

Communication from Public

Name: Apartment Owners Association of California (AOA)

Date Submitted: 11/09/2022 09:00 AM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: L.A. City Councilmembers: AOA and its 20,000+ members oppose this draft ordinance' rent freeze. It has already been 32 months of rent freezes! Enough is enough. All expenses related to maintaining rental property have increased, far out-pacing the CPI inflation numbers. Utility rates, SCEP fees, RecycleLA rates, and the city budget have all increased. If you can't imagine the city budget being frozen for 979 days, then understand how unreasonable this recommendation is for rental property owners. How is it that even relocation fees continue to be increased? These are classic examples of "Rules for thee, but not for me"! AOA strongly opposes a monetary threshold to evict. Tenants already have free legal aid available to them when they face eviction. Setting a monetary threshold of rents owed before an owner can evict will cause all rents to increase. There are many owners that are proud to be charging below market rent; however, they will have no choice but to increase rents to market rate in order to regain their ability to enforce contracts. Owners need legal protection; if what is proposed passes, owners will have a legal incentive to raise the rent. This recommendation kills organic affordable housing. 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"? AOA also strongly opposes imposing higher relocation fees for those owners with newer buildings and single family homes. This tenant protection is already covered by AB 1482. Do you remember why there was a carve-out for newer buildings and single family homes? It was because you knew that this would discourage new development. You knew it then, what has changed? Bad policies like this have contributed to an increased cost of doing business which, naturally, is passed on to the consumer - in this case, tenants. Tenant relocation fees encroach on property rights. Instituting more draconian relocation fees will inadvertently cause the process of approving applicants for housing more difficult and will ultimately raise the bar for tenant qualification criteria. The constant chipping away at owner protections discourages the development of new multi-family and ADUs. Is the goal to create more housing or just control more housing? Regards, Jeffrey Faller, President Apartment Owners Association of California

Communication from Public

Name: Apartment Owners Association of California

Date Submitted: 11/09/2022 09:08 AM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: L.A. City Councilmembers: AOA and its 20,000+ members oppose this draft ordinance' rent freeze. It has already been 32 months of rent freezes! Enough is enough. All expenses related to maintaining rental property have increased, far out-pacing the CPI inflation numbers. Utility rates, SCEP fees, RecycleLA rates, and the city budget have all increased. If you can't imagine the city budget being frozen for 979 days, then understand how unreasonable this recommendation is for rental property owners. How is it that even relocation fees continue to be increased? These are classic examples of "Rules for thee, but not for me"! AOA strongly opposes a monetary threshold to evict. Tenants already have free legal aid available to them when they face eviction. Setting a monetary threshold of rents owed before an owner can evict will cause all rents to increase. There are many owners that are proud to be charging below market rent; however, they will have no choice but to increase rents to market rate in order to regain their ability to enforce contracts. Owners need legal protection; if what is proposed passes, owners will have a legal incentive to raise the rent. This recommendation kills organic affordable housing. 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"? AOA also strongly opposes imposing higher relocation fees for those owners with newer buildings and single family homes. This tenant protection is already covered by AB 1482. Do you remember why there was a carve-out for newer buildings and single family homes? It was because you knew that this would discourage new development. You knew it then, what has changed? Bad policies like this have contributed to an increased cost of doing business which, naturally, is passed on to the consumer - in this case, tenants. Tenant relocation fees encroach on property rights. Instituting more draconian relocation fees will inadvertently cause the process of approving applicants for housing more difficult and will ultimately raise the bar for tenant qualification criteria. The constant chipping away at owner protections discourages the development of new multi-family and ADUs. Is the goal to create more housing or just control more housing? Regards, Jeffrey Faller, President Apartment Owners Association of California

Communication from Public

Name: Nathan

Date Submitted: 11/09/2022 09:29 AM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: I am Nathan Carbajal and I am a renter and I work with highschoolers in El Sereno and Lincoln Heights. Covid renters protections should not be ended unless we have strong permanent protections as found in the Tenant Bill of Rights as written by the Keep LA Housed Coalition. I've lived in apartments with maggots, no AC, and bed bugs with landlords not holding up their end of the rental agreement. Furthermore, We still have residents recovering from Covid financially, emotionally, and physically. Having the permanent protections found in the Tenant Bill of Rights will ensure that residents across the county will stay protected by having rent stabilization, code enforcement and anti harassment measures to ensure renters remain safe in their homes. We always hear talks of how bad the homeless crisis is in Los Angeles. We currently have an opportunity for us to keep people housed and avoid a wave of evictions and ultimately homelessness. Passing permanent protections ensures that renters in the city are safe and that families, students, and the elderly people in the community are housed and supported. Thank y'all and god bless!

