

Communication from Public

Name: Sal La

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 11:18 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Property management is also a business and currently, is expected to provide a service regardless of the customer's willingness to pay. A business can only go on for so long before it is unable to support itself. Soon after, a chain of businesses will begin closing which would lead to a housing shortage as more and more buildings get foreclosed. With no owners, who is to provide the housing to those who need it? While the action may be done in good nature, such polar views will always lead to issues in one area or another. I implore you to take a more ambivalent stance in your discussions and try to consider the implications on every side.

Communication from Public

Name: Susan kornfeld

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 10:28 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Just Cause Expansion to Non-RSO Units Citywide If instituted, I will not be able to afford to move back into my home. I rented it out when I had to move out of state for work. I have had to wait until the moratorium was over so I can move back into the home I lived in for 20 years. Now, I will not have the money to move back in. It is too much to ask single family home owners to take this financial burden. The Statewide Rent Control law, Assembly Bill 1482, subjects nearly all the City's multifamily rental housing to just cause eviction requirements, with more buildings added on a rolling basis. The City should first evaluate the effectiveness of the State Law instead of extending the City's just cause provisions that were established over forty years ago citywide! If the Council moves forward with the adoption of the ordinance it must include the recent amendment which would establish a vesting period prior to the application of these new just cause requirements.

Communication from Public

Name: Saul V.

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 10:22 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Hello, If additional protections are going to be passed for tenants, can you please add some for housing providers. Case in point. Verbal abuse and insults from a tenant. Frequently, a tenant directs verbal insults and harsh language at me, the housing provider, and I refrain from engaging in this type of behaviour. So why can you not add protection for housing providers from verbal abuse and intimidation, just like tenants have protections from this type of behaviour? Thank You, Saul V.

Communication from Public

Name: D.Pitt

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 09:24 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Dear City Council Members, I am pleading with you to give property owners some help by moving forward with ending the eviction memoradum. There are small landlords who have not been paid for almost 3 years and many are seniors like my Mother who need the income to live above the poverty level as Social Security is not enough for many. We need to protect them from losing their properties as many did with no rent since March of 2020. How is this fair?! Many did not get the payments from their tenants that was meant for them from the government. Please don't add more protection laws for renters. What we have to protect them is fine. If we keep making it harder for landlords many will sell and the corporations will come in and raise prices or builders will have no motivation to build more housing. Laws need to be fair for landlords as well as renters. Please help property owners, please... D. Pitt Los Angels County

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 06:10 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: The continued wave of rulings, giving tenants more legal power than landlords will undermine the rental market. These moves are designed to put the burden of housing on the landlords and not the tenants themselves. The government does not want the responsibility of people living on the streets. So, they put the burden on the landlords with no compensation. It is a disaster waiting to happen. The sitting councilman who was caught making racist statements, and refusing to step down is an example of the arrogance of the city council not, listening to their constituents. Those trying to make a living are being driven to bankruptcy. What a shame.

Communication from Public

Name: Shawn Kayy

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 08:37 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: I'm a small mom and pop owner of a 7 unit building. I have been losing a lot of money because of the different tenant protections of the city and with current high interest rates and drop in property values there is no place to go. I'm ready to call it quits and file bankruptcy. Therefore, I oppose the Proposed Tenant Protections Package. 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.

Communication from Public

Name: Jason Vogel

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 09:20 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Taxes, utilities, repairs, and other expenses have gone up dramatically during the last several years. Housing providers have been unable to raise rents to meet these increased expenses. Many tenants have not paid rent, whether they have been impacted by COVID or not. Now the City Council is considering other measures, which amount to a war on housing providers. The City Council needs to be fair and reasonable.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 08:27 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Over three years of not being able to raise rents in Los Angeles and it will be 4 by the time that we think we might be able to but I don't believe will happen for a second. How dare you dictate what we can charge for our livelihood! You're forcing people to sell their properties at a loss so these sharks can come in and swoop down and buy them for nothing and tear them down and build these monstrosities. Of course they can rent them for whatever they want, raise rents whenever and as much as they want. There's supposed to be a shortage of apartments in Los Angeles and I don't believe that for a second and I hope these developers over build it they can't rent them. That would be true justice! Case in point a developer who was going to build 25 apartments down the street with a certain percentage of them designated for low income people. He changes his mind a year down the road and decides to sell them as condo's at a million each. And there he goes to destroy other neighborhoods to do the same thing. Meanwhile, what happens to those low income apartments? They went nowhere and to nobody!! They're still homeless! Gas companies can raise their prices as much as they want, eggs go up from two dollars to \$10, food goes up and they can charge whatever they want for their food but meanwhile we can't raise rents! This is not a democracy anymore, it's full blown socialism! It's an atrocity to us owners and trying to save the city and solve the homeless on our backs! What has I gotcha? Nothing! Won't be long before it becomes communism. When I first bought my first apartment in 1977 and they said that rent control for one year and now it's 46 years later and it's turned into the devil! Having to register our units not once but twice, and you increased those fees so many times I 've lost track! I hope when all of your times come, and they will , I hope you don't expect to be going up because there's no way that he would allow you up there after what you've done to the poor people that saved and saved to buy apartments thinking they could make a living doing it. Then to have you come along and destroy their dreams. It wouldn't surprise me if some of those people out there are former landlords and if not homeless now they will be and all because of you. I could go on forever about this, but it's probably just a waste of my time and you will continue to give tenant more free rides because they obviously are the only ones that put you in office. or

Whenever there's an election, I've always voted for somebody other than any of you that I don't even know but you continue to be put in office because you give the tenant all they want. You are all such a joke! I hope you're all rot in hell! all The whole system is so corrupt just like all of you and I hope all of you get what you deserve! As a matter of fact all politicians are nothing but lowlifes! You will pay one way or the other because karma will get you! Kick you in your ass . This city slowly went to ruins thanks to that wonderful Mayor Garcetti. if he gets an ambassadorship then there is really no justice in this world! Thanks for nothing and may all of you have a shit life. May God be with all of us I'm still so disappointed that Carouso didn't get elected mayor. He would've saw this shit but not on the backs of small apartment owners like myself!!

