

ARGUMENT AGAINST MEASURE THE CITY OF LONG BEACH HOTEL WORKPLACE REQUIREMENTS AND RESTRICTIONS INITIATIVE

If this measure was truly about safety, we would not be opposed.

Unfortunately, it is a deeply burdensome arbitrary workplace regulation hiding behind "safety" as a cynical attempt to trick voters.

If this measure was about safety, why did the Long Beach City Council reject a similar measure?

Maybe it is because it has little to do with safety, is arbitrary and will have a harmful impact on the City.

If this measure was about safety, then why exclude union hotels?

If it was about safety, then why exclude hotels with under 50 rooms?

A majority of the downtown hotels already have and use panic buttons and have been using them for many years.

Hotels are actively engaged to ensure employees and customers are safe. Many hotels have safety protocols, panic buttons, and safety trainings on how to use panic buttons, sexual harassment prevention, domestic violence awareness, and other trainings designed to equip their employees to keep them safe.

If this measure was just about panic buttons, we would be supportive along with every hotel. BUT IT IS NOT.

The key to the measure is the mandate on how many square feet can an employee clean each day. However, the mandate **does NOT apply to employees in union hotels.**

If the mandate was truly a good idea, shouldn't be applied to everyone?

The result of the measure could reduce hours for employees who want full-time work and increase hotel prices which could impact the City's convention and tourism. This all could impact taxpayers.

The cynical attempt to hoodwink voters should be rejected.

The majority of the Long Beach City Council saw through this scheme and we urge you to also REJECT THIS MEASURE. We all want better safety so let's do it the right way.

18 AUG 17 PM 3 06

RECEIVED
CITY CLERK
LONG BEACH, CA