Communication from Public

Name: Michael Green

Date Submitted: 11/09/2022 11:02 AM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: The LA City Council continues its disgusting Globalist Equity plan of confiscating private property and buying votes with other people's money. It must end the fake emergency and reimburse landlords for the monies stolen from them. It must not restrict use of managers or owners from occupying units at their discretion.

Communication from Public

Name: Ashley Brim

Date Submitted: 11/09/2022 12:51 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Hi, my name is Ashley Brim, I am a tenant and I live in district 10. As a renter, I want to urge you to vote NO on ending emergency eviction protections on 1/31, and instead keep those protections in place until you can adopt and implement strong permanent tenant protections. I also urge you to fix the just cause ordinance language so that it reflects council's directive and doesn't leave out some tenants. Ending emergency eviction protections without permanent protections will result in more people on the streets. Even with these protections, we are seeing more people fall into Homelessness every day than we get housed in a day. Considering what we all heard 3 members of the City Council (2 of whom have not resigned) say about renters and their commitment to breaking up renter power in the redistricting process, I think the council owes renting Angelenos action to regain our trust and show you are committed to standing with the people who keep our city running and make it special.

Communication from Public

Name: Ky Trang Ho

Date Submitted: 11/09/2022 11:26 AM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Members of the Housing Committee: I am a renter. For the love of God, please end the war you are waging against landlords. My landlord is an individual. People like him keep housing prices low because they're all competing with each other to get tenants. By contrast, the big corporate landlords who own giant buildings enjoy pricing power because they're able to set the prices for an area. Small landlords, who own only one property, make up three-quarters of the market. If you put them out of business, rents will become ever more unaffordable because you will surely shrink the rental housing supply in Los Angeles. Your antagonistic treatment of landlords is going to turn Los Angeles into another Ireland. "In a country of 5.1 million people, there were just 716 homes available to rent on 1 August," Sky News reported in September. Why? Because landlords fled the market thanks to a ban on rent increases and other legislation that favors tenants at the expense of landlords' livelihoods.

Landlords fleeing rental market due to ban on rent hikes, committee hears

[irishtimes.com/politics/2022/09/20/landlords-fleeing-rental-market-due-to-ban-on-rent-hikes-committee-hears/](https://www.irishtimes.com/politics/2022/09/20/landlords-fleeing-rental-market-due-to-ban-on-rent-hikes-committee-hears/)



Pat Davitt, chief executive of IPAV, told an Oireachtas committee that landlords feel they are 'subsidising' their tenants because they are barred from hiking rents which are capped in rental pressure zones.

Photograph: Cyril Byrne

Brian Hutton

Tue Sep 20 2022 - 20:38

Half of all houses and apartments currently for sale around the country are owned by landlords fleeing the private rental market, the Institute of Professional Auctioneers and Valuers (IPAV) has claimed.

Pat Davitt, chief executive of IPAV, told an Oireachtas committee that landlords feel they are “subsidising” their tenants because they are barred from hiking rents which are capped in rental pressure zones (RPZ).

“Of our members most are saying 50 per cent of sales at the moment are from landlords leaving the marketplace,” he told the Oireachtas joint committee on housing, local government and heritage.

Mr Davitt said “landlords are feeling they are subsidising rent for those tenants”, insisting there should be “no reason” in cases where tenants leave a property that a landlord cannot then “charge market rent”.

READ MORE

It was “ridiculous” to suggest market rent in any area could not be accurately gauged, he told the hearing into recent trends in the private rental sector.

The IPAV represents more than 1,400 estate agents, auctioneers and valuers countrywide. Mr Davitt could not provide hard figures on the number of landlords leaving the market. But the exodus was being driven, he said, by a frustration among landlords at having to continue leasing out their property at the same rent as before under the RPZ controls. It means they have to “endure years of lower rent than in the marketplace”.

Mr Davitt said any plans to protect tenancies where a landlord decided to sell their property – where a buyer would have to honour the tenancy – “would mean even more leaving the market”.

Mr Davitt also blamed “huge problems” with the Residential Tenancies Board (RTB) – both technological and staffing – for compounding the grievances aired by landlords, citing “incredible delays” at the agency in dealing with issues.