Communication from Public

Name: Robin nelson

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 07:52 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: I've managed rentals in the city of LA since 2002. During the past few years we were stuck with renters who stopped paying the moment the governor instated the eviction moratorium. These tenants had jobs and income (one of even signed a book deal with a large payment advance that was published in the LA times) but since they didn't have to prove income, we ended up covering these lost rents ourselves, taking out loans to get ourselves through it. Our tenants wouldn't fill out the state paperwork for rental assistance, so we were out of luck. They moved and we don't know where they are living now, so there is not much chance of ever being repaid. The current laws protecting tenants do so at the expense of property rights. Property owners are in a very risky position in Los Angeles. We do not want to stay in the rental business anymore because of how the city treats property owners. It should not have been our jobs to float covid rental issues. We plan to sell and change our holdings to warehouse space in San Bernardino. You are chasing our small-time, decent landlords with the policies you are forcing on us. So many of us are done.

Communication from Public

Name: Maria Johnson

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 07:53 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: When will the City Council quit punishing Landlords with old small buildings. They are making it so we have no choice but to sell to Developers which ironically have ZERO rent control in the City of Los Angeles

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 07:40 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 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. 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, CP Lo

Communication from Public

Name: Charlene Russell

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 07:17 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: The City of Los Angeles and the state of California has hurt enough landlords! Please get your feet off our necks and let us live. Use government money to fix your problems, don't blame landlords! We can not continue to live and provide for our families when we are trying to help our community but are constantly being penalized. it's absurd, evil, disgusting and you should all be ASHAMED of yourselves

Communication from Public

Name: CP Lo

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 07:37 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 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. 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, CP Lo

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 06:56 PM

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,

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 07:01 PM

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, Karlen Mkrtchyan

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 07:03 PM

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, Aroutioun Aroutiounian

Communication from Public

Name: Alice Simonian

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 06:49 PM

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, Alice Simonian

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 06:48 PM

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, Matzak Simonian

Communication from Public

Name: Tony L Garcia

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 06:45 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: 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

Communication from Public

Name: Richard B

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 06:29 PM

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 see that tenants will start paying rent again as required by their leases, and that is the greatest protection against displacement and homelessness. I strongly oppose the proposed tenant protections. The proposed “protections” would disincentivize housing creation and will have a net negative impact on all rental housing units. You need to create a rent subsidy program instead of putting everything on the backs of rental property owners – the vast majority of whom are small “mom and pop” investors; many are retired, many depend on their rental units for their primary income. 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 an incentive to raise rents. In the long run, this proposal will destroy 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.
Thank you for voting for what is best for the rental housing system
instead of short-sighted policies that would result in fewer
affordable housing units.

Communication from Public

Name: Julie Farr

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 06:21 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: This proposal excessively favor tenants and hurt landlords. While landlords have not been able to raise rent for several years. you continue to raise the landlords cost, including doubling the SCEP fee and removing our ability to chose trash removal services. You are attempting to do social engineering via landlords, instead you should simply be providing money to 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 AB1482 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 - just like we had with the housing market. 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,Julie and Stan Dorobek Fountain View Apartments, Los Angeles 90027

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 06:12 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: For the most part, life has pretty much returned to normal now that the pandemic is no longer a life-threatening health threat for a majority of the population. Therefore, IT IS TIME FOR THE CITY COUNCIL TO LIFT THE MORATORIUM ON EVICTIONS AND REQUIRE THAT TENANTS PAY THEIR RENT IN A TIMELY MANNER. There are plenty of employment opportunities out there. Tenants who claim that they cannot afford to pay their rent need to go out and find a job. Property owners should not be forced to allow tenants to continue to live in an apartment without paying their rent each month. It is unfair to the property owner. If the city council decides to be magnanimous and allow the eviction moratorium to continue, then the city council should be required to subsidize the landlords with money from the city coffers to reimburse them for their missing rent. ALSO, IT IS TIME TO LIFT THE MORATORIUM ON TENANT RENT INCREASES IN RSO APARTMENT BUILDINGS. IT IS TOTALLY UNFAIR TO PROPERTY OWNERS TO BE FORCED TO MAINTAIN THEIR APARTMENT BUILDINGS IN GOOD CONDITION BUT NOT BE ABLE TO RAISE THE TENANTS' RENT TO PAY FOR THE NECESSARY REPAIRS AND IMPROVEMENTS. OUR OWN TENANTS HAVE NOT HAD A RENT INCREASE SINCE 2017. IN 2019, JUST AS WE WERE ABOUT TO RAISE THE RENTS, THE PANDEMIC HIT AND THE RENT INCREASE MORATORIUM WAS PUT INTO PLACE. NOW WE ARE BEING FORCED TO WAIT YET ANOTHER YEAR, UNTIL FEBRUARY OF 2024 TO BE ABLE TO RAISE RENTS. SEVEN YEARS WITHOUT TENANTS HAVING A RENT INCREASE IS RIDICULOUS!! ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!

