

## Communication from Public

**Name:** TB

**Date Submitted:** 01/27/2026 09:53 AM

**Council File No:** 26-0088

**Comments for Public Posting:** I understand that the City Council is putting forward a ballot measure that will undo the will of voters who passed Measure ULA, by slashing ULA revenues. This would lead to decreases in spending on affordable housing and renters assistance. Since it passed in 2023, ULA has collected over a billion dollars in revenue, with which nearly 800 affordable homes have been built, more than 150,000 LA renters received income support and rent relief, and 10,000 people avoided becoming homelessness through targeted support. I want MORE of this, not less. Please vote NO to putting this back on the ballot!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Ricardo Chavira

**Date Submitted:** 01/27/2026 10:38 AM

**Council File No:** 26-0088

**Comments for Public Posting:** January 23, 2026 RE: Opposition to Motion Amending Measure ULA Allocations Council File: 26-0088 Dear Los Angeles City Councilmembers, On behalf of the Liberty Hill Foundation, we write to oppose item #19 before you today seeking to amend Measure ULA's revenue structure via a proposed voter initiative, and we urge you to vote NO on Council File 26-0088. We also welcome continued conversations with the Council, the Mayor's Office, the Citizens Oversight Committee, and community stakeholders on how Measure ULA can be strengthened over time. Thoughtful evaluation is important — but advancing this motion in its current form would undermine voter intent and destabilize critical housing and homelessness prevention programs at a pivotal moment. Liberty Hill's Stake in This Work: For nearly 50 years, Liberty Hill has partnered with community-based organizations working in neighborhoods most affected by housing instability and displacement. Through grantmaking and civic engagement, our partners help tenants avoid unlawful evictions, provide outreach and education, support low-income families navigating housing systems, and ensure residents most impacted by housing decisions have a voice in shaping them. Measure ULA directly strengthens these same goals. It provides stable, locally controlled funding for homelessness prevention, tenant protections, and affordable housing development — infrastructure frontline organizations rely upon to serve communities effectively. Because of our close partnership with these organizations, we see firsthand the impact of ULA-funded programs on families striving to remain housed and neighborhoods working to stay intact. ULA's Early Impact: While ULA remains in its early years, initial indicators show meaningful progress, including expanded rental assistance, affordable housing development in the pipeline, strengthened tenant protections, and growing locally controlled revenue dedicated to housing stability. For families facing eviction and seniors on fixed incomes, these programs are lifelines. Disrupting or shrinking these investments now would have immediate consequences for residents already at risk of displacement. Premature Claims About Development Impacts: We recognize recent reports have raised questions about ULA's long-term impact on development. However, independent academic reviewers have found that some widely cited analyses

rely on short observation windows, limited datasets, proxies that do not directly measure building activity, and assumptions that do not reflect the complexity of Los Angeles's real estate market. Public policy designed to influence long-standing market dynamics requires longer time horizons and more complete data before definitive conclusions can responsibly be drawn. Housing production in Los Angeles is also shaped by interest rates, construction and insurance costs, labor availability, and recent zoning reforms. Advancing structural changes to Measure ULA based on incomplete data risks creating instability precisely when consistency and predictability are most needed. Respecting Voters and the Oversight Process: Measure ULA was approved by Los Angeles voters with a clear mandate and includes a Citizens Oversight Committee to guide implementation and any amendments. Introducing last-minute changes without full engagement of this body and key stakeholders bypasses the democratic process built into the measure itself and undermines public trust in voter-approved initiatives. A Better Path Forward: Liberty Hill believes policies as significant as Measure ULA deserve ongoing evaluation, transparency, and collaboration. We stand ready to participate in constructive discussions on how ULA can be improved over time. But advancing this motion now would reduce funding for homelessness prevention and tenant protections, create uncertainty in housing markets, and undermine voter intent. For these reasons, we respectfully urge you to reject the motion and vote NO on Council File 26-0088. Thank you for your consideration and continued leadership on housing issues. Sincerely, Shane Murphy Goldsmith President & Chief Executive Officer Liberty Hill Foundation



