

Communication from Public

Name: Valerie Acevedo
Date Submitted: 06/05/2019 11:38 AM
Council File No: 18-0350
Comments for Public Posting:

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Dana Trujillo
President
Excelerate Housing Group

Rachel Rosner
Vice President
Bocarsly Emden Cowan
Esmail & Arndt LLP

Daniel Huynh
Treasurer
LA Family Housing

Tara Barauskas
Secretary
Community Corporation of Santa Monica

Alex Russell
Ex-Officio
Many Mansions

Ed Holder
At-Large
Mercy Housing California

Nancy Conk

Becky Dennison
Venice Community Housing

Nina Dooley
LINC Housing

Anne Friedrich
Menorah Housing Foundation

Isela Gracian
East LA Community Corporation

Beulah Ku
Century Housing

Joan Ling
UCLA

Nicole Norori
California Housing Partnership

Bill Pavao

Welton Smith
Cesar Chavez Foundation

Jesse Slansky
West Hollywood Community Housing

Takao Suzuki
Little Tokyo Service Center

Jacqueline Waggoner
Enterprise Community Partners



SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF NonPROFIT HOUSING

June 5, 2019

Personnel and Animal Welfare Committee
City Council, c/o City Clerk, Room 395
City Hall, 200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012-4801

**Re: [Buildings Built with Public Financing / Permit Pet Ownership by Residents:
Council File # 18-0350]**

Dear Members of the Committee:

On Wednesday, June 5, 2019, the Personnel and Animal Welfare Committee will hear the City Attorney report and Ordinance relative to adding Article 17 to Chapter IV of the Los Angeles Municipal Code to allow tenants to possess pets in publicly-financed rental housing developments. On August 14, 2018, SCANPH submitted its comment letter expressing concerns our members have about the proposed ordinance. We recognize and appreciate the City incorporating many of our members' concerns in the current ordinance; however, we acknowledge the City did not follow through with its commitment to work with stakeholders as instructed in the motion. For this this reason, SCANPH opposes the current ordinance. Before the committee votes to approve the ordinance, we encourage the City to consider two things: 1) amend the ordinance to clarify an effective date and to specifically mention that the ordinance is to be applied on a going forward basis, not retroactively; 2) convene a public stakeholder working group that includes SCANPH members and consider incorporating our concerns not already included in the ordinance as listed in our comment letter below:

SCANPH's Comment Letter (August 14, 2018)

The Los Angeles City Council recently introduced a motion (Council File # 18-0350) instructing the Department of Animal Services to work with interested parties to develop pet policies for regulating the allowance of pets in publicly-financed affordable housing buildings. We are writing to encourage the Housing Committee to review this proposal to ensure that a comprehensive policy is adopted. Allowing pets in subsidized housing, while beneficial to some residents, has implications for other non-pet owning tenants and for building operations.

As Southern California's regional advocacy organization representing over 250 affordable housing developers, the Southern California Association of Nonprofit Housing (SCANPH) understands well the obstacles residents of affordable housing face when seeking or trying to maintain affordable housing.

Our members understand that owning a pet while being housed can be very important for improving the overall health and well-being of an individual. For this reason, many of our developers currently allow companion animals. However,

introducing a policy that would require developers to allow pets can also create some concerns for developers and neighboring residents and their families who may be affected by the presence of these animals.

For example, there are many residents who do not want to live next to a neighbor with a pet and an applicant can refuse an available unit next to a tenant that has a pet. So housing relinquishment and/or barriers may work both ways - either due to having a pet that is not allowed, or not wanting to live near a pet that is required to be allowed. Some residents have a fear of pets; some have health issues regarding pets such as allergies; and pets can at times bite or scratch other residents, including children, or may cause older/frail adults to fall.

In addition, people experiencing homelessness often have pets and sometimes refuse housing because pets are not allowed. To encourage them to seek and accept housing placement, it is crucial the city works with SCANPH and other interested parties to adopt a policy that addresses these concerns and considers building operations and costs associated. Funds spent on pet policies and administration could otherwise be invested in producing more sorely needed affordable homes.

Below, SCANPH highlights some additional concerns from developers and asks that the council consider these prior to considering the motion.