Communication from Public

Name: James C. Lim and Nancy Ngo Lim

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 05:31 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Honorable Councilmember 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, Nancy Lim

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 05:52 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: I am a small business owner and landlord. I am a hard working and productive member of society who contributes and makes a difference in our city daily. I am an immigrant who started at zero & am living proof that our city offers endless opportunities for those who chose to make a better life for themselves. I worked my whole life and sacrificed so much to make an investment in my apartment building. I made this investment to secure a better future for myself and my family. We are hurting and beyond fed up with the abuse and trampling of our rights as property owners. The shortsighted and unjust policies that our local & state government keep adopting are a form of operation and abuse that is only seen in third world countries. 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.

Communication from Public

Name: Chris Poon

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 05:23 PM

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. 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.

Communication from Public

Name: May Chiu

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 05:24 PM

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. 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.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 02:45 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Landlords are suffering! It is impossible to be a good landlord under these rules and guidelines. It leads to hardship and make things worse long term for the community and renters, but in addition to that, it is so hard for landlords to survive - how can landlords survive with NO rent, no ability to evict, and then more costs when just trying to regain possession of a property they worked so hard to buy...so hard. As a landlord, I am suffering from this and it's caused so much family trauma and pain.

Communication from Public

Name: Fred Keivanfar

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 02:46 PM

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.

Communication from Public

Name: Vincent Petrillo

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 02:46 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: I am a mom and pop landlord (self made) like many others in Los Angeles, who had hoped to fund my retirement with what I earned from my rentals. But since the Covid Eviction ban was enacted it has become a struggle to keep up with all the regulations enacted and to even get paid. I would like to keep providing safe, affordable housing to my tenants (it is good “karma”) but now I live in fear of what you might do next. I am ready to give up. If you enact what is being proposed I, and many others, will have no choice but to leave the rental business. At 75 years of age I do not need the stress or aggravation any more. It’s not worth it. The pity if it is that those who I serve will have no where else to go as the housing I provide is substantially below the market rate. Thank you-

Communication from Public

Name: Darius

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 02:51 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Honorable Councilmembers: 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 de-incentivize 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. Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 02:54 PM

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.

Communication from Public

Name: Hirah hafiz sheikh

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 02:59 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: You guys are hurting landlord not the tenant.we already suffered alot stop harrasing landlord. We already lost soo much in pandemic got alot of stress.tenants do not care about anything they waste all utilities.help landlord they deserve more.its their hardwork that they own it.

Communication from Public

Name: Ky Trang Ho

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 03:00 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Honorable Councilmembers: 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, Ky Trang Ho

Communication from Public

Name: Gita Sarafan

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 02:25 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 Gita Sarafan

Communication from Public

Name: Saman Behnam

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 02:21 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, Saman Behnam

Communication from Public

Name: Rebecca

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 02:17 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Please do not pass this. It's hard enough to own and manage property here. If you keep making it harder owners and builders will continue to leave.

Communication from Public

Name: Joe Trock

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

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,

Communication from Public

Name: Housing provider

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

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Honorable Council member : 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, Housing Provider

Communication from Public

Name: Alison Golub

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 10:57 AM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: As a renter in the city of LA, I urge the city council to pass permanent tenant protections! This Council recently voted to end the emergency order, yet we are in a new wave of COVID-19 with many people still recovering from earlier impacts of the pandemic. If you do not act quickly to implement permanent protections, hundreds of thousands of Angelenos like myself could be forced onto the streets. There are concrete, common sense policies on the table, and it is your responsibility to pass them & protect working class renters in your city. I urge you to support Universal Just Cause because no one should be evicted for no reason. Making exceptions for ADU's or other similar units will greatly impact low-income, multi-generational families who can only stay housed by living together. Just Cause should cover all units. These issues impact all of us. When we keep folks off the streets and in their homes, the entire city is better off. Please do not allow more of our neighbors to fall into homelessness. Pass these protections.

Communication from Public

Name: Sarah Noell

Date Submitted: 01/18/2023 03:35 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: I'm tired to see my husband going through health issues while paying for a tenant that is buying a condo, have a maid and have a jacuzzi and does not want to work. Why don't you investigate on each case? Why the independent landlords that bought property because numbers were making sense, have to pay for these cheaters? I ask the city to end the moratorium because Covid will still exist and this is not anymore a state emergency. City needs to pay for all of this - please help us. We can't even sell without loosing even more money. This is ridiculous.

Communication from Public

Name: Cherokee Nation Properties
Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 05:11 PM
Council File No: 21-0042-S3
Comments for Public Posting: I Oppose the Proposed Tenant Protections Package!

Honorable Councilmember: Harris-Dawson

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,
Cherokee Nation Properties, LLC

[Click here to post a public comment for the L.A. City Councilmembers.](#)

Communication from Public

Name: Yacov Stolpner

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 05:12 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Honorable Councilmembers: 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.

Communication from Public

Name: Steve Hau

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 05:21 PM

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. 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.

Communication from Public

Name: deonne

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 05:03 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Honorable Councilmembers: Gil Cedillo. Councilmember District 1. Paul Krekorian. Councilmember District 2. Bob Blumenfield. Councilmember District 3. Nithya Raman. Councilmember District 4. Paul Koretz. Councilmember District 5. Vacant. Councilmember District 6. Monica Rodriguez. Councilmember District 7. Marqueece Harris-Dawson. Councilmember District 8. 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. Regards Deonne

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 05:03 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: We have not been able to raise rent for 1050 days. NO rent increase what so ever. For me, it is even longer because the renewal for my RSO units were in April 2020. When we were able to raise the rent , we had the moratorium late March, so it is almost 4 years for me. My rents are about 50% below market. Before pandemic, I never raised to the allowable limit as inflation number was low and I care about my tenants. However, this has put me in a very difficult financial position, given rent freeze will be about 4 years (can't raise rent till next Feb 2024) for me, yet inflation is about 7-10% for the past 2 years and taxes and utilities continue to increase year over year. I am very discouraged and concern about my property rights being taken away. All these new proposals are making mom and pop housing provider very vulnerable when facing a tenant that is taking advantage of the system. This will cause all rents to raise , and is not fair for tenants that are working hard to pay for their shares. Subsidy rent program is the answer, not punishing the housing providers.

