

## Communication from Public

**Name:** End the injustice

**Date Submitted:** 11/28/2022 04:06 PM

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

**Comments for Public Posting:** Tuesday marks Day 1,000 since the beginning of the eviction moratorium. I oppose this draft ordinance's rent freeze. Rents have already been frozen for 32 months! All expenses related to maintaining rental property have increased, far out-pacing the CPI inflation numbers. Utility rates, SCEP fees, RecycleLA rates, and relocation fees have all increased. Unless you're willing to take a retroactive pay cut and work at your 2019 salary level and cut the entire city budget back to the budget size back at the end of 2019, then you would be a hypocrite to impose a rent increase freeze on housing providers. Inflation impacts both owners and renters. Will you make rules for others that you would never make for yourself? Rental property owners will be very grateful if you brought a swift end to the rent freeze. Tenant Relocation Fees: I also strongly oppose 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 even more new development. You knew it then, what has changed? Bad policies like this have contributed to a decrease in housing inventory. Do you want to encourage the creation of more units? If so, you need to unify RSO tenant relocation fees to match those of the state! In addition to discouraging the creation of new units, instituting more draconian relocation fees on smaller owners and owners of newer buildings will inadvertently cause the process of approving applicants for housing more difficult and raise the bar for tenant qualification criteria. Is the goal to create more housing or just control more 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"? The constant chipping away at owner protections discourages the development of new multi-family units and ADUs. I strongly oppose a monetary threshold to evict. 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 rents; 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. Revise the COVID hardship declaration form! Removing the requirement for tenants to provide notice of COVID hardship within seven days of rent becoming due will enable more COVID hardship fraud! You can find a sample revised COVID Hardship Declaration Form at: <https://aoausa.com/downloads/basis-for-covid-hardship-declaration.pdf>.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 11/28/2022 04:12 PM

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

**Comments for Public Posting:** ar City Council Members: Tuesday marks Day 1,000 since the beginning of the eviction moratorium. I oppose this draft ordinance's rent freeze. Rents have already been frozen for 32 months! All expenses related to maintaining rental property have increased, far out-pacing the CPI inflation numbers. Utility rates, SCEP fees, RecycleLA rates, and relocation fees have all increased. Unless you're willing to take a retroactive pay cut and work at your 2019 salary level and cut the entire city budget back to the budget size back at the end of 2019, then you would be a hypocrite to impose a rent increase freeze on housing providers. Inflation impacts both owners and renters. Will you make rules for others that you would never make for yourself? Rental property owners will be very grateful if you brought a swift end to the rent freeze.

Tenant Relocation Fees: I also strongly oppose 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 even more new development. You knew it then, what has changed? Bad policies like this have contributed to a decrease in housing inventory. Do you want to encourage the creation of more units? If so, you need to unify RSO tenant relocation fees to match those of the state! In addition to discouraging the creation of new units, instituting more draconian relocation fees on smaller owners and owners of newer buildings will inadvertently cause the process of approving applicants for housing more difficult and raise the bar for tenant qualification criteria. Is the goal to create more housing or just control more 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"? The constant chipping away at owner protections discourages the development of new multi-family units and ADUs. I strongly oppose a monetary threshold to evict. 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 rents; 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. Revise the COVID hardship declaration form! Removing the requirement for tenants to provide notice of COVID hardship within seven days of rent becoming due will enable more COVID hardship fraud! You can find a sample revised COVID Hardship Declaration Form at: <https://aoausa.com/downloads/basis-for-covid-hardship-declaration.pdf>.

Don't Forget Commercial Owners! There was no mention of expressly repealing "SEC. 49.99.3. PROHIBITION ON COMMERCIAL EVICTIONS". Without this wording in the ordinance, the commercial eviction protections will stay in place. Thank you for voting for what is best for everyone instead of mis-guided tenant right's groups. Sincerely,  
Sylvia Monares

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Beth Y.

**Date Submitted:** 11/28/2022 04:20 PM

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

**Comments for Public Posting:** 1000 day sand counting.. The eviction moratorium is bad for both tenants and landlords, ie small business owners. I oppose extending the emergency orders. It is a hardship that is untenable. It has lead to diminished confidence in local authorities. It is an unfair ask of any business to shoulder the responsibility of tenants potentially impacted by COVID 19. There continues to be NO TRUE measure by which tenants certify that they are impacted by COVID 19, yet we are mandated in LA county, to continue to take NO action to evict, when grounds are clear to do so and of a detriment to our property values, nor are we allowed to raise rents which are typically substantially below market value, due to rent control. As a single mother of two, I work 3 jobs and the rental business, primarily supports my family. Apartment owners have completed their duty. It is a burden we should no longer suffer to maintain. In addition to tenant priorities, please make small businesses and their survival a priority. They should continue to be a darlings, representative of Los Angeles's beautiful and unique and diverse economy. Please end the eviction moratorium; 1000 days is long enough; let's be partners and move past this difficult time in history which we have all been traumatized and impacted by.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Alexander Resnick  
**Date Submitted:** 11/28/2022 04:28 PM  
**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear City Council Members: Tuesday marks Day 1,000 since the beginning of the eviction moratorium. I oppose this draft ordinance's rent freeze. Rents have already been frozen for 32 months! All expenses related to maintaining rental property have increased, far out-pacing the CPI inflation numbers. Utility rates, SCEP fees, RecycleLA rates, and relocation fees have all increased. Unless you're willing to take a retroactive pay cut and work at your 2019 salary level and cut the entire city budget back to the budget size back at the end of 2019, then you would be a hypocrite to impose a rent increase freeze on housing providers. Inflation impacts both owners and renters. Will you make rules for others that you would never make for yourself? Rental property owners will be very grateful if you brought a swift end to the rent freeze.