DEVELOPER CONCERNS:

- **Effect on other residents of affordable housing without pets:**
 - The housing of pets in multifamily residences is often likely to lead to infestations of fleas. This, and the effect that pets have on residents who are allergic to them, may have the effect of creating substandard living conditions and may deter some prospective tenants from residing in housing with pets.
- **Already required to allow Service and companion animals**
 - Federal mandate: FR-4437-F-02
 - HCD requirement: AB 1137
- **Requiring that affordable housing developers allow pets is a significant expansion of existing policy:**
 - **Allowing pets should be the decision of the individual property owner:**
 - The regulation should not be a blanket, one-size-fits-all mandate.
- **Broad discretionary powers should be given to developers to develop the guidelines:**
 - This is necessary in order to protect residents in developments.
- **The last paragraph of the Motion is vague in regard to "guiding" building owners:**
 - Working out the details seems to occur only after the Motion is approved. Pet policies typically include restrictions in regard to size of pet, type of pet, number of pets, vaccinations, cleaning up after pets, restraint of pets in the common areas, etc. These issues could be controversial so it would be best decided prior to approving a Motion.

POTENTIAL IMPACT

- **The motion might create more liability for the City:**
 - The Motion addresses pets, not service or companion animals which are already required to be allowed. In our experience the pet issue is not a simple one and is often problematic from a management, liability, and insurance perspective. If the City is the entity requiring pets, this might open the City up to greater liability.
- **Effect on operating costs:**
 - We are concerned that the increased maintenance and insurance costs for housing animals will create a burden on the creation and continued operation of affordable housing. Increased operating expenses will

drive down the amount of debt a project can carry and create gaps in financing, which is counter-productive to the City of Los Angeles' current goal of housing 10,000 homeless households in ten years. Increased operating costs associated with this policy may also threaten the long-term feasibility of affordable housing projects.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Council require a report back from HCID and animal welfare committee about implementation considerations of the policy.**
 - The report should include information gathered from affordable housing developers and homeless service providers about the effects of a pet policy on building operations and residents.
 - The report should outline policy implementation recommendations based on stakeholder feedback.
Report should include consideration of the elements to be covered in a pet policy.
- **Include definition of "pet":**
 - The regulation requiring developers to allow pets must be general and must include a definition for "pet."
- **Pet size, species and breed, health, and resident ownership history:**
 - Should the City adopt a policy that requires pets be allowed in City funded affordable housing that they fund, we would request that the policy take into consideration several aspects of the animal and owner in question.
 - **Size:** the size of the pet allowed should be restricted by the size of the apartment rented.
 - **Species and Breed:** HCID should consider whether certain species and breeds of animal are deemed to have features or temperament that would not be conducive to the safety of residents of the apartment community.
 - **Health:** residents should be required to provide proof that their pets are up to date with all required immunizations and that the pets are kept in a healthy and humane way.
 - **Ownership History:** A policy that allows residents to keep pets should allow action by the owner or property management agent should the resident abuse, neglect, or show a recurring pattern of another inability to adequately care for the pet.
- **Reasonable Accommodation should exist:**
 - This means that if the Resident wants to have a pet, a Reasonable Accommodation form should be completed and submitted to management for approval or denial. This makes residents accountable and responsible to their Pets.
- **Lease rules:**
 - We would ask that any policy that is approved allow tenant leases to:
 - Require a pet deposit to insure that any increased maintenance costs are covered.
 - Require prior consent of property management.
 - Include language that pets may not cause any disturbance that might reasonably annoy neighbors.
 - Require that any damage caused by the pets be the responsibility of the pet owner to repair or they will be charged for it.
 - Indemnify the property owner for any damage or injury caused by the pet.

SCANPH believes these regulations, if amended, could have a positive impact for affordable housing developers, residents, and their families. Therefore, we urge the Los Angeles City Council Housing Committee to hear and consider this agenda item rather than waive its review in order to ensure our developers and resident concerns are considered and addressed.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Valerie Acevedo". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Valerie" and last name "Acevedo" clearly distinguishable.