Communication from Public

Name: Roger

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 05:05 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: You're going to make it harder on us little investors who risked it to provide housing . I will have to sell if yiu give renters more rights than landlords. Enough already . You wonder why we sell to big corporations and leave town. Los Angeles is very mismanaged . People are fleeing . Time to vote Republican !

Communication from Public

Name: Laura Raymond
Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 05:07 PM
Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: The Alliance for Community Transit-Los Angeles, as a coalition representing 42 organizations from all corners of LA, urges you to vote YES on Item 1 to pass permanent tenant protections. We cannot allow thousands of our neighbors to lose their housing. We ask that you move these protections as urgency matters and get them adopted immediately. If these can't be implemented in time, you should extend emergency protections until permanent ones are in place. Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name: Kim Rivera

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 04:42 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Council Members of Los Angeles City. I am a stakeholder in CD5 and also an owner of a duplex in the city of Los Angeles. It has been brought to my attention that there is a proposed motion to further extend renter protections. I strongly oppose the current protections along with the possibility of increased protections. In addition, I strongly oppose the expansion of "RSO style" just cause regulations to all dwelling units. All of these laws that favor tenants only has caused a great burden on mom and pop landlords. With the regulations that are currently in place, there is zero incentive for anyone to purchase a property with rental potential. There are also zero incentives for tenants to abide by the original terms of their lease agreements. I strongly oppose relocation assistance. As it stands, many renters are using this protection as a "pay day" all the while pushing the limits of their tenant leases for monetary gain. Then as it stands many landlords are already dealing with the negative impact of back rents due and zero possibility for rent increases. All the while the property owners lenders have not continued to extend mortgage moratoriums. Property landlords are now faced with increased utility bills, higher costs of repairs, replacements and maintenance. That coupled with an increase of tradesmen rates along with the basic cost of living. Costs and expenses have skyrocketed in every facet of life. How can landlord / owners be expected fund such losses while many have also taken huge financial hits due to the negative impacts of Covid? I also strongly oppose extending the protections for the presence of unauthorized occupants or pets. This will only become a further financial burden on the landlord / owners. There are many landlord / owners that are also on the brink of homelessness. Many have to make the choice to pay an inflated utility bill brought on by tenant(s) or make the choice of purchasing groceries or covering other personal expenses. The current rental protections also do not take into consideration that a tenant may have a better ability to pay than an owner / landlord. There is no current vetting or screening process. In many cases renters are bringing in much higher incomes while the landlord / owners are acting as private welfare agencies with no government funding. Right now many tenants are taking full advantage of the COVID protections while also benefiting from RSO protections at the expense of mom and pop landlord / owners. This entire

situation is unfair and unjust. It is in my opinion that mom and pop landlords / owners are being treated with extreme prejudice. How can I also be treated fairly? How is it that I myself am being expected to carry such a financial and mental burden? Who on the city council is looking out for stakeholders like us mom and pop landlords? I appreciate you taking the time to consider my position on the proposed motions. Please take the necessary steps to be fair to all tax paying residents. Thank you Kim Rivera

Communication from Public

Name: marguerite

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 04:34 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.

Communication from Public

Name: This-Is-Wrong

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 04:36 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Honorable Councilmember: 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, Your Name
[Click here to post a public comment for the L.A. City Councilmembers.](#)

Communication from Public

Name: marguerite adams
Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 04:38 PM
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. Marguerite Adams

Communication from Public

Name: Steve Bernal

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 04:27 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: I am a landlord who owns a fourplex and Duplex in south LA. I originally purchased this property to provide retirement income. At the time it was occupied by gang members who terrorized the neighborhood. I hired an off duty police officer to collect the rents and was able to eventually evict them. I've invested over \$100,000 in capital improvements and I now have (mostly) stable tenants. I've always taken good care of the property and been attentive to my tenants. I understood the restrictions of rent control when I purchased the property and generally am ok with it. It's been nearly three years since the city enacted severe restrictions on evictions and rent increases. I was asked to be a Covid safety net while my property expenses kept rising (LAHD fees, property taxes, insurance, repairs, water, etc.). I've done my part, so I'm perplexed as to why the City Council believes I should do even more? Because of rent control all of my tenants pay less than \$1000 a month (vs. \$1800 market rent). I'm against any proposal that limits my ability to evict a tenant that doesn't pay their rent per the terms of their rental agreement. For the first time since I purchased this property, I'm now seriously considering selling it. If I can't collect the rent when promised then what is the point of owning rental property?

Communication from Public

Name: Don Griffin

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 04:04 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: The proposed "tenant protections" are counter-productive and horribly damaging to property owners, as well as responsible tenants who have handled their responsibilities honestly and with integrity. We have several tenants with plenty of money for fancy cars, cell phones, vacations and luxuries, who have taken advantage of the mis-guided "tenant protections" to avoid paying rent. We know for a fact that several of these tenants are working and being paid in cash to avoid reporting income and to avoid paying taxes. Your protections are incentivizing these behaviors. Continued interference with tenant- landlord contracts and relationships is empowering dishonest and irresponsible tenants, and taking money from landlords without any justification or legal process. If your desire to continue to "protect" tenants is driven by your belief that this will get you votes, keep you in power, or actually help tenants, then you are either corrupt yourself, or completely ignorant of the workings and benefits of the free enterprise system. You are helping no one and you are doing tremendous damage, especially to small mom and pop landlords. You are only encouraging irresponsible behavior.

