Communication from Public

Name: Jesse Zwick
Date Submitted: 05/28/2026 10:23 PM
Council File No: 26-0782
Comments for Public Posting: On behalf of the Housing Action Coalition and our 175 member organizations, I write to express support for the motion introduced by Councilmember Lee and seconded by Council President Harris-Dawson to place Measure ULA amendments on the November 2026 ballot (Council File: 26-0782). The motion reflects real progress and incorporates several reforms the Mend It, Don’t End It coalition has long advocated for. We are grateful to Councilmembers Lee and Harris-Dawson for their leadership in advancing it. At the same time, the motion as written falls short of the full reform package needed to fix ULA’s most damaging structural flaws. To deliver a measure that restores housing production to the level our crisis demands, we urge the committee to incorporate the following modifications and additions before sending recommendations to the full Council: 1. Add a 15-year new construction exemption. This is the single most important reform missing from the motion, and we urge the committee to add it. The core design flaw in Measure ULA is that it taxes productive new investments in the city the same as windfall profits from land held for decades. A developer who builds 150 apartments and sells the completed building is doing exactly what Los Angeles desperately needs. A speculator who acquired a property decades ago, contributed sub-market taxes due to Proposition 13, and sells it for a tenfold gain is engaged in a fundamentally different transaction. The tax should treat them differently. A 15-year exemption following Certificate of Occupancy draws a clean, administrable line between these two cases. It removes the penalty on new construction — which research shows is costing Los Angeles an estimated 1,900 permitted apartments per year, including more deed-restricted affordable units than ULA’s revenues from taxing new construction can replace — while preserving the measure’s revenue base from longer-held properties. No other single change would do more to align ULA’s incentives with Los Angeles’s housing production goals. 2. Lower the rate cap to 1–2% on non-single-family properties. The motion instructs the CAO to report back with options in the 2–3.5% range. We urge the committee to set the target lower — at 1-2%. At 4–5.5%, Measure ULA represents a roughly tenfold increase over the prior combined city and county documentary transfer tax. That is not a

modest levy on luxury transactions; it is a structural barrier to the normal turnover of multifamily and commercial properties. The result has been a roughly 50% drop in high-value property sales in the City of Los Angeles compared to the rest of the county — a gap that reflects the tax's distorting effect, not broader market conditions. Investment capital has responded predictably: it has stepped across city limits to build homes, create jobs, and do business in Los Angeles County's other 87 cities. A 1–2% rate remains meaningfully higher than the pre-ULA baseline and preserves the measure's progressive intent. But it eliminates the penalty severe enough to drive investment out of the city entirely. Locking in a rate at the high end of the motion's proposed range risks perpetuating the same market distortion that has defined the past three years. 3. Add wildfire relief The 2025 fires displaced thousands of Angelenos and destroyed or damaged billions of dollars in housing stock across the region. Many survivors will need to sell affected properties as part of their recovery and rebuilding process. Subjecting those transactions to a transfer tax compounds hardship on disaster victims and creates a barrier to exactly the kind of property transfers needed to facilitate rebuilding. A 3–5 year exemption for properties directly affected by the 2025 fires and a standing exemption for future federally declared disasters, as proposed in a separate motion by Councilmembers Park and Padilla (Council File: 26-0774), costs little in revenue while removing an obvious and correctable injustice. We urge the committee to add this to the reform package. 4. Fix the financing rules that prevent ULA funds from reaching affordable housing projects. Current rules around ULA's existing subordination and foreclosure provisions make the measure's funds effectively unusable in affordable housing capital stacks, because lenders will not accept ULA's terms as a condition of project financing. Fixing these provisions, along the lines previously outlined by the City of Los Angeles Housing Department, would dramatically increase ULA's effectiveness as an affordable housing funding source and ensure that the revenues it collects can actually reach the projects that need them. The reforms outlined above would preserve the substantial majority of the measure's revenues while eliminating the structural flaws that have made it an obstacle to the housing production and investment Los Angeles needs. We are grateful for the work this committee has done and for the opportunity to continue contributing to it.

May 28, 2026

Rules, Elections and Intergovernmental Relations Committee
200 North Spring St.
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Ad Hoc Committee on Measure United to House Los Angeles
200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Chair Harris-Dawson, Chair Jurado, and honorable members of the committees,

On behalf of the Housing Action Coalition and our 175 member organizations, I write to express support for the motion introduced by Councilmember Lee and seconded by Council President Harris-Dawson to place Measure ULA amendments on the November 2026 ballot (Council File: 26-0782). The motion reflects real progress and incorporates several reforms the Mend It, Don't End It coalition has long advocated for. We are grateful to Councilmembers Lee and Harris-Dawson for their leadership in advancing it.

At the same time, the motion as written falls short of the full reform package needed to fix ULA's most damaging structural flaws. To deliver a measure that restores housing production to the level our crisis demands, we urge the committee to incorporate the following modifications and additions before sending recommendations to the full Council:

1. Add a 15-year new construction exemption.

This is the single most important reform missing from the motion, and we urge the committee to add it.