**President & CEO**

Shane Murphy Goldsmith

**Board of Directors**

Amelia Williamson  
*Board Co-Chair*

Jon Christensen  
*Board Co-Chair*

Mark Smith  
*Treasurer*

Angel Roberson Daniels  
*Secretary*

Sarah Pillsbury  
*Founder, Board Emeritus*

Belen Vargas

Dominique Tan

Jennifer Ito

Julie Hermelin

Marta Ferro

Mary Ann Braubach

Shimica Gaskins

Tim Silard

Veronica Flores

January 23, 2026

**RE: Opposition to Motion Amending Measure ULA Allocations**  
**Council File: 26-0088**

Dear Los Angeles City Councilmembers,

On behalf of the Liberty Hill Foundation, we write to **oppose item #19 before you today seeking to amend Measure ULA's revenue structure via a proposed voter initiative.**

At the same time, we welcome continued conversations with the Council, the Mayor's Office, the Citizens Oversight Committee, and community stakeholders on how Measure ULA can be strengthened over time to better serve Los Angeles residents. Thoughtful evaluation and improvement are important — but advancing this motion in its current form would undermine the will of voters and destabilize critical housing and homelessness prevention programs at a pivotal moment.

**Liberty Hill's Stake in This Work**

For nearly 50 years, Liberty Hill has partnered with community-based organizations working directly in neighborhoods most affected by housing instability and displacement. Through grantmaking, capacity-building, and civic engagement, our grantees:

- Help tenants avoid unlawful evictions
- Provide outreach and education
- Support seniors and low-income families navigating complex housing systems
- Advocate for policies that stabilize neighborhoods
- Ensure residents most impacted by housing decisions have a voice in shaping them

Measure ULA directly strengthens many of these same goals. It provides stable, locally controlled funding for homelessness prevention, tenant protections, and affordable housing development — the very infrastructure frontline organizations rely upon to do their work effectively.

Because of our proximity to these communities and organizations, we see firsthand the impact of ULA-funded programs on families striving to remain housed and neighborhoods working to stay intact.

**ULA's Early Impact Shows Meaningful Progress**

Although ULA remains in its early years — and many housing developments supported by ULA are still moving through multi-year pipelines — early indicators show real and measurable impact:

- Thousands of Angelenos kept housed through rental assistance
- Affordable housing developments moving forward in the pipeline
- Expanded tenant protections and enforcement capacity
- Implementation of Right to Counsel for tenants
- Growing locally controlled revenue dedicated to housing stability

For families facing eviction, tenants navigating harassment, and seniors on fixed incomes, these programs are not abstract policy tools — they are lifelines.

Disrupting or shrinking these investments now would have immediate consequences for residents already at risk of displacement.

### **The Claims Used to Justify This Motion Are Premature**

We recognize that recent reports have raised questions about Measure ULA's long-term impact on development. Engaging with research is healthy. However, independent academic reviewers have found that some widely cited analyses rely on:

- Short and volatile observation windows
- Limited datasets and small sample sizes
- Proxies that do not directly measure actual building activity
- Exclusion of major housing development programs
- Methodological assumptions that do not reflect the complexity of Los Angeles's real estate market

Public policy outcomes — particularly those designed to influence long-standing market dynamics — require longer time horizons and more complete data before definitive conclusions can responsibly be drawn. Moreover, housing production in Los Angeles is shaped by multiple factors beyond ULA, including interest rates, construction costs, insurance markets, labor availability, and recent zoning reforms such as the Citywide Housing Incentive Program. These broader dynamics must be considered when assessing development trends. Advancing structural changes to Measure ULA based on incomplete data risks creates instability precisely when consistency and predictability are most needed.

### **Respecting the Will of Voters and the Oversight Process**

Measure ULA was approved by Los Angeles voters with a clear mandate to create sustained funding for housing and homelessness solutions under strong civilian oversight. The ordinance explicitly establishes a Citizens Oversight Committee to review and guide implementation and any proposed amendments.

Introducing last-minute changes without full engagement of this oversight body and key stakeholders bypasses the democratic process built into the measure itself. Respecting that process is not optional — it is fundamental to maintaining public trust in voter-approved initiatives.

## A Better Path Forward

Liberty Hill believes that policies as significant as Measure ULA deserve ongoing evaluation, transparency, and collaboration. We stand ready to participate in constructive discussions about how ULA can be improved over time.

