

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Mike Johnson

**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2023 01:39 PM

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

**Comments for Public Posting:** If I have to hear 1x more tenant ask for "permanent tenant protections"....WHAT THE F@CK DO YOU THINK THE EXISTING RSO PROTECTIONS ARE!!! What they really mean is can we have the protections allowed in the moratorium i.e. ability to steal housing by living in a property without paying rent made permanent....GTFO no one is going to be "forced onto the streets" all you have to do is pay your rent, we're at record low unemployment levels and record high wage levels, inflation is coming down > wages so there is more purchasing power...rents stayed the same during the highest period of inflation in the last 40 years (i.e. - wages rose and rents were frozen) Jerome Powell even said there is a structural imbalance in the labor market we have >4M unfilled jobs in our country right now the reason this imbalance exists and people aren't going back to work...why do you need to work when you can live in your home rent free? this is causing employers to have to pay more for the people that will work which raises the price of goods and services for all of us. Policies like the moratorium have a direct impace on inflation which hurts everyone...existing tenants in RSO properties are just too god damn selfish and lazy to care about how the impacts of their greed hurt others (i.e. seniors surving on fixed pensions or SS income) If you want lower rent, move to a lower cost area...very simple Tenants need to be held accountable, especially the ones committing fraud (lying about being effected by Covid to steal housing is fraud and should be prosecuted just like Nithya Raman did to landlords with her anti-harassment bill) Where are the laws holding deadbeat & fraudulent tenants civilly and criminally accountable? If we had these landlords could be more flexible and house more people...the bad tenants make the property owners operate in a way that makes housing more expensive and less available...this has to change immediately for the betterment of both sides stop rewarding and incentivizing people to be lazy and not productive members of society @Nithya Raman...it must be nice to live on top of the hill above Silver Lake in one of the nicest blocks overlooking the reservoir (with no homeless anywhere in sight), send your kids to LILA and disparage the compassion of someone living on Hobart and James Wood because they want their block cleaned up and the public schools improved. When our kids get sick in the middle of the

night and we have to go to emergency room we have to sit in a homeless encampment with our sick crying kids...you for sure go to Cedar Sinai and probably get some sort of VIP treatment....you don't live in our world...your lack of self awareness and unwillingness to hold freeloaders accountable make you unfit for office...Nithya Raman needs to be recalled ASAP

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Elaine Powers  
**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2023 10:47 PM  
**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3  
**Comments for Public Posting:** We need help. You are killing us.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Frustrated tax payer andhousing provider

**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2023 09:56 AM

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

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please do not pass this eviction protection package. Your current protections are not only allowing, but encouraging bad actors to get away with horrible abuses of our property and violations of their leases. Eviction for non-payment of rent is all we have left! Please do not institute more "protections" that only encourage people to accumulate debt, disregard their financial responsibilities and become accustomed to violations of their leases. And on top of that, you're proposing an increase in re-location fees! Wow! I am not rich. This is my livelihood like any other small business. Please do not force us shoulder the financial burden of this disaster we did not cause. Housing providers are being crushed by these policies. We've done enough. Good, responsible people with good intentions already had more than adequate tenant protections in place. These laws will only protect the others. Please stop this madness!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Politicians stop lying  
**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2023 09:57 AM  
**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3  
**Comments for Public Posting:** Karen Bass one of your campaign promises was to extend the emergency eviction moratorium. If your true goal is to reduce homelessness extending the moratorium is the best way to go about it keep your promise to the people who voted for you

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Barbara Garcia  
**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2023 10:00 AM  
**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly oppose the proposed tenant protections. They would discourage building new apartments and ADUs. Homeowners will decide not to build because of all the laws that favor tenants. It could be dangerous to have additional tenants and pets living in your yard if you can't properly screen them. Landlords shouldn't bear the brunt of subsidizing renters. Many landlords are Mom and Pop owners who count on the income for their survival. As a widow whose only other income is social security, the apartment income is my main source. When major repairs are needed such as a new roof, I'm responsible., and I need to have the funds on hand to pay for them. You need to create a rent subsidy program instead of putting everything on the backs of rental property owners. I 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. I am one. However, they will have no choice but to increase rents to market rates in order to enforce contracts. 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 pendulum has swung so far towards so-called "tenant protection" that it does not make sense and tenants will have less housing available. Thank you for voting for what is best for the rental housing system instead of policies that would be detrimental to everyone.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** JONATHAN FLORES

