

Communication from Public

Name: Nicholas Mejerski

Date Submitted: 05/20/2026 10:32 AM

Council File No: 22-0178

Comments for Public Posting: This motion would completely crush the rental real estate market. The amount of legislation piled on owners is ridiculous. You just changed the RSO rent formula for the first time in 40 years and now you want to ban the Ratio Utility Billing System? Who in their right mind would invest in this City. I sell apartment buildings for a living. My business, and the 3,500 clients I closely track, would all be squashed by this motion. If you want to actually destroy the main pillar of LA's housing, this would be the ideal way to do it. It will leave apartment owners with an insurmountable cost - increasing expenses without being able to increase rents proportionately. Owners would be forced to re-rent their units at a higher cost. They would shoulder a higher vacancy. They would lose value in their buildings, and ultimately a loss of value is a loss of Taxes to the City. Not that the City seems to care. ULA, Rent Formula Change, Rising Insurance and Utility Bills, are all just a symptom of a much bigger problem. THE DSA WANTS LA TO FAIL. THEY WANT SOCIALISM. THEY WANT LOS ANGELES TO LOOK LIKE CUBA. GET YOUR FUCKING ACT TOGETHER!

Communication from Public

Name: Daniel Cunningham

Date Submitted: 05/20/2026 10:35 AM

Council File No: 22-0178

Comments for Public Posting: RUBS should not be banned. LA, in particular, has limited rent increases while reserving for itself the right to raise costs -mandated trash services, LADWP rates- at percentages that far exceed the allowed rent increase, and this is not new. Going back to the multi-100% increases in trash costs that RecycLA brought on, annual LADWP increases that regularly exceed 8%, the city has systematically engaged in, "One rule for me, another rule for thee." The context is, of course, even broader: development and redevelopment -or the multi-decade lack thereof- its effect on housing availability and cost, the increasing cost to maintain the ever older and older units that do exist, energy and conservation mandates, however well intentioned and necessary, etc. Arbitrarily deciding that landlords (and homeowners) must disproportionately shoulder those various costs while tenants are exempted is not just unfair, it is unwise -even if politically expedient and ideologically palatable. "One rule for me, another rule for thee" is at the heart of what is wrong right now -nationally and in LA.

Communication from Public

Name: Ryan Rothstein-Serling

Date Submitted: 05/20/2026 10:41 AM

Council File No: 22-0178

Comments for Public Posting: A ban on RUBs is misguided policy that will backfire on the very tenants it aims to protect. In Los Angeles, much of the multifamily housing stock, particularly RSO properties, simply cannot be individually metered without massive, impractical capital improvements. Eliminating RUBs doesn't eliminate utility costs; it just forces owners to bake those costs into higher base rents across all units, regardless of usage. That is less fair, not more. RUBs are one of the few tools that align tenant behavior with actual consumption, promoting conservation in a city facing ongoing water and energy constraints. Removing that incentive is a step in the wrong direction. If the concern is transparency, then regulate disclosure and billing standards, not the tool itself. An outright ban is an overcorrection that will increase operating costs, reduce efficiency, and ultimately raise the cost of housing. This is not the time for policy that further destabilizes an already strained housing market.

Communication from Public

Name: Nancy Jen

Date Submitted: 05/20/2026 10:44 AM

Council File No: 22-0178

Comments for Public Posting: I oppose the proposal to eliminate RUBS. Housing providers are under constant attack by the city. We are trying to provide fair and reasonable price housing. But city keeps imposing more regulations and more restrictions. All these measures only make housing more expensive. And discourage utility/energy saving.

Communication from Public

Name: Paul calvo

Date Submitted: 05/20/2026 10:49 AM

Council File No: 22-0178

Comments for Public Posting: This is just a pass of our expenses. Tenants should pay their fair share. Why are landlords always expected to cover all expenses. Especially when our expenses always go up.

