

## Communication from Public

**Name:** J Jones

**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2023 08:34 AM

**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3

**Comments for Public Posting:** As a long term housing provider in Los Angeles, I am appalled at the constant attack on our business. It is a business, one which cannot be easily gotten out of once in it. One which the city has decided it can trap into doing business without rights! Shame on you! It's bad enough that tenants can take advantage, now we have our city, county & state doing so. Why would anyone want to be a housing provider! You need us, but you're abusing us! Please rethink this action you're trying to pass, it's bad for the housing industry as well as the renters who need the housing. Not all housing providers are big fish, many of us are small mom & pops just trying to stay afloat & not lose a lifetime of saving & sacrificing. Thank you for considering this minority.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2023 08:37 AM

**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3

**Comments for Public Posting:** City Councilmembers Please vote YES on Item 1 to pass permanent tenant protections. Universal Just Cause should cover every unit, and there shouldn't be a waiting period. The proposed waiting period gives landlords an opportunity to discriminate or retaliate at the end of the lease. We need Relocation Assistance for high rent increase evictions to cover all tenants in order to stabilize the housing market. And the Threshold on Evictions for Nonpayment of rent needs to be higher than 1 month. Tenants need time to get back on their feet when their income is temporarily disrupted. We are struggling to pay back COVID debt on the City's timelines AND make rent going forward to keep our families housed. Many people got sick during the holidays and didn't work for weeks. Thank you Alfred

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2023 07:36 AM

**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly oppose any expansion of rent control measures in the county and city of Los Angeles.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Mark & Paula

**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2023 08:24 AM

**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3

**Comments for Public Posting:** Your misguided efforts to protect the general public is going to have an opposite effect and impact on the rental market and has of fact already has. We are property owners and provide a good living space at below market rates and yet you want to punish us. STOP YOUR MEDDLING. If you want to help tenants provide direct low interest loans to landlords that need help in maintaining there buildings.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2023 08:28 AM

**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please vote against this measure, we can not sustain our rental properties with these anti private property measures is place. It has taken our entire life's work to get a positive cash flow to assist us seniors in making ends meet in our retirement years! We are not on welfare and most of us have followed the rules our entire lives just to be financially punished by constant rule changes! Please vote against this and give us our Democratic rights to private property back!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Ali Asvadi

**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2023 07:12 AM

**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3

**Comments for Public Posting:** Honorable Councilmember Paul Krekorian: Today marks day 1,050, since housing providers lost the right to evict for the most basic of breaches of contract by tenants. February 1st, instead of seeing a tsunami of evictions, you will discover that tenants will start paying rent as they understand that the greatest protection against displacement and homelessness is by paying the rent. Tenants are in control of their own destiny, apart from any law that you may pass. I strongly oppose the proposed tenant protections. These proposed protections would disincentivize housing creation and will have a net negative impact on all rental housing units. Therefore, you need to create a rent subsidy program instead of putting everything on the backs of rental property owners. I strongly oppose a monetary threshold to evict. Setting a monetary threshold of rents owed before an owner can evict will cause all rents to increase. There are many owners who are proud to be charging below market rents; however, they will have no choice but to increase rents to market rates in order to regain their ability to enforce contracts. Owners need legal protection: if the proposed monetary threshold control passes, owners will have a legal incentive to raise the rent. In the long run, this recommendation kills organic affordable housing. I strongly oppose the expansion of RSO style "just cause" regulations to all dwelling units. It's common knowledge that the reason not all units are under RSO-style "Just Cause" regulations is to encourage investors to build more units. Many homeowners are considering building an ADU, but they will decide to not build because of the increasing number of laws that excessively favor tenants. The city is short on housing and we need to encourage new construction, not discourage it. The solution is simple, L.A. City should align RSO units with AB 1482 to reduce complexity and encourage new construction. I strongly oppose Displacement Relocation Assistance. Relocation fees to the tune of "three (3) times the fair market rent (FMR) in the Los Angeles Metro area ... for a rental unit of a similar size, plus \$1,411, in moving costs"? Even if the tenant has occupied the unit for a month? The constant chipping away at owner protections discourages the development of new multi-family units and ADUs. I strongly oppose extending protections for the presence of unauthorized occupants or pets. Unsafe conditions brought on

