

Communication from Public

Name: Erick Nungaray
Date Submitted: 01/22/2025 12:44 PM
Council File No: 00-9999

Comments for Public Posting: Hello: I trust that you are doing OK and are safe! I write with respect to Special Motion No 16, dated Jan 14th. I think that it is both legally flawed and counterproductive; it will have an effect opposite to the one ostensibly desired. SM # 16 is not at all narrowly tailored, and it will end up with landlords not wanting to rent to displaced persons. I urge your clients, the Committee, and the Council, to reconsider! To wit, here are some basic foundational data: There are about 860,000 rental units in the City of LA. Of those 860,000 rental units, about 640,000 are RSO units. Mom and Pops own about 30% of the rental units in the City of LA. Vacancy rates in the City of LA were about 4% as of the end of 2024. Population of Pacific Palisades is about 25,000. 20% of that population, thus about 5,000, are renters. Median house price in PP is a little above \$3m. There were 10,000 total housing units in PP, of which about 3,700 were rental units. Average rents in PP in Jan 2025 were \$2,950 per month vs average rents in the rest of LA of about 2,700 per month. I think that you can see where this is going. Vacancy rates of 4% on 860,000 rental units in LA means about 34,000 vacant units in LA. If you want only to look at RSO units, that means about 26,000 vacant RSO units. Even if the entire renter population of PP were displaced by the fires, that would mean 3,700 units are needed, as that is the number of rental units that existed in PP before the fires. As it happens, there are at least 26,000 vacant RSO units, and an additional 8,000 or so non-RSO units. If SM 16 passes as-is, landlords will know that the PP displaced tenants have the right, after they take possession, to refuse to pay rent for the rest of the year. Indeed, if SM 16 passes as-is, landlords will know that any tenant, anywhere in the City of LA, can assert a financial or medical impact and refuse to pay rent for the rest of the year. Thus, SM 16 is constitutionally defective, overbroad, and not remotely narrowly tailored, as its goal can easily be achieved by the existing vacant rental stock, as well as by enforcing PC 396 (how about some PSAs?) SM 16 will also have the exact opposite effect of that intended, as landlords will not want to rent when they know that their tenants will stop paying their rent; and it is not just PP-displaced tenants who will not pay their rents. Any tenant, anywhere in the City of LA, who asserts either a financial or medical impact can stop paying rent for one year. Assuming

that 12% of tenants in LA elect such a course of action, that is 100,000 units (nice easy number, perhaps only 10% would stop paying) not paying \$2,700 per month for 11.5 months. That's 3.1 billion dollars in deferred rents. Even if the rents eventually have to be repaid, you know (from Covid times) that landlords will likely have to eat most of that unpaid rental debt, either by waiving it in order to get their units back, or in losses from payments (reset mortgages, taxes, insurance etc) that lessors have to pay if they do not want to lose their buildings. This is an unconstitutional, and wholly unnecessary wealth transfer (a taking) from a very narrow and targeted group (landlords). It is legally defective as the City can completely achieve its goals without enacting SM 16; the existing vacant housing stock much more than covers PP renters (it even more than covers PP owners, though with a median price of over \$3m, these are anyhow not the target beneficiaries of SM 16). Mom and pops own 200,000 plus of the 860,000 rental units in LA. They are going to be buried, and it will be a direct result of the City's misguided, constitutionally void, and counterproductive law, if SM 16 is passed. Please have the City run the numbers; when it does, it will see that SM 16 will harm a lot of people in LA, including those whom it is meant to help. Cordial regards

