

Communication from Public

Name: Michael Wilson

Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 11:32 AM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: We are devastated for all our friends who have lost houses in the Palisades fire. But as a mom and pop landlord I have to ask if this measure is really necessary? There are already items addressing the issue from LA City, LA County, Governor Newsom's Executive Orders and Mayor Bass' Executive Orders AND rental assistance that has become available. Also I'd remind you that only a relatively small portion of the city was directly affected. Indeed go to the YMCA in west la closest the Palisades. The disaster relief center has an excess of goods for people and no customers ever. Its been like this for days. So the major immediate emergency has ended for the vast majority of victims. Having a one year instead of 90 day moratorium on evictions will bring us back the abuses of COVID-19 where tenants who are able to pay will use it as an excuse to not pay rent they owe. Landlords still have expenses like mortgages, insurance, property taxes, and trash pickup when a tenant doesn't pay for a year. If there is going to be an eviction moratorium it needs to NOT BE RETROACTIVE! It must only effect evictions filed after January 7, 2025 when the Palisades fire started. There needs to be serious proof considerations. The Housing Department must be vested with the power to subpoena employers and payroll companies to ascertain if someone has really suffered economically. HR departments will never disclose anything to landlords when trying to screen tenants. This will lead to a lot of fraudulent claims and excuses not to pay the rent for a year by dishonest tenants. This will be like COVID-19 all over again with dishonest tenants self certifying and committing fraud. Also the backlog in totally legitimate evictions will be insane once a year long moratorium expires, just as happened to the courts after the COVID-19 eviction moratoriums. Owners also need to be able to move into units subject to relocation assistance and cash for keys agreements. Many owners were displaced by the fires and suffered severe economic losses as well. They need to be able to re-occupy their unit. They should also have to prove losses due to fire to their home and/ or economic damages to qualify.

Communication from Public

Name: Ky Trang Ho
Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 11:38 AM
Council File No: 25-0006-S16
Comments for Public Posting: We can't afford to let residents live rent-free. Rents make housing happen. See attached.

RENTS MAKE HOUSING HAPPEN

Support Your Housing Provider, Support Your Community

The Los Angeles City Council should see housing providers as key to its mission of providing affordable housing to the people of Los Angeles.



Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 11:42 AM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: The fires impacted a relatively small portion of LA's population. The burden of the response ought to be shared equally across all residents of the city (in the form of money to pay rent, etc.), rather than placed upon the small minority who happen to own apartments. Furthermore, if, every time there is a natural disaster in LA, the city council puts a general moratorium on evictions for non-payment of rent, there is zero chance anyone will be able to convince investors to build the housing the city so desperately needs.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 12:43 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: While I deeply sympathize with those affected by the recent wildfires, I urge you to vote against enacting a city-wide eviction moratorium. While well-intentioned, such measures can have unintended consequences, including financial strain on housing providers, reduced housing supply, and long-term harm to the rental market.

Eviction Moratoriums: Political Pandering to the Majority?

With renters comprising 63% of the Los Angeles population and landlords just 7% of taxpayers, it's curious whether the LA city council members who proposed this want to address a genuine housing crisis or simply cater to the majority for political gain.



Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 12:53 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: YOU CALL IT AN EVICTION MORATORIUM. THEY HEAR FREE RENT! Eviction moratoriums encourage unscrupulous renters to exploit the system. When rent payments are deferred or waived without accountability, you empower renters to spend money on new cars, vacations, or other luxuries. Their perception of "free rent" strains housing providers, most of whom are mom-and-pop owners or even individuals renting a room in their house who rely on rental income to maintain properties and pay mortgages. Instead of broad moratoriums, a more balanced approach—such as targeted rental assistance, payment plans, or mediation programs—can help renters in genuine need while ensuring that landlords are not unfairly burdened. This way, we can support those truly impacted without creating a system that some may exploit.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 12:58 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: It is fundamentally immoral to force one group of individuals—housing providers—to bear the financial burden of providing free housing via the proposed eviction moratorium. Housing providers, many of whom are small-scale property owners, rely on rental income to pay mortgages, maintain properties, and support their own families. Mandating free rent without compensation is akin to requiring one group to subsidize another's living expenses, which is unfair and unsustainable. This violates the principles of fairness and personal responsibility, as it places the entire burden on private individuals rather than distributing it across society. The responsibility for ensuring housing stability should fall on the government, not individual property owners. Under a socialist system, the state would provide financial assistance, temporary housing, or subsidies to those in need, ensuring that no single group is unfairly burdened. This approach aligns with the socialist principle of collective responsibility, where societal needs are addressed through public resources rather than private sacrifice. Forcing landlords to provide free rent not only undermines their financial stability but also discourages investment in housing, ultimately reducing the availability of quality rental properties. A more just and effective solution would involve government intervention—such as rental assistance programs, housing vouchers, or temporary subsidies—to support tenants in crisis without unfairly penalizing housing providers. This way, the burden is shared equitably, and the rights and livelihoods of all parties are respected.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 12:59 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: Enacting an eviction moratorium, while often well-intentioned, can be seen as a form of authoritarianism that disproportionately impacts housing providers. By mandating that landlords cannot evict non-paying tenants, the government effectively forces property owners to provide housing without compensation, violating their property rights and civil liberties. This overreach undermines the fundamental principle of fair exchange—housing providers offer a service (housing) in return for payment (rent). When this balance is disrupted, it places an undue financial and emotional burden on landlords, many of whom are small-scale owners relying on rental income to pay mortgages, maintain properties, and support their own families. Furthermore, such policies can be viewed as a violation of the Fifth Amendment, which protects against the government taking private property without just compensation. By preventing landlords from enforcing lease agreements, moratoriums effectively seize their ability to manage their property and generate income, all while bearing the costs of upkeep and taxes. Instead of broad, one-size-fits-all mandates, solutions should focus on balanced approaches—such as rental assistance programs, mediation, or temporary subsidies—that protect both tenants and housing providers' rights. This ensures fairness and preserves the integrity of private property ownership, a cornerstone of a free society.