But advancing this motion now would:

- Reduce funding for homelessness prevention and tenant protections
- Create uncertainty in housing markets
- Undermine voter intent
- Circumvent established oversight mechanisms

For these reasons, we respectfully urge you to **reject the motion in its entirety and vote NO** on Council File 26-0088.

We look forward to continued dialogue on how Los Angeles can build a housing system that promotes stability, dignity, and opportunity for all residents.

Thank you for your consideration and for your continued leadership on housing issues.

Sincerely,



**Shane Murphy Goldsmith**  
President & Chief Executive Officer  
Liberty Hill Foundation

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Mary Leslie

**Date Submitted:** 01/27/2026 08:37 AM

**Council File No:** 26-0088

**Comments for Public Posting:** Honorable Members of the Los Angeles City Council, On behalf of the Los Angeles Business Council (LABC), a business research and advocacy organization representing more than 500 members across greater Los Angeles, I am writing in support of the motion put forth by Councilmember Nithya Raman under Council File #26-0088 placing a ballot initiative before voters to create a 15-year moratorium on Measure ULA for new construction. As an organization that has worked for decades to help bridge the crushing housing affordability gap in Los Angeles, the LABC believes Councilmember Raman's motion is a necessary and important step. Capital for new housing has stopped flowing because of ULA. As a result, thousands of fully entitled housing units -- projects that required years of effort and significant public and private investment -- are not moving forward. Builders are letting their entitlements lapse, and are taking their projects and capital to other markets. Creating a 15-year moratorium on Measure ULA for new construction is not a cure, but it is a practical and immediate band-aid to help stop the bleeding and jump-start housing production. As this proposal advances, our members suggest several improvements. • First, foreclosure-related exemptions should extend to subsequent resale of those properties for up to 180 months. • Second, transfers of properties damaged by natural disasters should be exempt for the same period, without conditioning relief on remediation or reconstruction. • Third, sales of single-family properties should receive a similar exemption, recognizing permitting delays and distressed conditions. More broadly, our members encourage a longer-term reset of ULA that preserves a targeted transfer tax on the highest-value single-family home sales, exempts new multifamily and commercial construction for 15 years, caps future tax rates for predictability, and dedicates revenues transparently to affordable housing and homelessness prevention. As a city, we need to stimulate new housing production and attract the capital that is necessary to make that happen. Today's action by the Council would be a great start. Sincerely, Mary Leslie President Los Angeles Business Council



January 27, 2026

Council President Marqueece Harris-Dawson  
Los Angeles City Council  
200 North Spring St.  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Honorable Members of the Los Angeles City Council,

On behalf of the Los Angeles Business Council (LABC), a business research and advocacy organization representing more than 500 members across greater Los Angeles, I am writing in **support** of the motion put forth by Councilmember Nithya Raman under Council File #26-0088 placing a ballot initiative before voters to create a 15-year moratorium on Measure ULA for new construction.

As an organization that has worked for decades to help bridge the crushing housing affordability gap in Los Angeles, the LABC believes Councilmember Raman's motion is a necessary and important step.

Capital for new housing has stopped flowing because of ULA. As a result, thousands of fully entitled housing units -- projects that required years of effort and significant public and private investment -- are not moving forward.

Builders are letting their entitlements lapse, and are taking their projects and capital to other markets.

Creating a 15-year moratorium on Measure ULA for new construction is not a cure, but it is a practical and immediate band-aid to help stop the bleeding and jump-start housing production.

As this proposal advances, our members suggest several improvements.

- First, foreclosure-related exemptions should extend to subsequent resale of those properties for up to 180 months.
- Second, transfers of properties damaged by natural disasters should be exempt for the same period, without conditioning relief on remediation or reconstruction.
- Third, sales of single-family properties should receive a similar exemption, recognizing permitting delays and distressed conditions.

More broadly, our members encourage a longer-term reset of ULA that preserves a targeted transfer tax on the highest-value single-family home sales, exempts new multifamily and commercial construction for 15 years, caps future tax rates for predictability, and dedicates revenues transparently to affordable housing and homelessness prevention.