Communication from Public

Name: Grace Byun

Date Submitted: 01/22/2025 01:14 PM

Council File No: 00-9999

Comments for Public Posting: Hello: I trust that you are doing OK and are safe! I write with respect to Special Motion No 16, dated Jan 14th. I think that it is both legally flawed and counterproductive; it will have an effect opposite to the one ostensibly desired. SM # 16 is not at all narrowly tailored, and it will end up with landlords not wanting to rent to displaced persons. I urge your clients, the Committee, and the Council, to reconsider! To wit, here are some basic foundational data: There are about 860,000 rental units in the City of LA. Of those 860,000 rental units, about 640,000 are RSO units. Mom and Pops own about 30% of the rental units in the City of LA. Vacancy rates in the City of LA were about 4% as of the end of 2024. Population of Pacific Palisades is about 25,000. 20% of that population, thus about 5,000, are renters. Median house price in PP is a little above \$3m. There were 10,000 total housing units in PP, of which about 3,700 were rental units. Average rents in PP in Jan 2025 were \$2,950 per month vs average rents in the rest of LA of about 2,700 per month. I think that you can see where this is going. Vacancy rates of 4% on 860,000 rental units in LA means about 34,000 vacant units in LA. If you want only to look at RSO units, that means about 26,000 vacant RSO units. Even if the entire renter population of PP were displaced by the fires, that would mean 3,700 units are needed, as that is the number of rental units that existed in PP before the fires. As it happens, there are at least 26,000 vacant RSO units, and an additional 8,000 or so non-RSO units. If SM 16 passes as-is, landlords will know that the PP displaced tenants have the right, after they take possession, to refuse to pay rent for the rest of the year. Indeed, if SM 16 passes as-is, landlords will know that any tenant, anywhere in the City of LA, can assert a financial or medical impact and refuse to pay rent for the rest of the year. Thus, SM 16 is constitutionally defective, overbroad, and not remotely narrowly tailored, as its goal can easily be achieved by the existing vacant rental stock, as well as by enforcing PC 396 (how about some PSAs?) SM 16 will also have the exact opposite effect of that intended, as landlords will not want to rent when they know that their tenants will stop paying their rent; and it is not just PP-displaced tenants who will not pay their rents. Any tenant, anywhere in the City of LA, who asserts either a financial or medical impact can stop paying rent for one year. Assuming

that 12% of tenants in LA elect such a course of action, that is 100,000 units (nice easy number, perhaps only 10% would stop paying) not paying \$2,700 per month for 11.5 months. That's 3.1 billion dollars in deferred rents. Even if the rents eventually have to be repaid, you know (from Covid times) that landlords will likely have to eat most of that unpaid rental debt, either by waiving it in order to get their units back, or in losses from payments (reset mortgages, taxes, insurance etc) that lessors have to pay if they do not want to lose their buildings. This is an unconstitutional, and wholly unnecessary wealth transfer (a taking) from a very narrow and targeted group (landlords). It is legally defective as the City can completely achieve its goals without enacting SM 16; the existing vacant housing stock much more than covers PP renters (it even more than covers PP owners, though with a median price of over \$3m, these are anyhow not the target beneficiaries of SM 16). Mom and pops own 200,000 plus of the 860,000 rental units in LA. They are going to be buried, and it will be a direct result of the City's misguided, constitutionally void, and counterproductive law, if SM 16 is passed. Please have the City run the numbers; when it does, it will see that SM 16 will harm a lot of people in LA, including those whom it is meant to help. Best Regards, Grace Byun

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/22/2025 01:26 PM

Council File No: 00-9999

Comments for Public Posting: Hello: I trust that you are doing OK and are safe! I write with respect to Special Motion No 16, dated Jan 14th. I think that it is both legally flawed and counterproductive; it will have an effect opposite to the one ostensibly desired. SM # 16 is not at all narrowly tailored, and it will end up with landlords not wanting to rent to displaced persons. I urge your clients, the Committee, and the Council, to reconsider! To wit, here are some basic foundational data: There are about 860,000 rental units in the City of LA. Of those 860,000 rental units, about 640,000 are RSO units. Mom and Pops own about 30% of the rental units in the City of LA. Vacancy rates in the City of LA were about 4% as of the end of 2024. Population of Pacific Palisades is about 25,000. 20% of that population, thus about 5,000, are renters. Median house price in PP is a little above \$3m. There were 10,000 total housing units in PP, of which about 3,700 were rental units. Average rents in PP in Jan 2025 were \$2,950 per month vs average rents in the rest of LA of about 2,700 per month. I think that you can see where this is going. Vacancy rates of 4% on 860,000 rental units in LA means about 34,000 vacant units in LA. If you want only to look at RSO units, that means about 26,000 vacant RSO units. Even if the entire renter population of PP were displaced by the fires, that would mean 3,700 units are needed, as that is the number of rental units that existed in PP before the fires. As it happens, there are at least 26,000 vacant RSO units, and an additional 8,000 or so non-RSO units. If SM 16 passes as-is, landlords will know that the PP displaced tenants have the right, after they take possession, to refuse to pay rent for the rest of the year. Indeed, if SM 16 passes as-is, landlords will know that any tenant, anywhere in the City of LA, can assert a financial or medical impact and refuse to pay rent for the rest of the year. Thus, SM 16 is constitutionally defective, overbroad, and not remotely narrowly tailored, as its goal can easily be achieved by the existing vacant rental stock, as well as by enforcing PC 396 (how about some PSAs?) SM 16 will also have the exact opposite effect of that intended, as landlords will not want to rent when they know that their tenants will stop paying their rent; and it is not just PP-displaced tenants who will not pay their rents. Any tenant, anywhere in the City of LA, who asserts either a financial or medical impact can stop paying rent for one year. Assuming