Communication from Public

Name: J. Mills

Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 01:18 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: Following the 34 month rent-free gift the city council gave tenants during Covid (from March 2020 - January 2023), the city council will vote, once again, to place the burden of a natural disaster on the backs of housing providers. If you truly want to assist tenants who may have been affected, why not create a city-wide site, where tenants can apply for rent relief? The city certainly has the technical expertise and staff to vet claims. By doing this, you can serve all of your constituents, both housing providers and tenants. Oh, but wait, I forgot. Housing providers aren't really constituents.

Communication from Public

Name: Hannah Ceselski

Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 01:37 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: I urge the Council to vote yes on item 13 and move forward with eviction protections. City Council must take action now to mitigate price gouging and the displacement of wildfire victims before it is far too late. It is inexcusable that City Council has failed to take action to protect Angelenos from displacement and rising rents. It is shameful that the City Council already had an opportunity to vote on rental protections for tenants and pushed the vote back. It has now been over a month since the wildfires began in the Palisades, and City Council still has not done anything to protect Angelinos who have lost their homes from skyrocketing rents and rent gouging. And while I support rent assistance aid to tenants, it will be far too late for most to avoid displacement-- LAHD said getting support to tenants would take 4-8 months minimum. Wildfire victims cannot wait another 4-8 months for relief! As a member of City District 5, I am acutely aware of how close my own neighborhood was to destruction. I am humbled, and I know the only difference between myself and those who no longer have homes is pure luck and proximity. I urge especially my own Councilmember Yaroslavsky to vote in favor of our displaced neighbors to the west, who no doubt will need to be welcomed into our neighborhoods and districts as LA rebuilds. We cannot welcome our neighbors without proper protections for renters and the many homeowners-turned-renters.

Communication from Public

Name: Jerard D. Wright

Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 10:52 AM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: To the Honorable Council President Marqueece Harris Dawson and Full City Council, We are writing on behalf of the Greater Los Angeles Realtors® (GLAR), a real estate trade organization representing a membership of nearly 12,000 REALTOR® members throughout the Los Angeles region, including the cities of Beverly Hills, Culver City, Los Angeles, Santa Monica and West Hollywood to express our concerns regarding the amended Rent Freeze and Eviction Moratorium. The proposed freeze will negatively impact housing affordability and availability, further destabilize the rental housing market overall by adding a confusing and conflicting policy to what the State has already adopted in their emergency ordinance and could undermine the existing protections the City already passed from what we learned through the questions of Councilmember Traci Park during floor discussion on January 29th. It is also worth noting that protections are already in place to protect those impacted by the wildfires. The amended policy will further erode smaller housing providers, those mom-and-pop landlords who provide the bulk of the naturally affordable housing in the city by making renting property less predictable and more confusing to navigate. Los Angeles already has strong renter protections; the proposed moratorium simply goes too far and adds another unnecessary layer of regulations... Smaller housing providers, who often operate on tight margins, would be harmed as most are barely recovering from not being allowed an increase in rents for nearly four years during COVID. We have seen housing providers get out of business and sell to corporate landlords because of the burden of costs and liabilities created by blanket policies like these as we witnessed during COVID. The timing of this action could not be at a more vulnerable time to housing providers as costs have increased over the last four years. • Insurance premiums increased by 25 to 50% and expected to rise even more due to the natural disasters ([CLICK HERE](#) to read news article). • Utility costs (which are owned by the City of LA) went up on average 15%. • Trash fees (also owned and controlled by the City) saw up to a 25% increase. GLAR wants to help people who are genuinely affected by recent natural disasters, but most of the proposed amended policies contain no guardrails that can lead to similar cases of fraud that will hurt housing providers and tenants