**Tenant Relocation Fees:** I also strongly oppose 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 even more new development. You knew it then, what has changed? Bad policies like this have contributed to a decrease in housing inventory. Do you want to encourage the creation of more units? If so, you need to unify RSO tenant relocation fees to match those of the state! In addition to discouraging the creation of new units, instituting more draconian relocation fees on smaller owners and owners of newer buildings will inadvertently cause the process of approving applicants for housing more difficult and raise the bar for tenant qualification criteria. Is the goal to create more housing or just control more 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"? The constant chipping away at owner protections discourages the development of new multi-family units and ADUs. I strongly oppose a monetary threshold to evict. 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 rents; 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. Revise the COVID hardship declaration form! Removing the requirement for tenants to provide notice of COVID hardship within seven days of rent becoming due will enable more COVID hardship fraud! You can find a sample revised COVID Hardship Declaration Form at: <https://aoausa.com/downloads/basis-for-covid-hardship-declaration.pdf>.

Don't Forget Commercial Owners! There was no mention of expressly repealing "SEC. 49.99.3. PROHIBITION ON COMMERCIAL EVICTIONS". Without this wording in the ordinance, the commercial eviction protections will stay in place. Thank you for voting for what is best for everyone instead of mis-guided tenant right's groups. Sincerely,  
Alexander Resnick

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Dennis Mogerman  
**Date Submitted:** 11/28/2022 03:46 PM  
**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear City Council Members: Tuesday marks Day 1,000 since the beginning of the eviction moratorium. I oppose this draft ordinance's rent freeze. Rents have already been frozen for 32 months! All expenses related to maintaining rental property have increased, far out-pacing the CPI inflation numbers. Utility rates, SCEP fees, RecycleLA rates, and relocation fees have all increased. Unless you're willing to take a retroactive pay cut and work at your 2019 salary level and cut the entire city budget back to the budget size back at the end of 2019, then you would be a hypocrite to impose a rent increase freeze on housing providers. Inflation impacts both owners and renters. Will you make rules for others that you would never make for yourself? Rental property owners will be very grateful if you brought a swift end to the rent freeze.

**Tenant Relocation Fees:** I also strongly oppose 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 even more new development. You knew it then, what has changed? Bad policies like this have contributed to a decrease in housing inventory. Do you want to encourage the creation of more units? If so, you need to unify RSO tenant relocation fees to match those of the state! In addition to discouraging the creation of new units, instituting more draconian relocation fees on smaller owners and owners of newer buildings will inadvertently cause the process of approving applicants for housing more difficult and raise the bar for tenant qualification criteria. Is the goal to create more housing or just control more 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"? The constant chipping away at owner protections discourages the development of new multi-family units and ADUs. I strongly oppose a monetary threshold to evict. 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 rents; 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. Revise the COVID hardship declaration form! Removing the requirement for tenants to provide notice of COVID hardship within seven days of rent becoming due will enable more COVID hardship fraud! You can find a sample revised COVID Hardship Declaration Form at: <https://aoausa.com/downloads/basis-for-covid-hardship-declaration.pdf>.

Don't Forget Commercial Owners! There was no mention of expressly repealing "SEC. 49.99.3. PROHIBITION ON COMMERCIAL EVICTIONS". Without this wording in the ordinance, the commercial eviction protections will stay in place. Thank you for voting for what is best for everyone instead of mis-guided tenant right's groups. Sincerely, Dennis Mogerman, Small 4 unit housing provider

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Gregg Seltzer

**Date Submitted:** 11/28/2022 03:50 PM

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

**Comments for Public Posting:** The City Council is causing long term damage to the most important subset of housing which are apartments in the \$1000 to \$2000/mo. range. The eviction moratorium and no rent increase laws will actually damage the affordable housing market long term.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jeffrey Palmer  
**Date Submitted:** 11/28/2022 03:52 PM  
**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear City Council Members: Tuesday marks Day 1,000 since the beginning of the eviction moratorium. I oppose this draft ordinance's rent freeze. Rents have already been frozen for 32 months! All expenses related to maintaining rental property have increased, far out-pacing the CPI inflation numbers. Utility rates, SCEP fees, RecycleLA rates, and relocation fees have all increased. Unless you're willing to take a retroactive pay cut and work at your 2019 salary level and cut the entire city budget back to the budget size back at the end of 2019, then you would be a hypocrite to impose a rent increase freeze on housing providers. Inflation impacts both owners and renters. Will you make rules for others that you would never make for yourself? Rental property owners will be very grateful if you brought a swift end to the rent freeze.

**Tenant Relocation Fees:** I also strongly oppose 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 even more new development. You knew it then, what has changed? Bad policies like this have contributed to a decrease in housing inventory. Do you want to encourage the creation of more units? If so, you need to unify RSO tenant relocation fees to match those of the state! In addition to discouraging the creation of new units, instituting more draconian relocation fees on smaller owners and owners of newer buildings will inadvertently cause the process of approving applicants for housing more difficult and raise the bar for tenant qualification criteria. Is the goal to create more housing or just control more 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"? The constant chipping away at owner protections discourages the development of new multi-family units and ADUs. I strongly oppose a monetary threshold to evict. 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 rents; 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. Revise the COVID hardship declaration form! Removing the requirement for tenants to provide notice of COVID hardship within seven days of rent becoming due will enable more COVID hardship fraud! You can find a sample revised COVID Hardship Declaration Form at: <https://aoausa.com/downloads/basis-for-covid-hardship-declaration.pdf>.