by exceeding occupancy limits should be remedied immediately. Additionally, owners need to know to whom they are renting. Rental applications must be filled out. Credit reports run. The owner needs to have the ability to approve or reject those unauthorized tenants and increase the rent appropriately for those who are allowed to remain. For the best possible outcome for unauthorized tenants, a proper credit and background check is needed. To allow renters to assume legal responsibility of a lease when they do not have the financial means to do so, sets up those unauthorized occupants for financial failure. Thank you for voting for what is best for the rental housing ecosystem instead of short-sighted policies that would result in fewer affordable housing units. Sincerely, Ali Asvadi 213-494-7774  
ali@lancord.com

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Ali Asvadi

**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2023 07:13 AM

**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3

**Comments for Public Posting:** Honorable Councilmember Blumenfield: Today marks day 1,050, since housing providers lost the right to evict for the most basic of breaches of contract by tenants. February 1st, instead of seeing a tsunami of evictions, you will discover that tenants will start paying rent as they understand that the greatest protection against displacement and homelessness is by paying the rent. Tenants are in control of their own destiny, apart from any law that you may pass. I strongly oppose the proposed tenant protections. These proposed protections would disincentivize housing creation and will have a net negative impact on all rental housing units. Therefore, you need to create a rent subsidy program instead of putting everything on the backs of rental property owners. I strongly oppose a monetary threshold to evict. Setting a monetary threshold of rents owed before an owner can evict will cause all rents to increase. There are many owners who are proud to be charging below market rents; however, they will have no choice but to increase rents to market rates in order to regain their ability to enforce contracts. Owners need legal protection: if the proposed monetary threshold control passes, owners will have a legal incentive to raise the rent. In the long run, this recommendation kills organic affordable housing. I strongly oppose the expansion of RSO style “just cause” regulations to all dwelling units. It’s common knowledge that the reason not all units are under RSO-style “Just Cause” regulations is to encourage investors to build more units. Many homeowners are considering building an ADU, but they will decide to not build because of the increasing number of laws that excessively favor tenants. The city is short on housing and we need to encourage new construction, not discourage it. The solution is simple, L.A. City should align RSO units with AB 1482 to reduce complexity and encourage new construction. I strongly oppose Displacement Relocation Assistance. Relocation fees to the tune of “three (3) times the fair market rent (FMR) in the Los Angeles Metro area ... for a rental unit of a similar size, plus \$1,411, in moving costs”? Even if the tenant has occupied the unit for a month? The constant chipping away at owner protections discourages the development of new multi-family units and ADUs. I strongly oppose extending protections for the presence of unauthorized occupants or pets. Unsafe conditions brought on by exceeding occupancy limits

should be remedied immediately. Additionally, owners need to know to whom they are renting. Rental applications must be filled out. Credit reports run. The owner needs to have the ability to approve or reject those unauthorized tenants and increase the rent appropriately for those who are allowed to remain. For the best possible outcome for unauthorized tenants, a proper credit and background check is needed. To allow renters to assume legal responsibility of a lease when they do not have the financial means to do so, sets up those unauthorized occupants for financial failure. Thank you for voting for what is best for the rental housing ecosystem instead of short-sighted policies that would result in fewer affordable housing units. Sincerely, Ali Asvadi  
213-494-7774 ali@lancord.com

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Chad Monk

**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2023 07:29 AM

**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hi, my name is Chad, and I live in district 3. I want to strongly urge you to vote YES on Item 1 to pass permanent tenant protections. Universal Just Cause should cover every unit, and there shouldn't be a waiting period. The proposed waiting period gives landlords an opportunity to discriminate or retaliate at the end of the lease. We need Relocation Assistance for high rent increase evictions to cover all tenants in order to stabilize the housing market. And the Threshold on Evictions for Nonpayment of rent needs to be higher than 1 month. Tenants need time to get back on their feet when their income is temporarily disrupted. We are struggling to pay back COVID debt on the City's timelines AND make rent going forward to keep our families housed. Many people got sick during the holidays and didn't work for weeks