**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2023 10:01 AM

**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:** 01/20/2023 10:02 AM

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

**Comments for Public Posting:** This proposal will only hurt mom-and-pop landlords who do not have the resources that large, corporate landlords do. Many mom-and-pop landlords are immigrants who are renting out an additional unit for extra income. Very few of us make enough to indefinitely house tenants who are living on our properties for free and incurring high utility costs. If restrictive, one-sided policies become the blanket rule, then small, independent landlords will exit the rental business and allow large corporate landlords to take over. LA City already sees massive income disparity, this will only kick the middle class down.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** MARTHA FLORES  
**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2023 10:02 AM  
**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:** 01/20/2023 10:08 AM

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

**Comments for Public Posting:** Honorable Council member Krekorian, Price, Blumenfield, Yaroslavsky, Rodriguez, Mcosker, Lee, Park, Hutt, and Harris-Dawson: As you prepare to submit your vote for (1) 21-0042-S3 in today's council meeting, please keep in mind the elderly/senior landlords that immigrated to the United States whom rely on their small rental property as the sole source of income and livelihood. Many of us arrived in the United States many, many years ago with very little but the clothes we had on and were able to learn English as a second language, learned that working hard and staying earnest was important to survive in this country, and eventually buy property with still very little but with the hard earned money we worked so hard to save over the years. Tenants and tenant advocates fail to realize to see and hear that we, too, our struggling and experiencing financial and emotional hardship. Many of us landlords do not have the health, mobility, means, resources to be seen or heard in the council meetings. So, I hope, with this public posting I am able to speak for the landlords without advocates and have been overlooked or dismissed since the start of the moratorium. Again, I ask, to please be our advocates and keep us in mind when submitting your votes today. Thank you, Salvacion Aguilar

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Robert Welch

**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2023 09:50 AM

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

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

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

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Rafael Jaime

**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2023 07:39 AM

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

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Los Angeles City Council, I am writing on behalf of the 48,000 Academic Workers at the University of California who are represented by the United Auto Workers union to urge you to vote to adopt the current package of renter protections being heard in City Council before the emergency protections expire on January 31st. At UCLA, Academic Workers work in classrooms, research centers, and laboratories. Our labor pushes the boundaries of scientific inquiry, finds cutting-edge solutions to problems like climate change and deadly diseases, and educates the next generation of California's educators and scholars. The vast majority of the Academic Workers are renters. Over 5,000 UC Academic Workers live in the city of Los Angeles, and the vast majority of us are renters. Our ability to perform our jobs- which are vital to our city's role as a hub for higher education and high-tech research- is dependent on our access to safe and secure housing. Many of us owe rent debt accumulated during the first years of the pandemic. Others struggle to keep up with rising rents in non-rent-controlled apartments. For us, these proposed protections represent the difference between being able to live near where we work on the expensive West Side versus being forced to endure long, carbon-emitting commutes from neighborhoods across Southern California. Ending emergency protections now, especially without first implementing permanent ones, would be a reckless thing to do. 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. In solidarity Rafael Jaime President, United Auto Workers Local 2865

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2023 09:35 AM

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

**Comments for Public Posting:** You are only going to make the housing crises worse- and you are crating a situation where nobody will want to rent -- so it will be only big corporations and public housing. Is that the spirt of freedom? Will all due respect-- you are out of your minds.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jacob Eisenberg  
**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2023 09:41 AM  
**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3

**Comments for Public Posting:** Eviction moratorium puts pressure on housing providers. Particularly those without provide low income housing. You are incentivizing low income housing providers to charge more because you allow people to live for free. Unfortunately people with great jobs and taking advantage of this system forcing small landlords out and large corporations move in to fill the gap. Please stop harming small mom & pop landlords. Please stop increasing the cost of housing for all. Our expenses for maintenance, insurance, utility and property tax bills have increased tremendously. There is zero incentive to manage or build new housing developments in Los Angeles. Thank you for your consideration. Love always, Jacob