Don't Forget Commercial Owners! There was no mention of expressly repealing "SEC. 49.99.3. PROHIBITION ON COMMERCIAL EVICTIONS". Without this wording in the ordinance, the commercial eviction protections will stay in place. Thank you for voting for what is best for everyone instead of mis-guided tenant right's groups.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** George Yao  
**Date Submitted:** 11/28/2022 08:36 PM  
**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3  
**Comments for Public Posting:** Stop bureaucracy and remove eviction moratorium ASAP.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Estela Niazi Tomasek

**Date Submitted:** 11/28/2022 08:37 PM

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

**Comments for Public Posting:** The LA County Board of Supervisors don't care about Moms and Pops Landlord like me who have been tapping into my kids college fund to pay the mortgage for my property so my property doesn't go for foreclosure. I had to beg the tenants for a year to apply for Rent Relief Program which they did after 10 months of back and forth. The government paid for 18 months of rent and the tenants still have to pay a back due rent which exceeds over \$45,000. Tenants who not only don't live on the property but have rented my single family house as airbnb, they have rented rooms, and cut the long story short, they are collecting rent. This is pathetic. In the beginning of the Pandemics, they collected all sorts of government aids and did the trips to Bahamas, purchased new cars and lived a luxury life style at my expense. I would like to see if any of the board of Supervisors will pay for my kids tuition (\$35000) plus my primary resident's mortgage, my rental property's mortgage and so forth. This is ridiculous and utterly unacceptable to make decisions for people like me who are struggling to survive at the expense of these board members.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Nick  
**Date Submitted:** 11/28/2022 08:41 PM  
**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear City Council Members: Tuesday marks Day 1,000 since the beginning of the eviction moratorium. I oppose this draft ordinance's rent freeze. Rents have already been frozen for 32 months! All expenses related to maintaining rental property have increased, far out-pacing the CPI inflation numbers. Utility rates, SCEP fees, RecycleLA rates, and relocation fees have all increased. Unless you're willing to take a retroactive pay cut and work at your 2019 salary level and cut the entire city budget back to the budget size back at the end of 2019, then you would be a hypocrite to impose a rent increase freeze on housing providers. Inflation impacts both owners and renters. Will you make rules for others that you would never make for yourself? Rental property owners will be very grateful if you brought a swift end to the rent freeze.

**Tenant Relocation Fees:** I also strongly oppose 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 even more new development. You knew it then, what has changed? Bad policies like this have contributed to a decrease in housing inventory. Do you want to encourage the creation of more units? If so, you need to unify RSO tenant relocation fees to match those of the state! In addition to discouraging the creation of new units, instituting more draconian relocation fees on smaller owners and owners of newer buildings will inadvertently cause the process of approving applicants for housing more difficult and raise the bar for tenant qualification criteria. Is the goal to create more housing or just control more 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"? The constant chipping away at owner protections discourages the development of new multi-family units and ADUs. I strongly oppose a monetary threshold to evict. 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 rents; 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. Revise the COVID hardship declaration form! Removing the requirement for tenants to provide notice of COVID hardship within seven days of rent becoming due will enable more COVID hardship fraud! You can find a sample revised COVID Hardship Declaration Form at: <https://aoausa.com/downloads/basis-for-covid-hardship-declaration.pdf>.

Don't Forget Commercial Owners! There was no mention of expressly repealing "SEC. 49.99.3. PROHIBITION ON COMMERCIAL EVICTIONS". Without this wording in the ordinance, the commercial eviction protections will stay in place. Thank you for voting for what is best for everyone instead of mis-guided tenant right's groups. Sincerely,  
Nick

## Communication from Public

**Name:** A Concerned Landlord

**Date Submitted:** 11/28/2022 08:53 PM

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

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear City Council Members: Please end the eviction moratorium and rent freeze now. Tuesday marks Day 1,000 since the beginning of the eviction moratorium. I oppose this draft ordinance's rent freeze. Rents have already been frozen for 32 months! All expenses related to maintaining rental property have increased, far out-pacing the CPI inflation numbers. Utility rates, SCEP fees, RecycleLA rates, and relocation fees have all increased. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** George Jung

**Date Submitted:** 11/28/2022 09:09 PM

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

**Comments for Public Posting:** This is about the Council voting on issues regarding the evictions and rental increase moratorium this week. It has been three years since these unjust rules were forced upon us. It is totally unfair to the small rental owners. As a result It drains our savings because the rental incomes do not matches our expenses each month, it is hurting us beyond believes. It is obvious that any person with a reasonable mind can understand what is going on. Please reverse these unjust ordinance as soon as possible.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Stephen P Fleschler  
**Date Submitted:** 11/28/2022 09:22 PM  
**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear City Council Members: Tuesday marks Day 1,000 since the beginning of the eviction moratorium. I oppose this draft ordinance's rent freeze. Rents have already been frozen for 32 months! All expenses related to maintaining rental property have increased, far out-pacing the CPI inflation numbers. Utility rates, SCEP fees, RecycleLA rates, and relocation fees have all increased. Unless you're willing to take a retroactive pay cut and work at your 2019 salary level and cut the entire city budget back to the budget size back at the end of 2019, then you would be a hypocrite to impose a rent increase freeze on housing providers. Inflation impacts both owners and renters. Will you make rules for others that you would never make for yourself? Rental property owners will be very grateful if you brought a swift end to the rent freeze.

**Tenant Relocation Fees:** I also strongly oppose 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 even more new development. You knew it then, what has changed? Bad policies like this have contributed to a decrease in housing inventory. Do you want to encourage the creation of more units? If so, you need to unify RSO tenant relocation fees to match those of the state! In addition to discouraging the creation of new units, instituting more draconian relocation fees on smaller owners and owners of newer buildings will inadvertently cause the process of approving applicants for housing more difficult and raise the bar for tenant qualification criteria. Is the goal to create more housing or just control more 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"? The constant chipping away at owner protections discourages the development of new multi-family units and ADUs. I strongly oppose a monetary threshold to evict. 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 rents; 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. Revise the COVID hardship declaration form! Removing the requirement for tenants to provide notice of COVID hardship within seven days of rent becoming due will enable more COVID hardship fraud! You can find a sample revised COVID Hardship Declaration Form at: <https://aoausa.com/downloads/basis-for-covid-hardship-declaration.pdf>.