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Julian

**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2023 06:36 AM

**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hello, We do not need more renter protections. We need small property owner protections. Why doesn't the city pay for the relocation fees? Sure pass all these laws but take away the landlord and add the city, it's only fair. Not only did squatters not pay me anything for three years while I was homeless but now I'll have to pay these squatters in the thousands of dollars to leave after their abuse!!! How is this fair? If this city is so great and this city council is so great and progressive then why don't you guys take the unjust financial responsibility the city is forcing on small property owners!? Shame.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Padita

**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2023 03:34 AM

**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3

**Comments for Public Posting:** You're better STOP YOUR TRICKY AND NASTY HARASSMENTS TO ALL LANDLORDS NOW!!!. This was YOUR UNFAIR PRACTICES TO LANDLORDS. BAD TENANTS NEED TO BE EVICTED WHEN THEY STAY RENT FREE, BREACHED OUR RENTAL CONTRACT, AND DAMAGED OUR PROPERTY. You created more unfair and unconstitutional practice in our society.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Nancy

**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2023 06:12 AM

**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3

**Comments for Public Posting:** Speaking on behalf of the housing providers who have been mostly effected by all the unrealistic moratoriums of LA county and LA city. Not being able to pay the mortgage ,utility bills, preventative maintenance ,ex..... ,enough is enough with this unfair unconstitutional laws neglecting Housing providers community.As this community is a tremendous help for resolving homelessness issues without these small business owners there would be way more homeless in this City considering the current economic crisis. Since 2020 as a housing provider we have struggled and challenged every couple months coming up with new additional limitation on moratoriums which is allowing a lot people to take advantage of the system and don't work, don't pay rent and won't be evicted because of moratorium .All these application frauds on rent assist programs and all the false unemployment claims.Tenants who bought new cars ,going on vacations ,not working at all using these money and not paying any rent took advantage of the system and Us as housing providers . However ,there's no one at this point effected by COVID.The Mayor has also declared to end the emergency .Theres not legitimate reason for any individual not pay rent as we have way more opening job positions for any level. After almost 3 years of all this financial hardship for housing providers and huge loss of income on properties its unreal that we are still waiting to give more options to the people who have been taking advantage of the system with all the false claims and fraud to be able to move forward. Asking housing providers to pay more relocation fees would allow this injustice to stay .I encourage you all to this of yourself as a housing provider knowing all these financial problems for 3 years and still being treated with injustice.We are all in this together ,so lets not get any paycheck and don't make any money for the next 3 years and see the results .That would be a fair solution .

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Edith Frere

**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2023 06:17 AM

**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3

**Comments for Public Posting:** Around 25 years ago, my husband renovated a building on Union Drive with help from the City of Los Angeles. Here is a bit about the building, for background information: The tenants have mostly lived there for the entire 25 years. It is their home. The building has a wonderful resident manager, and it is well-maintained -- and the tenants are happy. The building is subject to RSO/SCEP and is a low-cost housing building, which means among other things that rents could be raised only 3% each year. With no rent over \$875 per month for two bedrooms, and most around \$500-600 for a studio, this has meant a maximum increase of under \$27 per month, with most potential rent increases around \$15-18. The cost of trash collection, electricity and water have continued to climb but we have been unable to charge even a minimal increase in rent to help cover these increases. The last rent increase was in 2019. The Council today is considering eviction for cause, and this is why I am writing today. For one example: We are currently faced with tenants in breach of their leases due to bringing pets into the building. As you know, an "emotional support animal" must be accepted and no pet deposit can be charged. Our leases specifically prohibit pets, but we have accommodated them for "emotional support" dogs, even though one can simply pay \$200 online and receive a letter stating that such an animal is necessary. In principle, someone who needs such support is to keep such their animal with them, but these dogs are often left alone in the apartments. We are unable to charge a pet deposit, but we do request evidence of renters/liability insurance for pet owners, and one tenant has not provided this information, despite requests that date back over 8 months. We also require evidence of a valid rabies shot and a Los Angeles County dog license, which is required for all dogs living within the city. At a minimum, we want to protect other tenants if the dogs cause problems or damage, bite a resident or visitor child, etc. We have sent multiple three-day notices to one particular tenant, requesting this documentation, but without response. I have ended up turning this over to an attorney, which is costly but seems to be the only way to get the necessary papers. A property owner should be able to evict for cause, and not be subject to another delay of a year, which seems to be what is under discussion at today's Council meeting. Why should any