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Elba Romo  
**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2023 09:19 AM  
**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am a real estate broker who manages properties for mom and pop housing providers. The tenant protections the City of Los Angeles has enacted since the start of COVID has severely hurt housing providers. The protections have served to protect mainly tenants who abuse the system while leaving housing providers struggling financially and severely stressed. I have tenants who received thousands of dollars, (some, tens of thousands) from the Rent Relief fund and KEPT the money, using it to fund new car purchases, cruises, and/or new furniture. The landlord, has not gotten paid and of course, we can not evict. There are tenants who have moved in many additional occupants, causing water bills and other bills when applicable, to go up, but we can not raise rents and we can not evict. Other tenants have moved in unpermitted pets such as pit bulls, but we can not do anything because the tenants refer to them as Emotional Support Animals that they need due to Covid, despite these dogs being a nuisance to other tenants, but proving this before the courts is difficult and per LA City laws, issuing 3 day notices can be deemed harrassment. Thus, your laws tie our hands to allow disrespectful, abusive tenants to take advantage to the detriment of both landlords and good tenants. I have an owner who recently had to short-sale his property to avoid foreclosure because the last time his tenants paid rent was March 2020 and the tenant kept the rent relief money. Meanwhile, EVERYTHING from taxes, to insurance, to water bills has gone up, but landlords have had rent freezes imposed on them for almost FOUR years! The protections have served to protect abusive tenants. Landlords work with good tenants to keep them housed. We don't want vacancies (it is bad for business) and my clients and I deeply care about our tenants. Please oppose the "tenant protection" package on the agenda today. This does not protect good tenants or good landlords. It hurts them. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Andres Briceno  
**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2023 09:20 AM  
**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am a small landlord in the city of LA and I have never been so discouraged about the state of housing regulations in our city. This council has made it crystal clear over the past three years that it will not give its housing providers a fair shake. Small landlords have been crushed by 3 years of lost rent under the moratorium and declining revenue under the rent freeze, and now this suite of expansive regulations solely benefiting tenants are being rushed through. There has been no consideration or stakeholder input as to how this will affect the housing market and disincentivise new construction and investment in current housing. The report from LAHD on tenant protections had zero information as to the financial impacts the recommendations would have. This proposal for a non payment threshold is supposed to protect people in “ a dollar short and a day late” situations. But this proposal will allow many tenants in the 800,000+ rent stabilized units in the city with below market rent to miss multiple months of rent before they meet the threshold. landlords should not have to carry the burden of any unpaid rent but it is ludicrous to allow tenants to miss more than one month of rent, especially for landlords already facing trying to meet financial obligations and maintain the building with below market rents. This will cause financial hardship and will continue to push mom and pop landlords out of the city. This also discourages new investment in housing in the city and new construction since it creates uncertainty around receiving timely rent payments. Additionally, there are no guard rails for this provision, and it appears tenants could simply carry this balance in perpetuity as long as they never pass the threshold of the yearly indicated, fair market rent for their unit type. Allowing for non payment of rent will cause financial distress and will compromise owners ability to cover their bill and maintain our aging housing stock. This city is continuing down a path of one sided regulations with no regard for the consequences. Overall these tenant protections are super rushed and will likely discourage investment in new and existing housing as they encompass all types and ages of housing incl new construction. Councilmembers should ask themselves, what benefit is there to be a landlord in this city anymore? It’s becoming an extremely risky and unfriendly place to own rental housing. Other nearby cities offer much more reasonable and balanced approaches to housing and we should not

be surprised when investors take their capital elsewhere in the future.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Irma  
**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2023 09:24 AM  
**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3

**Comments for Public Posting:** I have a 4 unit building and 1 of my tenants has a dog. She never cleans up after this dog. I have sent her numerous text asking her to remove the waste as it is a health issue. It attracts rodents and bugs. She refuses to pick it up, giving me excuse after excuse. On these grounds, eviction is necessary. The other tenants complain all the time. If we can't evict, then I recommend the city councilmember come over and clean up after Fido on a daily basis. Your solution to this pandemic has made landlords incompetent. Please rethink your position in this matter. Some of tenants are taken advantage of you, me, and everybody else

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Mel

**Date Submitted:** 01/19/2023 08:54 PM

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

**Comments for Public Posting:** The taking advantage of landlords and taking away their rights to collect rent is criminal by thr city of Los Angeles. It is making it impossible to manage and own property. The government is slowly stealing our money amd control. No on further rent concessions to tenants. We need rent increases

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Samuel J.

