

Communication from Public

Name: Mikayla Gibson
Date Submitted: 08/12/2026 09:37 AM
Council File No: 23-0932

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Honorable Councilmembers, On behalf of the Valley Industry and Commerce Association (VICA), representing hundreds of employers across the San Fernando Valley and greater Los Angeles region, I write to express our opposition to the wage enforcement recommendations advanced under Council File 23-0932. While VICA supports fair treatment of workers and full compliance with California's wage and hour laws, we are concerned that layering additional local enforcement mechanisms on top of the recently chaptered SB 261 (Wahab) is unnecessary and duplicative. SB 261 already grants the City Attorney authority to pursue civil penalties of up to three times the outstanding judgment amount against employers who fail to satisfy final wage judgments within 180 days, and it further allows courts to award prevailing plaintiffs full attorney's fees and costs. These are significant, state-level enforcement tools that did not exist before, and the Chief Legislative Analyst's own report confirms that state law does not preempt any additional City recommendations — meaning the City is now considering stacking further local penalties on top of a newly strengthened state framework before its effects have even been evaluated. We are also concerned about the compounding liability the recommendations could create for employers, particularly small and mid-sized businesses already navigating a complex patchwork of state and local labor requirements. SB 261's joint-and-several liability provisions for successor employers, combined with mandatory treble damages and attorney's fee awards, already represent a substantial escalation in exposure. Adding City-level enforcement mechanisms on top of these state remedies risks disproportionately burdening employers for administrative or disputed wage matters rather than targeting genuine bad actors. VICA respectfully requests that the Council decline to advance new local enforcement measures under this file and instead allow time to assess the real-world impact of SB 261's enforcement provisions, which took effect only recently. We welcome the opportunity to work with your offices and Council staff on any future enforcement proposals to ensure they are narrowly tailored, avoid duplicative penalties, and do not create undue hardship for the business community.



August 12, 2026

The Honorable Members of the Los Angeles City Council
Los Angeles City Hall
200 N. Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: Council File 23-0932 (Wage Enforcement Recommendations) — OPPOSE

Dear Honorable Councilmembers,

On behalf of the Valley Industry and Commerce Association (VICA), representing hundreds of employers across the San Fernando Valley and greater Los Angeles region, I write to express our opposition to the wage enforcement recommendations advanced under Council File 23-0932.

While VICA supports fair treatment of workers and full compliance with California's wage and hour laws, we are concerned that layering additional local enforcement mechanisms on top of the recently chaptered SB 261 (Wahab) is unnecessary and duplicative. SB 261 already grants the City Attorney authority to pursue civil penalties of up to three times the outstanding judgment amount against employers who fail to satisfy final wage judgments within 180 days, and it further allows courts to award prevailing plaintiffs full attorney's fees and costs. These are significant, state-level enforcement tools that did not exist before, and the Chief Legislative Analyst's own report confirms that state law does not preempt any additional City recommendations — meaning the City is now considering stacking further local penalties on top of a newly strengthened state framework before its effects have even been evaluated.

We are also concerned about the compounding liability the recommendations could create for employers, particularly small and mid-sized businesses already navigating a complex patchwork of state and local labor requirements. SB 261's joint-and-several liability provisions for successor employers, combined with mandatory treble damages and attorney's fee awards, already represent a substantial escalation in exposure. Adding City-level enforcement mechanisms on top of these state remedies risks disproportionately burdening employers for administrative or disputed wage matters rather than targeting genuine bad actors.

VICA respectfully requests that the Council decline to advance new local enforcement measures under this file and instead allow time to assess the real-world impact of SB 261's enforcement provisions, which took effect only recently. We welcome the opportunity to work with your offices and Council staff on any future enforcement proposals to ensure they are narrowly tailored, avoid duplicative penalties, and do not create undue hardship for the business community.

Sincerely,

James Theiring
VICA Chairman
Mission Community Hospital

Jessica Yasukochi
VICA Chief Operating Officer

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 08/12/2026 02:20 PM

Council File No: 23-0932

Comments for Public Posting: Sometimes, “ditto” is enough. I listened to the discussion on Item 6 today, and at some point it stopped adding information and started sounding like political theater, buzzwords, word salad, and multiple speeches saying essentially the same thing. And this is Council File 23-0932. This discussion has been going on since 2023. We understand: wage theft is wrong, workers should be protected, and laws on the books should be enforced. Got it. But every Councilmember does not need to give their own increasingly elaborate version of the exact same speech. By the time Councilmember Price spoke at the end, we had heard the same basic point over and over again. Please get to the substance, make your point, vote, and move on. Sometimes another Councilmember has already said it perfectly well. When everyone comes prepared with increasingly elaborate speeches making essentially the same point, it starts to feel overly rehearsed and coordinated, as though the actual discussion may have already happened somewhere else. Whether or not that is the case, that is not the impression a public body should be giving. We should be watching the discussion and deliberation happen publicly, not just watching everyone deliver prepared remarks. And when, in the same body, the City is also considering a separate item involving microloans for its own employees, maybe some of that extra speaking time could be spent examining why City workers may need those kinds of financial tools in the first place. Sometimes, “ditto” and an aye vote really is enough. Talk and discuss like regular people do in meetings. Enough with the prepared speeches. Ask questions. Get answers. Discuss the issue. Make a decision. Move on. Live. Learn. Get Luvs.