Communication from Public

Name: Van Nuys Property

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 04:12 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Council, I am a small property owner and my wife and I local teachers that have worked for the school district, saved our money and purchased 2 small apartment buildings. We depend on the rents being paid to pay our mortgages and all other bills. Our interest rates have gone up, DWP have gone up, Trash bill has gone up, insurance has gone up, Housing Department yearly bill has gone up, our tenants have more than doubled the population of our 2 buildings by adding multiple people, maintenance costs have increased, etc... We are suffering and our tenants owe us thousands of dollars from pandemic years. We depend on prompt payments so that we can continue paying the bills promptly. Please we can no longer survive, we have used our teaching salaries to compensate for the money our tenants have not paid us. We just ask for a simple prompt monthly payment from our tenants.

Communication from Public

Name: FARIBA SOLEIMANI

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 04:13 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: As a small landlord, who have worked hard to be able to buy and hold on an asset to retire, the actions of council members is taking their retirement away. I have tenants that have been working all along during pandemic and not paying a penny. They make fun of the system and how allows them to get away with it. I have a tenant who is doing short term rental, people are in and out of his unit, drug use, damage to unit and etc., he collects rent, yet he is not paying me rent. When one of his roomates dont pay rent, he throws their stuff in the street, when I just have to see him and say nothing as they have learned to say "You are Harassing me". This entire system is and will cost the tenants alot more. If we are not getting rent, we cannot maintain the building. I have applied for tax reduction due to 1/3 less income. The City needs to bear the burden of issuing subsidy to tenants who really need it, not to the people who are scamming the government. Thank you

Communication from Public

Name: JOHN JANA VS
Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 04:14 PM
Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Councilmembers: There is no other group of constituents that this City Council treats with the disdain, outright bias, and arrogance that you treat housing providers with. You do not tell grocery stores to give away food. You do not forbid any other business from refusing service to anyone as they judge appropriate. You never told nurses and doctors that they had to give away their labor and income during COVID because they are critical workers. But this is what you do to housing providers, without hesitation. You should be working with us as team members on the path to housing Los Angeles rather than treating us as criminals, but you choose not to. You have an opportunity to make fair and balanced housing policy and repeatedly you choose not to. I strongly oppose the latest proposed tenant protections. They will not achieve what you think they will and they will cost housing providers at the same time that you have the gall to continue to freeze rents. You cannot make housing better by treating the people that provide it poorly. A monetary threshold for eviction will only result in thousands of tenants perpetually carrying a balance they owe till they move, and housing providers will never collect that balance at the end of the tenancy. The net result will be that we will not take chances on marginal tenants. We will increase rents and deposits as high as possible to cover the inevitable rip-offs we face. Just Cause requirements are poor policy. Housing providers are in charge of the quality of life for many tenants. One bad tenant can affect a hundred other lives. Just Cause requirements result in bad tenants extending their stay endlessly as housing providers face the challenge and cost of documenting and executing an eviction. I had a tenant assault my 78 year old female manager and it still took 5 months to get him evicted. 5 months that the manager and other tenants lived in fear because of one person. The eviction process is broken and your proposal just breaks it more. Guess what, not every tenant is a good honest person. We should have the right to eliminate the problem people with minimal cost or delay. Unauthorized tenants are unacceptable. Owners must know and approve who is living in their building. IT'S A MATTER OF SAFETY. Background and credit checks are a surprisingly accurate predictor of the quality of a tenant. Housing providers must be allowed to qualify all adult tenants. Leases cannot be just assumed by anyone nor at

the same terms as they may have been originally written. Additionally, there are real expense increases from unauthorized additional tenants. These include increased wear, damage, service calls and significantly increased utility costs. Relocation Assistance, if any, should be limited to people that are older than 65, and have lived in their apartment for longer than 7 years, and only to those that are being asked to move for tear down purposes. I KNOW OF DOZENS OF UNITS THAT HAVE BEEN PULLED OFF THE MARKET BECAUSE OWNERS NO LONGER TRUST THE CITY COUNCIL OR WANT TO DEAL WITH THE HOUSING DEPARTMENT. YOU MADE THAT HAPPEN. WRITE FAIR HOUSING POLICY.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 04:19 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Please see attached letter

Landmark Realty

Honorable Councilmember:

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, you will discover that tenants will start paying rent as they understand they can no longer get away with “legal theft”. Tenants are in control of their own destiny, apart from any law that you may pass.

I strongly oppose the proposed tenant protections, including 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. In addition, any tenant can find a way to pay a small amount to avoid eviction.

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. This proposal will discourage new construction.

I strongly oppose Displacement Relocation Assistance. Relocation fees of “three (3) times the fair market rent (FMR) in the Los Angeles Metro area, plus \$1,411, in moving costs” is completely ridiculous and unfair. 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. 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 unauthorized tenants and increase the rent appropriately for those who are allowed to remain.