Don't Forget Commercial Owners! There was no mention of expressly repealing "SEC. 49.99.3. PROHIBITION ON COMMERCIAL EVICTIONS". Without this wording in the ordinance, the commercial eviction protections will stay in place. Thank you for voting for what is best for everyone instead of mis-guided tenant right's groups. Sincerely,  
Stephen Fleschler

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Susan Kornfeld

**Date Submitted:** 11/28/2022 09:46 PM

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

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear City Council Members: Tenant Relocation Fees: I also strongly oppose 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 even more new development. You knew it then, what has changed? Bad policies like this have contributed to a decrease in housing inventory. Do you want to encourage the creation of more units? If so, you need to unify RSO tenant relocation fees to match those of the state! In addition to discouraging the creation of new units, instituting more draconian relocation fees on smaller owners and owners of newer buildings will inadvertently cause the process of approving applicants for housing more difficult and raise the bar for tenant qualification criteria. Is the goal to create more housing or just control more 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”? The constant chipping away at owner protections discourages the development of new multi-family units and ADUs.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Donna Christman

**Date Submitted:** 11/28/2022 09:47 PM

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

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear City Council Members: Tuesday marks Day 1,000 since the beginning of the eviction moratorium. I oppose this draft ordinance's rent freeze. Rents have already been frozen for 32 months! All expenses related to maintaining rental property have increased, far out-pacing the CPI inflation numbers. Utility rates, SCEP fees, RecycleLA rates, and relocation fees have all increased. Unless you're willing to take a retroactive pay cut and work at your 2019 salary level and cut the entire city budget back to the budget size back at the end of 2019, then you would be a hypocrite to impose a rent increase freeze on housing providers. Inflation impacts both owners and renters. Will you make rules for others that you would never make for yourself? Rental property owners will be very grateful if you brought a swift end to the rent freeze. Tenant Relocation Fees: I also strongly oppose 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 even more new development. You knew it then, what has changed? Bad policies like this have contributed to a decrease in housing inventory. Do you want to encourage the creation of more units? If so, you need to unify RSO tenant relocation fees to match those of the state! In addition to discouraging the creation of new units, instituting more draconian relocation fees on smaller owners and owners of newer buildings will inadvertently cause the process of approving applicants for housing more difficult and raise the bar for tenant qualification criteria. Is the goal to create more housing or just control more 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"? The constant chipping away at owner protections discourages the development of new multi-family units and ADUs. I strongly oppose a monetary threshold to evict. 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 rents; 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. Revise the COVID hardship declaration form! Removing the requirement for tenants to provide notice of COVID hardship within seven days of rent becoming due will enable more COVID hardship fraud! Don't Forget Commercial Owners! There was no mention of expressly repealing "SEC. 49.99.3. PROHIBITION ON COMMERCIAL EVICTIONS". Without this wording in the ordinance, the commercial eviction protections will stay in place. Thank you for voting for what is best for everyone instead of mis-guided tenant right's groups. The tenants are NOT the only ones undergoing hardships. Sincerely, Donna Christman

Dear City Council Members:

Tuesday marks Day 1,000 since the beginning of the eviction moratorium. I oppose this draft ordinance's rent freeze. Rents have already been frozen for 32 months! All expenses related to maintaining rental property have increased, far out-pacing the CPI inflation numbers. Utility rates, SCEP fees, RecycleLA rates, and relocation fees have all increased.

**Unless you're willing to take a retroactive pay cut** and work at your 2019 salary level and cut the entire city budget back to the budget size back at the end of 2019, then you would be a hypocrite to impose a rent increase freeze on housing providers. Inflation impacts both owners and renters. Will you make rules for others that you would never make for yourself? Rental property owners will be very grateful if you brought a swift end to the rent freeze.

**Tenant Relocation Fees:** I also strongly oppose 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 even more new development. You knew it then, what has changed? Bad policies like this have contributed to a decrease in housing inventory.

**Do you want to encourage the creation of more units?** If so, you need to unify RSO tenant relocation fees to match those of the state! In addition to discouraging the creation of new units, instituting more draconian relocation fees on smaller owners and owners of newer buildings will inadvertently cause the process of approving applicants for housing more difficult and raise the bar for tenant qualification criteria.

**Is the goal to create more housing or just control more 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"?

The constant chipping away at owner protections discourages the development of new multi-family units and ADUs.

**I strongly oppose a monetary threshold to evict.** 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 rents; 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.

**Revise the COVID hardship declaration form!** Removing the requirement for tenants to provide notice of COVID hardship within seven days of rent becoming due will enable more COVID hardship fraud!

**Don't Forget Commercial Owners!** There was no mention of expressly repealing "SEC. 49.99.3. PROHIBITION ON COMMERCIAL EVICTIONS". Without this wording in the ordinance, the commercial eviction protections will stay in place.

Thank you for voting for what is best for everyone instead of mis-guided tenant right's groups. The tenants are NOT the only ones undergoing hardships.