**Date Submitted:** 01/19/2023 04:26 PM

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

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hello As the councils considers protections for the tenants, on behalf of our family I simply request that the council also consider the protections of those that provide those services to the tenants. Whenever a law is enacted it has unintended consequences and generally speaking most laws increases the cost and in this case not just on landlords which will almost certainly always be passed on to the tenants. There may be some bad landlords but there are many good landlords. Please consider how everyone of your actions affects them in an adverse way. What are the steps you are taking to protect the landlords that provide great services to their tenants and a competitive market? Please consider! Samuel J.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Mila Gurevich

**Date Submitted:** 01/19/2023 04:28 PM

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

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am against the Rent Control expansion. The Rent Control hurts the Owners of the property tremendously. The Rent Control is not fare to the Owners of the property. I am a Vietnam War Veteran and disabled and can't move-in into the rental unit with no stairs even, so I have fallen down the stairs in my house. That is so unfair.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Gary kamisher

**Date Submitted:** 01/19/2023 04:52 PM

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

**Comments for Public Posting:** To the City Coucil, I strongly oppose the tenants rights package.I own a small 4 unit apartment building.. I have suffered greatly, by not being allowed to raise the rents 3 years while cost have gone up. One tenant filed a fraudulent law suit stating there were bedbugs , but there were none. Only flees from Rather than fight her the insurance company paid her off The insurance paid her off a large sum equal to 2, years of rent and I paid a large sum for moving fees and 3 months free rent ! We k-9. Look for bed bugs but none were found. Please support the landlords who work so hard to survive. Do not let tenants abuse their rights.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** M Candice Graham

**Date Submitted:** 01/19/2023 07:20 PM

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

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Sirs Dear Madames Please CEASE AND DESSIST!!!!  
Warning This New Housing Ordinance Could be Deemed Bias....  
I'm pleading for The City to Clearly reframe from the Abusive  
Procedures Of Different Menial Ways of Harming Housing  
Providers. This Will Most Definatly have and Adverse Effect. In  
your Changing of the Law for Housing and Not Talking with us  
Heads of Housing Providers in the City of Los Angeles,  
Numbering over 170,000 property owners.. A small Discriminated  
Selected Group of Los Angelians being Bias Against. You Inturn  
will Lose Hundreds and Thousands of Housing. And Property  
owners will have no choice but to Abandon Ship and Leave the  
City Causing a major Impact on Housing Look How is a Property  
Owner to Be Free and Help to Procure Housing when you tie  
there hands... With Fear Speaking Frankly Good People, Bad, The  
Ugly want Housing But the Justification of your Actions will  
produce reactions to where housing will not be open.... Crime has  
Increased inside of Apartments, And Rentals and Will Continue to  
do so Where Good Tenants, Landlords, The Police and Public the  
problems non ending. By Changing the Law you will hurt The  
public. The City Entities have Caused a Major Housing Shortage  
by doing so whether Intentional or not. Right Now By changing  
the Law Will Damage Housing . Thus Damaging 1. Good Tenants  
2. Good Property Owners (Housing Providers) Will Suffer from  
Feloneous & Loss of Housing Stock (And will Leave Under  
Durrress) 3. The City of Los Angeles would open itself to Multiple  
Lawsuits Real and Feloneous with Merit Loss of Housing Stock  
the City and Public Needs And Real Rising Crime and no effect  
on Housing Help. 4. Biasly Giving to Anti Group who  
Feloneously will Impact and have impacted the Housing Loss, by  
Blackmail, fees, liens etc causing stress on the Housing Stock 5.  
And The City Being Open to a Major Lawsuit Because of the Bias  
Useage of Money handling to Feloneous Group Note Although  
Real Estate is A Dream for Ma and Pa Owners Its now a night  
mare and Note if you Run All of the Little People Out by Making  
It hard you haven't Solved the Housing Problem you've  
Compounded it or worst, With Harrassment Even Death.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** JR

**Date Submitted:** 01/19/2023 07:46 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. I strongly oppose the proposed tenant protections. I strongly oppose a monetary threshold to evict. 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 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. L.A. City should align RSO units with AB 1482 to reduce complexity and encourage new construction. I strongly oppose Displacement Relocation Assistance. 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, J Randall

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Shirley Marabou  
**Date Submitted:** 01/19/2023 03:30 PM  
**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3  
**Comments for Public Posting:** Please this has to pass I have a tenant that has been in my place for over a year. I need them out of my place.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2023 11:13 AM