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,

Donald Griffin

Communication from Public

Name: Eleanor Wacker
Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 03:56 PM
Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Honorable Council Members: It is difficult, if not impossible, to understand why owners of rental property should have regulations imposed upon them mandating special privileges for renters who either do not pay their rent or do not abide by the contract they agreed upon. We do not ask grocery stores, gas stations, clothing stores, etc to exchange their offered goods for whatever price or terms are offered. Why then should land owners accept any and all conditions offered by a tenant ? If there's a difference, please explain it to me. On the basis of fair business, the "punishment " imposed on housing providers is INEXPLICABLE ! I urge a vote to reject any and all additional restrictions on apartment owners.
Most sincerely, E. Wacker, a very small apartment owner

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 03:59 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Honorable Councilmembers: 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. Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name: David Morgan

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 04:03 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Honorable Councilmembers, 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, David Morgan duplex owner & occupant 1427/1429 S Sherbourne Dr Los Angeles, CA 90035 district 5

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 03:47 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Please stop telling tenants to not pay rent. They are getting spoiled. I manage 7 properties and the ones that are not paying rent are clearly taking advantage of the system. They keep using the Covid excuse and then we have people that were really in need of help and they helped themselves. They worked other jobs to continue to be responsible.

Communication from Public

Name: patrick n sherman

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 03:48 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Please don't enact or expand any more rent control regulations. I have 18 units over 4 small buildings. My insurances have tripled, my mortgage has gone up, and labor and maintenance have more than tripled. I have already had to sell my largest building, a 10-unit property, and exchange it for a property outside of California. The Covid restrictions caused me so much hardship, that I Can't afford to keep these properties anymore.

Communication from Public

Name: Concerned Housing Provider who has been greatly effected by Covid and and other tenant allowances

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 03:22 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: 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 Concerned Housing Provider

Communication from Public

Name: Michael Green

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 03:38 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: It is difficult to see much difference between the new proposed rent control bill and cattle rustling during the 1800s. You propose to void contracts because tenants cannot afford to meet their obligation to pay rent because they do not have enough money. You propose to steal from landlords and give the money to poor people from their pockets--not from City coffers. You propose to treat private property as though its disposition was subject only to your whim. Beneath your proposal is a combination of black greed and white guilt that is as regrettable as it is despicable. Below also find the more sober and dispassionate boilerplate from AOAUSA. 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.

Communication from Public

Name: Cheryl Taylor

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 03:38 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Honorable Councilmember Bernard Parks : As a Mom and Pop Landlord, 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, Cheryl Taylor - Mom and Pop Landlord

Communication from Public

Name: Melanie A Streitfeld
Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 03:40 PM
Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Honorable Councilmembers: 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, Melanie Streitfeld Harbor City and Sherman Oaks retired property owner.

Communication from Public

Name: Trying to Remain Middle Class

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 03:43 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: I want you to strongly consider that a good leader is fair to BOTH/ALL of the needs of any group of people. Currently you are considering ONLY the Tenants and making it almost impossible and definitely unfavorable for anybody to want to be a housing provider. Your newest proposed actions are further hurting the current housing shortage. If we continue on this road, the only housing providers will be the government. Your actions only threaten our housing stock more and more, and this will only cause more and more homelessness. Can't you see what you are doing? I say it with compassion, that you are being blind to the big picture. You pass laws but do not consider the small "Mom and Pop" owners. What are you doing? Are you completely immune to the needs of people trying to remain Middle Class. Do you want a community of only THE RICH and THE POOR- with no MIDDLE? What is wrong with you? What are you unwittingly encouraging "Learned Helplessness." This is far from healthy. I URGE—NO BEG YOU not to ignore the NEEDS of people like me.!!! If you pass these laws you will have only providers that are either big corporations, OR public housing providers. Is that your leadership vision for this city? These laws will only make it harder to have a decent thriving city. Please, please, please, don't do this!!!! Do you WANT the middle class to abandon this city???? You are doing a very good job of that! Also you are encouraging "Learned Helplessness" I strongly oppose the proposed tenant protections. These proposed protections would dis-incentivize 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. This is far from fair!!!! 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. 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.

Communication from Public

Name: Judy Johnson

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 03:33 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Kindly consider the plight of small well-meaning landlords with property in your jurisdiction when you vote. There is nobody who cannot work right now due to covid. But we are subject to no evictions, no rent increases, having tenants not pay for close to three years while our maintenance costs, trash costs, and expenses escalate and our mortgages and property taxes continue. We have properties with non-paying tenants who have brought others into their apartments that we can do nothing about. We applied for covid relief, but if a tenant did not complete his portion the claim was never paid. So all around the tenant wins and we continue to be upside down financially. Rent control constricts the supply and actually drives up the cost of units because the only way to try to make up for financial loses is to charge more for open units. Rent control is illegal in many states for this reason. Which of you would vote that it is okay for someone to stay at a hotel for 1000 days without paying or eat a sandwich every day for 1000 days at a restaurant (and restrict the price of that sandwich or room) without having to pay and the inability to remove the person? Votes in favor make us doubt the basic economic/financial/business understanding of our city council and drive real estate purchases out of state just like the businesses. Thank you for listening and for consideration of honest small business owners so financially damaged by the unfairness of your decisions.

Communication from Public

Name: Cynthia

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 03:35 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: I am own a first time homeowner. It happens to be a duplex. I live in one unit and I inherited a long time tenant. Said tenant has moved in a partner and her child. Their rent is less than \$900 for a 1,200sq 2+1. I am watching them upgrade their vehicles to luxury SUV model (at the price of gas!!! an SUV) . I assure you, they do not need your protection. I believe that special concessions must be made for the "mom & pop" owners of less than five (5) units. My mortgage is nearly \$5,500/month. FYI. How is it fair that I must endure another year before I can increase the rent. And now to hear you're offering further protections? Enough.