Valerie Acevedo
Policy Coordinator
The Southern California Association of NonProfit Housing

Communication from Public

Name: Susan Riggs
Date Submitted: 06/17/2019 02:17 PM
Council File No: 18-0350
Comments for Public Posting:



June 17, 2019

Councilmember Paul Koretz, Chair
City of Los Angeles City Council
PAWS Committee
200 N. Spring St., Room 440
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Via Electronic Communication

RE: Council File 18-0350 - Pet-Friendly Housing Ordinance

Honorable Chairman Koretz and Members of the Committee:

On June 5, 2019, this body continued the above referenced item in order to further consider whether the proposed pet-friendly housing requirements should be applied retroactively to affordable housing developments that have been financed by the City prior to the effective date of the proposed ordinance. I am writing today to express our support for applying the provisions of the proposed ordinance retroactive to no later than September 4, 2018. As you are aware, the Los Angeles City Council unanimously provided clear intent on that date to ensure that housing financed utilizing City-resources allow pets.

According to the Housing and Community Investment Department's website, since the City Council provided this direction, under the Proposition HHH program alone, nearly 400 units of supportive housing have begun construction and another \$120 million in funding was announced just over a month ago. The tenants occupying this housing are some of the most deserving and needing of the companionship of a pet. To deny these individuals the benefit of the City Council's intention to allow pets would be counterproductive and could jeopardize the City's significant investment in both their mental and physical well-being.

For your reference, I have attached our support letter dated May 31, 2019 expressing further justification for adoption of Council File Item 18-0350. Thank you for your leadership in comprehensively addressing the well-being of low-income Angelenos.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Susan Riggs', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Susan Riggs
Sr. Director of State Legislation

Attachment



May 31, 2019

Councilmember Paul Koretz, Chair
City of Los Angeles City Council
PAWS Committee
200 N. Spring St., Room 440
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Via Electronic Communication

RE: Council File 18-0350 - Pet-Friendly Housing Ordinance

Honorable Chairman Koretz and Members of the Committee:

On behalf of the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA), I am writing to express our support for Council File Item 18-0350 to amend the City's Municipal Code to allow tenants to possess pets in publicly-financed residential rental housing (Ordinance). The Ordinance would create new pet-friendly housing for households struggling with a choice of keeping a roof over their head and relinquishing their pet to a shelter. We thank you for your leadership in acknowledging the significant role that the City can take in avoiding this grim decision.

Founded in 1866, the ASPCA was the first humane society to be established in North America and is today one of the largest in the world. The ASPCA believes that pets and people belong together; that financial circumstances alone are not reliable indicators of the capacity to love and care for a companion animal, and that strong bonds between people and pets make for stronger communities. Unfortunately, every year tens of thousands of dogs and cats are relinquished to California's animal shelter due to housing-related issues. From our direct care of companion animals, our work with animal welfare agencies, veterinarians, law enforcement and policy makers and our own research, we have learned that there are a variety of challenging circumstances that can cause pets to lose their homes. Poverty, short term emergencies, illness, lack of affordable, accessible vet care, and a shortage of pet friendly housing can conspire to force even the most devoted pet owner to relinquish a beloved pet to a local shelter or rescue group.

A recent law journal article focused on the Los Angeles region finds that renters today face widespread landlord-imposed pet restrictions.¹ As homeownership declines and renting becomes the norm for the majority of households, landlord-imposed pet restrictions increasingly constrain choices, effectively reducing access to housing for many families with pets. The note further finds that these policies particularly impact low-income families and those with socially maligned dog breeds.

¹O'Reilly-Jones, Kate, When Fido is Family: How Landlord-Imposed Pet Bans Restrict Access to Housing, Columbia Journal of Law and Social Problems 52:3, 427-472. <http://jlsplaw.columbia.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/8/2019/04/Vol52-OReilly-Jones.pdf>.



The Los Angeles experience is unfortunately not unique. A national study conducted by the ASPCA revealed that those who rent are more likely to need to rehome their pets for housing issues than for any other reason.² Furthermore, a primary housing issue cited by families relinquishing is financial eviction from their current housing and a lack of suitable pet-friendly alternatives in the rental market. For example, in Los Angeles, housing was a reason given for roughly 23 percent of dog surrenders and 19 percent of cat surrenders between 2011 and 2015. This equates to approximately 30,000 dogs and cats being surrendered each year in Los Angeles alone. Historically, 50% of these pets will ultimately be euthanized.