tenant be allowed to not follow the law, and why should a property owner be obliged to pay them to leave the building if they violate the lease and the law? Taking away the ability to require tenants to follow the law is not fair to property owners. In our particular case, the tenant in question has been a problem for over two years, first by having an air conditioner (prohibited by the lease) which caused over \$15,000 damage to two apartments, and now by having a dog without liability insurance or a City dog license. I am sure that our particular case is echoed by others, and that most landlords are perhaps not quite as nice as we have been. (We filed a claim with our insurance company for the damage from the air conditioner and did not make the tenant pay,) But it is not fair to other tenants for anyone living in the building to be above the law. The tenants are lovely people for the most part, and it is irksome to say the least to have a couple of tenants who feel empowered to flaunt the law because they do not think they can be asked to leave the building for cause. This sets a terrible precedent. My husband is retired, and the income from the Union Drive building and one other low-cost building is his sole source of revenue aside from Social Security. We are not wealthy people. We are probably quite typical of small apartment owners who have consistently maintained buildings in great shape, plus we try to make the tenants enjoy the building by putting up a Christmas tree each year, handing out holiday candy at Christmas and Valentine's Day, and providing laundry facilities in the basement. We have happy tenants but are frustrated by the current inability to recoup some of the increase in expenses, and by the inability to require respect for the lease and the law. Since 2019, we have seen our revenues stagnate and our expenses increase. We are unable to raise the rent even 3% and we are now potentially unable to require a tenant to comply with the law because of the no-eviction-for-cause discussion. We fully believe in low-cost housing, but I do not think the Council has considered the implications of this eviction discussion for current apartment owners, or for the future of low-cost housing in the City of LA.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2023 06:27 AM

**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3

**Comments for Public Posting:** All our utilities have tripled, we have to pay properly tax, business tax and housing fees. Our maintenance, plumbing and etc. have quadrupled Yet you are telling us not to get paid for almost 3 years now and provide services, would you work for free and also pay from your pocket to keep your job??? It seems your plan is to put mom and pop businesses out and let the corporations buy us cheap!!! We need to be able to give rent increases NOW to be able to survive and keep our homes. Are we punished because we worked hard and created something? Is this a communist city? Even in communism, states provide housing not the individuals. Please do your job and provide housing for low income and homeless and do not put the burden on private property owners.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Donna Barstow

**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2023 04:56 AM

**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3

**Comments for Public Posting:** I wonder how many on the City Council are aware that Rent Control only protects about 60% of renters in LA. That leaves hundreds of thousands of renters with only limited state protections, including anyone renting in a building newer than 2004, all of, or just a room in a house or condo, and all roommates. Since Taylor Equities evicted my whole building on Waverly Dr just before Covid, I lost my home and studio of 19 years, and have lived in 15 short term places as chaos ruled housing. There is a huge underground housing movement that is totally unregulated. I've seen everything: renters of 5 or 6 in a house, living rooms divided with curtans, 6 bunkbeds in a room, a front porch boarded up as a bedroom. I won't say my age, but just try to even find a share to rent when you have grey hair, and might move a little slower or have less income! Over the last 2 years, I rented a room in a house and then in a condo, both with abusive landladies. One of them tried to raise my rent to \$10,000 a month, evict me 3 times, stop my meal deliveries, told the FBI I was a domestic terrorist, turned the fridge down so my food rotted, and in the middle of Covid, forced me to leave because I have a parakeet. My current landlady put a hole in my 30 year old car with her truck and wouldn't pay for it, opens my mail. would not fix the handle on the toilet for a year, smokes when she told me she doesn't, comes in my room without permission, won't let me open a window and more. Neither of them report these rentals to the city. This is all done in secret, underground. Those of us hidden away from the light desperately need this Universal Just Cause protection some councilpersons have suggested here!!! What a gift to the renters of the city: not to have the threat of losing your home for no reason at all! I'd like to add that Councilman Bloomfield's last minute propped Amendment is ludicrous. Is Mr. Bloomfield trying to say that house and condo owners are the ones most likely to suffer in this housing crisis?! 30 day short term rentals are already in place and highly regulated. Those are short term solutions for actors, etc. No one could seriously suggest that taking a home, or even a room, (like I rent), off the market for a year is anything but cruel and detrimental. Please seriously consider all the thirsty renters, trying to stay stable, instead of the musical chairs that make some of us homeless. I start shivering uncontrollably when I think of what

