

Communication from Public

Name: Jane Demian

Date Submitted: 04/05/2024 10:03 AM

Council File No: 23-0623-S1

Comments for Public Posting: I have been a supporter of affordable housing for many years, but I am opposed to this ED 1-inspired ordinance because it is not providing actual "affordable" housing and it does not protect tenants. This ordinance must include language that specifically prevents the eviction of RSO tenants, and the demolition of RSO properties as part of ED 1 ministerial review. There are no tenant protections against eviction and displacement stated within this ordinance. I am also opposed because ED 1 purports to build 100% "affordable" housing, but it is only affordable to high income earners making 80-120% of AMI (Area Median Income). AMI in LA County is \$98,200 / year and so 80% will be \$78,560. 120% of AMI is \$117,840. With all the low income individuals who are vulnerably housed and NEED actual low income housing in LA City, the ED 1 ordinance needs to expand its income eligibility requirements to include those tenants whose incomes are at or below 30-50% of AMI. Many pro-housing advocates claim incorrectly that building de facto market rate housing will eventually "trickle down" to low income individuals, but if the ED 1 ordinance demolishes low income affordable RSO housing and instead builds housing for high income earners, how does that help provide housing for the people who really need it NOW? The negative consequences of this ordinance will be to create more homelessness. In addition, the ordinance does not provide labor standards for construction of the "affordable" units. Construction workers without labor standards will make so little money in wages that they will not be able to afford to live in the same developments they helped build. Please oppose unless the ED 1 ordinance is amended. Thank you.