who really need the help. In addition, the methodology cited in the preamble to the original motion and recent research cited by the 'Rent Brigade' being used to show price gouging and other tactics are faulty and problematic. The over 1300 listings cited in the price gouging tracker, GLAR learned that more than two-thirds of these units are brand new listings, these are predominately single family homes, and the majority of these listings are located in luxury market locations in the Hollywood Hills, Century City, Brentwood, Venice Beach which generally listed for a higher price even before the start of the wildfires. There were zero reports of price gouging in South and East LA. These findings were verified in an oral presentation by the City Attorney's office and LA Housing Department on January 29th at the Housing and Homelessness committee. GLAR along with our housing provider partners urge that the only work that should be done is to find financial assistance to help tenants and housing providers pay rent and mortgage. A program with verification and means testing should be a way to ensure that victims who lost work and or housing due to natural disasters will receive these resources. It should not be a blank check. There must be guard rails that will ensure that tenants and housing providers receive the support that they need. The city has already stepped up to protect renters impacted by the wildfires – it does not need to overreach with the remaining language in the amended motion which would ultimately harm the city's already strained rental housing stock.

February 12, 2025

**LA City Council President Marqueece Harris-Dawson
Los Angeles City Hall
200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012**



**Re: ITEM 13 – Rent Freeze and Eviction Moratorium – 25-0006-S16
(OPPOSE)**

To the Honorable Council President Marqueece Harris Dawson and Full City Council,

We are writing on behalf of the Greater Los Angeles Realtors® (GLAR), a real estate trade organization representing a membership of nearly 12,000 REALTOR® members throughout the Los Angeles region, including the cities of Beverly Hills, Culver City, Los Angeles, Santa Monica and West Hollywood to express our concerns regarding the amended Rent Freeze and Eviction Moratorium.

The proposed freeze will negatively impact housing affordability and availability, further destabilize the rental housing market overall by adding a confusing and conflicting policy to what the State has already adopted in their emergency ordinance and could undermine the existing protections the City already passed from what we learned through the questions of Councilmember Traci Park during floor discussion on January 29th. It is also worth noting that protections are already in place to protect those impacted by the wildfires.

The amended policy will further erode smaller housing providers, those mom-and-pop landlords who provide the bulk of the naturally affordable housing in the city by making renting property less predictable and more confusing to navigate. Los Angeles already has strong renter protections; the proposed moratorium simply goes too far and adds another unnecessary layer of regulations.

GLAR and other partners are currently collaborating with the Mayor's office with the "Homes for Vets" plan to link homeless veterans with housing providers with open units. The unintended consequence of this motion has already jeopardized partnerships that the Mayor's office has worked diligently to create to structure this unique program. We learned that newer housing providers are becoming reluctant to house veterans through the program because the language in the amended motion still contains language that suggests a blanket approach eviction moratorium and rent freeze.

Smaller housing providers, who often operate on tight margins, would be harmed as most are barely recovering from not being allowed an increase in rents for nearly four years during COVID. We have seen housing providers get out of business and sell to corporate landlords because of the burden of costs and liabilities created by blanket policies like these as we witnessed during COVID.

The timing of this action could not be at a more vulnerable time to housing providers as costs have increased over the last four years.

- Insurance premiums increased by 25 to 50% and expected to rise even more due to the natural disasters ([CLICK HERE](#) to read news article).
- Utility costs (which are owned by the City of LA) went up on average 15%.
- Trash fees (also owned and controlled by the City) saw up to a 25% increase.

The current proposed rent freeze policy prevents owners from passing through costs to tenants to keep properties maintained while the amended motion still does not contain any suggestion of property tax freezes, utility rate freezes or trash hauling fee suspensions.

We had one long standing member dip into their life savings and sell his other duplex that he would have passed down to his child for generational wealth to cover the cost of modernizing and repairing five units from problem tenants that they could not evict due to the overreaching of that moratorium. Out of retaliation, these problem tenants caused significant mildew and plumbing damage to the adjacent units because this style of motion prevented this member from legally evicting this problem tenant who would not pay rent, though they had the legitimate means to pay their rent.