Communication from Public

Name: Sudheer Donthineni

Date Submitted: 05/20/2026 10:50 AM

Council File No: 22-0178

Comments for Public Posting: There are many reasons why RUBS exists and is needed for landlords to recoup even the smallest portion of their water and sewer cost. LA Charges up to 10x more for water than neighboring cities because it imports the vast majority of its water from ice melt areas. There's a long history of systemic fraud and mismanagement at LADWP. Water cost in LA outpaces inflation regularly, based on many studies, most recently by UCLA:
<https://luskin.ucla.edu/l-a-county-water-bills-rising-faster-than-inflation-ucla-luskin-center-for-innovation-finds>

Communication from Public

Name: Aida Scher

Date Submitted: 05/20/2026 11:05 AM

Council File No: 22-0178

Comments for Public Posting: RUBS is presented as an important tool for older buildings with shared meters, enabling landlords to pass along utility costs based on resident usage and incentivize conservation. Banning RUBS was proposed without council direction or landlord input, and that a similar ban in San José actually led to increased water consumption in affected apartments — suggesting the policy can backfire environmentally.

Communication from Public

Name: andy goldman

Date Submitted: 05/20/2026 11:10 AM

Council File No: 22-0178

Comments for Public Posting: As a landlord, I strongly suggest that you do not pass this bill The burden of costs are already elevated to a point that a majority of landlords are leaving the LA housing market It is impossible to provide services that continue to undermine our ability to function Insurance, utilities, maintenance, retrofitting, rehabilitation and improvements of vacant units. We are already in a no win situation

Communication from Public

Name: John Tapia

Date Submitted: 05/20/2026 11:22 AM

Council File No: 22-0178

Comments for Public Posting: This is beyond irresponsible. Abusive and will lead to less rentals

Communication from Public

Name: Morgan

Date Submitted: 05/20/2026 10:17 AM

Council File No: 22-0178

Comments for Public Posting: RUBS is one of the few practical tools available to encourage conservation in older, master-metered buildings where individual unit usage cannot be measured. It allows housing providers to fairly recover rising utility costs tied to resident consumption. Any policy change should be based on data, stakeholder input, and a full analysis of impacts on conservation, affordability, and housing operations. If passes, it will destroy the real estate rental market. It will leave apartment owners with an insurmountable situation, increasing expenses without being able to increase rents proportionately in a market that is constantly losing good prospective tenants due to the high migration from California to business-friendly states with lower taxes.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 05/20/2026 11:43 AM

Council File No: 22-0178

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Members of the LA City Council; If the Council prohibits RUBS as one of the FEW remaining means of controlling property management costs, it will negatively affect on our housing industry's long-term future. Especially considering that housing providers are currently not even permitted to raise rates just to keep up with inflation! At every turn, local government seeks to shift the SOCIETAL burden of housing our citizens from ALL of us - to only a few. And, ironically, punishing the industry we should rightfully be encouraging. The high price of rent is NOT the problem. It is a symptom of the problem. (Tell me that's wrong.) That problem is low supply. Efforts to control the price of rent - without controlling the costs of construction and property management - only squeeze housing providers out of the economy by punishing the industry we should rightfully be encouraging. Partnership is required. The City needs more housing. / The private sector provides housing. The City's priority should be to encourage that. We should work together. Density limits should be increased. The permitting process should be streamlined - perhaps providing a single point of contact to any developer. More tax incentives would get important affordable housing on the drawing board. The outrageous cost of insurance should be addressed. Etc. I believe the WRONG approach to this problem is to make the job of providing housing more onerous and less profitable - which has been our direction. It exacerbates the problem AND makes the problem worse for future generations. Clearly, IT IS BAD FOR OUR CITY'S FUTURE. Thank you for your consideration.