As a city, we need to stimulate new housing production and attract the capital that is necessary to make that happen. Today's action by the Council would be a great start.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Mary Leslie". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Mary Leslie

President

Los Angeles Business Council

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Michael Stein

**Date Submitted:** 01/27/2026 09:02 AM

**Council File No:** 26-0088

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am an attorney specializing in the development of affordable low income housing for over 50 years. I am submitting these comments in support of the proposed amendment to Section 21.9.14 of the Municipal Code addressing the exemption from the so-called "Mansion Tax" for low income housing limited partnership purchasers by "adding" language to include limited partnerships whose general partner is a limited liability company controlled by a qualified nonprofit housing developer exempt from federal income tax under Section 501(c)(3) (i.e. "eligible nonprofit"). This amendment should be revised to state that it is intended as a clarification of existing law. When the exemption for affordable housing developed by eligible nonprofit sponsors was under consideration by the Mansion Tax's sponsors, it was intended that it track the property tax exemption for low income housing contained in California Revenue and Taxation Code Section 214(g) and for the most part it did. Section 214(g) exempts limited partnerships whose general partner is an eligible nonprofit OR a limited liability company wholly controlled by an eligible nonprofit. However, the ordinance as written contains inadvertent text errors that have been read, for no apparent reason, to exempt only limited partnerships whose general partner is an "eligible nonprofit" and not include those whose general partner is a limited liability company controlled by an "eligible nonprofit". As I will explain, this erroneous interpretation has had and will continue to have a devastating impact on the development of low income housing in the City of Los Angeles, particularly the rehabilitation of older housing properties into quality low income housing. The overwhelming majority of developments of affordable housing in the City of Los Angeles and the country as a whole is financed through the operation of the federal low income housing tax credit program. This program directs private investment funding into these projects in exchange for tax credits against federal income tax liabilities. A similar program also provides tax credits against state income and franchise tax liabilities which operates alone or in tandem with the federal program. The investments are structured as limited partnerships with a nonprofit developer sponsor or its controlled limited liability company as general partner and the tax credit investor(s) as the limited partners. In order to meet certain requirements of

institutional lenders (including government agencies) to these projects, and to protect the general charitable purpose assets of the no[n] profit from creditor claims of the limited partnership, each of these investments has been, for quite some time, structured solely as a limited partnership in which the general partner is a limited liability company controlled by an eligible nonprofit. To limit the investment return to the investors to the expected tax benefits including the tax credits], these investments are structured so that with a property tax exemption they are just barely feasible. Adding the Mansion Tax has been and will be a major block to these developments. This is particularly true for rehabilitation projects which involve existing structures and will cost a significant sum to purchase and rehabilitate. The resulting Mansion Tax puts these projects "under water". That the ordinance was intended to track the welfare exemption for low income housing under Section 214(g ) of the Rev. & Taxation Code and its near identical language to Section 214(g) led people structuring developments under the federal or state tax credit program to reasonably believe that, if you qualified for the property tax exemption, you qualified for the Mansion Tax exemption as well. Because exemption from both taxes is necessary to make the projects financially feasible, the result of the City asserting the Mansion Tax to properties that should qualify for the Mansion Tax exemption is devastating. The number of projects at risk dwarfs the number of replacement projects that could be built from the Mansion Taxes on these projects. A number of projects are under development now in the reasonable expectancy that they would be feasible because they would be exempt from both property taxes and the Mansion Tax. The City gains nothing by having these projects put under water and likely fail so that a smaller amount of other low income housing may be developed. In order to avoid this debacle, the amendment should be a clarification of existing law.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Araceli Palafox  
**Date Submitted:** 01/27/2026 09:11 AM  
**Council File No:** 26-0088  
**Comments for Public Posting:** On behalf of Enterprise Community Partners, we write to urge the City Council to vote NO on motion 26-0088 or request that the motion be sent back to committee for a report back on the full implications of the proposed amendments to ULA. Please see public comment letter attached.



January 26, 2026

**Los Angeles City Council**  
200 N Spring St. Room 340  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

**RE: Motion 26-0088 ULA Amendments on Ballot**

Dear City Councilmembers,

Since its passage in 2023, Measure ULA has raised over \$1 billion dollars to support the production and preservation of affordable housing in Los Angeles, while making significant and sustained progress towards reducing homelessness in the city. As the city's most significant local funding source for affordable housing, Measure ULA serves as an effective tool enabling the city to make critical investments in housing and homelessness at scale. We join local affordable housing partners in expressing our concerns about the proposed amendments outlined in Motion 26-0088 which could result in significant cuts to Measure ULA funds and hinder the City's progress on homelessness. **On behalf of Enterprise Community Partners, we write to urge the City Council to vote NO on motion 26-0088 or request that the motion be sent back to committee for a report back on the full implications of the proposed amendments to ULA.**