Sincerely,

Donna Christman

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Los Angeles small landlord

**Date Submitted:** 11/28/2022 10:05 PM

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

**Comments for Public Posting:** We are small landlords in Los Angeles city, This moratorium policy was to kill all landlords and businesses. The landlord has no protection from the government, we still have to pay a mortgage every month, and feed our family members. Housing problems are government problems, not landlord problems. Why put the housing problem on the landlord or property owner? Why don't shift the problems to Governor, Mayor, and City Council? How do you feel, you can use your money or your house to feed them. Dear City Council Members: Tuesday marks Day 1,000 since the beginning of the eviction moratorium. I oppose this draft ordinance's rent freeze. Rents have already been frozen for 32 months! All expenses related to maintaining rental property have increased, far out-pacing the CPI inflation numbers. Utility rates, SCEP fees, RecycleLA rates, and relocation fees have all increased. Unless you're willing to take a retroactive pay cut and work at your 2019 salary level and cut the entire city budget back to the budget size back at the end of 2019, then you would be a hypocrite to impose a rent increase freeze on housing providers. Inflation impacts both owners and renters. Will you make rules for others that you would never make for yourself? Rental property owners will be very grateful if you brought a swift end to the rent freeze. Tenant Relocation Fees: I also strongly oppose 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 even more new development. You knew it then, what has changed? Bad policies like this have contributed to a decrease in housing inventory. Do you want to encourage the creation of more units? If so, you need to unify RSO tenant relocation fees to match those of the state! In addition to discouraging the creation of new units, instituting more draconian relocation fees on smaller owners and owners of newer buildings will inadvertently cause the process of approving applicants for housing more difficult and raise the bar for tenant qualification criteria. Is the goal to create more housing or just control more 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"? The constant chipping away at owner protections discourages the development of new multi-family units and ADUs. I strongly oppose a monetary threshold to evict. 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 rents; 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. Revise the COVID hardship declaration form! Removing the requirement for tenants to provide notice of COVID hardship within seven days of rent becoming due will enable more COVID hardship fraud! You can find a sample revised COVID Hardship Declaration Form at: <https://aoausa.com/downloads/basis-for-covid-hardship-declaration.pdf>. Don't Forget Commercial Owners! There was no mention of expressly repealing "SEC. 49.99.3. PROHIBITION ON COMMERCIAL EVICTIONS". Without this wording in the ordinance, the commercial eviction protections will stay in place. Thank you for voting for what is best for everyone instead of mis-guided tenant right's groups. Sincerely, David

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Shawn C Luong  
**Date Submitted:** 11/28/2022 11:11 PM  
**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear City Council Members: Tuesday marks Day 1,000 since the beginning of the eviction moratorium. I oppose this draft ordinance's rent freeze. Rents have already been frozen for 32 months! All expenses related to maintaining rental property have increased, far out-pacing the CPI inflation numbers. Utility rates, SCEP fees, RecycleLA rates, and relocation fees have all increased. Unless you're willing to take a retroactive pay cut and work at your 2019 salary level, and cut the entire city budget back to the budget size back at the end of 2019, then you would be a hypocrite to impose a rent increase freeze on housing providers. Inflation impacts both owners and renters. Will you make rules for others that you would never make for yourself? Rental property owners would be very grateful if you brought a swift end to the rent freeze. Tenant Relocation Fees: I strongly oppose 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 even more new development. You knew it then; what has changed? Bad policies like this have contributed to a decrease in housing inventory. Do you want to encourage the creation of more units? If so, you need to unify RSO tenant relocation fees to match those of the state! In addition to discouraging the creation of new units, instituting more draconian relocation fees on smaller owners and owners of newer buildings will inadvertently cause the process of approving applicants for housing more difficult and raise the bar for tenant qualification criteria. Is the goal to create more housing or just control more 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"? The constant chipping away at owner protections discourages the development of new multi-family units and ADUs. I strongly oppose a monetary threshold to evict. Tenants already have free legal aid available to them when they face eviction. Setting a monetary threshold of rent owed before an owner can evict will cause all rents to increase. Many owners are proud to be charging below-market rents; however, they will have no choice but to increase rents to market rate 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. Revise the COVID hardship declaration form! Removing the requirement for tenants to provide notice of COVID hardship within seven days of rent becoming due will enable more COVID hardship fraud! Thank you for voting for what is best for everyone instead of misguided tenant rights groups.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Nasrin Maleki  
**Date Submitted:** 11/28/2022 05:05 PM  
**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear City Council Members: Tuesday marks Day 1,000 since the beginning of the eviction moratorium. I oppose this draft ordinance's rent freeze. Rents have already been frozen for 32 months! All expenses related to maintaining rental property have increased, far out-pacing the CPI inflation numbers. Utility rates, SCEP fees, Recycle LA rates, and relocation fees have all increased. Unless you're willing to take a retroactive pay cut and work at your 2019 salary level and cut the entire city budget back to the budget size back at the end of 2019, then you would be a hypocrite to impose a rent increase freeze on housing providers. Inflation impacts both owners and renters. Will you make rules for others that you would never make for yourself? Rental property owners will be very grateful if you brought a swift end to the rent freeze. I retired on June 1, 2022, due to chronic kidney disease. I would like to move in my rental property. My tenant who has a property in Big Bear is requiring me to pay him relocation fee according to housing authorities' requirements. I worked for 22 years to pay for this property I do not have the money to pay the relocation fee to the tenant. My rent has been about \$1,000 below market price for last four years this tenant lived in my property. City of LA made me homeless. In age 70 I am renting a room in someone house and my tenant is enjoying low rent and accusing me of harassment because you are allowing it. Tenant Relocation Fees: I also strongly oppose 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 even more new development. You knew it then, what has changed? Bad policies like this have contributed to a decrease in housing inventory. Do you want to encourage the creation of more units? If so, you need to unify RSO tenant relocation fees to match those of the state! In addition to discouraging the creation of new units, instituting more draconian relocation fees on smaller owners and owners of newer buildings will inadvertently cause the process of approving applicants for housing more difficult and raise the bar for tenant qualification criteria. Is the goal to create more housing or just control more 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"? The constant chipping away at owner protections discourages the development of new multi-family units and ADUs. I strongly oppose a monetary threshold to evict. 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 rents; 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. Revise the COVID hardship declaration form! Removing the requirement for tenants to provide notice of COVID hardship within seven days of rent becoming due will enable more COVID hardship fraud! You can find a sample revised COVID Hardship Declaration Form at: <https://aoausa.com/downloads/basis-for-covid-hardship-declaration.pdf>. Don't Forget Commercial Owners! There was no mention of expressly repealing "SEC. 49.99.3. PROHIBITION ON COMMERCIAL EVICTIONS". Without this wording in the ordinance, the commercial eviction protections will stay in place. Thank you for voting for what is best for everyone instead of mis-guided tenant right's groups. Sincerely,  
Nasrin Maleki

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 11/28/2022 05:09 PM

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

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear City Council Members: Tuesday marks Day 1,000 since the beginning of the eviction moratorium. I oppose this draft ordinance's rent freeze. Rents have already been frozen for 32 months! All expenses related to maintaining rental property have increased, far out-pacing the CPI inflation numbers. Utility rates, SCEP fees, RecycleLA rates, and relocation fees have all increased. Unless you're willing to take a retroactive pay cut and work at your 2019 salary level and cut the entire city budget back to the budget size back at the end of 2019, then you would be a hypocrite to impose a rent increase freeze on housing providers. Inflation impacts both owners and renters. Will you make rules for others that you would never make for yourself? Rental property owners will be very grateful if you brought a swift end to the rent freeze.

