The effective date for all provisions within the ordinances should be the date of adoption not a retroactive date. • And finally, all the ordinances should sunset on December 31, 2020. • We hope you will reject these ordinances today and refer them to committee for discussion. • Thank you for your consideration.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Amanda Munoz  
**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 01:49 PM  
**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** This is a call to our City Council to take into consideration the tenants who are the life line of Los Angeles. I am calling for moratorium on evictions, rent forgiveness and mortgage suspension, and an immediate freeze on all residential and commercial rent and utility bill increases. This pandemic is affecting all of Los Angeles, and it is up to those of you to protect us during this time. Due to COVID-19, many of us have lost our only sources of income and it is disgusting that you expect us to continue payments as if there is not a pandemic happening. Those who have lost their jobs deserve increased protections and supplemental sick leave in order to help keep the rest of the community safe. Without these things in place, I don't understand how else we will be able to survive.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Michael Racanelli & Chateau Marmont Workers

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 01:45 PM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** mike.racanelli@gmail.com On behalf of myself and my coworkers at Chateau Marmont, who attempted to speak in public comment but were unable to, I urge you to support the citywide worker retention ordinance. Regards, Michael Racanelli on behalf of myself and Chateau Marmont workers Walter Armendaris, Jesus Arriola, Martha Moran and Hector Reyes ---- For years I worked at the Chateau Marmont in Hollywood until the majority of us were terminated last week. I am here asking you to support the Citywide Right of Recall and Worker Retention Ordinance and ensure that all workers can go back to work when this crisis ends without fear of retaliation. Chateau Marmont initially told us we would be able to maintain our health insurance. Two days later, they told us we would be terminated with no health insurance or any commitment to bring us back to our jobs when the hotel recovers. This is a hotel that many of us have worked at for years and that, even with the crazy situation, is charging \$885 a night to book a one bed bedroom suite. We need the City to protect workers. We desperately need the recall and worker retention ordinance, please vote for it today and make sure we have the right to return to our jobs.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Sarah Wiltfong

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 01:36 PM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** My name is Sarah Wiltfong and I am here on behalf of the Los Angeles County Business Federation - also known as BizFed. We are an alliance of over 190 business organizations who represent 400,000 employers with 3.5 million employees in LA County. We represent employers in all 15 council districts. We are disappointed we were not able to speak today via telephonic public comment. We called in an hour before council started and according to the system we were caller 18. We also know other members who had joined shortly after us who did not get to speak either - so we are concerned names were not called in order for fairness. We are commenting because we strongly oppose the LA City Council's clear overreach and lack of process over the Right of Recall and Right of Retention ordinances. Businesses are already struggling to survive and doing their best to adapt under unprecedented circumstances. When this crisis is over, it should be up to them to figure out how best rehire and rebuild their businesses, not politicians. This morning both the LA Times and the Southern CA News Group editorial boards released their OPPOSITION to the Right of Recall ordinance as well. To quote the LA Times "The city has an interest in employers getting back to business as quickly and easily as possible. It's best to help them do it rather than impose burdensome rules and regulations for how to do it." While the business community applauds the City Council for its attempt to protect employees, we are afraid some of the attempted solutions won't help struggling businesses now or when this crisis is behind us. Like our brave healthcare professionals, the Los Angeles City Council should follow the hypocritic oath when it comes to tinkering with Los Angeles' economy – first, do no harm. Thank you for your consideration of our comments. Remember - #BusinessMakesLAWork



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Zach Negin

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 01:34 PM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** If a business survives the economic downturn", once we resume full operations, hiring back only employees based on seniority NOT role would cripple any attempt at sustaining a business. The oldest employees may neither be qualified nor capable of the necessary positions at that time to ramp business back up to create more jobs and there would be no way for us to operate our business. That's like saying you have to get everyone on the airplane except for the pilot and flight attendants expect the plane to fly. This WILL bankrupt us all. I understand the reasons these are being considered, however forcing our small businesses to operate in such a fashion will prevent the exact thing we are all trying to achieve, namely keep our doors open and have jobs for our employees. If you were to purchase the assets of a restaurant and change the style of food and service being offered, the current employees would not be qualified for those jobs. Additionally, when purchasing a business it's often because the business is failing. If you were to keep the pieces in place that were making the business fail then EVERYONE would lose their jobs.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Mariana Huerta

**Date Submitted:** 03/27/2020 01:32 PM

**Council File No:** 20-0147-S15

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Healthy LA platform. The Los Angeles City Council must enact a strong right of recall and worker retention policy that includes protections against retaliation. Workers should be able to return to work when they are safely able to. Many workers have been at their jobs for their entire careers. They deserve to come back to work as soon as it is safe. This should be the case even if companies go bankrupt and/or are sold during the crisis.