***Measure ULA is an effective tool at addressing housing and homelessness challenges in Los Angeles***

Measure ULA has delivered results for the city and its residents. In its first year, ULA funding helped keep more than 10,000 tenants housed through rental assistance and income support and funded nearly 800 affordable homes across multiple projects citywide; with a projected 13,000+ affordable homes over the next decade. We are concerned that the proposed changes would undermine ULA's ability to deliver results in the future due to a significant loss in revenue.

***Motion 26-0088 should not circumvent the committee process***

The process of amending ULA should not be rushed or advanced without community input and additional analysis to justify the proposed changes. Amendments or changes to ULA should come from thoughtful and transparent community and stakeholder engagement to ensure that changes or amendments do not undermine what voters approved in 2023.

With the City continuing to face a housing and homelessness crisis, we must act with integrity to protect this vital source of funding for the city. We ask that the council do not go forward with this motion without deeper analysis and more thoughtful community and stakeholder engagement.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "araceli palafox".

Araceli Palafox

Associate Director, Policy

**Enterprise Community Partners Southern California**

[apalafox@enterprisecommunity.org](mailto:apalafox@enterprisecommunity.org)

## Communication from Public

**Name:** sylvia aroth

**Date Submitted:** 01/27/2026 09:37 AM

**Council File No:** 26-0088

**Comments for Public Posting:** I understand that the City Council is putting forward a ballot measure that will undo the will of voters who passed Measure ULA, would slash Measure ULA revenues and spending on affordable housing and renters assistance. Since it passed in 2023, ULA has collected over a billion dollars, nearly 800 affordable homes have already been built, more than 150,000 LA renters received income support and rent relief, and 10,000 people avoided becoming homelessness through targeted support. I want MORE of this, not less. Please vote NO to putting this back on the ballot!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Amy Nevarez

**Date Submitted:** 01/27/2026 03:25 PM

**Council File No:** 26-0088

**Comments for Public Posting:** \* Please vote against any amendments to ULA at this time. \* From the beginning, the real estate lobby has been determined to sabotage ULA by identifying loopholes, filing lawsuits, and introducing bad-faith legislation to repeal it. They spent millions fighting it at the ballot, failed, and launched a lawsuit that also failed. Why would you believe anything they say? \* Developers don't like paying the tax, and are using every excuse in the book to get rid of it. Blaming ULA for a slow down in housing production is ridiculous. What about high interest rates, inflation, insurance, and all the other factors that contribute to the real estate market? \* The amendments proposed today would reduce who pays into ULA and delay when revenue is collected. This will make it more difficult to solve our affordable housing crisis. It's imperative you stay the course and give a chance to let ULA work. And that means not losing our nerve every time L.A.'s real estate industry invents a new story about how the sky is falling.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Los Angeles Right to Counsel Coalition

**Date Submitted:** 01/27/2026 03:29 PM

**Council File No:** 26-0088

**Comments for Public Posting:** January 26, 2026 RE: Urgent Request to Vote NO on All Items in the Motion Amending Measure ULA's Allocations, Council File: 26-0088 Dear Los Angeles City Councilmembers and Mayor Karen Bass, On behalf of the Los Angeles Right to Counsel (LA RTC) Coalition, we write to urge you to oppose all items included in the pending motion and to vote NO. Advancing this motion would significantly undermine the intent of Measure United to House LA (ULA) and result in harmful reductions to funding for Affordable Housing Production and Preservation, as well as critical Homelessness Prevention Programs. The results could be immediate, as we anticipate the idea of a ballot-initiative would be enough incentive for developers and real estate interests to hold sales, once again distorting the efficacy of Measure ULA. The proposed changes would make it substantially more difficult to expand the Stay Housed LA Program and to fully realize a citywide Right to Counsel for tenants — a policy this Council voted to codify just last year. This means less funding for legal representation, rental assistance, and tenant navigation services at a time when housing instability and displacement continue to rise across the city. The LA RTC Coalition is deeply concerned by the misleading narratives L.A. City Councilmembers are using to justify this motion. Their assertions that lenders are pulling out, housing production has stalled, or that Measure ULA has slowed the market are not supported by evidence. The period before and after Measure ULA's passing is too short to accurately determine long-term market trends. Despite macroeconomic factors — such as higher interest rates that affect every major U.S. city — and concerns about Measure ULA, the Los Angeles County multifamily housing market has been recovering since 2023. More apartment units were sold in 2024 and 2025, and Compass Real Estate reported this week that investor interest is increasing even with higher taxes. We are also alarmed by the broader efforts at the state level and through real estate-backed ballot initiatives to repeal or weaken Measure ULA. However, this motion mirrors those same efforts: to erode voter-approved protections at the behest of developers and real estate interests. Moving this motion forward is not only undemocratic but a blatant and willful violation of the Measure ULA ordinance that this Council itself approved. Any amendment must fall within the spirit and intent of