that 12% of tenants in LA elect such a course of action, that is 100,000 units (nice easy number, perhaps only 10% would stop paying) not paying \$2,700 per month for 11.5 months. That's 3.1 billion dollars in deferred rents. Even if the rents eventually have to be repaid, you know (from Covid times) that landlords will likely have to eat most of that unpaid rental debt, either by waiving it in order to get their units back, or in losses from payments (reset mortgages, taxes, insurance etc) that lessors have to pay if they do not want to lose their buildings. This is an unconstitutional, and wholly unnecessary wealth transfer (a taking) from a very narrow and targeted group (landlords). It is legally defective as the City can completely achieve its goals without enacting SM 16; the existing vacant housing stock much more than covers PP renters (it even more than covers PP owners, though with a median price of over \$3m, these are anyhow not the target beneficiaries of SM 16). Mom and pops own 200,000 plus of the 860,000 rental units in LA. They are going to be buried, and it will be a direct result of the City's misguided, constitutionally void, and counterproductive law, if SM 16 is passed. Please have the City run the numbers; when it does, it will see that SM 16 will harm a lot of people in LA, including those whom it is meant to help. Cordial regards Veronica M

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/22/2025 02:23 PM

Council File No: 00-9999

Comments for Public Posting: Hello: I trust that you are doing OK and are safe! I write with respect to Special Motion No 16, dated Jan 14th. I think that it is both legally flawed and counterproductive; it will have an effect opposite to the one ostensibly desired. SM # 16 is not at all narrowly tailored, and it will end up with landlords not wanting to rent to displaced persons. I urge your clients, the Committee, and the Council, to reconsider! To wit, here are some basic foundational data: There are about 860,000 rental units in the City of LA. Of those 860,000 rental units, about 640,000 are RSO units. Mom and Pops own about 30% of the rental units in the City of LA. Vacancy rates in the City of LA were about 4% as of the end of 2024. Population of Pacific Palisades is about 25,000. 20% of that population, thus about 5,000, are renters. Median house price in PP is a little above \$3m. There were 10,000 total housing units in PP, of which about 3,700 were rental units. Average rents in PP in Jan 2025 were \$2,950 per month vs average rents in the rest of LA of about 2,700 per month. I think that you can see where this is going. Vacancy rates of 4% on 860,000 rental units in LA means about 34,000 vacant units in LA. If you want only to look at RSO units, that means about 26,000 vacant RSO units. Even if the entire renter population of PP were displaced by the fires, that would mean 3,700 units are needed, as that is the number of rental units that existed in PP before the fires. As it happens, there are at least 26,000 vacant RSO units, and an additional 8,000 or so non-RSO units. If SM 16 passes as-is, landlords will know that the PP displaced tenants have the right, after they take possession, to refuse to pay rent for the rest of the year. Indeed, if SM 16 passes as-is, landlords will know that any tenant, anywhere in the City of LA, can assert a financial or medical impact and refuse to pay rent for the rest of the year. Thus, SM 16 is constitutionally defective, overbroad, and not remotely narrowly tailored, as its goal can easily be achieved by the existing vacant rental stock, as well as by enforcing PC 396 (how about some PSAs?) SM 16 will also have the exact opposite effect of that intended, as landlords will not want to rent when they know that their tenants will stop paying their rent; and it is not just PP-displaced tenants who will not pay their rents. Any tenant, anywhere in the City of LA, who asserts either a financial or medical impact can stop paying rent for one year. Assuming

