

West, Danielle@Labor

From: Peter Aronson <aronson.peter@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2026 2:15 PM
To: West, Danielle@Labor
Subject: PAGA input - thank you

THIS EMAIL ORIGINATED FROM OUTSIDE OF YOUR ORGANIZATION

DO NOT click on links or open attachments unless you recognize and/or trust the SENDER.

Dear Ms. West,

We operate 14 hair salons with just over 100 employees in the Sacramento area. Ours is a successful business (so far) but haircut margins are small and we work hard for an objectively modest profit. We strive to be conscientious and fully compliant employers and, thankfully, have not been subjected to a PAGA (or any other employment) claim. However, a few of our peers have and the impact to their businesses has been truly existential. These are otherwise compliant small businesses that may have overlooked a technicality but forced to pay an exorbitant (\$100,000+) penalty. All it takes is one disgruntled employee and an activist attorney to bring an otherwise compliant small business to its knees. Defense costs alone are beyond the scope of a modest business like ours in part because the potential losses are so significant.

We understand the need to protect employees from unscrupulous employers and why a PAGA-like structure may appear effective in such a large state, but even the revised PAGA legislation puts small businesses in the cross hairs of attorneys who understand that most employers, as well-intentioned as they may be, are vulnerable somewhere.

As you revise the PAGA guidelines, we respectfully request that you keep in mind the plight of California's small businesses (125 employees is a small business) and provide remedies that fit a potential violation and do not incentivize attorneys to pursue exorbitant claims against otherwise well-intentioned employers.

Thank you,
Peter Aronson
503 201-7972