this voter-approved law. The proposed motion does not align with that intent. Additionally, if amendments are to be considered, the People's Oversight Committee has the explicit right to adjourn, review, and weigh in. Respecting that role is not optional — it is the democratic process embedded in Measure ULA's ordinance. Additionally, introducing a last-minute amendment without engaging Measure ULA stakeholders reflects a blatant disregard for transparency and democratic governance. Had stakeholders been meaningfully engaged, we could have collaborated to address concerns while remaining faithful to Measure ULA's purpose. For these reasons, we strongly urge you to reject this motion in its entirety and vote NO. Upholding Measure ULA means honoring the will of voters, protecting critical housing and tenant programs, and maintaining a transparent, collaborative legislative process. Sincerely, Amylinda Nevarez, Campaign Director The Los Angeles Renters' Right to Counsel Coalition



January 26, 2026

RE: Urgent Request to Vote NO on All Items in the Motion Amending Measure ULA's Allocations, Council File: 26-0088

Dear Los Angeles City Councilmembers and Mayor Karen Bass,

On behalf of the Right to Counsel (RTC) Coalition, we write to urge you to oppose all items included in the pending motion and to vote NO. Advancing this motion would significantly undermine the intent of Measure United to House LA (ULA) and result in harmful reductions to funding for Affordable Housing Production and Preservation, as well as critical Homelessness Prevention Programs. The results could be immediate, as we anticipate the idea of a ballot-initiative would be enough incentive for developers and real estate interests to hold sales, once again distorting the efficacy of Measure ULA.

The proposed changes would make it substantially more difficult to expand the Stay Housed LA Program and to fully realize a citywide Right to Counsel for tenants — a policy this Council voted to codify just last year. This means less funding for legal representation, rental assistance, and tenant navigation services at a time when housing instability and displacement continue to rise across the city.

The RTC Coalition is deeply concerned by the misleading narratives L.A. City Councilmembers are using to justify this motion. Their assertions that lenders are pulling out, housing production has stalled, or that Measure ULA has slowed the market are not supported by evidence. The period before and after Measure ULA's passing is too short to accurately determine long-term market trends. Despite macroeconomic factors — such as higher interest rates that affect every major U.S. city — and concerns about Measure ULA, the Los Angeles County multifamily housing market has been recovering since 2023. More apartment units were sold in 2024 and 2025, and [Compass Real Estate reported](#) this week that investor interest is increasing even with higher taxes.

We are also alarmed by the broader efforts at the state level and through real estate-backed ballot initiatives to repeal or weaken Measure ULA. However, this motion mirrors those same efforts: **to erode voter-approved protections at the behest of developers and real estate interests.**



Moving this motion forward is not only undemocratic but a blatant and willful violation of the Measure ULA ordinance that this Council itself approved. Any amendment must fall within the spirit and intent of this voter-approved law. The proposed motion does not align with that intent. Additionally, if amendments are to be considered, the People's Oversight Committee has the explicit right to adjourn, review, and weigh in. Respecting that role is not optional — it is the democratic process embedded in Measure ULA's ordinance.

Additionally, introducing a last-minute amendment without engaging Measure ULA stakeholders reflects a blatant disregard for transparency and democratic governance. Had stakeholders been meaningfully engaged, we could have collaborated to address concerns while remaining faithful to Measure ULA's purpose.

For these reasons, we strongly urge you to reject this motion in its entirety and vote NO. Upholding Measure ULA means honoring the will of voters, protecting critical housing and tenant programs, and maintaining a transparent, collaborative legislative process.