Also, before the hearing Margaret McCormick of the Irish Property Owners’ Association (IPOA), which represents smaller private landlords, described the “exodus” as an “absolute emergency”. Any proposal for a rent freeze would make it worse, she told TDs and Senators.

The RPZ caps were linked to when a landlord began renting a property, and did not take account, for example, the “indebtedness” of the property owner, or outstanding mortgage, subject to interest rate hikes, she added. “The (rental) yield is too low. It is not workable as a business.”

Ms McCormick said if landlords were forced to sell properties with “tenants in situ” it would “devalue properties massively”, with only large investors being able to take them on. “Even the fear of that is leading to people leaving the market,” she said, adding that landlords would generally prefer to be making an annual income rather than getting a “lump sum” from a sale.

Ms McCormick said the entire private rental market was “dysfunctional” with “legislatively prescriptive” regulations which have been altered 88 times through statutory instruments and 21 times through direct changes since 2009. “There is no confidence and stability in the

market. It is dysfunctional, it is constantly changing. There is nothing there to keep landlords in the market.”

Ann Marie O’Reilly, of housing charity Threshold, said the lack of private rental accommodation had resulted in a number local authorities currently turning away people who were in need of emergency housing. Quizzed on which local authorities, Ms O’Reilly declined to name them.

Ms O’Reilly suggested a focus on promoting long-term lease agreements in the private rented sector “where there is less obligation on a landlord on what to provide, maintenance and so on”.

She said many renters would never buy a house and have become very settled in communities and would like to see guaranteed tenancies of “10, 15, 20 years”.

Fine Gael Senator Mary Seery Kearney told the committee she had “a concern about the build-to-rent model that is going on at the moment”, suggesting it could be impacting on house prices in south Dublin. “We have a huge need for it, and I am completely supportive of it, but on the other hand I come from a constituency called Dublin South Central where pretty much every multi-unit development that is going on is build-to-rent. That has an onward effect on the property market, on the sales, on the lettings.”

Mr Davitt rejected the suggestion, insisting the model “isn’t going to have a huge effect on the market at the moment, because of the levels of properties for sale”.

“At the moment it is a sellers’ market and I don’t think it is having any effect or will have any effect on the price of property at all.”

Communication from Public

Name: george wong

Date Submitted: 11/09/2022 11:28 AM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: My wife and I are part of the mom/pop apartment owners class whose buildings are under the RSO. It will be 5 years since our last rent increases when the rent increase freeze is lifted in 2024. No other group in this city has been discriminated as much as the mom/pop owners of apartment buildings. The increases in insurance, interest rates, property taxes, compliance fees, income taxes, utilities, professional services and general maintenance have been borne entirely by this class of owners. Meanwhile, our cost of living has gone up because of the bad policies of all levels of government. Meanwhile, our ability to live within our means and without government handouts has been eroded by inflation. No other class of citizens in Los Angeles has gone five years without an increase in income. On top of that, we undertook a costly out-of-pocket \$70,000 earthquake retrofit, which one part of the city says we can recover through increase in rents, with another part of the city forbidding us to collect the recoveries. This class of owners deserve a rent increase NOW, and this class should have its RSO and Inspection Fees WAIVED for the next ten years, as well as have its City Revenue Tax waived for the next ten years. Additionally, the City of Los Angeles should rebate to this class of owners 50% of the property taxes going back to 2020. This class of owners is a defacto arm of the City in providing affordable housing by edict, and the City should pick up some of the costs of operating these apartments. thank you