could happen to me this next year. Thank you for doing the right thing.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jen Candoff

**Date Submitted:** 01/19/2023 02:56 PM

**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3

**Comments for Public Posting:** Honorable Council-members, I strongly oppose the proposed tenant protections. This will cause small mom and pop rentals to be sold off to larger conglomerates that have their own attorneys. My tenants haven't had an increase in 5 years. If I sell where will they go? Los Angeles needs people like me to stay in the market. We take a personal interest in our renters. Help out struggling renters with a subsidy instead of forcing senior citizens that rent out a property to carry all the load. I'm ready to sell if our situation gets worse than it already is. Sincerely, Jen Candoff

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jerome Gaultier  
**Date Submitted:** 01/19/2023 03:11 PM  
**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3

**Comments for Public Posting:** Honorable Councilmember [name of your representative]: Today marks day 1,050, since housing providers lost the right to evict for the most basic of breaches of contract by tenants. February 1st, instead of seeing a tsunami of evictions, you will discover that tenants will start paying rent as they understand that the greatest protection against displacement and homelessness is by paying the rent. Tenants are in control of their own destiny, apart from any law that you may pass. I strongly oppose the proposed tenant protections. These proposed protections would disincentivize housing creation and will have a net negative impact on all rental housing units. Therefore, you need to create a rent subsidy program instead of putting everything on the backs of rental property owners. I strongly oppose a monetary threshold to evict. Setting a monetary threshold of rents owed before an owner can evict will cause all rents to increase. There are many owners who are proud to be charging below market rents; however, they will have no choice but to increase rents to market rates in order to regain their ability to enforce contracts. Owners need legal protection; if the proposed monetary threshold control passes, owners will have a legal incentive to raise the rent. In the long-run, this recommendation kills organic affordable housing. I strongly oppose the expansion of RSO style “just cause” regulations to all dwelling units. It’s common knowledge that the reason not all units are under RSO-style “Just Cause” regulations is to encourage investors to build more units. Many homeowners are considering building an ADU, but they will decide to not build because of the increasing number of laws that excessively favor tenants. The city is short on housing and we need to encourage new construction, not discourage it. The solution is simple, L.A. City should align RSO units with AB 1482 to reduce complexity and encourage new construction. I strongly oppose Displacement Relocation Assistance. Relocation fees to the tune of “three (3) times the fair market rent (FMR) in the Los Angeles Metro area ... for a rental unit of a similar size, plus \$1,411, in moving costs”? Even if the tenant has occupied the unit for a month? The constant chipping away at owner protections discourages the development of new multi-family units and ADUs. I strongly oppose extending protections for the presence of unauthorized occupants or pets. Unsafe conditions brought on

by exceeding occupancy limits should be remedied immediately. Additionally, owners need to know to whom they are renting. Rental applications must be filled out. Credit reports run. The owner needs to have the ability to approve or reject those unauthorized tenants and increase the rent appropriately for those who are allowed to remain. For the best possible outcome for unauthorized tenants, a proper credit and background check is needed. To allow renters to assume legal responsibility of a lease when they do not have the financial means to do so, sets up those unauthorized occupants for financial failure. Thank you for voting for what is best for the rental housing ecosystem instead of short-sighted policies that would result in fewer affordable housing units. Sincerely, Jerome Gaultier