The Ordinance would require that housing units financed by the City be pet-friendly. This would result in much-needed pet-friendly housing being added to the market and would build on and complement the strong commitments of both the federal and state governments in supporting pet-friendly housing opportunities. The federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has required all of its public housing and all HUD-insured and/or –financed housing for senior or disabled households to be pet-friendly since 2000 and 2008 respectively.³ In addition, the State of California passed a law in 2017 to require that all housing financed by the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to allow pets. The City’s commitment to pet-friendly housing would maximize the number of pet-friendly option for Los Angeles residents and reduce intake pressure on City animal shelters resulting from housing-related relinquishment.

A primary reason that both the state and federal governments have made significant commitments to pet-friendly housing is an acknowledgement that allowing pets is a significant way to contribute to the overall well-being of the families living in affordable housing. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, pets have positive impacts at nearly every stage of life.⁴ Pets influence social, emotional, and cognitive development in children, promote an active lifestyle, and have been able to detect oncoming epileptic seizures or the presence of certain cancers. Research has shown that cats provide emotional support, improve moods, and contribute to the overall morale of their owners. Cats are also credited with promoting socialization among the elderly and physically or mentally disabled people. Furthermore, people with pets tend to have lower blood pressure, cholesterol and triglyceride levels. These benefits are consistent with goals to holistically address the social, economic, and health outcomes for residents of affordable housing. As such, pet-friendly housing promotes happier and healthier families, better futures for the family pet, and a reduced financial burden to animal shelters and the public.

According to the HCD, California’s ongoing housing crisis “is worse than ever.”⁵ HCD’s recent report, *“California’s Housing Future: Challenges and Opportunities California”*, states that housing production has averaged less than 80,000 new homes annually over the last 10 years, and ongoing production

² Weiss, E., Gramann, S., Spain, V., & Slater, M. (2015). Goodbye to a good friend: An exploration of the re-homing of cats and dogs in the U.S. *Open Journal of Animal Sciences*. 5: 435- 456.

³ Pet Ownership in Public Housing, 24 CFR 960, <https://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/24/part-960/subpart-G> (March 29, 2000); Pet Ownership for the Elderly and Persons With Disabilities, 24 CFR Part 5, Subpart C, <https://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/24/part-5/subpart-C> (Nov. 26, 2008).

⁴ Healthy Pets Healthy People, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention <https://www.cdc.gov/healthypets/health-benefits/index.html> (April 30, 2014).

⁵ Liam Dillon, The Los Angeles Times, <http://www.latimes.com/politics/essential/la-pol-ca-essential-politics-updates-california-housing-affordability-1483490282-htmlstory.html> (Jan. 3, 2017).



continues to fall far below the projected need of 180,000 new homes annually. Furthermore, home ownership is at its lowest level since the 1940s.

The lack of supply of new housing has resulted in historically low vacancies and high rents in the rental market. While renters may have difficulty finding suitable housing options in the market, those households with pets are confronted with an even greater challenge. The tight rental market means landlords can be more discerning in the types of households they rent to and often exclude potential tenants with pets.

One reason for this may be that many landlords have an unsubstantiated belief that households with pets will become a financial or social burden for their communities. In fact, a recent study found that there is little if any difference in damage between tenants with and without pets and, in fact, there are a number of benefits that both landlords and the community realize when pets are allowed.⁶ While some issues can arise within a community with pets, many can be addressed through property design and the tenant intake process. In fact, with some forethought, the presence of pets can become a means for building community within a development. The ASPCA stands prepared to assist the City as it considers and adopts best practices for developments being financed and constructed under the proposed pet-friendly policy.

The City has at its discretion the ability to open up much-needed pet-friendly housing opportunities, strengthen communities and families, and improve public health outcomes for those households affected. We respectfully request your support for this Ordinance forward so that fewer households are faced with the difficult decision of giving up their pet and keeping a roof over their head.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Susan Riggs', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Susan Lea Riggs
Senior Legislative Director, Western Region

⁶ *Companion Animal Renters Study: The Market for Rental Housing for People with Pets*, The Pet Savers Foundation, <https://www.petfinder.com/dogs/living-with-your-dog/pet-friendly-housing-study/> (2004).