Communication from Public

Name: Shirley Marabou

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 03:36 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: I need this to pass so bad I have a lady living in my house that's been there almost 2 years and no payment I need to get somebody in there that'll be able to take care of what they're supposed to do. I need them out soon. Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name: Randy Fortunato

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 03:23 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: I have renters that only pay when they have by law They owe me thousands of dollars and I can collect. If this continues, I might have to claim bankruptcy.. Please enough is enough.I still have to pay taxes, insurance, etc,etc..please vote no !!! I'm a senior citizen that depends on rent.Im going broke.

Communication from Public

Name: Sami Kamjoo

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 03:28 PM

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. Thank you

Communication from Public

Name: Apartment Owners Association of California (AOA)

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 03:32 PM

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. AOA strongly opposes 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. AOA strongly opposes 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. AOA strongly opposes 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. AOA strongly opposes “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. AOA strongly opposes 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, Jeff Faller, President Apartment Owners Association of California

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 02:29 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: PLEASE consider the rights and responsibilities of the landlords in this area. We have been penalized for providing housing for the past 3 years with rent abatement and evictions prohibited. We understand the reasons for these provisions in the BEGINNING of the pandemic but this is 3 years later. Many landlords face increasing bills, property taxes, insurance, utilities without being able to collect rent. This situation is untenable. Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 02:31 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: As a mom and pop landlord, I strongly appose the new tenant protections attempting to be put in place. Your actions will make things worse, not better. You are scaring off the mom and pop landlords, they are selling to corporations who want more and more profits. The mom and pops will no longer buy in LA, this will mean less incentive for developers to build anything in LA, causing an even greater shortage in housing, ultimately meaning higher rent and poorer conditions.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 02:40 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: 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

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,
Your Name

[Click here to post a public comment for the L.A. City Councilmembers.](#)

Communication from Public

Name: Kelvin Tolbert

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 03:00 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: It is criminal for the city of Los Angeles to make not paying rent legal. What does any contract mean when a tenant can come in and take all the private owner's rights away and all terms of that contract are no longer enforceable. If an owner signs a 1 year lease - it is not enforceable - but rather becomes a life estate for the tenant. There is a cost that the private owner has to absorb because of your policies - it is definitely the taking of private property without compensation and is unjust. You guys make your \$200,000 plus salary each year but you mandate private property owner's, who most make less than you, absorb the cost of housing folks who do not pay. It already takes an owner over 60 days to get a non paying tenant out. You folks need to wake up and stop giving away hard working landlords property because you do not respect the work that they do. These policies are destroying the small housing providers and are a gift to the large property owner's because the large property owner's are buying up the properties that are being sold by the small property owner who can no longer stay in business.

Communication from Public

Name: Judith

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 03:00 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Honorable Councilmembers : 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, Judith Elizabeth

Communication from Public

Name: Melissa Barlow

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 03:01 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: I am staunchly opposed to further unnecessary intervention by LA City Council into the already strained and frayed Landlord-Tenant relationship. Vote NO on the new proposal. You are costing the City of Los Angeles mom-and-pop landlord-run buildings that historically have lower rents and house more vulnerable tenants. Mom and Pop landlords are being forced to sell their properties to large corporations due to the negative intervention of City of Los Angeles Council.

Communication from Public

Name: Sam Shaw

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 03:02 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Honorable Councilmember: 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 sam shaw

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 03:05 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Although I am sympathetic to people being evicted"through NO FAULT of their own" as in the COVID era when businesses were forced to close without regard for liberty and the pursuit of happiness - in my opinion it is beyond City council authority to implement "social"rules without regard for property owners that have worked hard in many cases all their life and now faced with Mortgage payments without the income. How can this be fair? What is next? Going into people's homes and deciding too much square footage for one family? Where does it stop? It keeps me up at night to see how laws are implemented for the protection on one class and total disregard for others. Where are the protection for the property owners? We have a housing shortage and pretty soon who is going to want to build apartments and buy rental property if it means it can be "nationalized" with the stroke of a pen? It is a very slippery road .

Communication from Public

Name: Zubair Ahmad

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 03:06 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: In the last two years, we as landlords have taken a beating. From the first day of the pandemic the danger to property rights became very real. The cancel the rent crowd, who on the one hand were so scared of the pandemic they couldn't pay rent but at the same time they held massive mask-less rallies demanding an end to rent. The government for their part, took the time to make eviction illegal but didn't bother to write in any kind of support for landlords. State and local governments presented us with the same apathy. Our third and Fifth Amendment rights had been stolen with the stroke of a pen and we quietly accepted it thinking this temporary and there is a crisis. Political opportunists painted landlords as some cross between Richie Rich and Simon Legree. Since then the crisis has been mostly forgotten, every club and restaurant is open, people wander in every direction without masks and congregate as they please. Apparently, the only thing that'll bring down the COVID apocalypse is the rights to property being restored to landlords. Why? Could it be vote buying on the backs of landlords? In that pursuit of vote buying, The LA County Eviction Moratorium was extended illegally. This extension is in explicit violation of State Code of Civil Procedure 1179.05 Subsection A. It is on the record in the Meeting minutes that all county supervisors were well aware that the extension of this Moratorium was in direct violation Code of Civil Procedure 1179.05 Subsection A. But the County Supervisors willfully pushed forward with the extension anyway. Did you consider or imagine how much harm and confusion this is causing for me as a small Landlord, for our Attorney (If I could afford one) and our Tenant? This is willful neglect and pure abuse of power on your part. The law you helped to enact carries a penalty of \$5,000 per day for violating the moratorium and there is no safe harbor for mistakes. Do you think it is reasonable for you to burden a small landlords with such a heavy-handed potential penalty when you are guilty of violating state law? The RSO/MRSO for the unincorporated LA County is unnecessary, and the department (LA County Consumer & Business Affairs) assigned to regulate is highly inefficient and incapable. Why do we need a RSO/MRSO for unincorporated LA County when a rent control law already exists on the State Level (AB1482)? Do you think LA County is more capable then the state to administer Rent Control? If so,