**Tenant Relocation Fees:** I also strongly oppose 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 even more new development. You knew it then, what has changed? Bad policies like this have contributed to a decrease in housing inventory. Do you want to encourage the creation of more units? If so, you need to unify RSO tenant relocation fees to match those of the state! In addition to discouraging the creation of new units, instituting more draconian relocation fees on smaller owners and owners of newer buildings will inadvertently cause the process of approving applicants for housing more difficult and raise the bar for tenant qualification criteria. Is the goal to create more housing or just control more 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"? The constant chipping away at owner protections discourages the development of new multi-family units and ADUs. I strongly oppose a monetary threshold to evict. 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 rents; 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. Revise the COVID hardship declaration form! Removing the requirement for tenants to provide notice of COVID hardship within seven days of rent becoming due will enable more COVID hardship fraud! You can find a sample revised COVID Hardship Declaration Form at: <https://aoausa.com/downloads/basis-for-covid-hardship-declaration.pdf>.

Don't Forget Commercial Owners! There was no mention of expressly repealing "SEC. 49.99.3. PROHIBITION ON COMMERCIAL EVICTIONS". Without this wording in the ordinance, the commercial eviction protections will stay in place. Thank you for voting for what is best for everyone instead of mis-guided tenant right's groups. Sincerely,  
Michael Berg

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 11/28/2022 05:51 PM

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

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear City Council Members: Tuesday marks Day 1,000 since the beginning of the eviction moratorium. I oppose this draft ordinance's rent freeze. Rents have already been frozen for 32 months! All expenses related to maintaining rental property have increased, far out-pacing the CPI inflation numbers. Utility rates, SCEP fees, RecycleLA rates, and relocation fees have all increased. Unless you're willing to take a retroactive pay cut and work at your 2019 salary level and cut the entire city budget back to the budget size back at the end of 2019, then you would be a hypocrite to impose a rent increase freeze on housing providers. Inflation impacts both owners and renters. Will you make rules for others that you would never make for yourself? Rental property owners will be very grateful if you brought a swift end to the rent freeze.

**Tenant Relocation Fees:** I also strongly oppose 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 even more new development. You knew it then, what has changed? Bad policies like this have contributed to a decrease in housing inventory. Do you want to encourage the creation of more units? If so, you need to unify RSO tenant relocation fees to match those of the state! In addition to discouraging the creation of new units, instituting more draconian relocation fees on smaller owners and owners of newer buildings will inadvertently cause the process of approving applicants for housing more difficult and raise the bar for tenant qualification criteria. Is the goal to create more housing or just control more 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"? The constant chipping away at owner protections discourages the development of new multi-family units and ADUs. I strongly oppose a monetary threshold to evict. 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 rents; 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. Revise the COVID hardship declaration form! Removing the requirement for tenants to provide notice of COVID hardship within seven days of rent becoming due will enable more COVID hardship fraud! You can find a sample revised COVID Hardship Declaration Form at: <https://aoausa.com/downloads/basis-for-covid-hardship-declaration.pdf>.

Don't Forget Commercial Owners! There was no mention of expressly repealing "SEC. 49.99.3. PROHIBITION ON COMMERCIAL EVICTIONS". Without this wording in the ordinance, the commercial eviction protections will stay in place. Thank you for voting for what is best for everyone instead of mis-guided tenant right's groups. Sincerely,  
Lisa Silver

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 11/28/2022 06:03 PM

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

**Comments for Public Posting:** Enough is enough. People are now just taking advantage of the laws and not paying rent. Rents have been frozen for 32 months while our costs have increased tremendously, like the price of gas. EVICTION MORATORIUM HAS TO BE LIFTED AND RENT INCREASES HAVE TO BE PERMITTED RETROACTIVELY. Not all apartment owners, especially ones that own RSO properties, are large corporations which can absorb the RISING costs of maintenance. Many are mom and pop small landlords, like us, who cannot keep providing units that meet the strict requirements for habitability while not being able to increase rents or be paid rent by some tenants. No one would be willing to take a pay cut to 2019 pay correct? Why make these rules for small landlords like us? This is hurting exactly the people you are trying to protect like my 90 year old mother who lives off the income of small apartment units she has worked hard all her life to save for. It is not fair or equitable. We have a tenant who is young and capable of working and can pay rent who refuses to pay rent because of the rules you have created. There has to be accountability—there is rampant fraud by tenants taking advantage of the unfair rules you have created. If there are tenants who really need the help, then provide funding for the owners and pay their rent. But increases have to be permitted to allow us to operate apartments and pay our bills. Thank you for your time

## Communication from Public

**Name:** dhiru mistry

**Date Submitted:** 11/28/2022 06:24 PM

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

**Comments for Public Posting:** I own some apartment buildings in the city of Los Angeles. My expenses have increased quite a bit, but still I cannot increase the rents. some tenants have been loving free because of your stupid laws. I want you to vote to end the eviction moratorium and rent increase freeze D Mistry

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Fred Keivanfar  
**Date Submitted:** 11/28/2022 06:53 PM  
**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear City Council Members: Tuesday marks Day 1,000 since the beginning of the eviction moratorium. I oppose this draft ordinance's rent freeze. Rents have already been frozen for 32 months! All expenses related to maintaining rental property have increased, far out-pacing the CPI inflation numbers. Utility rates, SCEP fees, RecycleLA rates, and relocation fees have all increased. Unless you're willing to take a retroactive pay cut and work at your 2019 salary level and cut the entire city budget back to the budget size back at the end of 2019, then you would be a hypocrite to impose a rent increase freeze on housing providers. Inflation impacts both owners and renters. Will you make rules for others that you would never make for yourself? Rental property owners will be very grateful if you brought a swift end to the rent freeze.