Communication from Public

Name: Valerie Acevedo
Date Submitted: 05/07/2019 10:15 AM
Council File No: 18-0350
Comments for Public Posting:

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Dana Trujillo
President
Excelerate Housing Group

Rachel Rosner
Vice President
Bocarsly Emden Cowan
Esmail & Arndt LLP

Daniel Huynh
Treasurer
LA Family Housing

Tara Barauskas
Secretary
Community Corporation of Santa Monica

Alex Russell
Ex-Officio
Many Mansions

Ed Holder
At-Large
Mercy Housing California

Nancy Conk

Becky Dennison
Venice Community Housing

Nina Dooley
LINC Housing

Anne Friedlich
Menorah Housing Foundation

Isela Gracian
East LA Community Corporation

Beulah Ku
Century Housing

Joan Ling
UCLA

Nicole Norori
California Housing Partnership

Bill Pavao

Welton Smith
Cesar Chavez Foundation

Jesse Slansky
West Hollywood Community Housing

Takao Suzuki
Little Tokyo Service Center

Jacqueline Waggoner
Enterprise Community Partners



SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF NonPROFIT HOUSING

May 7, 2019

Housing Committee
City Council, c/o City Clerk, Room 395
City Hall, 200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012-4801

**Re: [Buildings Built with Public Financing / Permit Pet Ownership by Residents:
Council File # 18-0350]**

Dear Members of the Committee:

On Wednesday, May 8, 2019, the housing committee will hear the City Attorney report and Ordinance relative to adding Article 17 to Chapter IV of the Los Angeles Municipal Code to allow tenants to possess pets in publicly-financed rental housing developments. On August 14, 2018, SCANPH submitted its comment letter expressing concerns our members have about the proposed ordinance. We recognize and appreciate the City incorporating many of our members' concerns in the current ordinance; however, we acknowledge the City did not follow through with its commitment to work with stakeholders as instructed in the motion. For this this reason, SCANPH opposes the current ordinance. Before the committee votes to approve the ordinance, we encourage the City to consider two things: 1) amend the ordinance to clarify an effective date and to specifically mention that the ordinance is to be applied on a going forward basis, not retroactively; 2) convene a public stakeholder working group that includes SCANPH members and consider incorporating our concerns not already included in the ordinance as listed in our comment letter below:

SCANPH's Comment Letter (August 14, 2018)

The Los Angeles City Council recently introduced a motion (Council File # 18-0350) instructing the Department of Animal Services to work with interested parties to develop pet policies for regulating the allowance of pets in publicly-financed affordable housing buildings. We are writing to encourage the Housing Committee to review this proposal to ensure that a comprehensive policy is adopted. Allowing pets in subsidized housing, while beneficial to some residents, has implications for other non-pet owning tenants and for building operations.

As Southern California's regional advocacy organization representing over 250 affordable housing developers, the Southern California Association of Nonprofit Housing (SCANPH) understands well the obstacles residents of affordable housing face when seeking or trying to maintain affordable housing.

Our members understand that owning a pet while being housed can be very important for improving the overall health and well-being of an individual. For this reason, many of our developers currently allow companion animals. However, introducing a policy that would require

developers to allow pets can also create some concerns for developers and neighboring residents and their families who may be affected by the presence of these animals.

For example, there are many residents who do not want to live next to a neighbor with a pet and an applicant can refuse an available unit next to a tenant that has a pet. So housing relinquishment and/or barriers may work both ways - either due to having a pet that is not allowed, or not wanting to live near a pet that is required to be allowed. Some residents have a fear of pets; some have health issues regarding pets such as allergies; and pets can at times bite or scratch other residents, including children, or may cause older/frail adults to fall.

In addition, people experiencing homelessness often have pets and sometimes refuse housing because pets are not allowed. To encourage them to seek and accept housing placement, it is crucial the city works with SCANPH and other interested parties to adopt a policy that addresses these concerns and considers building operations and costs associated. Funds spent on pet policies and administration could otherwise be invested in producing more sorely needed affordable homes.

