

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jason Enright

**Date Submitted:** 01/25/2026 07:15 AM

**Council File No:** 26-0088

**Comments for Public Posting:** First off, moving forward with this without hearing it in committee or doing first and second readings, basically ignoring all established procedures to allow for the public and other council members to comment and debate is terribly undemocratic. We don't live in a dictatorship yet and Councilmember Raman doesn't know better than the rest of council and her constituents. If she thought this important she should have brought it up months ago. Second, her entire argument for doing this is based off a flawed UCLA study that was rushed and whose findings are widely disputed. How can we say housing production is down solely because of ULA when we have also had interest rates doubled, tariffs raising the price of building materials and parts of our workforce under attack by ICE. ULA is doing good work. It is raising a lot of money. Building has always been slow in this city but we also just announced a bunch of new ULA funded building projects starting. Be patient and let ULA do its work.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Gabbie Metheny

**Date Submitted:** 01/25/2026 07:42 AM

**Council File No:** 26-0088

**Comments for Public Posting:** I OPPOSE Raman motion 26-0088 unless amended to 1) remove commercial exemption, 2) clarify mixed use exemption, and 3) clarify natural disaster exemption. 1) Opposition to ULA as written hinges on the assertion that the tax quashes housing development, and exempting commercial properties from the transfer tax will do nothing to address this; in fact, it may result in more commercial development and, as a consequence, less multifamily development. We have an excess of commercial vacancies as it is, while we have a shortage of multifamily units that are affordable to residents. 2) Mixed use developments could be exempted if limited to developments that include a certain high percentage of housing in the development (for instance, min 80% housing/max 20% commercial). 3) While we want to protect our neighbors genuinely impacted by natural disasters, the language in the motion is so vague that it could be abused by bad actors to claim hardship for disasters that negligibly impact their homes and tie everyone up in costly litigation. We need more housing, and unless council can amend this motion to properly address that need, it should be voted down and, should it somehow pass and make it to the ballot, should be voted down by Angelenos come November.