

Communication from Public

Name: Mark Rosenthal
Date Submitted: 05/06/2025 11:51 AM
Council File No: 14-1371-S13

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Sir or Madam- As an owner and operator of multiple service businesses with a seven decade history in the City of Los Angeles, I can assure you, the current LA tourism minimum wage ordinance, no matter how well intended, is a recipe for disaster given the perfect economic storm that is headed our direction. As a result of the current tariff policies in the US, we have a declining tourism demand from foreign nations and economic uncertainty facing all businesses is causing a reduction in domestic travel. This reduced demand means that your local tourism-based businesses will NOT be able to increase prices to offset the proposed labor cost increases, which means that, to offset rising base labor costs, cuts will be required to staff counts, middle management and executive positions and capital expense outlays. And, it is distinctly possible, that if you make it less costly to close entirely rather than remain open and operate – it could result in more shuttered hotels and restaurants. None of these options will preserve the local job base. No one I know in business wants to see their dedicated staff members struggle to get by on their earnings, but the success of the employees in any business is inextricably linked to the success of the business. It will not matter what minimum wage you set. Absent a robust economic climate allowing businesses to meet all their financial obligations and reinvest for their future, your proposed increases will either force businesses to cut staff or close their doors altogether. I cannot imagine that anyone would find that to be a productive outcome for this community. In the past two years, our city has seen several hotels, and scores of restaurants, close their doors; please do not exacerbate the problem. Delay implementation of the proposed wage increases until we know that the affected businesses can afford it.

Communication from Public

Name: Greg Patrick

Date Submitted: 05/06/2025 09:44 AM

Council File No: 14-1371-S13

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Councilmembers, Thank you for your commitment to fair wages and a strong economy in Los Angeles. I respectfully urge the Committee to delay action on the proposed “Olympic Wage” ordinance for hotel and airport workers. While the goal of improving worker livelihoods is vital, implementing a rapid 70% wage increase amid declining tourism trends may unintentionally harm the very sectors it aims to uplift. Key considerations: Tourism is contracting. Visit California projects a 1% decline in overall state visitation for 2025, with international travel down over 9%. In Los Angeles, airport officials warn of a potential 25–30% drop in international visitors. Travel from Canada and Mexico alone is down 15% and 24%, respectively. Businesses are under strain. Many hotels and airport vendors are still recovering from pandemic-related losses and natural disaster disruptions. Industry groups caution that rising labor costs could force closures or service reductions—especially at mid-sized and family-owned properties. Jobs may be lost. The American Hotel & Lodging Association estimates that up to 15,000 jobs could be at risk. Automated services may replace positions, undermining the ordinance’s intended benefits. Fiscal impacts are growing. The City faces a projected \$1 billion budget shortfall for FY 2025–26. Sharp cost increases across city-supported tourism infrastructure may limit future service investments. I urge the Committee to delay adoption of the ordinance and commission an independent economic impact analysis. A more phased approach—tied to measurable recovery benchmarks—would provide balance: supporting workers while protecting small businesses, jobs, and the city’s global tourism competitiveness. Thank you for your thoughtful consideration. Sincerely, Greg Patrick Resident, Los Angeles

Communication from Public

Name: Paula

Date Submitted: 05/06/2025 11:07 AM

Council File No: 14-1371-S13

Comments for Public Posting: Hello, The living wage law was made before the ACA and is outdated in how its administered. The insurance section of the living wage has been corrupted by some businesses at LAX . Unfortunately, the city (BCA and City attorney office) has failed to administer it correctly. Because, when a workers' complaint is filed, it seems a level of chicanery exists between the parties, meaning the corporation and the city department that is to investigate. Airport workers are being taken advantage of because of the radical segregation of who pays for the full cost of health care coverage and who pays only a negotiated premium. One airline claims that if you are making more than the living wage and on their pay scale the worker will only pay \$40.00 a month premiums for their low cost plan. If on the living wage... meaning today under 5 ½ yrs of service at this company, you will be pay deducted by about 3.50-4.00 an hr ,overtime deducted, for “health benefits“ while still taking out a negotiated premium. The lawa wage allows companies to push a Full amount of “health benefits“ on to the new hire worker as its been called a credit, which lowers the wage. A credit that is not audited. I filed a complaint in fall 2022 with the BCA and ,Mkycal Rodrigez , Sophie Tzeng, and Lynda Mcglinchey who failed me and my 300+ co-workers @ contract compliance office of this city (bca). They allowed these horrible practices to continue to happen and have doubled down on their “ investigation“. An investigation where no information was provided on what the actual premium rate of the health insurance is for an lax worker where I'm employed. I have a state case open for the wage theft of overtime, as the airline claims they can take health insurance costs off of overtime , even if they are not owed that money. What is worse, today , the domestic payroll at Corporate for this company , goes into the LAX workers payroll system .. and separates the under 5 1/2 yrs employees that signed up for insurance ... then places a pay decrease hourly, calling it a later/ transfer. In months of 3 paychecks I paid well over 1,000 for “health benefits” for just myself all while still paying a \$40.00 monthly premium. I filed with the city Atty office for damages who refused to response to anything with multiple calls and emails , Called lawa for help to file for damages , who says " they don't handle wages ". The only recourse I had is to file a lawsuit on the investigation and the

collusion that the BCA and the representatives for my airline were in. This lawsuit is 25stsc00962. On my w2 delta said my insurance was worth 7,956.00 . I paid 8,580 with premiums and pay not including overtime. While a person that works next to me over 5 ½ yrs of service paid only low premiums which cost less than 1,000 a year under the same plan. The other issue, at my company, we have people that only work 20hrs a week that are allowed to sign up for health care and the person working 40hrs a week under 5 1/2 years today will pay more for “ insurance “ than the 20 hr a week person under 5 1/2 years. Health Insurance isn't a fluctuation and this law today is allowing it to fluctuate and let the Airline choose if they want to pay the living wage and make insurance a privilege and not a right. Using the new living wage scale, at year 8 1/2 is \$30.73 an hour anywhere in the country at my position. The living wage with insurance that person will make less than anyone at the airline at 8 1/2 because of the airline saying they can take about 4.00 an hr for the cheapest plan, premiums, and take from OT. This means an LAX worker will be paid less at 8 1/2 years seniority and actually make a 5 1/2 year salary all because of healthcare and the company claims they are allowed to violate their own pay scale due to wording of the living wage in regards to health insurance. A rigorous reorganisation of the living wage law and a cease and desist with the nebulous jesters of increases that do not begin to touch on the weak foundation upon which this law is written as it does not protect the workers at LAX who need insurance . If the word Health benefits was changed to the words race or gender, these practices seem similar to the equal but separate law that was changed due to brown V Board of education in 1954, which would be illegal today. Companies like HMS host ,Airlines, and etc make billions of dollars in taxpayer subsidized profits. Airlines have gotten billions in bailouts that they use in stock buybacks and bonuses. This is called good business ,while it is said 60% of people in the USA are living paycheck to paycheck. At Lax, prices are going up , Airline tickets , even though traffic is down, prices are going up with bag fees that are not taxed and pure profit. Lets all remember, the government's role should be to ease the negative effects on Americans of exploitation, not subsidize behaviors that are harmful.