

From: [front_desk](#)
To: [Puckett Matthew](#)
Cc: [Rep Whisnant](#)
Subject: RE SB 454.doc
Date: Tuesday, February 10, 2015 6:41:30 PM

Please distribute to all committee members

TO: House Committee on Business and Labor

RE: SB 454 and HB 2005

My husband & I own and operate a small (12 unit) motel on the Oregon Coast. There's no way we can comply with SB 454 as written.

Our employees work the hours necessary to clean rooms, prepare them for the next guest and maintain the property. They do not work a set number of hours in any pay period. They are not guaranteed a minimum number of hours in any pay period. They all work as needed. A forty hour week is rare, occurring maybe once or twice in the summer for a housekeeper.

In reading the text of SB 454, I found no mention for an exception for employers like us, only for construction and longshore union members.

If one housekeeper is taking paid time off I still have to find and pay another housekeeper to do the job. That means it costs twice as much to clean a room. And that assumes I have a second housekeeper available to do it. Finding and keeping good help is another issue entirely.

We do try to keep them employed and busy during slow periods by having them paint, clean carpets, etc. but our business is dependant on the whims of the traveling public.

To keep good employees we pay well over the minimum wage, as much as \$12 per hour for housekeepers. Of course, it actually costs us much more than that with social security and state and federal payroll taxes.

This sick pay scheme may work for a manufacturer or retail operation but compliance is impossible for a small hospitality business like ours. We cannot afford to comply to yet another government regulation and stay in business. If we raise prices to pay for paid sick leave, occupancy will go down. Fewer rooms to clean=fewer paid hours. It just does not work.

Peggy & Rick Leoni
Trollers Lodge
Depoe Bay
www.trollerslodge.com
e-mail: Frontdesk@trollerslodge.com