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 01/19/2023 02:22 PM

**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3

**Comments for Public Posting:** Honorable Council members, I depend on my rental income to pay the mortgage, insurance, maintenance of the building. I also depend on the rents to buy food, health insurance, gas to maintain the property and other essential of my living in Los Angeles. This is my income. Today marks day 1,050, since housing providers lost the right to evict for the most basic of breaches of contract by tenants. February 1st, instead of seeing a tsunami of evictions, you will discover that tenants will start paying rent as they understand that the greatest protection against displacement and homelessness is by paying the rent. Tenants are in control of their own destiny, apart from any law that you may pass. I strongly oppose the proposed tenant protections. These proposed protections would disincentivize housing creation and will have a net negative impact on all rental housing units. Therefore, you need to create a rent subsidy program instead of putting everything on the backs of rental property owners. I strongly oppose a monetary threshold to evict. Setting a monetary threshold of rents owed before an owner can evict will cause all rents to increase. There are many owners who are proud to be charging below market rents; however, they will have no choice but to increase rents to market rates in order to regain their ability to enforce contracts. Owners need legal protection; if the proposed monetary threshold control passes, owners will have a legal incentive to raise the rent. In the long-run, this recommendation kills organic affordable housing. I strongly oppose the expansion of RSO style “just cause” regulations to all dwelling units. It’s common knowledge that the reason not all units are under RSO-style “Just Cause” regulations is to encourage investors to build more units. Many homeowners are considering building an ADU, but they will decide to not build because of the increasing number of laws that excessively favor tenants. The city is short on housing and we need to encourage new construction, not discourage it. The solution is simple, L.A. City should align RSO units with AB 1482 to reduce complexity and encourage new construction. I strongly oppose Displacement Relocation Assistance. Relocation fees to the tune of “three (3) times the fair market rent (FMR) in the Los Angeles Metro area ... for a rental unit of a similar size, plus \$1,411, in moving costs”? Even if the tenant has occupied the unit for a month? The constant

chipping away at owner protections discourages the development of new multi-family units and ADUs. I strongly oppose extending protections for the presence of unauthorized occupants or pets. Unsafe conditions brought on by exceeding occupancy limits should be remedied immediately. Additionally, owners need to know to whom they are renting. Rental applications must be filled out. Credit reports run. The owner needs to have the ability to approve or reject those unauthorized tenants and increase the rent appropriately for those who are allowed to remain. For the best possible outcome for unauthorized tenants, a proper credit and background check is needed. To allow renters to assume legal responsibility of a lease when they do not have the financial means to do so, sets up those unauthorized occupants for financial failure. Thank you for voting for what is best for the rental housing ecosystem instead of short-sighted policies that would result in fewer affordable housing units. Sincerely, Cara

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jeffrey Cohen

**Date Submitted:** 01/19/2023 11:08 PM

**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3

**Comments for Public Posting:** Honorable Councilmember N. Raman, Today marks day 1,050, since housing providers lost the right to evict for the most basic of breaches of contract by tenants. February 1st, instead of seeing a tsunami of evictions, you will discover that tenants will start paying rent as they understand that the greatest protection against displacement and homelessness is by paying the rent. Tenants are in control of their own destiny, apart from any law that you may pass. I strongly oppose the proposed tenant protections. These proposed protections would disincentivize housing creation and will have a net negative impact on all rental housing units. Therefore, you need to create a rent subsidy program instead of putting everything on the backs of rental property owners. I strongly oppose a monetary threshold to evict. Setting a monetary threshold of rents owed before an owner can evict will cause all rents to increase. There are many owners who are proud to be charging below market rents; however, they will have no choice but to increase rents to market rates in order to regain their ability to enforce contracts. Owners need legal protection; if the proposed monetary threshold control passes, owners will have a legal incentive to raise the rent. In the long-run, this recommendation kills organic affordable housing. I strongly oppose the expansion of RSO style “just cause” regulations to all dwelling units. It’s common knowledge that the reason not all units are under RSO-style “Just Cause” regulations is to encourage investors to build more units. Many homeowners are considering building an ADU, but they will decide to not build because of the increasing number of laws that excessively favor tenants. The city is short on housing and we need to encourage new construction, not discourage it. The solution is simple, L.A. City should align RSO units with AB 1482 to reduce complexity and encourage new construction. I strongly oppose Displacement Relocation Assistance. Relocation fees to the tune of “three (3) times the fair market rent (FMR) in the Los Angeles Metro area ... for a rental unit of a similar size, plus \$1,411, in moving costs”? Even if the tenant has occupied the unit for a month? The constant chipping away at owner protections discourages the development of new multi-family units and ADUs. I strongly oppose extending protections for the presence of unauthorized occupants or pets. Unsafe conditions brought on by exceeding occupancy limits