GLAR wants to help people who are genuinely affected by recent natural disasters, but most of the proposed amended policies contain no guardrails that can lead to similar cases of fraud that will hurt housing providers and tenants who really need the help.

In addition, the methodology cited in the preamble to the original motion and recent research cited by the 'Rent Brigade' being used to show price gouging and other tactics are faulty and problematic. The over 1300 listings cited in the price gouging tracker, GLAR learned that more than two-thirds of these units are brand new listings, these are predominately single family homes, and the majority of these listings are located in luxury market locations in the Hollywood Hills, Century City, Brentwood, Venice Beach which generally listed for a higher price even before the start of the wildfires. There were zero reports of price gouging in South and East LA. These findings were verified in an oral presentation by the City Attorney's office and LA Housing Department on January 29th at the Housing and Homelessness committee.

GLAR along with our housing provider partners urge that the only work that should be done is to find financial assistance to help tenants and housing providers pay rent and mortgage. A program with verification and means testing should be a way to ensure

that victims who lost work and or housing due to natural disasters will receive these resources. It should not be a blank check. There must be guard rails that will ensure that tenants and housing providers receive the support that they need. The city has already stepped up to protect renters impacted by the wildfires – it does not need to overreach with the remaining language in the amended motion which would ultimately harm the city's already strained rental housing stock.

GLAR will continue to advocate for increasing homeownership opportunities for all, increasing workforce housing production, protecting property rights, and supporting small businesses. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact our Government Affairs Director at (323) 919-9424 or jerard@glarealtors.com.

Thank you for the opportunity to share our concerns with this proposal.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Anne Russell". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Anne" and last name "Russell" clearly distinguishable.

Anne Russell
GLAR President 2025

Communication from Public

Name: Brock Harris

Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 09:15 AM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: There is no need for an eviction moratorium. Having lived through the FIVE YEAR Covid eviction moratorium, we all know what this means: Thousands (TENS OF THOUSANDS) of bad actors who were not actually materially impacted by the fires will ****take advantage**** of the moratorium to live ****rent-free** for more than a year****** (they will not pay rent then take 6-9 months to evict), and the owners will NEVER see that money back. Will you guys then do that thing where you try to give money to landlords? Are we going to spend the next 2-3 years dealing with unpaid rent around this fire like we did with Covid? What a waste of time. We can't do this EVERY TIME something happens. No doubt this will be tried during the Olympics too. It's getting tiresome and affecting the business of thousands of mom-and-pop building owners.

Communication from Public

Name: Matt

Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 02:37 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: I am a “mom and pop” RPO. My wife and I decided to sell the condo we were living in when we got married 10 years ago to buy a fixer and rent it out as our retirement plan. We fixed up the condo, sold it, bought a major fixer, fixed it for the last 7 months (with \$400k in improvements) and now we are heavily restricted by the regulations around renting the home. There is not rental history in the last year so the most we could rent our new, fully furnished with brand new appliances and furniture, home for would be about \$8400. Market rent before the fires would be about 12k for perspective. Our mortgage, property taxes, and insurance is over \$11,000. We may have to take about a \$3,000 hit every month just to get through this and hold onto the home. If there is a rental freeze that would mean we would be bound by that low rent and if a tenant decided to stop paying for a full year we would 100% lose the home. I am asking you NOT to pass these rent freezes and moratoriums. Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 02:37 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: We vote against the Moritorium. Please stop the mandate

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 02:38 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: reject this proposal for Final Rent Freeze and Eviction
Moratorium should be

Communication from Public

Name: Karen

Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 02:39 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: Hello my name is Karen . I'm from SAJE and I live in District 9th. I'd like to comment on item 13 and general public comment. I urge the Council to vote yes on item 13 and move forward with eviction protections. I have canvasses the CD9 district twice a week talking to both residential and commercial tenants and they have reported being one pay check away from not being able to pay the rent. Many residential tenants are struggling to decide in making food purchases or pay rent to stay housed. I urge the council to do the right thing. Our communities are economically burden and they cannot continue to pay very high rent increases and at the same time have expectations of more rent increase while living expenses are also increasing. Many of the community residents I am referring to are members that are low-income, seniors, people of color that are bring most affected by the lack of protections. We need to pause the system. The wildfires have devastated our communities, and tenants who were already facing unaffordable rent and persistent rent burden are now more vulnerable than ever to displacement. Thousands of people have lost their homes, their neighborhoods, and their jobs. LA City must provide eviction protections to help people struggling to pay rent after losing their income and prevent further displacement and homelessness caused by the fires. Tenants are trying to recover from these wildfires, and cannot face the threat of losing their homes.

