

## Communication from Public

**Name:** James McKenna  
**Date Submitted:** 05/04/2020 11:52 AM  
**Council File No:** 00-9999

**Comments for Public Posting:** Instituting a rent increase freeze retroactively to March 4th will place financial and administrative burdens on me by requiring that you issue refunds to renters who received a legally permissible rent increase before March 30th, many of whom may no longer be paying rent to you under the City's eviction moratorium. Further, a one year freeze based on a yet to be established commencement date will result in many owners losing their annual rent increase adjustment for a period of two years, losses that we will never recover. The annual general adjustment is effective July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020 and it is not cumulative or retroactive. I struggle to pay my bills with many tenants now not paying their rent. More than several of my tenant rents are \$500 or more below the market rate. I rely on the annual rent increases in order to keep up with the costs of running and improving my rental properties. Please vote no on the rent freeze. Thank you

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 05/04/2020 01:06 PM

**Council File No:** 00-9999

**Comments for Public Posting:** We urge the City Council to vote NO on the proposal to Extend Rent Increase Freeze Retroactively for ALL of City's Occupied RSO units Effective March 4th and For ONE-YEAR Following the End of the Local Emergency! The proposal will not only hurt many landlords already suffering from the low rent receipts since the onset of the COVID-19 crisis, it will likely result in foreclosures of rental properties across the city. What makes the council believe that landlords can afford another one sided ordinance? This proposal is clearly a power grab and is likely illegal, and will lead to many law suits against the City of Los Angeles. VOTE NO!

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 05/04/2020 01:52 PM

**Council File No:** 00-9999

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Councilmembers, We are writing to express our opposition to extend the current rent increase freeze beyond Mayor Garcetti's Executive Order and require housing providers to roll back rent increases given to rental rates in effect as of March 4th and prohibit any new increases for one year following the lifting of the local emergency declaration. The proposed ordinance extends the rent increase freeze in the City of Los Angeles beyond what has been established in other localities within California. We believe this proposal is an overreach of the City's legal authority and seriously affects the financial responsibilities of apartment owners. The Council is very active in protecting tenants but does not give any support to property owners who provide housing. The expenses to maintain and operate apartments are ongoing and costly, especially in older buildings under RSO regulations. We do our best to maintain and manage our apartments to provide safe and comfortable housing but the expenses are constant and considerable. In addition, not every tenant needs to have their rent frozen, especially for a year. Many tenants have good jobs and incomes and are just given the benefit of blanket policies. Some tenants do have financial hardship but most landlords are reasonable, fair and willing to work w/ them to keep them in their units. We urge all the Council members to be reasonable and consider the expenses and responsibilities of the owners of apartments and not only the tenants needs. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Fred Smith

**Date Submitted:** 05/04/2020 03:56 PM

**Council File No:** 00-9999

**Comments for Public Posting:** To the city council. Please come up with action items that are within your authority to help landlords ,not bankrupt landlords. Freezing rent increases for a year after the moratorium is excessive. Items for you to consider that are in your control to support tenants and landlords are pay cuts within city government across the board. You are making landlords to a cut so jump in the boat with them. Use the funds to create housing vouchers. This way the city is helping lanlords and tenants. Finally build affordable housing not pray it happens. You can't have free enterprise and expect developers to cap prices on building homes.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** robert veeh

**Date Submitted:** 05/04/2020 04:09 PM

**Council File No:** 00-9999

**Comments for Public Posting:** If everyone else is going to keep prices the same for one year that would be fair. City Council are you not going to raise property taxes, utilities, trash and all your fees? Fair is fair. You start with all of the things you control the price off. Maybe do it for two years.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** John Choi

**Date Submitted:** 05/04/2020 06:49 PM

**Council File No:** 00-9999

**Comments for Public Posting:** To: Councilmembers of Los Angeles, My mom is a landlord and I understand that everyone is suffering from the coronavirus. My mom purchased a small apartment building as part of her retirement plan. She was a small business owner and doesn't have a pension or 401K to fall back on. Please don't let more regulations that punishes landlords to pass. My mom worked hard her whole life to save to make this investment. And she deserves to make a fair return on her investment. Don't punish her for making sacrifices to save up the money to buy an investment for her retirement. She desperately needs the rent money to pay the bills/taxes/utilities associated with maintaining the building as well as for her basic needs. Most of the tenants in her building are not paying market rent already. Without the ability to even increase rent to match inflation. How do you expect her to keep up with services/maintenances she provides to the tenants living in her building? Some rent controlled tenants are already submitting notice that they cannot pay rent. But, With unemployment benefits plus the \$600 PUA most of the tenants are making more money than when they had jobs. I feel that self certified method opens the door to fraud and people taking advantage of the current situation. I believe that the only fair way for both sides is for the city to help the renters in need with renter's assistance. And the renter's that need assistance should be able prove they are really in need of assistance due to Covid-19. Look forward to hearing back from you and your support. Thank you, John Choi

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Shawna  
**Date Submitted:** 05/04/2020 08:58 PM  
**Council File No:** 00-9999  
**Comments for Public Posting:** How does one apply for the Rent Relief program Mitch O'Connell has been mentioning in his newsletter?

