

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 09/05/2022 03:16 PM

Council File No: 20-0291

Comments for Public Posting: I am deeply troubled by the report which includes recommendations by the housing department to end the eviction protections. Not only do the recommendations turn a blind eye to the reality in which Angelenos currently live, the report goes against its own mission statement. I am asking that the city council not to adapt any of the recommendations at this time. When, then? We are at the beginning of what is anticipated by economists and leading banks to be an economic downturn. All macroeconomic indicators are pointing to this. Layoffs have started. Small businesses are shutting their doors. Every American who shops for basic necessities and gets bills for utilities experiences the coming decline firsthand. The end of the eviction protections could not be more poorly timed. Please let's revisit phasing out protections once our economy has stabilized. The report points out that the protections were crafted to be temporary, but it does not sufficiently acknowledge the breadth of challenges all Angelenos face that extend beyond the original emergency of March 2020. From the perspective of the inflation, climate, food, energy, water, crime, supply chain, hospital care, and homeless crises, our "new normal" is worse. Long covid affects a great portion of the population, but it is not mentioned once in the 72-page report which claims a thorough investigation was completed. Many of us have perished, become disabled, or are hanging on by a thread in our pursuit of providing for our loved ones. Our most vulnerable populations do not have the means to voice their concerns with city council, or they are afraid of retribution and are operating under a cloud of shame. Ending the moratorium as outlined by the report would push this population over the edge. The report does not show a population which has recovered enough to manage their monthly rent and utilities, and that is what would be needed for an orderly return to a "new normal." Rental increases should not be considered until inflation has stabilized in real terms. Anybody who shops in Los Angeles knows that this has not yet occurred. Forcing tenants to repay back rent within the period of one year is not feasible. In many cases, that is a very large sum, and will take years to pay off. While some tenants may be ready to start to make payments, many are not ready, and are struggling to pay the bills that they currently have. Many of us are still waiting for Housing Is Key

funds for the period before April 2022. Those of us who are disabled by the pandemic have not had any assistance since April 2022. For those renters who can prove disability, this rent could be given a longer repayment period, one in line with disability benefits. Adopting the recommendations of the report would lead to a surge in our already mushrooming homeless population. From just an accounting perspective, it would cost much more to address and re-house a population that has become homeless en masse, than simply to keep them housed. The report does not acknowledge the intricacies of reinstating no-fault evictions. For those of us renters who received their no-fault eviction notices prior to the commencement of the emergency order, some have since become disabled due to the pandemic. This population could have at least another year of protection, but instead they only have 60-days to leave their premises. The amount of relocation assistance, which is totally dislocated from the market value of rentals in the area, would only cover 2 or 3 months of rent at best. This forces a renter disabled by the pandemic into homelessness. For those renters whose landlords have been delaying commencement of no-fault evictions, the relocation assistance still does not provide any market rate rental for more than a short period of time. It must be asked what the aim of relocation assistance is, and I understand I am pointing to a deficit in the Ellis Act law as a whole, but it could be addressed by a more realistic set of protections. I would like to point out that the tenant anti-harassment ordinance did not protect tenants as intended, unfortunately. Civil and criminal consequences to a landlord found in violation are clearly laid out in the ordinance; in practice, it was another matter altogether. When a landlord attempted an illegal eviction, the only repercussion was a warning from the housing investigator. Thus, landlords continued to issue 3-day notices once they realized that they could do so with impunity. Landlords became creative in their ways of intimidating tenants beyond what was listed in the ordinance, such as posting demolition notices and stealing tenant's property. Considering that our police departments are stretched, most of these thefts went unaddressed, and tenants did not report them. Thank you for reading and considering my input.