Communication from Public

Name: Sharon Tsukamoto

Date Submitted: 11/09/2022 11:32 AM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: My name is Sharon Tsukamoto. My husband Craig & I own small rental units and we had experienced severe financial distressed caused by the city of Los Angeles' Covid-19 mandates. We had problems collecting rents, bans on rent increases and huge increases in building & operating costs, which continue to increase during these recessionary times. Over the last two years & more, city rates & fees including the SCEP, RecycLA, and the LA Dept of Water & Power have skyrocketed. NO OTHER CITIES, including Los Angeles County's unincorporated areas, are ENTIRELY BANNING RENT INCREASES THROUGH 2023 THE RENT INCREASE FREEZE MUST END IN 2022!!!! We rental housing providers have struggled to collect rent owed but now new restrictions on evictions for non-payment of rent can be permanent. The city's RSO & SCEP fees have increased but who is to pay them? We don't have any rent to cover the large increase and cannot pass it down to the tenants. THESE MORATORIUMS WERE SUPPOSED TO BE TEMPORARY EMERGENCY MEASURES DUE TO THE UNKNOWN COVID SITUATION. HOWEVER, NOW WE HAVE AN UNDERSTANDING ABOUT IT AND VACCINATIONS ARE NOW AVAILABLE TO COMBAT COVID-19. PERMANENT HOUSING POLICIES NEED TO BE CONSIDERED SEPARATELY AND NOT COMBINED WITH THE TERMINATION OF THE EMERGENCY ACTIONS PUT IN PLACE MEANT TO BE TEMPORARY. I HAVE TENANTS WHO ARE CLAIMING THAT THEY ARE NEGATIVELY AFFECTED BY COVID AND CANNOT PAY RENT. THEY ARE IN ARREARS FOR \$35,000 WHEN & IF THEY WILL PAY ME BACK IN 2024 IS VIRTUALLY IMPOSSIBLE. THEY ARE WORKING & SPENDING THEIR MONEY FREELY WHILE THEY REFUSE TO PAY RENT HIDING BEHIND THEIR COVID FACADE. WHO IN THE CITY WILL HELP ME TO FIND OUT IF THEY ARE NOT COVID AFFECTED? NOBODY THAT I HAVE TALKED TO. PLEASE END THE RENT INCREASE FREEZE IN 2022!! END THE EVICTION MORATORIUM IN 2022. HELP US SMALL MOM & POP HOUSING PROVIDERS. THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME. RESPECTFULLY SHARON & CRAIG TSUKAMOTO (310) 951-1505

Communication from Public

Name: CHRIS R RIDDLE

Date Submitted: 11/09/2022 01:22 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Hi, my name is Chris Riddle I am a tenant and I live in district 10. As a renter, I want to urge you to vote NO on ending emergency eviction protections on 1/31, and instead keep those protections in place until you can adopt and implement strong permanent tenant protections. I also urge you to fix the just cause ordinance language so that it reflects council's directive and doesn't leave out some tenants. The pandemic has significantly affected my living situation because it showed how unstable our housing situation is LA. Many of my fellow tenants in my area lost their livelihoods suddenly, and were it not for these protections, they would have lost their places to live too. A system that keeps working tenants just barely able to survive isn't good for anyone in LA. Landlords hoarding empty units or turning them into short term rentals is shortsighted and bad for the city, and the council must do more to protect and empower renters since we're the ones working to keep LA going. There was a need for tenant protections prior to the pandemic, and there is an even greater need now. Lifting emergency protections without implementing, not just a report back, but actually having strong permanent protections in place, is reckless and inhumane and will result in thousands of evictions. The City should not phase out emergency protections until permanent protections are enacted The 1/31 date is arbitrary and does not reflect the adequate amount of time it will take to implement permanent protections. The motion to end emergency tenant protections was passed by an illegitimate council whose leadership was clearly anti-tenant. There are other tenant protections, like adequate Tenant Anti-Harassment and Right to Counsel, that have been stalled by this illegitimate council and they must be addressed before ending emergency protections. A 1/31 sunset date does not offer enough time for council to implement all of the permanent protections needed. There should be no sunset date until these protections are actually in place. The Council should not move forward with this just case ordinance. This ordinance is not what the council directed the Housing Department and City Attorney to draft. The directive called for an ordinance that would apply the 14 just cause reasons for eviction under LARSO to apply to all renters in the city this ordinance is far from that. This ordinance creates additional just cause reasons that are not found in LARSO, and it arbitrarily

exempts groups of renters. This version of just cause would be the city sanctioning different classes of tenants based on housing typology. LAHD and CA came back with something vastly different from what the Council asked for. We cannot let city departments hijack the council's legislative authority I ask you to please not end the EEP until there are real, meaningful, permanent protections in place for LA renters. Just bending over for landlords and special interests is not the job you were elected to do. Thanks for your time.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 11/09/2022 01:22 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: My name is Sofia, I am a tenant and I live in district 10. As a renter, I want to urge you to vote NO on ending emergency eviction protections on 1/31, and instead keep those protections in place until you can adopt and implement strong permanent tenant protections. I also urge you to fix the just cause ordinance language so that it reflects council's directive and doesn't leave out any tenants. There was a need for tenant protections prior to the pandemic, and there is an even greater need now. Lifting emergency protections without implementing, not just a report back, but actually having strong permanent protections in place, is reckless and inhumane and will result in thousands of evictions. The Council should not phase out emergency protections until permanent protections are enacted. The motion to end emergency tenant protections was passed by an illegitimate council whose leadership was clearly anti-tenant. The Council should not move forward with this just cause ordinance. This ordinance is not what the council directed the Housing Department and City Attorney to draft.