please see the attached my Emails to the LA County Consumer & Business Affairs. I waited on hold for 5.5 Hours on 10/11/2021 when I called. And since that day, I have written them an email on a daily without any call back until 11/19/2020. Do you think that it is reasonable for you to burden a small landlord or a tenant to wait 5.5 hours on hold without anyone picking up the phone? The whole justification for this law has been that somehow, someway the county supposedly did research and found that landlords are asking for a rent increase of around 28%. The rents in the county did not go up an average of 28%, just supposedly the landlords who asked for a rent increase of about 28% a conveniently round number around \$300. If you were to believe the county numbers the average rent is roughly \$1200.00 but if the data is correct why hasn't rent in the county gone up as the county numbers tell us they should. But here are some numbers that are verified. REAL INFLATION: -AVERAGE PRICE OF PRODUCTS ON AMAZON IS UP 25% JUST THIS YEAR (CNBC) -THE PRICE OF GAS IS UP ON AVERAGE NEARLY 50% \$2.97-\$4.46 (LA ALMANAC) NOVEMBER TO NOVEMBER -PRICE OF EGGS HAS RISEN BY 29 % (NPR) -HOME PRICES HAVE GONE UP 18.6% IN 12 MONTHS (Case-Shiller U.S. National Home Price index) -HOME PRICES HAVE GONE UP 20% IN 2021 IN CA (C.A.R.) -The price of beef increased 20.1% (Bureau of Labor Statistics shows) -The price of Freon R-22 has gone from \$50 a pound to \$300 a pound since 2019 a 6 fold increase -CALIFORNIA WATER PRICES HAVE JUMPED 48% IN JUST 3 WEEKS (FORBES) Nasdaq Veles California Water Index (NQH2O) -between 2010 and 2017 water rates in Los Angeles jumped 71 percent. (KQED) These prices didn't just go up for landlords or renters, they went up for everyone. When expenses rise by that much, income has to be increased as well, landlords can't just go and ask for a raise. The only way to deal with rising expenses is to raise the Rent to cover inflation. Rents are often our only source of income and most small time landlords are pensioners and the rent is their only supplementary income. The Board of Supervisors, have a very confusing worldview. They seem to think that the property Values going up is ok but rents going up is wrong. Why not tie the price of housing to inflation as well, did they think that home values can go up without rents following suit. That's like expecting that oil prices can go up but gas prices won't be allowed to rise in price.

Communication from Public

Name: Lito Manalo

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 03:06 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: 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. 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 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. We need your help as we are just a mom & pop landlord with 4 units, occupying 1 for our own use. Our rents are way below market, and it's not easy to pay the mortgage & rely on any rent surplus for retirement income.?Please consider and treat us small landlords fairly.

Communication from Public

Name: A. Carroll / Multiunit Property Owner & Landlord
Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 03:08 PM
Council File No: 21-0042-S3
Comments for Public Posting: Tenant protections have gotten out of hand. It has been nearly 3 YEARS since the start of pandemic and “mom n’ pop” property owners like me are on the brink of defaulting on our mortgages and losing our properties because of laws that overly favor tenants and punish owners that provide tax revenue to the city. PLEASE VOTE NO ON ALL FURTHER TENANT PROTECTIONS.

Communication from Public

Name: James Samore

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 03:10 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: You have been taking advantage of us mom & pop landlords for three years as well as collecting our fees for doing business in southern ca for three years as well as rent control while ALL of our costs going up with inflation. Wake up do not be blind and or stupid. It is plain common sense people. If any of you own property you sure as hell know what I am talking about. Once again vote for what is right and stop helping the lazy

Communication from Public

Name: vincent jones

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 03:14 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: This just amounts to theft, flat out. California, Los Angeles County and the city of Los Angeles is unashamedly stealing our money(landlords)and taking away our property rights. I have never seen such an assault on business and investment. Many of us have nor been able to collect rent for nearly three years and now this, more PROTECTIONS for people who just abuse the system. If you all want to help these tenants, pay their rent. Don't bankrupt us.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 03:15 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: I urgently and strongly oppose the foregoing of the proposed tenant protections, monetary threshold to evict, expansions of RSO style "just cause" regulations to all dwelling, Displacement Relocation Assistance, and I strongly oppose extending protections for the presence of unauthorized occupants or pets. All of the above mentioned will cause a greater hardship on Owners to lose their properties, exhaust all financial savings, create increase in fights, threats, and killings, due to these protections. I have had a tenant threatened my life, to kill me because he was Ted to take over my house in everyday possible. I strongly oppose all of these protections because it will paralyze and destroy our city.

Communication from Public

Name: Sergio Palos

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 03:16 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: 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.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 01/19/2023 03:20 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: I am a mom and pop landlord, not a big company. It is not fair or reasonable that there are so many benefits and rights given to the tenants and not the landlord. It is not right that the landlord's have to bear the burden of tenant's not paying their rent. We have bills and families to take care of as well. If you're going to make rules and laws protecting the tenants, you need to do the same for the landlords. For many of us, rental properties are our livelihood. These rules are a complete bias against landlords and totally unfair. We've suffered enough. Please consider landlord rights, equally as the tenants.