Communication from Public

Name: Yvonne Flores

Date Submitted: 05/20/2026 01:09 PM

Council File No: 22-0178

Comments for Public Posting: As a homeowner and manager of properties in Los Angeles, I strongly oppose limitations on RUBS reimbursement. Please do not make property ownership and Rentals more difficult than it already is in the city of Los Angeles as it will discourage investors and developers from developing additional housing units, which are very necessary. Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 05/20/2026 01:18 PM

Council File No: 22-0178

Comments for Public Posting: We urge you to stop the RUBS ban. RUBS is one of the few tools available that encourages conservation of water and other utilities in older, master-metered buildings where individual-unit usage cannot be specifically measured. RUBS utilizes fair and reasonable allocation methodologies that allocate water and other utility costs on a variety of factors that ensure accuracy. RUBS allows housing providers to fairly recover rising utility costs tied to resident consumption. In the face of the city's recent reduction of allowable rent increases to 90% of CPI up to a maximum of 4% (from previous 8%) and elimination of the 1% additional allowed increases for gas and electric in master metered buildings, maintaining the use of RUBS is critical to the survival of many of today's housing providers who may be operating at the margins. The LAHD proposal was developed without direction from the City Council and without input from housing providers.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 05/20/2026 01:52 PM

Council File No: 22-0178

Comments for Public Posting: Please do NOT place a ban on RUBS for the following reasons: Water consumption is known to decrease when the consumers of water pays for its usage. Tenants do not have the opportunity to waste water as a means of retaliation against housing providers. Housing providers are increasingly finding it difficult to sustain housing with limits on rent increase and the inability to pass-through expenses as mandated by municipalities. Increase in repair/maintenance costs far exceed the CPI index which is the index by which municipalities determine the allowable rent increase. More recently, housing providers are limited to 90% of the CPI index further eroding ability to meet repair/maintenance expenses.

Communication from Public

Name: Eddie

Date Submitted: 05/20/2026 02:15 PM

Council File No: 22-0178

Comments for Public Posting: When does the small landlord get a break!! Why would you want to be a landlord with all your rights being slowly stripped away!!

Communication from Public

Name: CHUCK REECE

Date Submitted: 05/18/2026 03:05 PM

Council File No: 22-0178

Comments for Public Posting: BANNING RUBS WILL ADD AN ADDITION BURDEN ON LANDLORDS

Communication from Public

Name: Sheryl Hanniff

Date Submitted: 05/18/2026 05:43 PM

Council File No: 22-0178

Comments for Public Posting: Eliminating RUBS is a bad idea. If tenants aren't responsible for their utility usage (like homeowners are), they will have no incentive to conserve electricity, gas or water, all this at the landlord's expense. The ramifications are obvious. Landlord's will be micromanaging tenant's utility bills, just like parents who shout at their kids to turn off the lights. It seems that governmental entities only want to hold the responsible citizens accountable. If tenants leave their air conditioning, heating, gas or water on 24/7 at the expense of the landlord, these expenses would probably exceed the cost of rent. The person who consumes a product MUST be responsible to pay for their consumption.

Communication from Public

Name: Ludi Mora

Date Submitted: 05/18/2026 06:31 PM

Council File No: 22-0178

Comments for Public Posting: There are many reasons for the use of Rubs. RUBS promotes conservation and responsible utility usage Utility costs continue to rise dramatically for housing providers who are not the end users. Eliminating RUBS removes a fair and widely used cost-allocation tool Policies should encourage conservation, not discourage it Additional operational restrictions make housing more difficult and expensive to provide

Communication from Public

Name: Sevy

Date Submitted: 05/18/2026 06:45 PM

Council File No: 22-0178

Comments for Public Posting: We own a small four unit property, my mother lives in unit A and myself in unit B, we have two tenants. Our property does not have individual utility metering. In order to be able to afford our property in Los Angeles we depend on sharing utilities with our tenants, please don't take this away from small mom & pop property owners.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 05/18/2026 11:55 PM

Council File No: 22-0178

Comments for Public Posting: • RUBS promotes conservation and responsible utility usage •
Utility costs continue to rise dramatically for housing providers •
Eliminating RUBS removes a fair and widely used cost-allocation
tool • Policies should encourage conservation, not discourage it •
Additional operational restrictions make housing more difficult
and expensive to provide

Communication from Public

Name: Melissa Meistrell

Date Submitted: 05/19/2026 08:10 AM

Council File No: 22-0178

Comments for Public Posting: Dear City Council Members, I am writing to respectfully urge the City Council to oppose any proposal or ordinance that would ban the use of Ratio Utility Billing Systems (RUBS) for new tenancies. While the intent may be to protect residents, eliminating RUBS would have severe negative consequences for housing providers, utility conservation, and overall rental affordability in our community. To maintain a balanced, sustainable, and affordable housing market, we must allow property owners and new residents the flexibility to utilize RUBS. I strongly urge you to reject this ban and instead support policies that encourage conservation without penalizing housing providers.