Communication from Public

Name: Cheryl Santiel

Date Submitted: 11/09/2022 01:29 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: LAHD: Stop the madness. You are suppose to represent both the landlord and the tenants. We have suffer for almost 3 years of tenants not paying there rent. Now you want to impose more and more restrictions. I never thought I would regret being a landlord, but I do. This has been the MOST unfair past 3 years years with no positive hope in the future.

Communication from Public

Name: Eloy Armendariz

Date Submitted: 11/09/2022 01:44 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: I believe ending this protection will unfairly affect those in our community that are still struggling to recover from the financial effects of COVID-19. Furthermore, ending the protections does nothing to encourage sustainability for those community members and only creates more harm.

Communication from Public

Name: Jesica Santiago

Date Submitted: 11/09/2022 01:44 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: As a worker in Boyle Heights and having friends and family in the area, I feel the need to be a voice and advocate for the community. I want to urge the city to vote NO on ending emergency eviction protections on January 31, 2023. The City should not phase out emergency protections until permanent protections are enacted. The 1/31 date is arbitrary and does not reflect the adequate amount of time it will take to implement permanent protections. Please consider the community's needs and vote NO on ending emergency eviction protections, these are life changing decisions.

Communication from Public

Name: Belinda Campos Bresnahan

Date Submitted: 11/09/2022 02:08 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Hi, my name is Belinda , I work with tenants and I want to urge you to vote NO on ending emergency eviction protections on 1/31, and instead keep those protections in place until you can adopt and implement strong permanent tenant protections. I also urge you to fix the just cause ordinance language so that it reflects council's directive and doesn't leave out some tenants. The pandemic has significantly affected my living situation because ...

Communication from Public

Name: Ben Wilson

Date Submitted: 11/09/2022 03:04 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: The committee has a moral obligation to the citizens of Los Angeles to protect the right to housing. It is imperative that tenants are protected so as to not contribute to the already rampant housing crisis in Los Angeles. Removing these protections would only exacerbate these concerns and displace more vulnerable individuals, often working class or people of color. While many people are treating the pandemic as if it is over, many of our neighbors are still feeling the economic, mental, and emotional hardships. We should not add another hurdle to moving forward. We must keep these protections for renters.

Communication from Public

Name: Emmanuel M

Date Submitted: 11/09/2022 03:22 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: The 1/31 end date was negotiated by disgraced councilmembers who were conspiring to weaken tenant power. It's an arbitrary date that is not based on the needs of tenants right now, and it doesn't allow sufficient time to implement permanent protections to keep people housed. Just Cause ordinance that was published was not what was agreed on and its adding barriers that exclude more tenants. Do Not expire emergency tenant protections on 1/31 and until stronger permanent protections are in place. I have been working with tenants for about two years now. There is a lot of folk in need of better protections in need of a place in which someone actually cares. A lot of them did not have a choice as to their living situation and even now do not know about these meetings. They have to continue to find new ways to support themselves at all times to be able to semi exist. There is only a certain few that are lucky enough to make it to the hearings to make it to the meetings, to give their experiences a voice. The community around me is not so tech savy and have a hard time connecting to anything that has to do with electronics. Their experiences matter their lives matter and so do I. I want to feel like I matter but at the current time I do not.

Communication from Public

Name: Cinthia Gonzalez

Date Submitted: 11/09/2022 03:25 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Hi my name is Cinthia Gonzalez and I am a resident from CD14. As a renter, mother and daughter of renters I want to urge you to vote NO on ending emergency eviction protections on 1/31 and instead adopt those protections until you can adopt and implement stronger protections. I also urge you to fix the just cause ordinance language so that it reflects council's directive and doesn't leave out some tenants. As a renter I've had to pause on paying rent twice because of COVID and my family as well. It is so unfair to say that COVID finished while we still have so many people like myself and others who are still affected. My family lost family members during COVID, as a low-income person we had to all pitch in to help our families while still have no real rent relief from the State. We urge you to please take into consideration the tenants who are still facing the many effects of COVID. For many of us it's still not done. For many of us we lost household members who helped keep us afloat. Thank you!

