

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Laura Lee Blake

**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2026 03:28 PM

**Council File No:** 25-0029

**Comments for Public Posting:** January 20, 2026 Re: Strong Opposition to Proposed 20 percent Increase to the Transient Occupancy Tax Dear Mayor Bass and Members of the Los Angeles City Council, We are writing this letter on behalf of the Asian American Hotel Owners Association (AAHOA), the largest hotel owners association in the United States. Our nearly 20,000 members own 60 percent of the nation's hotels, including 1,167 family-owned properties in the Los Angeles metropolitan area. AAHOA appreciates the City's fiscal challenges and the responsibility you carry to fund essential services. However, we are here today to express serious concern with the proposed 20 percent increase to the Transient Occupancy Tax. This proposal creates a cost spiral. As fees stack up, Los Angeles risks becoming the most expensive option in a competitive market. Higher room rates are inevitable, and visitors and conventions will choose nearby locations with lower overall costs. When costs spiral, business migrates. Hotels cannot simply absorb these costs, nor can they pass them on without consequence. Higher room taxes directly affect demand, placing Los Angeles at a competitive disadvantage compared to other major destinations. Reduced occupancy ultimately means fewer jobs, less economic activity, and lower long-term tax revenue for the City. Indeed, this proposal does not exist in isolation. Los Angeles hotels are simultaneously confronting the implementation of a \$30 minimum wage by 2028, one of the highest minimum wage levels in the country. Labor already represents the single largest operating cost for hotels. When combined with a substantial increase in lodging taxes, the impact becomes unsustainable, particularly for economy and limited service hotels that operate on narrow margins. AAHOA members want to be partner with the City of Los Angeles. Our industry has helped power tourism, job creation, and economic recovery. But repeatedly turning to hotels as a revenue solution risks undermining one of the City's most dependable economic engines. We respectfully urge the Council to evaluate the combined effects of the proposed TOT increase and the \$30 minimum wage, and engage with industry stakeholders to identify more balanced, sustainable solutions. Sincerely, Laura Lee Blake President & CEO



January 20, 2026

Re: ***Strong Opposition to Proposed 20 percent Increase to the Transient Occupancy Tax***

Dear Mayor Bass and Members of the Los Angeles City Council,

We are writing this letter on behalf of the Asian American Hotel Owners Association (AAHOA), the largest hotel owners association in the United States. Our nearly 20,000 members own 60 percent of the nation's hotels, including 1,167 family-owned properties in the Los Angeles metropolitan area.

AAHOA appreciates the City's fiscal challenges and the responsibility you carry to fund essential services. However, we are here today to express serious concern with the proposed 20 percent increase to the Transient Occupancy Tax.

This proposal creates a cost spiral. As fees stack up, Los Angeles risks becoming the most expensive option in a competitive market. Higher room rates are inevitable, and visitors and conventions will choose nearby locations with lower overall costs. ***When costs spiral, business migrates.***

Hotels cannot simply absorb these costs, nor can they pass them on without consequence. Higher room taxes directly affect demand, placing Los Angeles at a competitive disadvantage compared to other major destinations. Reduced occupancy ultimately means fewer jobs, less economic activity, and lower long-term tax revenue for the City.

Indeed, this proposal does not exist in isolation. Los Angeles hotels are simultaneously confronting the implementation of a \$30 minimum wage by 2028, one of the highest minimum wage levels in the country. Labor already represents the single largest operating cost for hotels. When combined with a substantial increase in lodging taxes, the impact becomes unsustainable, particularly for economy and limited service hotels that operate on narrow margins.

AAHOA members want to be partner with the City of Los Angeles. Our industry has helped power tourism, job creation, and economic recovery. But repeatedly turning to hotels as a revenue solution risks undermining one of the City's most dependable economic engines.

We respectfully urge the Council to evaluate the combined effects of the proposed TOT increase and the \$30 minimum wage, and engage with industry stakeholders to identify more balanced, sustainable solutions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Laura Lee Blake', is positioned above the typed name.

Laura Lee Blake  
President & CEO

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Kevin Litwin  
**Date Submitted:** 01/19/2026 03:19 PM  
**Council File No:** 25-0029  
**Comments for Public Posting:** Please see attached for your consideration



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

**RE: Council File Number 25-0029**

Dear Councilmembers:

I am writing to strongly urge you to vote AGAINST the 50% proposed Parking Occupancy Tax (POT) increase as you are considering ways to close the budget shortfall in our City.

An increase to the POT will have a detrimental impact on an already challenging economic recovery from the pandemic and will hurt the citizens of Los Angeles. The businesses and people of our City are already struggling with a volatile economy and soaring prices.

The parking industry already contributes well over \$100 million annually to the City's general fund. We are one of the City's most consistent and transparent revenue sources. Such a drastic increase in the price of parking will dissuade many Los Angeles residents, visitors, and workers from being able to afford to park the urban areas where the greatest percentages of the POT revenues are collected.