Below, SCANPH highlights some additional concerns from developers and asks that the council consider these prior to considering the motion.

DEVELOPER CONCERNS:

- **Effect on other residents of affordable housing without pets:**
 - The housing of pets in multifamily residences is often likely to lead to infestations of fleas. This, and the effect that pets have on residents who are allergic to them, may have the effect of creating substandard living conditions and may deter some prospective tenants from residing in housing with pets.
- **Already required to allow Service and companion animals**
 - Federal mandate: FR-4437-F-02
 - HCD requirement: AB 1137
- **Requiring that affordable housing developers allow pets is a significant expansion of existing policy:**
 - **Allowing pets should be the decision of the individual property owner:**
 - The regulation should not be a blanket, one-size-fits-all mandate.
- **Broad discretionary powers should be given to developers to develop the guidelines:**
 - This is necessary in order to protect residents in developments.
- **The last paragraph of the Motion is vague in regard to "guiding" building owners:**
 - Working out the details seems to occur only after the Motion is approved. Pet policies typically include restrictions in regard to size of pet, type of pet, number of pets, vaccinations, cleaning up after pets, restraint of pets in the common areas, etc. These issues could be controversial so it would be best decided prior to approving a Motion.

POTENTIAL IMPACT

- **The motion might create more liability for the City:**
 - The Motion addresses pets, not service or companion animals which are already required to be allowed. In our experience the pet issue is not a simple one and is often problematic from a management, liability, and insurance perspective. If the City is the entity requiring pets, this might open the City up to greater liability.
- **Effect on operating costs:**
 - We are concerned that the increased maintenance and insurance costs for housing animals will create a burden on the creation and continued operation of affordable housing. Increased operating expenses will

drive down the amount of debt a project can carry and create gaps in financing, which is counter-productive to the City of Los Angeles' current goal of housing 10,000 homeless households in ten years. Increased operating costs associated with this policy may also threaten the long-term feasibility of affordable housing projects.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Council require a report back from HCID and animal welfare committee about implementation considerations of the policy.**
 - The report should include information gathered from affordable housing developers and homeless service providers about the effects of a pet policy on building operations and residents.
 - The report should outline policy implementation recommendations based on stakeholder feedback.
Report should include consideration of the elements to be covered in a pet policy.
- **Include definition of "pet":**
 - The regulation requiring developers to allow pets must be general and must include a definition for "pet."
- **Pet size, species and breed, health, and resident ownership history:**
 - Should the City adopt a policy that requires pets be allowed in City funded affordable housing that they fund, we would request that the policy take into consideration several aspects of the animal and owner in question.
 - **Size:** the size of the pet allowed should be restricted by the size of the apartment rented.
 - **Species and Breed:** HCID should consider whether certain species and breeds of animal are deemed to have features or temperament that would not be conducive to the safety of residents of the apartment community.
 - **Health:** residents should be required to provide proof that their pets are up to date with all required immunizations and that the pets are kept in a healthy and humane way.
 - **Ownership History:** A policy that allows residents to keep pets should allow action by the owner or property management agent should the resident abuse, neglect, or show a recurring pattern of another inability to adequately care for the pet.
- **Reasonable Accommodation should exist:**
 - This means that if the Resident wants to have a pet, a Reasonable Accommodation form should be completed and submitted to management for approval or denial. This makes residents accountable and responsible to their Pets.
- **Lease rules:**
 - We would ask that any policy that is approved allow tenant leases to:
 - Require a pet deposit to insure that any increased maintenance costs are covered.
 - Require prior consent of property management.
 - Include language that pets may not cause any disturbance that might reasonably annoy neighbors.
 - Require that any damage caused by the pets be the responsibility of the pet owner to repair or they will be charged for it.
 - Indemnify the property owner for any damage or injury caused by the pet.

SCANPH believes these regulations, if amended, could have a positive impact for affordable housing developers, residents, and their families. Therefore, we urge the Los Angeles City Council Housing Committee to hear and consider this agenda item rather than waive its review in order to ensure our developers and resident concerns are considered and addressed.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Valerie Acevedo". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Valerie" and last name "Acevedo" clearly distinguishable.

Valerie Acevedo
Policy Coordinator
The Southern California Association of NonProfit Housing