Communication from Public

Name: Jonpaul Rodriguez

Date Submitted: 11/09/2022 04:17 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: My name is Jonpaul Rodriguez and I am a CD 2 constituent and a member of the Hartsook Tenant Association. I am urging you to vote no on item number five. TENANT PROTECTIONS MUST STAY PERMANENT and in place. Landlords are out there crying about losing properties like people who purchased too many beanie babies during the beanie baby boom whereas tenants are suffering at the hands of violent and negligent "housing providers." my landlord arthur r. aslanian is pro removal of eviction protections. He is also anti-tenant. He is also now in the custody of the ATF for allegedly hiring a hitman with his tenant's rent money (my rent money) to assassinate someone who he tried to displace. This can all be verified via the LA Times and through the official complained filed by the ATF. And tenants? They just want stability and a roof over their heads. Be real, and do the right thing. Keep people housed and keep the arthur aslanians of the world in check.

Communication from Public

Name: Clare Letmon

Date Submitted: 11/09/2022 04:25 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: I'm writing to urge council to reject the Housing Department's recommendations for ending COVID emergency tenant protections. I am a member of the Hartsook Tenant Association. You might have seen our story on the front page of the LA Times. My landlord, Arthur R. Aslanian is facing federal murder for hire charges for using tenant rent checks to hire a hitman to kill 2 people (one who'd litigated his abusive business practices and won in court). We paid our rent during the pandemic. It didn't stop him from beginning demolition, enabling arson, and harassing senior and disabled tenants. Resuming Ellis Act evictions will give my landlord permission to evict me and my neighbors for his company's sole financial benefit. It is our experience that the Los Angeles Housing Department is WHOLLY incapable of enforcing housing law as it exists right now. The Housing Department functions for landlords and developers. In January, without notice or hearing with tenants, the dept. recommended our building be removed from REAP despite ongoing noncompliance and endangerment (including attempted ARSON). Adding on new protections for LAHD to implement--like we saw with the TAHO—is a meaningless platitude that will not keep people housed. ZERO instances of tenant harassment have been referred to the city attorney. It's UNCONSCIONABLE that city council is ending tenant protections when LAHSA cites the city's protections as the primary reason the city saw only a 1.7 increase in homelessness since 2020.

Communication from Public

Name: Angel

Date Submitted: 11/09/2022 04:35 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Hola, mi nombre es Angel, soy inquilino y vivo en el distrito 14 Como inquilino, quiero instarle a que vote NO a la finalización de las protecciones de desalojo de emergencia el 31/1 y, en cambio, mantenga esas protecciones vigentes hasta que pueda adoptar e implementar protecciones sólidas para inquilinos permanentes. También le insto a corregir el lenguaje de la ordenanza de causa justa para que refleje la directiva del consejo y no deje fuera a algunos inquilinos. La pandemia ha afectado significativamente mi situación de vida porque... (Yo en este momento tengo un caso de hostigamiento extremo por el propietario de mi edificio, y si terminan las protecciones aumentaría mas el abuso de los propietarios como el mio, lo unico que detiene el abusode los dueños son las protecciones, por el bienestar de los Angelinos, es indispensable que continúen)

Communication from Public

Name: NAIOP SoCal

Date Submitted: 11/09/2022 05:03 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Via email November 9, 2022 Los Angeles Housing Committee 200 North Spring Street Los Angeles, CA 90012 RE: Item 5 - Emergency Housing Measures Dear Honorable Committee Members, We understand Item 5 will be considered during today's Committee meeting. With over 1,100 members, NAIOP SoCal is the leading nonprofit organization for developers, owners and investors of office, industrial, retail and mixed-use real estate throughout Southern California. We join with many other organizations and businesses to urge the committee to approve previously directed ordinances related to the sunseting of COVID emergency housing orders. The lifting of the rent freeze and eviction moratorium are long overdue. Los Angeles is among the last jurisdictions in the United States to maintain such strict and burdensome regulations. Many other cities and public agencies across the state having ended or will end these orders by the end of 2022. The conditions of 2020 are completely different than today, and the reasoning used in the original city orders are no longer in existence. It is time to end the emergency measures. We urge the committee to immediately lift its freeze on rent. The intent of the temporary COVID-19 regulations was to provide enhanced protections to tenants. Project and development expenses are at record highs due to inflation and lingering supply chain issues. There is no data justification the continuance of the freeze. It hurts those that build and develop much needed housing and will ultimately lead to a more unaffordable and deteriorating housing stock. Reject Rushed Policies Item 5 contains 3 ordinances and a report proposing further regulations. It is inappropriate to intertwine unrelated and contentious policies with a straightforward matter of ending temporary measures. The additional Housing report was released with only one week of review and had no feedback period or outreach to stakeholders. Additionally, "for cause" recommendations have had no meaningful feedback or thoughtful deliberation. These should not be moved until each item is given an appropriate forum for deliberation and public engagement. Further, items contained in the housing report should be rejected outright. Rents are the result of a mutually and legally agreed-upon contract at the start of a tenancy. Prohibiting the ability to enforce collection of funds for services rendered forces business and property owners to provide