With parking supply at a record high – many workers are still working remotely full or part time - parking operators cannot pass the cost of a tax increase through without losing customers. The current oversupply of parking makes major price increases impossible. The practical result is simple: operators will have no choice but to reduce their workforce, which is comprised of predominantly union workers.

Vote NO on an increase to the Parking Occupancy Tax. This is not a responsible way to generate revenue for our City.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'K. Litwin', is written over a light blue horizontal line.

Kevin Litwin  
Chief Operating Officer

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Vishal Mandalia  
**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2026 06:58 PM  
**Council File No:** 25-0029

**Comments for Public Posting:** The proposal to increase the City of Los Angeles Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) beyond its current level is fundamentally misguided and counter-productive at a time when the local economy is still adjusting to evolving tourism dynamics, and the City's fiscal structure faces long-term challenges. Raising the TOT further does not address underlying budget issues and may inadvertently suppress economic growth and investment. Los Angeles, as a global tourism hub, has experienced significant disruptions over the past several years. While visitation is recovering, demand for lodging remains sensitive to cost, particularly when travelers compare multiple destinations. Increasing TOT could discourage stays, reduce occupancy, and divert visitors to alternative markets with more favorable cost structures. Tourism is an elastic market; even modest increases in cost can impact visitor decisions, especially among leisure and international travelers who contribute disproportionately to local revenues. Economic growth in the lodging sector is driven by occupancy, customer experience, and investment, not incremental tax rates. Raising TOT on operators does not incentivize new investment or development; in fact, higher operating costs can constrain capital reinvestment, renovation projects, and the expansion of hotel facilities. Businesses make long-term operational decisions based on total cost structures, and higher taxes can tilt the balance away from Los Angeles relative to competing destinations. The City's fiscal challenges stem largely from structural spending obligations, including labor costs, pensions, and operational expenditures, rather than from insufficient TOT revenues alone. Simply increasing taxes on visitors provides a short-term infusion but does not address long-term fiscal sustainability. Without careful reform of expenditure priorities, additional TOT revenue is likely to be absorbed by existing obligations rather than being used to strengthen essential services or invest in sustainable city growth. A portion of Los Angeles lodging is dedicated to extended-stay residents, business travelers on multi-week assignments, and clients with ongoing professional or personal needs. These relationships provide stable, predictable revenue streams that support both hotels and the broader local economy. Increasing TOT uniformly across all stays risks penalizing these longer-term

engagements, undermining reliable sources of income that are essential to the sector's stability. TOT revenue extends beyond hotels, indirectly supporting retail, dining, transportation, and entertainment sectors through visitor spending. An increase in lodging costs can reduce demand and negatively impact these ancillary businesses. Additionally, Los Angeles competes with other major cities for conventions, tourism, and film production; higher taxes may reduce the City's attractiveness as a destination and discourage new investment in hospitality infrastructure and services. Many of the operators of Los Angeles lodging properties are generational owners or franchisees who have invested their personal savings, time, and resources into building and maintaining these businesses. These are not large corporate chains or institutional investors—they are individuals and families who made a deliberate choice to invest in Los Angeles, contributing to the local economy and employment. Imposing higher TOT burdens on these operators does not incentivize growth or investment; rather, it creates additional financial strain, potentially threatening their ability to maintain quality, service, and long-term viability. Such increases ultimately fail to benefit anyone—neither the occupants, who may face higher costs, nor the operators, whose hard-earned investments are undermined. In summary, raising the TOT beyond its current level is not a well-considered approach to solving the City's fiscal or economic challenges. It does not promote business growth, investment, or tourism recovery, and it risks undermining long-term client relationships and stable revenue streams. Instead, the City should focus on structural fiscal reforms, targeted tourism and business support, and strategies that strengthen long-term economic growth without discouraging investment or visitor activity.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Christopher Bowen

**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2026 09:54 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0029

**Comments for Public Posting:** Date: January 20, 2026 To: Los Angeles City Council Budget and Finance Committee From: Building Owners and Managers Association, Greater Los Angeles (BOMA/GLA) Re: Oppose Parking Occupancy Tax 2026 Increase Dear Chair Yaroslavsky and Members of the Budget and Finance Committee, Founded in 1915, BOMA/GLA represents nearly 2,000 commercial real estate owners, managers, and service providers responsible for more than 135 million square feet of property across the City of Los Angeles. Our members help generate the economic activity and tax base that fund essential City services. We write to urge the Committee not to advance an increase to the Parking Occupancy Tax (POT) from 10% to 15% or place this proposal on the June 2026 ballot. At a time when Los Angeles faces a nearly \$1 billion structural deficit, policies that further suppress economic activity in already fragile commercial districts risk worsening—not solving—the City’s long-term fiscal challenges. While the Parking Occupancy Tax currently generates approximately \$140 million annually, financial projections assume that increasing the rate from 10% to 15% would yield an additional \$70 million. That estimate is highly dependent on parking demand remaining stable, even as higher costs are passed directly to drivers, workers, and visitors—an assumption that is particularly risky in markets already experiencing depressed utilization. Los Angeles’s commercial real estate sector continues to face unprecedented headwinds driven by reduced office utilization, elevated operating costs, and cumulative tax burdens. Measure ULA, while intended to fund critical housing programs, has already reduced high-value commercial transaction activity according to UCLA’s “The Unintended Consequences of ULA” study, limiting reinvestment in the City’s urban core. Layering additional taxes on top of this environment further discourages the very activity needed to restore foot traffic, employment density, and revenue generation. A higher Parking Occupancy Tax would directly undermine efforts to reactivate downtowns and commercial corridors. In areas such as Downtown Los Angeles and Hollywood—where office vacancy rates exceed 35% and 25% respectively—parking demand is already depressed. Increasing the cost of parking disincentivizes return-to-office efforts, reduces retail and hospitality visits, and places additional strain on small businesses