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

**Comments for Public Posting:** As a former small apartment owner (which I sold because the restrictions you imposed and continue to impose made it impossible to maintain my building or be compensated fairly) and a current property supervisor for multi-family buildings, I oppose all your proposals. Not only is it hard to maintain the buildings properly, your proposals make things difficult for the majority of tenants who pay their rent and are good tenants. They have to pay more, receive less, and suffer with neighbors who are rude and noisy, careless with security, aggressive to other tenants, shouting profanity at them, disturbing them in the middle of the night, walking away with deliveries that belong to others, and generally making life miserable for other occupants. Due to your restrictions, we are unable to evict the one tenant that is making everyone else in the building miserable. We also have tenants who have literally paid no rent for three years and we still haven't been able to get them out. How is that fair to either Landlords or other tenants who are struggling but are paying their rent and want to live in decent housing. Therefore, I strongly oppose the proposed tenant protections, the monetary threshold to evict, and the expansion of RSO style "just cause" regulations to all dwelling units (particularly since this is already covered under California rent control laws). I also strongly oppose Displacement Relocation Assistance and extending protections for the presence of unauthorized occupants or pets. All of these proposals amount to unauthorized taking of the Landlord's property by TREMENDOUSLY limiting his ability to maintain and operate his property in the best way possible while also condemning the majority of tenants to pay for the abusive ones through higher rent and unsatisfactory living conditions. Please stop catering to a minority of abusive tenants and start thinking about how your proposals will affect the overall housing market. They will only make the current housing shortage worse and life unpleasant for all other tenants.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2023 11:26 AM

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

**Comments for Public Posting:** It is unethical to make laws that encourage people to build new units under the expectation of a certain set of rules and then change the rules after the units have been built, \*unless\* existing units are 'grandfathered' in. Please 'grandfather' existing units. Otherwise, that is considered a costly bait-and-switch. Thank you, and have a great day.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Cassidy Bennett  
**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2023 11:30 AM  
**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3

**Comments for Public Posting:** My name is Cassidy Bennett, and I am an attorney at the Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles and a tenant in District 10. I am writing today in solidarity with the Keep LA Housed Coalition to request that you put permanent protections for tenants in place before the emergency protections expire on January 31. We need universal just cause in place that does not delay in protecting tenants for a whole year or the term of their lease. This just gives landlords opportunity to discriminate or retaliate against tenants at the end of a lease - but the just cause policy already allows landlords to address problems if they come up. We should not be making exceptions and creating carve outs that will end up impacting low-income families more than anyone else. We also need a minimum threshold for failure to pay - because no one should be losing their home for falling behind on rent because they lost a few days of work. We should not allow evictions for smaller amounts of rent debt when tenants are struggling to pay back COVID debt on the City's timelines AND continue making rent going so they can stay housed. As an organization that handles many eviction defense cases, LAFLA sees evictions pursued against tenants who were unable to work and got behind by just a few hundred dollars. We can't make people choose between food and rent. For tenants who are evicted, we need to implement relocation assistance for everyone – because when tenants are displaced, and were already barely afford to make rent, they will end up on the street unless they receive financial assistance to help cover the high cost of moving expenses. Enact strong permanent protections today so they can be in place before the end of January, amend just cause and pass permanent protections.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** DANNY PARK

**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2023 10:32 AM

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

**Comments for Public Posting:** We are calling on the Los Angeles City Council members to vote YES on the new Covid-19 Renters Protection. If something's working, something's working. The Corona Virus pandemic and the times of distress in many ways called on many to draw on their will and courage to make the politically impossible, possible. Take the leap of faith in creating beautiful policy. Don't let knowing too much stop you from revolutionary acts.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2023 11:03 AM

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

**Comments for Public Posting:** If you vote for this and ever use the words "My" or "mine" again, let my spirit be there to haunt you!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Robert Roman  
**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2023 10:23 AM  
**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 for your time and consideration

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Hallie V.