lines of credit, creates an administrative nightmare and deprives the individual of compensation for their labor, expenses, and service. NAIOP SoCal would support rental subsidies program to help those who are facing financial needs and gaps. We urge the committee members to explore and implement solutions that have consensus and board support to help those in need. Support Housing Providers Item 5 contains several rushed items. NAIOP SoCal has worked with cities and legislators across Southern California to address similar challenges in the commercial real estate industry. Working collaboratively, we have been able to carefully study and find solutions with a greater benefit for all stakeholders. We are ready to work with the Committee and staff to study and find well-rounded solutions for all stakeholders. NAIOP SoCal's Government Relations Director, Jose Cornejo, will be in contact with the city on this matter. His contact information is jose@cornejost.com, 213-444-6502. We urge the committee to end the emergency housing measures, lift the rent freeze immediately and reject rushed policies. Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, Timothy Jemal CEO



COMMERCIAL REAL ESTATE
DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

SoCAL CHAPTER

Via email

November 9, 2022

Los Angeles Housing Committee
200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: Item 5 - Emergency Housing Measures

Dear Honorable Committee Members,

We understand Item 5 will be considered during today's Committee meeting.

With over 1,100 members, NAIOP SoCal is the leading nonprofit organization for developers, owners and investors of office, industrial, retail and mixed-use real estate throughout Southern California.

We join with many other organizations and businesses to urge the committee to approve previously directed ordinances related to the sunset of COVID emergency housing orders. The lifting of the rent freeze and eviction moratorium are long overdue. Los Angeles is among the last jurisdictions in the United States to maintain such strict and burdensome regulations. Many other cities and public agencies across the state have ended or will end these orders by the end of 2022. The conditions of 2020 are completely different than today, and the reasoning used in the original city orders are no longer in existence. It is time to end the emergency measures.

We urge the committee to immediately lift its freeze on rent. The intent of the temporary COVID-19 regulations was to provide enhanced protections to tenants. Project and development expenses are at record highs due to inflation and lingering supply chain issues. There is no data justification the continuance of the freeze. It hurts those that build and develop much needed housing and will ultimately lead to a more unaffordable and deteriorating housing stock.

Reject Rushed Policies

Item 5 contains 3 ordinances and a report proposing further regulations. It is inappropriate to intertwine unrelated and contentious policies with a straightforward matter of ending temporary measures.

The additional Housing report was released with only one week of review and had no feedback period or outreach to stakeholders. Additionally, "for cause" recommendations have had no meaningful feedback or thoughtful deliberation. These should not be moved until each item is given an appropriate forum for deliberation and public engagement.

Further, items contained in the housing report should be rejected outright. Rents are the result of a mutually and legally agreed-upon contract at the start of a tenancy. Prohibiting the ability to enforce collection of funds for services rendered forces business and property owners to provide lines of credit, creates an administrative nightmare and deprives the individual of compensation for their labor, expenses, and service.

NAIOP 2022 OFFICERS AND BOARD OF DIRECTORS

PRESIDENT

Gregory May, Newmark

PRESIDENT-ELECT

Justin McCusker, C.J. Segerstrom & Sons

VICE PRESIDENT

W. Eric Paulsen, Kidder Mathews

TREASURER

Mark Mattis, Avison Young

SECRETARY

Stephane Wandel, Thrifty Oil

PROGRAMS AND EDUCATION LIAISON

Fran Inman, Majestic Realty Co.

PAST PRESIDENT

Rob Antrobus, Prologis

Taylor Arnett, CapRock Partners

Angela Azizian, MetLife Investment Management

Brian Baker, JP Morgan Chase

Andy Bratt, Gantry

Eric Brown, LBA Realty

Greg Brown, JLL

John Casasante, DWS

Michael Chukwueke, BentallGreenOak

Chris Drzyzga, Voit Real Estate Services

Ryan Gallagher, Space Investment Partners

Brooke Birtcher Gustafson, Birtcher Development

Michael Hodges, Irvine Company Office Properties

Ryan Jones, Panattoni Development Company

Emily Mandrup, ECM Management

Thomas McAndrews, Tiarna Real Estate Services

Parke Miller, Lincoln Property Company

Brad Nielsen, Allen Matkins

Lindsey Engign Olson, Bixby Land Company

Steve Pearson, DAUM Commercial

Jodie Poirier, Colliers International

John Premac, Chicago Title Company

Martin Pupil, Stream Realty Partners L.P.