**Tenant Relocation Fees:** I also strongly oppose 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 even more new development. You knew it then, what has changed? Bad policies like this have contributed to a decrease in housing inventory. Do you want to encourage the creation of more units? If so, you need to unify RSO tenant relocation fees to match those of the state! In addition to discouraging the creation of new units, instituting more draconian relocation fees on smaller owners and owners of newer buildings will inadvertently cause the process of approving applicants for housing more difficult and raise the bar for tenant qualification criteria. Is the goal to create more housing or just control more 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"? The constant chipping away at owner protections discourages the development of new multi-family units and ADUs. I strongly oppose a monetary threshold to evict. 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 rents; 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. Revise the COVID hardship declaration form! Removing the requirement for tenants to provide notice of COVID hardship within seven days of rent becoming due will enable more COVID hardship fraud! You can find a sample revised COVID Hardship Declaration Form at: <https://aoausa.com/downloads/basis-for-covid-hardship-declaration.pdf>.

Don't Forget Commercial Owners! There was no mention of expressly repealing "SEC. 49.99.3. PROHIBITION ON COMMERCIAL EVICTIONS". Without this wording in the ordinance, the commercial eviction protections will stay in place. Thank you for voting for what is best for everyone instead of mis-guided tenant right's groups. Sincerely,  
Fred Keivanfar

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Cherokee Nation Properties

**Date Submitted:** 11/28/2022 06:56 PM

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

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear City Council Members: Tuesday marks Day 1,000 since the beginning of the eviction moratorium. I oppose this draft ordinance's rent freeze. Rents have already been frozen for 32 months! All expenses related to maintaining rental property have increased, far out-pacing the CPI inflation numbers. Utility rates, SCEP fees, RecycleLA rates, and relocation fees have all increased. Unless you're willing to take a retroactive pay cut and work at your 2019 salary level and cut the entire city budget back to the budget size back at the end of 2019, then you would be a hypocrite to impose a rent increase freeze on housing providers. Inflation impacts both owners and renters. Will you make rules for others that you would never make for yourself? Rental property owners will be very grateful if you brought a swift end to the rent freeze.

Dear City Council Members:

Tuesday marks Day 1,000 since the beginning of the eviction moratorium. I oppose this draft ordinance's rent freeze. Rents have already been frozen for 32 months! All expenses related to maintaining rental property have increased, far out-pacing the CPI inflation numbers. Utility rates, SCEP fees, RecycleLA rates, and relocation fees have all increased.

**Unless you're willing to take a retroactive pay cut** and work at your 2019 salary level and cut the entire city budget back to the budget size back at the end of 2019, then you would be a hypocrite to impose a rent increase freeze on housing providers. Inflation impacts both owners and renters. Will you make rules for others that you would never make for yourself? Rental property owners will be very grateful if you brought a swift end to the rent freeze.

**Tenant Relocation Fees:** I also strongly oppose 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 even more new development. You knew it then, what has changed? Bad policies like this have contributed to a decrease in housing inventory.

**Do you want to encourage the creation of more units?** If so, you need to unify RSO tenant relocation fees to match those of the state! In addition to discouraging the creation of new units, instituting more draconian relocation fees on smaller owners and owners of newer buildings will inadvertently cause the process of approving applicants for housing more difficult and raise the bar for tenant qualification criteria.

**Is the goal to create more housing or just control more 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"?

The constant chipping away at owner protections discourages the development of new multi-family units and ADUs.

**I strongly oppose a monetary threshold to evict.** 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 rents; 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.

**Revise the COVID hardship declaration form!** Removing the requirement for tenants to provide notice of COVID hardship within seven days of rent becoming due will enable more COVID hardship fraud! You can find a sample revised COVID Hardship Declaration Form at: <https://aoausa.com/downloads/basis-for-covid-hardship-declaration.pdf>.

Thank you for voting for what is best for everyone instead of mis-guided tenant right's groups.

Sincerely,

**Cherokee Nation Properties, LLC**

(323) 333-0088

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Concerned Rental property Owner

**Date Submitted:** 11/28/2022 07:44 PM

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

**Comments for Public Posting:** Stop over-regulating the rental mom and pa businesses. Costs have steadily increased for the ma and pa property owners. This regulation allows big corporations to take over the rental housing market by buying out the smaller troubled rental property owners. Remember, they are strict number counters that must answer to their stockholders. As we get driven out of the rental business, in comes the greedy corporations with the money to influence the politicians to support them. Please do the right thing for all parties involved in this mess, especially the small ma and pa rental property owners.

---

# MRB Properties

2227 W. 29<sup>th</sup> St., Los Angeles, CA 90018

---

November 28, 2022

Dear City Council Members:

Tuesday marks Day 1,000 since the beginning of the eviction moratorium. I oppose this draft ordinance's rent freeze. Rents have already been frozen for 32 months! All expenses related to maintaining rental property have increased, far out-pacing the CPI inflation numbers. Utility rates, SCEP fees, RecycleLA rates, and relocation fees have all increased.

**Unless you're willing to take a retroactive pay cut** and work at your 2019 salary level and cut the entire city budget back to the budget size back at the end of 2019, then you would be a hypocrite to impose a rent increase freeze on housing providers. Inflation impacts both owners and renters. Will you make rules for others that you would never make for yourself? Rental property owners will be very grateful if you brought a swift end to the rent freeze.

**Tenant Relocation Fees:** I also strongly oppose 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 even more new development. You knew it then, what has changed? Bad policies like this have contributed to a decrease in housing inventory.

**Do you want to encourage the creation of more units?** If so, you need to unify RSO tenant relocation fees to match those of the state! In addition to discouraging the creation of new units, instituting more draconian relocation fees on smaller owners and owners of newer buildings will inadvertently cause the process of approving applicants for housing more difficult and raise the bar for tenant qualification criteria.