Communication from Public

Name: Robert B

Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 02:42 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: Once again, the City of LA is overreaching! The proposed - and are unnecessary as the council has already passed an eviction moratorium for fire-displaced residents. Instead of new and unnecessary regulations, the City should use ULA funds for direct rental assistance to those truly in need. Enough already. As a person who represents housing providers, it is already next to impossible to rent out single family homes without the government imposing ridiculous standards like the Just Cause Ordinance. Insane that you can't end a Lease at the end of the term or sell a home that you own at the end of a Lease. Enough!

Communication from Public

Name: Will Tiao

Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 02:44 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: We are mom and pop landlords and also manage multifamily properties for other mom and pop landlords. We have friends who have lost houses and apartments in the devastating fires. However, we strongly feel this resolution is not really helping anyone who has been affected by the fires -- and is more aimed at a larger base that has not been affected by the fires at all. The way the resolution is worded, tenants only have to say that they have been affected by the wildfires and show no proof. Based on our experience during the pandemic, we had numerous tenants "self-attest" to being affected and then used it as an excuse to not pay rent. This amounted to tens of thousands of dollars of losses for ourselves and our other mom and pop clients when those tenants were unable to or chose not to pay their back rent. This is an unfair burden to mom and pop landlords. Moreover the rent freeze applies the same burden to us small landlords as bills continue to rise for utilities, maintenance, property taxes, and other costs. Rather than focusing on punishing property owners, if the City council wants to do something, they should make sure all the aid programs they are promoting to help the homeless and others find housing are fully funded and running properly. We provide housing to a number of these recipients of aid programs -- and many of these tenants and their aid programs are not paying in a timely manner or at all. How are we supposed to solve a housing crisis if the City council does not focus on the real issues at hand? If property owners are not paid by these programs in a timely manner or at all, what is our incentive to rent to these recipients? It's beyond frustrating to see the City Council continuing to focus their efforts on items such as rent freezes and eviction moratoriums that really don't affect the real people who are suffering, but rather on certain member's political agendas.

Communication from Public

Name: Julio Cesar Ruiz

Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 02:20 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: RE: 25-0006-S16 Rent freezes are unnecessary and counterproductive. While it's crucial to support those affected by the fires, we must also consider the broader implications for landlords and the rental market. Many gardeners, service workers, nannies, and employees are struggling right now, and they shouldn't face eviction if they can't make ends meet temporarily. However, it's essential that eviction protections are well-defined to prevent abuse. There are tenants who exploit these protections, using them as a loophole to avoid rent payments, knowing they cannot be evicted. Additionally, landlords have faced significant financial challenges due to non-payments and rent freezes that were a result of the pandemic. Many landlords are relying on the necessary increases in rent that were previously put on hold during the COVID-19 moratoriums. Implementing rent freezes would unjustly impact these landlords, many of whom are also victims of the fires. For these reasons, I firmly stand against rent freezes. They do not serve the best interests of our community or the housing market.

Communication from Public

Name: Hamid Dehghan

Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 02:30 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: I disagree with this proposal. I have a house in Winnetka for rent. I need the rent if this house specially its outside of the fire zone and nobody has been affected in this area, specially my tenant. Its not to freez his rent and I can not do anything. Just pay the mortgages. Its not fair.

Communication from Public

Name: Kevin

Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 02:31 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: These proposals are an extreme overreach - and are unnecessary as the council has already passed an eviction moratorium for fire-displaced residents. Instead of new and unnecessary regulations, the City should use ULA funds for direct rental assistance to those truly in need.

Communication from Public

Name: Dan Fried

Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 02:33 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: Please vote no on the rent freeze and eviction moratorium. This is not a solution for those that have been displaced. We already have laws in place to combat price-gouging. The cost of casualty property insurance for Los Angeles apartment owners has increased an average of 100% over the last four years. Property taxes have increased 10% (compounded) over the last 4 years. Utilities and Trash are up 15%-25%.... Yet, landlords have been allowed just one diminimus rent increase to tenants in the last four years. This is insanely inequitable. It does not make sense that Landlords need to continue to subsidize tenants out of the small margins that most make, and in addition be forced to house certain tenants who can't or won't pay for their rent and not be allowed to evict them as long as the tenants self state that they were affected by the fires. Landlords are feeling the strain as well, from increasingly skyrocketing operating expenses and finance costs, and from not being able derive a fair rate of return on their investments. We must not confuse helping those individuals specifically disadvantaged by the disaster, with blanket restrictions on all properties in all parts of Los Angeles that penalizes landlords and can be easily manipulated and abused by any unscrupulous renters. There is no sufficient nexus for such broad regulation. It is overreaching and will not solve the true issues at hand: Getting help directly to those displaced by the fires. This is not the job of landlords to solve, it is the job of the community as a whole to work together to solve. Please vote NO on this regulation which unfairly and unjustifiably singles out landlords to bear this burden.

