Communication from Public

Name: Mikayla Gibson
Date Submitted: 10/01/2025 02:02 PM
Council File No: 25-1036
Comments for Public Posting: recommendations before you today are based on flawed logic and discredited data. The City’s own adjustment study has been shown by Beacon Economics to contain serious errors. Policy should not be made on bad information. The fact is, the Rent Stabilization Ordinance formula is not broken. It already produced a balanced 3% increase this year beginning July 1. Nothing is extreme, and no changes are warranted. Housing providers need 100% of CPI-All Items to keep up with inflation. We need a floor to build reserves during low inflation and a cap that recognizes high inflation with rollover to recover costs in future years. Eliminating the ability to pass through gas and electricity on master-metered buildings—roughly 20% of RSO units—removes a legitimate operating cost that must be recouped to preserve housing. The indoor temperature mandate is equally problematic. If adopted without changes, it will mirror the County’s version, which allows no pass-through and will force small providers out of business. When they sell, corporate owners redevelop properties into luxury housing, and naturally affordable housing is permanently lost. Any mandate should set a reasonable standard of 86 degrees, apply to one room, include a 100% cost pass-through, and be backed by LADWP analysis to confirm the grid can handle the demand. The City must also complete LAHD’s cost study on retrofits before moving forward. Even the noticing changes add another layer of confusion and cost at a time when housing providers are already overwhelmed with regulation. Taken together, these items represent a continuation of punitive housing policy that threatens affordability and stability across Los Angeles. On behalf of VICA, I respectfully urge you to reject Items 2, 3, and 4. Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name: Maria A
Date Submitted: 10/01/2025 11:10 AM
Council File No: 25-1036
Comments for Public Posting: To: Los Angeles City Council Housing and Homelessness Committee I am writing this letter to you in response to the LA City Council regarding 1) the intent to reduce rent increases to as low as 60% of CPI, and 2) the intent to create an 82°F indoor temperature mandate. First of all, reducing rent increases to 60% of inflation does not reflect the actual real cost increases to housing providers. I am a property manager of approximately 45 units throughout the City of Los Angeles, and costs for housing providers have gone up astronomically, far greater than the increase in CPI. After 3 years of Covid-period eviction moratoriums and 4 years of rent freezes housing providers are still suffering from the impacts. Where insurance companies have not cancelled our policies, our premiums have more than doubled. Our labor costs have increased by 65%, and labor has become increasingly difficult to find and retain. Utilities and trash hauling costs have increased well above inflation, and the City Council has voted to significantly increase our trash hauling and sewer fees. Soft story seismic requirements, SCEP inspection repairs, and now balcony inspections and repairs have added hundreds of thousands of dollars to our capital costs. Secondly, the 82°F indoor temperature mandate gives no considerations of the costs that many housing providers, especially mom-and-pop owners of smaller and older buildings, will have to bear to meet such a mandate. One of the buildings I manage is a 21-unit building of primarily 1-bedroom units built in the 1940s. The electric panels and wiring for this building are older, with a maximum capacity of 40A per unit. The mandate proposes that the whole unit must maintain a temperature of 82°F. We have through-wall AC units in the living room of each of the apartments, an analysis we did looking into whether we could add AC units in the bedrooms as well indicated that we do not have enough electrical capacity to make such an upgrade. The cost just to rewire the building to accommodate such upgrades would be $75k to $100k - this is before upgrading the AC in each unit. In addition, the City's proposal apparently won't allow housing providers to pass through any of the capital costs to make the upgrades to meet this mandate. This on top of below-CPI allowable rent increases and after four years of rent freezes during the pandemic – surely the City hasn't taken into consideration how economically damaging

this could be to small housing providers, especially those with older buildings? As housing providers, we are not arguing against efforts to improve the cooling capacity of our older units, however we do insist that they be reasonable. A higher threshold of 86°F would allow a greater range of cooling options such as evaporative coolers, ceiling fans, and cooling roof coatings. The California Department of Industrial Relations set an indoor maximum temperature of 86°F in June 2024 for all workplaces. There is no legitimate "health" reason that a residence should be cooler than a workplace. Even regulations for "Residential Care Facilities for the Chronically Ill" allow temperatures up to 85 degrees. Furthermore, housing providers should be required to maintain a "safe" temperature of 86°F in one room of the unit rather than inside the whole unit. Requiring that the entire unit be held to the cooling mandate during heatwaves reaching in excess of 100°F will, again, incur insurmountable costs on housing providers. We hope that you will consider the actual impacts these proposals will impose on those of us who provide much-needed good-quality affordable housing to the residents of the city of Los Angeles.