## Communication from Public

**Name:** David Potter

**Date Submitted:** 05/05/2020 12:08 AM

**Council File No:** 00-9999

**Comments for Public Posting:** We need to work as a team do not put a Freeze on Rents A rent increase freeze is not a viable option for small apartment owners. Over the last 42 years the City of Los Angeles has allowed a measly 3% increases per year on rent controlled units. The City of Los Angeles controls the rates of DWP All utility rates billed by DWP have increased at times by more than 3% per year. Los Angeles City increased Minimum wage – 25% in four years by 2021 – When wages increase all associated taxes go up accordingly (i.e. workmans' Comp, Unemployment Tax, Social Security tax, medicare tax, Federal Income Tax). There was also a recent increase in Los Angeles City RSO fees this year. Apartment owner's insurance rates have skyrocketed along with the County Tax Property Tax which can increase up to 2% per year which is a substantial amount of money compared to small rent increases. Many apartment owners are struggling to pay for L.A. City mandated earthquake retrofit costs. When the City of Los Angeles mandated the single trash hauler my monthly rate went up 40%. The L.A. City RSO apartment registration fee for 2020 went up almost 50% You guys are killing small business owners! Los Angeles City Council needs to be fair and equal about this situation and allow small business owners a small, tiny, little opportunity operate their business without government overreach. Please put a stop to this nonsense and allow apartment owners a measly 3 percent increase so they can keep their heads above water. We are drowning!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Belanie Brown

**Date Submitted:** 05/05/2020 02:59 AM

**Council File No:** 00-9999

**Comments for Public Posting:** Firstly Congratulations on recognizing Cannabis as an essential business for health, and in my interest cancer and other ailments that is innovative. I would like to motion that all verified Equity applicants that have an interest to learn all about the legal business at no cost to have innovative models as pilot projects to bring forth in the vote of testimony that don't usually utilize cannabis as relaxation or disease healing. I am against opening equity applications again these are after the cause, nonetheless I believe we should bring forth opportunities for the equity eligible that was willing to wait for formal structural guidance. This group are not desperate and have sincere plans to do it right. WE were just waiting for an opportunity in innovation and equity. There's is more than a smoke shop me myself have no interest but there is an innovative plan that many are waiting for to come forth. Please if we open up only up to responders in equity and VERIFIED ON Record. AND work with all collectively. No more Equity Application for Verification... Not Fair. Responsible and Thoughtfully Fair of Process. Thank you. Belanie Brown

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 05/05/2020 08:37 AM

**Council File No:** 00-9999

**Comments for Public Posting:** To whom it may concern, My partners and I have pursued a Los Angeles cannabis license for the past two years. All five of my partners are social equity candidates however only one of us is on our license. For the last two years we have struggled with challenge upon challenges to ensure we are following all necessary city regulations with the limited funding we have available. Up until this time we have still not been able to complete our project. In pursuing this license, we reviewed all the necessary documentation explaining the advantages of applying as a social equity candidate in the city of LA. It seemed honorable that the city of los Angeles would be able to accommodate citizens who have been historically disadvantaged and reprimanded in the area of cannabis. The social equity programs seemed ideal in its mission and purpose. But the reality of this process has not been as promised. Although DCR has conducted some priority licensing for the SE candidates, they have not offered ONE resources different from the general population of applicants. All fees are the same, there are no legitimate programs for reimbursement, no additional workshops or consultation, no start up funding or supports, and no real urgency in moving SE applicants through the process in a timely matter. Many of us are even more financially troubled since starting this licensing process, and that is ultimately due to be lack of organization and transparency of the department. We are asking for this new grant and that of the one from last year be used for the purpose identified in the governors letter. Design a legitimate grant program to ease the financial burden of this licensing process on those that have been historically impacted the most. Otherwise, there is no real evidence to consider LA a social equity licensing division outside of website language and “good” intent. We will be writing a letter to the governors office next. In solidarity.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Pamela

**Date Submitted:** 05/05/2020 10:41 AM

**Council File No:** 00-9999

**Comments for Public Posting:** My name is Pamela Chennells SEP tier 1 and 2 and phase 2 applicants license holder 274 , I paid last year for my license, I Ask DCR to put on agenda for us to be allowed me to move my location do to USA bank not allowing cannabis tenant in his building after the address change accured , I would like to ask the City members to please to an emergency vote for DCR to allow change of address for phase 2 please ! We have been waiting for The City Members to have a meeting to make this happen for us and you keep postponing the meeting! This is unfair please put an emergency vote today!!! We are getting pressure to have our pre walk through by July 3 but our request needs to in with them by JUNE 3 this leave no time for another meeting like the one now today! Please please please I'm going to be homeless with my 80 year mother who I'm taking care of !! This has to be done please today Thank you Pamela Chennells license holder 274 manufacturing and distribution!!! Please I'm also waiting on Phase 3 I'm also one of the applicants!!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** James McKenna  
**Date Submitted:** 05/05/2020 02:01 PM  
**Council File No:** 00-9999

**Comments for Public Posting:** I, as a housing provider am not in the eviction business and I am not seeking ways to evade the provisions of temporary eviction moratorium. The civil remedies proposed are excessive and simply unfair. Further, establishing two separate standards for the awarding of attorney's fees is inequitable and inappropriate. Housing providers should not be required to obtain a court determination that the renter's action was frivolous in order to be eligible for reasonable attorney's fees. With regard to the added notice requirements, forcing me to provide a second notice relative to the protections of the ordinance would be administratively burdensome as I have already provided similar notice to my renters based on the original ordinance requirements. Further, the notice should be provided in the same language as was provided in the lease agreement as that should be reflective of the predominant language of the renter. My family, my employees and myself are exhausted and stressed out due to the financial and health related impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. These new measures you are considering will further challenge my ability to maintain my rental property and remain in the multifamily rental housing industry.