

PAYD PARENTAL  
LEAVE

160065

Good afternoon, supervisors,

President Breed,

Hello, my name is Richie Greenberg, I'm a San Francisco resident of over 15 years, a constituent, and my profession is a small business advisor. I've personally helped nearly 1,000 individuals and couples launch their new ventures.

**I come to you today to voice my opposition to the proposal** to mandate San Francisco small businesses pay their employees for Parental Leave for 6 weeks. Nobody is denying the emotional benefits for parent and child for time to bond.

**My objection is based on personal, hands-on knowledge of MY past, current, and future clientele's** financial burdens for operating in San Francisco, and my personal knoweldge of how business' rules and regulations work in foreign countries, being that I've consulted with businesses and traveled to Europe dozens and dozens of times.

**Currently, parents here do receive a portion of their salary paid by California State run**

**parental leave - 55% of their salary** - and funding comes from State Disability Insurance payroll deductions of 0.9% of the gross salary of the employee per payroll period. It's matched by the employer, and the funds are added to California State's fund, a pool for payouts to claimants.

**Supervisor Wiener wants the remaining 45% paid to employees as well** - and in writing this proposal, uses the justification that parents in Europe or elsewhere overseas receive full salary or close to it. But the crucial difference between those other countries and the United States, is the program comes as a payroll deduction paid by both the employer and employee, paid into the socialized healthcare and retirement's national fund. It's a totally different style of economy and insurance - Just like the United States doesn't use the metric system, we also don't have a socialized insurance based economy.

**Moreover, just last week, the state of New York** just approved a bill mandating not 6 but 12 weeks of paid parental leave for bonding, for 70% of an employee's salary, but this leave is funded with all employees contributing \$1.00, (yes \$1.00) each week, to their state's insurance fund. As in Europe, New York's plan doesn't force small business owners to pay employees directly.

**If you pass this proposal - I foresee the following ramifications:**

- 1) Some small businesses straining under the burden would close, or leave town to more favorable cities.
- 2) downsize payroll on purpose to be below the 20 employee threshold
- 3) purposely avoid hiring young newlywed women for fear they may become pregnant in the near future
- 4) the local consumers will be <sup>hurt</sup> ~~hurt~~ by having to pay higher prices for good, services and food if the rising cost is passed on

**In an election year where so many politicians are seeking to make SF more affordable, this proposal will do the opposite** - increasing costs to both businesses and residents.

Yes, SF would be the first in the country to have this type of law, <sup>but</sup> ~~and~~ the notariety of the ordinance would be tainted <sup>by</sup> ~~with~~ the knowledge that SF <sup>has placed</sup> ~~places~~ yet another unfair burden on the small businesses here. This is not the type of law we need and not the notariety we want.

Thank you.