**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2023 10:26 AM

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

**Comments for Public Posting:** HCIDLA needs to do more thorough investigations when a landlord uses a non fault eviction process. They simply take a landlord's claim of moving in themselves or moving in a relative or property manager at face value. That is rarely the truth. Most of the time, landlords are using this as a loophole to rehab the unit and increase rent OR turn the unit into an illegal STR. There is absolutely no oversight into this process. Tenants typically move out instead of risking eviction court. If the city is serious about the homeless crisis, you need to have more oversight on so called no fault evictions. Keep the people already in their homes in their homes. Don't add to the number of people on the streets. HCIDLA serves only to aid landlords in these situations. They do nothing to help tenants who often have a strong case.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** hubert

**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2023 10:29 AM

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

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am opposed to rent protections and continuing the moratorium. You have stolen my livelihood and have taken what I've worked hard for away from me and my family. The tenants not paying rent to me are frauds and are all working and earning a living.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Brendan Quinn

**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2023 12:43 PM

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

**Comments for Public Posting:** I support Item 1 to ensure permanent protections for tenants. I appreciate the challenges small landlords have gone through, but while we should build more housing at all levels to alleviate our extreme housing shortage, we won't see the benefits of that for years. We need safeguards for existing tenants NOW. Thank you to Councilmembers Raman, Harris-Dawson, Soto-Martinez, and Hernandez for their leadership on this issue.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Children's Institute  
**Date Submitted:** 01/20/2023 11:55 AM  
**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3  
**Comments for Public Posting:** On behalf of Children's Institute, we are in favor of extending the city's eviction moratorium and support the key tenant protections outlined under the proposed Just Cause for Eviction Ordinance. These protections include citywide just cause for tenants, relocation assistance, and nonpayment protections to ensure families remain housed.



January 20, 2023

The Honorable Los Angeles City Councilmembers  
Los Angeles City Hall  
200 N Spring Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

**Re: In Favor– extending city’s eviction moratorium and 21-0042-S3 (adding Article 5 to Chapter XVI of the LAMC: Just Cause for Eviction Ordinance of the City of Los Angeles)**

On behalf of Children’s Institute, we are in favor of extending the city’s eviction moratorium and support the key tenant protections outlined under the proposed Just Cause for Eviction Ordinance. These protections include citywide just cause for tenants, relocation assistance, and nonpayment protections to ensure families remain housed.

Children’s Institute (CII) is one of the largest and oldest human service agencies serving 28,000 Los Angeles County children and their families. We are committed to fostering supportive and caring relationships and reversing the effects of toxic stress, because we know that exposure to adversity impacts learning, behavior, and health. We believe all children and families have boundless potential to achieve emotional well-being and educational success, which build pathways to economic mobility. Central to our work is a two-generation approach, providing trauma-informed resources to strengthen and promote personal, family and community capacity for healing, wellness and success. We do this through our network of early childhood education centers and community hubs that provide behavioral health services, education and employment supports, and family strengthening programs.

The COVID-19 pandemic exposed the disproportionate harm a health, social and economic crisis has on communities of color. At CII 70% of our families are people of color, with a majority identifying as Black and or Latino. Black and Latino households have acutely been affected particularly as it relates to their financial stability. In a study conducted by UCLA’s Luskin Institute, Black and Latino households make up almost half of all renters who were unable to pay rent due to COVID-19 hardship<sup>1</sup>. A situation where the declaration of COVID-19 emergency is lifted without expanding

---

<sup>1</sup> Les Dunseith, “Black, Latino Renters Far More Likely to Be Facing Housing Displacement during Pandemic,” UCLA (UCLA, August 11, 2020), <https://newsroom.ucla.edu/releases/blacks-latinos-more-likely-to-face-housing-displacement>.



tenants' rights to include just cause, relocation assistance, and nonpayment protections will lead to a wave of evictions in the coming months that hit Black and Latino households the hardest. This would further exacerbate the city's homelessness crisis and conflict with the Mayor's recent emergency declaration on homelessness. It is critical these proposed tenant protections are enacted before January 31 and efforts are coordinated with the county to prevent a wave of evictions.

Therefore, Children's Institute requests the council to extend the eviction moratorium deadline and strongly supports the proposed tenant protections under the Just Cause for Eviction Ordinance which include citywide Just Cause eviction protections and tenant relocation assistance for no-fault evictions.

Now more than ever, we must do everything to protect our families and guarantee their housing stability.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Terry Kim'.

Terry Kim  
Director of Government Relations & Advocacy

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jonathan Vasquez'.

Jonathan Vasquez  
Government Relations & Advocacy Assistant