that 12% of tenants in LA elect such a course of action, that is 100,000 units (nice easy number, perhaps only 10% would stop paying) not paying \$2,700 per month for 11.5 months. That's 3.1 billion dollars in deferred rents. Even if the rents eventually have to be repaid, you know (from Covid times) that landlords will likely have to eat most of that unpaid rental debt, either by waiving it in order to get their units back, or in losses from payments (reset mortgages, taxes, insurance etc) that lessors have to pay if they do not want to lose their buildings. This is an unconstitutional, and wholly unnecessary wealth transfer (a taking) from a very narrow and targeted group (landlords). It is legally defective as the City can completely achieve its goals without enacting SM 16; the existing vacant housing stock much more than covers PP renters (it even more than covers PP owners, though with a median price of over \$3m, these are anyhow not the target beneficiaries of SM 16). Mom and pops own 200,000 plus of the 860,000 rental units in LA. They are going to be buried, and it will be a direct result of the City's misguided, constitutionally void, and counterproductive law, if SM 16 is passed. Please have the City run the numbers; when it does, it will see that SM 16 will harm a lot of people in LA, including those whom it is meant to help. Cordial regards Jose F Carrillo

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/23/2025 01:06 PM

Council File No: 00-9999

Comments for Public Posting: As an introvert, I am not as inclined to speak up about things or show up in a public space. It is not due to being shy and/or insecure in my ideas; it is moreso about energy preservation because my internal battery has only but so much energy throughout any given day so I have to be wise with my energy expenditure. However, there is something that needs to be pointed out as I'm sure the association was missed by those unaware of both the spiritual and political implications. (Or the association wasn't missed and our leaders did not care enough to do something about it or respect the African American community enough to do something about it.) A president of European descent that is trying to trump everything that Martin Luther King Jr. stood, marched and died for was inaugurated on MLK Jr. Day. The African American community has been trying to convince governments to officially honor Malcolm X on his birthday (May 19) for years. Malcolm X is another important historical figure in the struggle for African American freedom; his transformational journey is particularly important for the development of the mind and development of a spirit of peace and harmony. It is a great example of how someone learned to genuinely embrace other ethnicities based on character and merit while also continuing to support his own ethnicity. However, rather than recognizing his birthday and honoring the African American community, another man of European descent is being honored on that day by the Los Angeles City Council. That decision trumped the sentiments of those fighting to have various governing bodies to recognize this prominent leader from the Civil Rights Era. Understand what is happening here. Our leaders need to be able to read and discern patterns like this in order to mitigate damaging the community. Foresight is important. The lives of all people that aren't male, heterosexual and of beige-skinned European descent depend on it. It is our hope that our leaders can take a step back to see the whole picture and make connections like this so they have the ability to genuinely support all of our communities. And I do want to clarify something, the European man that is currently being honored on that day has contributed greatly to society as well; however, another day would have been more respectful and appropriate. Impact outweighs intention every time and to deliberately choose May 19 was a thoughtless decision with

passive aggressive overtones; however, I am sure that those who made the decision will see it as an "innocent" act. It is disgraceful to not have considered this prior to using Malcolm X's birthday...or even worse yet, to have considered it and still make the decision to do it anyway. Another option could have been to officially honor May 19 as Malcolm X Day first and then if anyone else were to be honored on that day, it would be in recognition of the connection that the person makes with Malcolm X's story and how it honors his legacy and moves the needle forward in the same direction in which he was growing. The order in which things are done has a profound effect on the meaning of a message. Our leaders could have made a better and more considerate decision here. A more respectful way to go about it was a choice that was readily available to them. (Even elected/appointed officials have inner work to do as you all are having a human experience too.)

Communication from Public

Name: Kirsten Xavier

Date Submitted: 01/23/2025 04:52 PM

Council File No: 00-9999

Comments for Public Posting: My husband, Patrick Xavier and I are both librarians for LAPL. Our home in Altadena burned down to the ground on January 7. As librarians we will use all of our professional knowledge as information scientists to navigate our way through the fire insurance maze. As fire survivors we will use all of this new knowledge to educate the public about fire safety, environmentally conscious architecture and how to protect your family from any predatory companies.