Sincerely,

Amylinda Nevarez, Campaign Director

The Los Angeles Renters' Right to Counsel Coalition

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Laddie Williams

**Date Submitted:** 01/27/2026 07:49 PM

**Council File No:** 26-0088

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please help Venice Community to get low income housing. We desperately need housing in the Venice community. Please respect the community and its immediate need for affordable housing. Thank you LaddieWilliams.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Karen

**Date Submitted:** 01/27/2026 03:44 PM

**Council File No:** 26-0088

**Comments for Public Posting:** My name is Karen Ramirez, I live in district 8th and i oppose the amendments to ULA for the following reasons: The proposed amendments would reduce who pays into ULA, delay when revenue is collected, and shift funds away from permanent housing and prevention. The same real estate interests that fought ULA at the ballot box and in court are now trying to weaken it through misleading narratives that ignore ULA's real, measurable impacts. Any amendments or changes to ULA should come from a thoughtful, transparent process that includes impacted stakeholders — not be rushed through the ballot to undermine what voters overwhelmingly approved. Council we urge you to make the right choice for the constitutes you represent that are already struggling to survive. Thank You

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Carlos Singer

**Date Submitted:** 01/27/2026 05:49 PM

**Council File No:** 26-0088

**Comments for Public Posting:** Just a few years ago, cranes dotted our skyline. While some might have regarded these as eyesores, they were tangible proof of our faith in the future of Los Angeles. Today, their absence is cause for concern. Despite the heated rhetoric often heard in City Hall, Angelenos remain deeply aligned. Far more of us than not are dismayed by the powerful forces that show open hostility to our people, our community, and our values. We all want dignified jobs, fair wages, and a real solution to our housing crisis. To achieve this, we must restore confidence in our City as a place where people can still afford to build and invest. The motion that Councilmember Raman introduced on Friday protects residents rebuilding after the January wildfires and optimizes Measure ULA. It displays a genuine understanding that while Measure ULA can bring in needed funds to build affordable housing, it has unintentionally caused a severe drop in real estate activity in this City. This drop is diametrically opposed to our interest in building housing and making the City more affordable. The proposed changes do not in any way “gut” the initiative; they ensure its success. By balancing critical funding for homelessness with the market-rate and mixed-income growth we desperately need, we can make the system work for all Angelenos. The Chamber seeks to reinvigorate Los Angeles’ reputation as a premier destination for investment. Let’s please choose to have faith in ourselves. We respectfully ask that you work cooperatively and expediently with all major stakeholders toward a solution to Measure ULA that works for all of us.

January 27, 2026

Honorable Members of the City Council  
City of Los Angeles c/o City Clerk  
City Hall  
200 North Spring Street  
Los Angeles, California 90012

Re: **Council File No. 26-0088-Amendment to Measure ULA**

Dear Honorable Councilmembers,

Just a few years ago, cranes dotted our skyline. While some might have regarded these as eyesores, they were tangible proof of our faith in the future of Los Angeles.

Today, their absence is cause for concern.

Despite the heated rhetoric often heard in City Hall, Angelenos remain deeply aligned. Far more of us than not are dismayed by the powerful forces that show open hostility to our people, our community, and our values.

We all want dignified jobs, fair wages, and a real solution to our housing crisis. To achieve this, we must restore confidence in our City as a place where people can still afford to build and invest.

The motion that Councilmember Raman introduced on Friday protects residents rebuilding after the January wildfires and optimizes Measure ULA. It displays a genuine understanding that while Measure ULA can bring in needed funds to build affordable housing, it has unintentionally caused a severe drop in real estate activity in this City. This drop is diametrically opposed to our interest in building housing and making the City more affordable. The proposed changes do not in any way “gut” the initiative; they ensure its success. By balancing critical funding for homelessness with the market-rate and mixed-income growth we desperately need, we can make the system work for all Angelenos.

The Chamber seeks to reinvigorate Los Angeles’ reputation as a premier destination for investment. Let’s please choose to have faith in ourselves. We respectfully ask that you work cooperatively and expediently with all major stakeholders toward a solution to Measure ULA that works for all of us.

Sincerely,



Carlos A. Singer  
Chief Policy Officer  
Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce