

Communication from Public

Name: Emily

Date Submitted: 02/28/2020 01:30 PM

Council File No: 19-1392

Comments for Public Posting: To the Los Angeles City Council, et al, The following is an itemization of what I consider the negative consequences of the law known as AB5: - Financial harm to people who need to 'work from home' for a variety of reasons (physical impediments, transpo issues, child/elder/family care issues) - Career damage to those who like/need supplemental 'gig' work - Burden on working poor, who for now, rely on 'contract' work - Harmful/contradictory to achieving climate goals...because it stands to force people back into their cars (at this time, public transit cannot accommodate commuters, as envisioned) - Risk of spreading contagion, in the era of Covid19, superbugs, resurgence of H1N1 - Forces some to resort to public assistance, further burdening the social safety net I passionately and pragmatically disagree with her motivation; however Ms. Gonzales' goal of making jobs such as ride-share and delivery drivers full-time, benefited, and unionized has not been realized. The companies and workers are finding ways to get around this chokehold. The net result is the workers she professed to want to 'help,' are not benefiting from the law; and those who work in fields she didn't carve-out as exceptions to AB5 have been clobbered. Judge Dolly M. Gee's used the words "irreparable harm" when referring to Uber and Postmates. While I'm concerned that a company's suffering will have trickle-down effects on the labor market, I'm more concerned about the components of the labor market: people who work...and pay taxes...who now can't. It's a bad law for California residents (not to mention for the career of any lawmaker who supports it). Thank you for taking the time to read and consider my concerns, Emily Los Angeles