should be remedied immediately. Additionally, owners need to know to whom they are renting. Rental applications must be filled out. Credit reports run. The owner needs to have the ability to approve or reject those unauthorized tenants and increase the rent appropriately for those who are allowed to remain. For the best possible outcome for unauthorized tenants, a proper credit and background check is needed. To allow renters to assume legal responsibility of a lease when they do not have the financial means to do so, sets up those unauthorized occupants for financial failure. Thank you for voting for what is best for the rental housing ecosystem instead of short-sighted policies that would result in fewer affordable housing units. Sincerely, Jeffrey Cohen  
Housing Provider

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Marilyn Balduff

**Date Submitted:** 01/19/2023 11:59 PM

**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please don't do this. I am a 80 year old widow and I use the rent money to live on. My tenant has not paid one penny since Covid started. I received rent relief money which helped a lot, however it ended March 31, 2022. I have not received any money from my tenant. I am still paying homeowner dues each month on this unit from my savings. This tenant has the same job that she had before Covid started. She has never stopped working. She just stopped paying because the rent control laws said she did not have to pay. Please help me.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jonathan

**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2023 05:47 AM

**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3

**Comments for Public Posting:** Today marks day 1,050, since housing providers lost the right to evict for the most basic of breaches of contract by tenants. February 1st, instead of seeing a tsunami of evictions, you will discover that tenants will start paying rent as they understand that the greatest protection against displacement and homelessness is by paying the rent. Tenants are in control of their own destiny, apart from any law that you may pass. I strongly oppose the proposed tenant protections. These proposed protections would disincentivize housing creation and will have a net negative impact on all rental housing units. Therefore, you need to create a rent subsidy program instead of putting everything on the backs of rental property owners. I strongly oppose a monetary threshold to evict. Setting a monetary threshold of rents owed before an owner can evict will cause all rents to increase. There are many owners who are proud to be charging below market rents; however, they will have no choice but to increase rents to market rates in order to regain their ability to enforce contracts. Owners need legal protection; if the proposed monetary threshold control passes, owners will have a legal incentive to raise the rent. In the long-run, this recommendation kills organic affordable housing. I strongly oppose the expansion of RSO style “just cause” regulations to all dwelling units. It’s common knowledge that the reason not all units are under RSO-style “Just Cause” regulations is to encourage investors to build more units. Many homeowners are considering building an ADU, but they will decide to not build because of the increasing number of laws that excessively favor tenants. The city is short on housing and we need to encourage new construction, not discourage it. The solution is simple, L.A. City should align RSO units with AB 1482 to reduce complexity and encourage new construction. I strongly oppose Displacement Relocation Assistance. Relocation fees to the tune of “three (3) times the fair market rent (FMR) in the Los Angeles Metro area ... for a rental unit of a similar size, plus \$1,411, in moving costs”? Even if the tenant has occupied the unit for a month? The constant chipping away at owner protections discourages the development of new multi-family units and ADUs. I strongly oppose extending protections for the presence of unauthorized occupants or pets. Unsafe conditions brought on by exceeding occupancy limits should be remedied immediately.

Additionally, owners need to know to whom they are renting. Rental applications must be filled out. Credit reports run. The owner needs to have the ability to approve or reject those unauthorized tenants and increase the rent appropriately for those who are allowed to remain. For the best possible outcome for unauthorized tenants, a proper credit and background check is needed. To allow renters to assume legal responsibility of a lease when they do not have the financial means to do so, sets up those unauthorized occupants for financial failure. Thank you for voting for what is best for the rental housing ecosystem instead of short-sighted policies that would result in fewer affordable housing units. Sincerely, Jonathan