Communication from Public

Name: Nadia Fahimian
Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 02:08 PM
Council File No: 25-0006-S16
Comments for Public Posting: The proposals are an extreme overreach - and are unnecessary as the council has already passed an eviction moratorium for fire-displaced residents. Instead of new and unnecessary regulations, the City should use ULA funds for direct rental assistance to those truly in need.

Communication from Public

Name: Carolina Gutierrez

Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 02:11 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: The proposals are an extreme overreach - and are unnecessary as the council has already passed an eviction moratorium for fire-displaced residents. Instead of new and unnecessary regulations, the City should use ULA funds for direct rental assistance to those truly in need.

Communication from Public

Name: Nikki Coppa

Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 02:14 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: These proposals are an extreme overreach. They are unnecessary as the council has already passed an eviction moratorium for fire-displaced residents. Instead of new and unnecessary regulations, the City should use ULA funds for direct rental assistance to those truly in need.

Communication from Public

Name: Max and Gisele Legrand

Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 03:42 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: As a property owner and small landlord, we urge you to please limit the eviction moratorium to those specifically displaced by the LA wildfires from January 7th, 2025. If you choose to enact this eviction moratorium, it is imperative to have very specific criteria to which those who truly need the help, then get the help. We had many awful experiences during the COVID -19 eviction moratorium, with some of our tenants refusing to pay their rent for more then a year, all while going out of town on lavish vacations, purchasing new cars or nice furniture for their unit simply because all they had to do was self certify their economic hardship but not really required to provide any proof. We even had a few tenants move out of their units after quite some time, right before they were required to pay back rent, and they left us owing us more than \$50,000.00 in back rent. We lost all of that income and now to go after them in court, will require even more money that we do not have. For small landlords like us, with this being our retirement, we really suffered during the COVID-19 eviction moratorium and feel that some of our tenants really took advantage of the blanket protections, choosing not to pay rent, even when they continued to work or could pay their rent. So given our past experience with eviction moratorium, we simply ask that should you choose to enact eviction protections for tenants who are affected by the LA wildfires, that you please implement very specific criteria and regulations that tenants are required to follow (more than just to self certify) in order to obtain the protection and assistance. Thank you!

Communication from Public

Name: Bryan

Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 03:56 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: PLEASE vote no on the rent freeze and eviction moratorium. This is not a solution for those that have been displaced. We already have laws in place to combat price-gouging. The cost of casualty property insurance for Los Angeles apartment owners has increased an average of 100% over the last four years. Property taxes have increased 10% (compounded) over the last 4 years. Utilities and Trash are up 15%-25%....Yet, landlords have been allowed just one diminimus rent increase to tenants in the last four years. This is insanely inequitable. It does not make sense that Landlords need to continue to subsidize tenants out of the small margins that most make, and in addition be forced to house certain tenants who can't or won't pay for their rent and not be allowed to evict them as long as the tenants self state that they were affected by the fires. Landlords are feeling the strain as well, from increasingly skyrocketing operating expenses and finance costs, and from not being able derive a fair rate of return on their investments. We must not confuse helping those individuals specifically disadvantaged by the disaster, with blanket restrictions on all properties in all parts of Los Angeles that penalizes landlords and can be easily manipulated and abused by any unscrupulous renters. There is no sufficient nexus for such broad regulation. It is overreaching and will not solve the true issues at hand: Getting help directly to those displaced by the fires. This is not the job of landlords to solve, it is the job of the community as a whole to work together to solve. Please vote NO on this regulation which unfairly and unjustifiably singles out landlords to bear this burden.

Communication from Public

Name: HEIDI DAVIS

Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 04:01 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: Hello. I am writing to vehemently oppose Item 13 (Rent freeze and eviction moratorium). I am sorry to be blunt...this is absurd. It makes no practical sense. I am a realtor and therefore you could make the assumption I would oppose this. I will tell you why. I represent owners all over the city who lease their properties. Owners of single family homes, duplexes and triplexes - they are all "Mom & Pop" rental owners. They own property and in many instances are under water on expenses each month. Many keep rents at below market value to appease their tenants. In a city with already strict rent control laws and on top of that the protections in place for those affected by the fires - WHY would you need this added on? For what? and for who? If a tenant (not affected by the fire) does not pay their rent, why should they not be evicted? What is this gift you would give them and why? In addition, rent control only allows for marginal increases and in the long run keeps rents well below what they might rent for on the open market. Let me ask you this (whoever is reading this) - you work, right? You have a job? If you were the one renting an apartment in the city and decided not to pay your rent, should you be able to stay? The answer is clearly NO. Doesnt anyone have anything better to come up with then this useless and hurtful ordinance. Its truly a shame.