that depend on customer access. By contrast, markets like Century City, with vacancy rates closer to 11%, demonstrate how safety, infrastructure investment, and accessibility—not higher taxes—drive utilization and recovery. We appreciate the opportunity to have met with each Budget and Finance Committee office in recent weeks and value the ongoing dialogue. We respectfully urge the Committee to pursue budget solutions that stabilize and grow the City's tax base, rather than policies that risk accelerating commercial decline. For these reasons, BOMA/GLA strongly opposes advancing a Parking Occupancy Tax increase or placing it before voters in 2026. Sincerely,  
Christopher Nikhil Bowen Director of Government and Public Affairs Building Owners and Managers Association of Greater Los Angeles



Date: January 20, 2026

To: Los Angeles City Council Budget and Finance Committee

From: Building Owners and Managers Association, Greater Los Angeles (BOMA/GLA)

Re: Oppose Parking Occupancy Tax 2026 Increase

---

Dear Chair Yaroslavsky and Members of the Budget and Finance Committee,

Founded in 1915, BOMA/GLA represents nearly 2,000 commercial real estate owners, managers, and service providers responsible for more than 135 million square feet of property across the City of Los Angeles. Our members help generate the economic activity and tax base that fund essential City services.

We write to urge the Committee **not to advance an increase to the Parking Occupancy Tax (POT) from 10% to 15% or place this proposal on the June 2026 ballot**. At a time when Los Angeles faces a nearly \$1 billion structural deficit, policies that further suppress economic activity in already fragile commercial districts risk worsening—not solving—the City’s long-term fiscal challenges.

While the Parking Occupancy Tax currently generates approximately \$140 million annually, financial projections assume that increasing the rate from 10% to 15% would yield an additional \$70 million. **That estimate is highly dependent on parking demand remaining stable, even as higher costs are passed directly to drivers, workers, and visitors—an assumption that is particularly risky in markets already experiencing depressed utilization.**

Los Angeles’s commercial real estate sector continues to face unprecedented headwinds driven by reduced office utilization, elevated operating costs, and cumulative tax burdens. Measure ULA, while intended to fund critical housing programs, has already reduced high-value commercial transaction activity according to UCLA’s [“The Unintended Consequences of ULA”](#) study, limiting reinvestment in the City’s urban core. Layering additional taxes on top of this environment further discourages the very activity needed to restore foot traffic, employment density, and revenue generation.



A higher Parking Occupancy Tax would directly undermine efforts to reactivate downtowns and commercial corridors. In areas such as Downtown Los Angeles and Hollywood—where office vacancy rates exceed 35% and 25% respectively—parking demand is already depressed. Increasing the cost of parking disincentivizes return-to-office efforts, reduces retail and hospitality visits, and places additional strain on small businesses that depend on customer access. By contrast, markets like Century City, with vacancy rates closer to 11%, demonstrate how safety, infrastructure investment, and accessibility—not higher taxes—drive utilization and recovery.

We appreciate the opportunity to have met with each Budget and Finance Committee office in recent weeks and value the ongoing dialogue. We respectfully urge the Committee to pursue budget solutions that stabilize and grow the City's tax base, rather than policies that risk accelerating commercial decline.

For these reasons, BOMA/GLA strongly opposes advancing a Parking Occupancy Tax increase or placing it before voters in 2026.

Sincerely,

Christopher Nikhil Bowen

Director of Government and Public Affairs

Building Owners and Managers Association of Greater Los Angeles

## Communication from Public

**Name:** cari wolk

**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2026 11:17 AM

**Council File No:** 25-0029

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Councilmembers I urge you to vote AGAINST the proposed 50% increase to the parking occupancy tax. Los Angeles is still struggling with the effects of the pandemic with the added pejorative effects of inflation, tariffs ,loss of filming and now the ICE raids. Businesses and your constituents cannot afford more taxes. The effect of increased parking rates with the added tax will further dissuade people from parking to attend sporting events, to shop, to dine , attend theater, visit museums -- Many of these entities are already reeling from lack of customers. Fewer people parking means less revenues generated and an increase might actually have a negative effect to the existing parking tax base. Now is not the time for tax increases in an already tax weary city. Again I urge a no vote on the proposed 50% parking tax increase