Alison Ramsey, JP Morgan Chase

David Salisbury, U.S. Bank

Nancy Shultz,

Kurt Strasmann, CBRE

Richard Sung, Newmark

Christopher Tipre, Trammell Crow Company

Jay Todisco, Ware Malcomb

Sean Treglia, CBRE

Steven Hillgren, Kearny Real Estate Company

NAIOP SoCAL EXECUTIVE STAFF

Timothy Jemal, Chief Executive Officer

Jose Cornejo, Senior Director of Government Relations

Xavier Castaneda, Coordinator, Membership
& Communications

Becky Ezell, Director of Administration

NAIOP SoCal would support rental subsidies program to help those who are facing financial needs and gaps. We urge the committee members to explore and implement solutions that have consensus and board support to help those in need.

Support Housing Providers

Item 5 contains several rushed items. NAIOP SoCal has worked with cities and legislators across Southern California to address similar challenges in the commercial real estate industry. Working collaboratively, we have been able to carefully study and find solutions with a greater benefit for all stakeholders.

We are ready to work with the Committee and staff to study and find well-rounded solutions for all stakeholders. NAIOP SoCal's Government Relations Director, Jose Cornejo, will be in contact with the city on this matter. His contact information is jose@cornejost.com, 213-444-6502.

We urge the committee to end the emergency housing measures, lift the rent freeze immediately and reject rushed policies.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Timothy Jemal". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized initial 'T'.

Timothy Jemal
CEO

Communication from Public

Name: Injustice

Date Submitted: 11/09/2022 06:21 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: Raman - How can anything that you are doing is fair? When you voted and the city council voted to end the moratorium on 1/31/2023, how can you take a step back and delay the process by bringing in additional amendments to extend ? How can this be fucking go on for 3 years when the rest of the country has moved on ! Just allow us to sell our properties and you guys can take it all and shove it up your and your tenants' asses ! When the property taxes and services need to be paid let's see how they will pay for it ! That's your plan right ? Take our properties and house all your vote banks . Shame on you raman ! Absolutely no regard to hardwork. No regard to the small housing providers. Ppl with 1 property , where do I go ? I can't even bloody sell the property and no rent that's coming in. No matter what you do to your tenants, they will never be happy with you - just understand that before you kill us

Communication from Public

Name: Carol Rojas

Date Submitted: 11/09/2022 10:22 PM

Council File No: 21-0042-S3

Comments for Public Posting: I saw, with great dismay, yet another revision motion from Nithya Raman again trying to squeeze the last drop of blood from small business owners. Yet another frivolous distraction from a council member who can't figure out what to do. The catastrophe this council has become is appalling and you just keep at it, coming up with ideas, scenarios, solutions that make no sense. You think nothing through, you are throwing everything against the wall and seeing what sticks. You ask housing for help, then try and rewrite what they've written for you, question, waste so much time and back to square one. Seriously, not only are we Angelenos horrified by the bigotry on display less than, what, not even a month ago, but we are now furious that no one can figure out how to end the moratorium without basically massaging tenants like they are newborns? There are jobs, the economy is working, why aren't you? This is insane and stupid, thoughtless and very dangerous. Are only 2 or 3 of you capable of looking ahead? You are turning this city over to investors that are grabbing up properties by the armload. Don't you get it? You will have no There there, no affordable housing, block after block after block of new builds with 'market value' rentals that no one can afford. Have you all just lost your minds? Raman wants to delay another month, why? Is selling the city to investment groups not as important as looking like a hero to tenants who don't pay rent? You have strung this out like fraught hormonal teenagers about to go on a date. Stop this, move forward. You continue to use the SOE as camouflage for the most inept regime this city has ever had. Three council members are criminals, three are bigots, and most but not all of the rest incapable, inadequate and irresponsible. You have been elected to BE responsible for this city, to. provide oversight, make decisions, create and follow through on policies that actually make sense and work. So, here is what you do: 1) pass the ordinance 2) end the SOE/ moratorium 3) go to work because it looks very much cannot do your jobs. And after all the hoopla of ending the moratorium to then say, oh oops, we are taking another month is the height of poor performance.