Communication from Public

Name: David Hitt

Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 04:08 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: 25-0006-S16 The proposals are an extreme overreach - and are unnecessary as the council has already passed an eviction moratorium for fire-displaced residents. Instead of new and unnecessary regulations, the City should use ULA funds for direct rental assistance to those truly in need.

Communication from Public

Name: Seth Phillips

Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 04:16 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: Please stop the overreach. Yes, protect the fire victims. You don't need to hurt housing providers citywide to accomplish that.

Communication from Public

Name: Chris Scornaienchi

Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 04:42 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: Hello, These restrictions are causing too much hardship for the ma and pa owners which already bear too much for the RSO rent control laws. We are not wealthy Wall Street investors with endless supplies of money! The proposals are an extreme overreach - and are unnecessary as the council has already passed an eviction moratorium for fire-displaced residents. Instead of new and unnecessary regulations, the City should use ULA funds for direct rental assistance to those truly in need. Thank you for listening, Chris

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 04:55 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: Instead of asking small landlords who consist of elderly citizens and family business to risk their livelihoods, please consider a grant towards landlords to help pay their tenants rent. Otherwise there will be more abuses for renters to claim non payment and instead go on vacations, lease cars etc as many did during Covid. Please consider the collapse of many of these small landlords who were forced to house a non-paying tenant and then eventually lost their properties when they had to foreclose on their property and some ended up homeless themselves or had to leave the state.

Communication from Public

Name: Chanelle

Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 05:00 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: LA tenants need protection in the wake of the unprecedented destruction of the Palisades and Eaton fires. Vote YES on item 13. Do what's right!

Communication from Public

Name: THolliday

Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 02:49 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed rent freeze in Los Angeles. While the intent may be to support tenants, this measure will disproportionately harm property owners—many of whom are still struggling to recover from the financial impact of the pandemic-era rent freeze. If another rent freeze is imposed, it will deepen the existing hardship for property owners. Many will be unable to cover essential expenses such as mortgages, property taxes, utilities, and maintenance costs. Without the income generated from rent, they risk losing their properties, which not only jeopardizes their livelihood but also affects their ability to provide for their families. Small property owners, in particular, have carried a significant burden over the past few years. Imposing another rent freeze is like pouring salt on an open wound. Rather than providing relief, it will push many into untenable financial situations, leading to foreclosures and a reduction in the availability of quality housing. Ask yourself: How would you feel if you owned a rental property, held all the responsibility for paying property taxes, maintenance, repairs, and a mortgage—while still trying to provide for your family without rental income? Imagine not having the financial ability to address unexpected expenses like major repairs or emergencies because your primary source of income has been frozen. Would you be able to sustain your livelihood, feed your family, meet your obligations, or maintain the property for your tenants? I urge you to consider the long-term consequences and work toward balanced solutions that support both tenants and property owners alike. A sustainable path forward requires collaboration, not additional restrictions that could devastate housing providers. Thank you for your time and consideration. TH

Communication from Public

Name: Avery Carroll, property owner

Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 02:51 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: As a Small, mom and pop investment property owner, I strongly object to this rent moratorium. For the four years during the Covid era, we were unable to raise rents however, all of our associated costs continue to skyrocket. We have to pay more for insurance, maintenance, upkeep, And everything else yet we were unable to raise rent. Please do not enact a rent moratorium. That only harms property owners like me who pay taxes to the city.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 03:07 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: Reject this proposal! Small time landlords are being crushed for providing housing. We are 3yrs out of the pandemic. It's clearly time for people to start paying their agreed upon bills.