**Is the goal to create more housing or just control more 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”?

The constant chipping away at owner protections discourages the development of new multi-family units and ADUs.

**I strongly oppose a monetary threshold to evict.** 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 rents; 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.

**Revise the COVID hardship declaration form!** Removing the requirement for tenants to provide notice of COVID hardship within seven days of rent becoming due will enable more COVID hardship fraud! You can find a sample revised COVID Hardship Declaration Form at: <https://aoausa.com/downloads/basis-for-covid-hardship-declaration.pdf>.

**Don't Forget Commercial Owners!** There was no mention of expressly repealing "SEC. 49.99.3. PROHIBITION ON COMMERCIAL EVICTIONS". Without this wording in the ordinance, the commercial eviction protections will stay in place.

Thank you for voting for what is best for everyone instead of mis-guided tenant right's groups.

Sincerely,



## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 11/28/2022 07:56 PM

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

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please do what is right for all parties involved. The small apartment owners have suffered enough in the last three years for paying higher operating expenses with any rent increase. Please end all the unfair "Executive Orders" immediately. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Marco G Ventura

**Date Submitted:** 11/28/2022 08:31 PM

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

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear City of Los Angeles Council Members: Please end the eviction moratorium, now! Many landlords are suffering big losses from unscrupulous non-paying tenants. How does allowing people to live rent-free on the backs of housing providers help with alleviating the housing crisis? It likely does exactly the opposite. Plus, it is unjust to suffering landlords and unfair to the majority of ordinary tenants who do pay rent. Please end the rent freeze, now! Landlords are local businesses, just like the neighborhood coffee shop, market, and gas station, we provide an essential service to the community. Do you suppose that preventing these other businesses from passing on rising costs to their customers is appropriate? Probably not. So, why landlords? Please do not regulate the amount of rent owed for eviction. You are moving towards over-regulating this market to oblivion. Landlords are in the business of providing housing, not in evicting for no reason. Do you really believe you can regulate your way out of a housing crunch by making it harder for landlords to run their business? Think again, you are creating serious disincentives for housing providers. Please end all COVID related restrictions, including the prohibition on commercial property evictions. It is past due time.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Priscilla Campbell

**Date Submitted:** 11/28/2022 04:41 PM

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

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear City Council Members: Tuesday marks Day 1,000 since the beginning of the eviction moratorium. I oppose this draft ordinance's rent freeze. Rents have already been frozen for 32 months! All expenses related to maintaining rental property have increased, far out-pacing the CPI inflation numbers. Utility rates, SCEP fees, RecycleLA rates, and relocation fees have all increased. Unless you're willing to take a retroactive pay cut and work at your 2019 salary level and cut the entire city budget back to the budget size back at the end of 2019, then you would be a hypocrite to impose a rent increase freeze on housing providers. Inflation impacts both owners and renters. Will you make rules for others that you would never make for yourself? Rental property owners will be very grateful if you brought a swift end to the rent freeze. Tenant Relocation Fees: I also strongly oppose 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 even more new development. You knew it then, what has changed? Bad policies like this have contributed to a decrease in housing inventory. Do you want to encourage the creation of more units? If so, you need to unify RSO tenant relocation fees to match those of the state! In addition to discouraging the creation of new units, instituting more draconian relocation fees on smaller owners and owners of newer buildings will inadvertently cause the process of approving applicants for housing more difficult and raise the bar for tenant qualification criteria. Is the goal to create more housing or just control more 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"? The constant chipping away at owner protections discourages the development of new multi-family units and ADUs. I strongly oppose a monetary threshold to evict. 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 rents; 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. Revise the COVID hardship declaration form! Removing the requirement for tenants to provide notice of COVID hardship within seven days of rent becoming due will enable more COVID hardship fraud!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Ken Lee  
**Date Submitted:** 11/28/2022 04:52 PM  
**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear City Council Members: Tuesday marks Day 1,000 since the beginning of the eviction moratorium. I oppose this draft ordinance's rent freeze. Rents have already been frozen for 32 months! All expenses related to maintaining rental property have increased, far out-pacing the CPI inflation numbers. Utility rates, SCEP fees, RecycleLA rates, and relocation fees have all increased. Unless you're willing to take a retroactive pay cut and work at your 2019 salary level and cut the entire city budget back to the budget size back at the end of 2019, then you would be a hypocrite to impose a rent increase freeze on housing providers. Inflation impacts both owners and renters. Will you make rules for others that you would never make for yourself? Rental property owners will be very grateful if you brought a swift end to the rent freeze.

**Tenant Relocation Fees:** I also strongly oppose 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 even more new development. You knew it then, what has changed? Bad policies like this have contributed to a decrease in housing inventory. Do you want to encourage the creation of more units? If so, you need to unify RSO tenant relocation fees to match those of the state! In addition to discouraging the creation of new units, instituting more draconian relocation fees on smaller owners and owners of newer buildings will inadvertently cause the process of approving applicants for housing more difficult and raise the bar for tenant qualification criteria. Is the goal to create more housing or just control more 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"? The constant chipping away at owner protections discourages the development of new multi-family units and ADUs. I strongly oppose a monetary threshold to evict. 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 rents; 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. Revise the COVID hardship declaration form! Removing the requirement for tenants to provide notice of COVID hardship within seven days of rent becoming due will enable more COVID hardship fraud! You can find a sample revised COVID Hardship Declaration Form at: <https://aoausa.com/downloads/basis-for-covid-hardship-declaration.pdf>.

Don't Forget Commercial Owners! There was no mention of expressly repealing "SEC. 49.99.3. PROHIBITION ON COMMERCIAL EVICTIONS". Without this wording in the ordinance, the commercial eviction protections will stay in place. Thank you for voting for what is best for everyone instead of mis-guided tenant right's groups. Sincerely,