Communication from Public

Name: Elizabeth Hurtado

Date Submitted: 05/19/2026 10:22 AM

Council File No: 22-0178

Comments for Public Posting: please don't implement more expenses on landloard as its been difficult to us already with all expenses we have to caring form the tenants

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 05/20/2026 09:24 AM

Council File No: 22-0178

Comments for Public Posting: A blanket prohibition on Ratio Utility Billing Systems would eliminate a proven, cost-effective tool that incentivizes tenant conservation and helps smaller landlords manage rising utility costs without costly sub-metering infrastructure. Banning RUBS entirely ignores the reality that many affordable housing providers rely on this system to remain financially viable, and doing so could ultimately lead to higher base rents that hurt the very tenants this policy aims to protect.

Communication from Public

Name: Luka L

Date Submitted: 05/20/2026 09:34 AM

Council File No: 22-0178

Comments for Public Posting: Being a landlord has become increasingly difficult, and for many families, rental income isn't just a business, it's a lifeline. My dad, for example, depends on his apartments as his primary source of income in retirement. Eliminating programs like RUBS makes that already difficult situation even harder. When tenants aren't responsible for their own utility usage, there's no reason for them to conserve. Growing up, my parents constantly reminded us to turn off the lights, turn off the AC, and keep showers short because every dollar on that bill mattered. That kind of accountability is what drives responsible behavior. Without it, waste increases, and landlords are left absorbing costs they have absolutely no control over. RUBS creates a fair and simple principle: you use it, you pay for it. It encourages conservation, reduces waste, and keeps small landlords from being buried under rising expenses they can't manage or recover. For people like my dad, margins are already razor thin. Eliminating RUBS doesn't just hurt landlords, it removes a common sense incentive for tenants to be mindful of what they consume. Please keep a program that promotes fairness, personal responsibility, and sustainability. Everyone should pay their fair share.

Communication from Public

Name: Clint Lukens

Date Submitted: 05/20/2026 09:35 AM

Council File No: 22-0178

Comments for Public Posting: Please OPPOSE any proposal that would ban RUBS for new tenancies. Council File Number: 22-0178. RUBS promotes conservation and responsible utility usage = Utility costs continue to rise dramatically for housing providers = Eliminating RUBS removes a fair and widely used cost-allocation tool = Policies should encourage conservation, not discourage it = Additional operational restrictions make housing more difficult and expensive to provide. The overwhelming majority of property owners in LA are mom & pop operators not corporate trump cronies. Please be mindful to how difficult it has become to operate buildings in LA! This is about getting tenants to literally pay for their personal usage!

Communication from Public

Name: Responsible Housing Provider

Date Submitted: 05/20/2026 03:50 PM

Council File No: 22-0178

Comments for Public Posting: Please vote against this measure. When we include utilities with rent, the tenants have 2-300% higher usage than when utilities are hosted by tenants. There is no motivation to conserve water. There is rampant usage of the air conditioner which can easily take an electric bill from \$125 to \$800 per month. Removing RUBS will be the straw that breaks the camels back. All persons should participate in conservation of water and electricity. Conservation should not be a "us vs them" concept else we will fail as Angelenos. There should be no question about conservation and responsibility and what better method to help motivate people to conserve than to have them responsible for the costs of utilities. True example, we had tenants who for whatever reason asked us to keep the utilities in our name. They were given a reasonable monthly budget of \$125 which was fine until the weather warmed and the tenants left the A/C on when they went out for the day, and when they left for the holidays driving the bills to \$800/month.