Communication from Public

Name: H. Keenan

Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 05:28 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: Another eviction moratorium/defense for all of the city of Los Angeles is extreme overreach. I am a “mom and pop” housing provider in CD 14/ Boyle Heights/90023 who has registered with the LA RSO since I bought my two properties in 2019. If a blanket eviction moratorium passes without requiring tenants having to provide verifiable proof under penalty of perjury of being affected by the fires, my husband and I will face financial ruin. To date, neither of our two tenants have told us that they were financially impacted or affected by the fires in the Pacific Palisades or Altadena. We certainly would have heard from our tenants by now. The vast majority of tenants in Los Angeles were not affected by the wildfires. We are currently in the process of filing an eviction on one of our tenants for non payment of rent since October. If an eviction moratorium is passed my non paying tenant will get a free ride and continue to not pay rent until the moratorium ends. As of February 1st this year our tenant owes us \$14,000 in unpaid rent, over three months past his RSO “threshold” rent that the LA RSO requires. We are being forced to subsidize a bad actor tenant who has told us he’s not paying with no explanation. How is that at all fair? We gave our tenant some grace to pay his rent by January 1st 2025 and he promised us he could pay by then. But he has yet to pay us a penny. At fault evictions for non payment of rent should be allowed for tenants who were not impacted by fires. Only tenants who can provide verifiable proof (under penalty of perjury) of substantial financial impact should be given temporary eviction protection. The LA RSO works and gives tenants strong protections already! It has become far too difficult to be a mom and pop housing provider in the city of Los Angeles. The city council through Covid-19 has failed to support mom and pop housing providers, has never offered mom and pop landlords any relief and has not recognized the difficulties we have shouldered financially through the pandemic and now again if this motion passes. Please vote NO on a blanket eviction moratorium when it comes to council this Friday.

Communication from Public

Name: edna monroy

Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 05:30 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: Hello my name is edna monroy. I'm from SAJE, and I live in Council District 9. I'd like to comment on item 13 and general public comment. I urge the Council to vote YES on item 13 and move forward with eviction protections. Thousands of tenants have lost their income due to the fires -- fires that started over a month ago, and will be facing eviction and housing insecurity unless **STRONG TENANT PROTECTIONS ARE IN PLACE!** In addition, a lot of us have and will be directly impacted by the debris and unhealthy air quality that will have long term effects on our health and wellbeing, which is **HEALTH IMPACT** that should have been included as part of the emergency protections **IN ADDITION** to a rent increase pause. It is inexcusable that Council has failed to take action to protect Angelenos from displacement and rising rents. While I support rent assistance aid to tenants, it will be far too late for most to avoid displacement-- LAHD said getting support to tenants would take 4-8 months minimum. It's been over a month since the wildfires started. We need to pause the system. The wildfires have devastated our communities, and tenants who were already facing unaffordable rent and persistent rent burden are now more vulnerable than ever to displacement. Thousands of people have lost their homes, their neighborhoods, and their jobs. Price gouging has also been out of control as a result of these fires, worsening our affordability crisis. The motion, as amended, creates a narrow and crucial eviction defense for tenants who have been economically impacted by the wildfires. It is not an eviction moratorium. Tenants will have to prove they have been economically impacted and it is up to the courts whether that proof is sufficient-- this narrow protection will not be abused. It will help our fire impacted neighbors stay in their homes. LA City must provide eviction protections to help people struggling to pay rent after losing their income and prevent further displacement and homelessness caused by the fires. Tenants are trying to recover from these wildfires, and cannot face the threat of losing their homes. Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name: David Putnam

Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 06:09 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Council members. Please do not implement further rental freezes or eviction moratoriums in Los Angeles. The measures taken during Covid did financial harm to friends and clients over extended periods of time. The inability to collect rent or to raise rents (to keep up with the cost of living) during this time became a burden which was unfairly shouldered by many small landlords. Please remember that small landlords often do not often operate with large profit margins. One non- paying tenant can be disastrous for a single building and can do great financial harm to honest, hardworking owners. Please help fire victims in need of help. Please don't overreach and harm others unnecessarily. Thank you David Putnam

Communication from Public

Name: Harvey Mack Alligood III

Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 07:01 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: As a small rental property owner who resides in and relies on rental income from my duplex to cover my mortgage, I am urging you to oppose any further rental restrictions and extensions of eviction moratoriums. These policies are not only unsustainable but are driving small property owners like myself out of the housing market and, ultimately, out of the state. The financial burden placed on independent landlords has become unbearable. We cannot afford to properly maintain our properties when we are prohibited from adjusting rent to reflect the rising costs of inflation, contractors, materials, and utilities. Additionally, when tenants simply choose not to pay rent, we are left with little recourse, placing our livelihoods and homes at risk. The previous COVID-era rental freezes and eviction bans have already forced countless mom-and-pop landlords into financial ruin. Continuing down this path will only exacerbate the problem, discouraging private property ownership and reducing the availability of quality rental housing. I implore you to stop this government overreach. These policies are not protecting renters; they are dismantling the foundation of small-scale property ownership and pushing hardworking families toward financial devastation. Enough is enough. Please reconsider these damaging measures before more property owners lose everything they have worked tirelessly to build.

Communication from Public

Name: Jarrett Camarda

Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 11:00 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: I respectfully request that the committee reject the proposal of Item 13. City funds are much better spent helping people who can prove they have actually suffered damages or loss of income due to the fires, rather than a blanket moratorium that so many could take advantage of, and so many housing providers cannot afford.