The core design flaw in Measure ULA is that it taxes productive new investments in the city the same as windfall profits from land held for decades. A developer who builds 150 apartments and sells the completed building is doing exactly what Los Angeles desperately needs. A speculator who acquired a property decades ago, contributed sub-market taxes due to Proposition 13, and sells it for a tenfold gain is engaged in a fundamentally different transaction. The tax should treat them differently.

A 15-year exemption following Certificate of Occupancy draws a clean, administrable line between these two cases. It removes the penalty on new construction — which research shows is costing Los Angeles an estimated 1,900 permitted apartments per year, including more deed-restricted affordable units than ULA's revenues from taxing new construction can replace — while preserving the measure's revenue base from longer-held properties. No other single change would do more to align ULA's incentives with Los Angeles's housing production goals.

2. Lower the rate cap to 1–2% on non-single-family properties.

The motion instructs the CAO to report back with options in the 2–3.5% range. We urge the committee to set the target lower — at 1-2%.

At 4–5.5%, Measure ULA represents a roughly tenfold increase over the prior combined city and county documentary transfer tax. That is not a modest levy on luxury transactions; it is a structural barrier to the normal turnover of multifamily and commercial properties. The result has been a roughly 50% drop in high-value property sales in the City of Los Angeles compared to the rest of the county — a gap that reflects the tax's distorting effect, not broader market conditions. Investment capital has responded predictably: it has stepped across city limits to build homes, create jobs, and do business in Los Angeles County's other 87 cities.

A 1–2% rate remains meaningfully higher than the pre-ULA baseline and preserves the measure's progressive intent. But it eliminates the penalty severe enough to drive investment out of the city entirely. Locking in a rate at the high end of the motion's proposed range risks perpetuating the same market distortion that has defined the past three years.

3. Add wildfire relief

The 2025 fires displaced thousands of Angelenos and destroyed or damaged billions of dollars in housing stock across the region. Many survivors will need to sell affected properties as part of their recovery and rebuilding process. Subjecting those transactions to a transfer tax compounds hardship on disaster victims and creates a barrier to exactly the kind of property transfers needed to facilitate rebuilding.

A 3–5 year exemption for properties directly affected by the 2025 fires and a standing exemption for future federally declared disasters, as proposed in a separate motion by Councilmembers Park and Padilla (Council File: 26-0774), costs little in revenue while removing an obvious and correctable injustice. We urge the committee to add this to the reform package.

4. Fix the financing rules that prevent ULA funds from reaching affordable housing projects.

Current rules around ULA's existing subordination and foreclosure provisions make the measure's funds effectively unusable in affordable housing capital stacks, because lenders will not accept ULA's terms as a condition of project financing. Fixing these provisions, along the lines previously outlined by the City of Los Angeles Housing Department, would dramatically increase ULA's effectiveness as an affordable housing funding source and ensure that the revenues it collects can actually reach the projects that need them.

The reforms outlined above would preserve the substantial majority of the measure's revenues while eliminating the structural flaws that have made it an obstacle to the housing production and investment Los Angeles needs. We stand ready to provide technical assistance, member perspectives, and policy expertise as this process moves to the full Council.

We are grateful for the work this committee has done and for the opportunity to continue contributing to it.

Jesse Zwick

Southern California Director
Housing Action Coalition

Communication from Public

Name: Jacob Pierce
Date Submitted: 05/28/2026 10:46 PM
Council File No: 26-0782
Comments for Public Posting: Abundant Housing LA writes to support Mr. Lee's motion CF 26-0782 to reform ULA, because of its potential to create more opportunities for mixed-income housing development. We also request the following amendments: 1. Cap the maximum tax rate on multifamily and non-residential properties at 1.5%-2%; 2. Exempt new multifamily and non-residential properties from the tax for a period of 15 years. See the attached letter for our full comments

Ad Hoc Committee on Measure ULA
200 S. Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA, 90012

March 27, 2026

Re: CF 26-0782 for targeted ULA reforms, support housing production at all income levels

Dear Councilmembers Jurado, Lee and Padilla,

On behalf of Abundant Housing LA, I write in advance of the May 29 Ad Hoc Committee on Measure ULA about the need to reform ULA to ensure that the City of Los Angeles can build critically needed new housing while protecting the measure's continued success.

That is why our organization is proud to **support motion CF 26-0782, submitted by Mr. Lee and seconded by Council President Harris-Dawson, to draft a ballot measure that would make important changes to ULA programing, including a reduction in the tax rate on parcels that meet specified parameters, removal of barriers to bonding, and expansion of public reporting and performance measures**. We, however, also would like to urge targeted amendments to maximize its impact.

Our organization, which endorsed Measure ULA in 2022, fully realizes that the measure raises substantial and important funds for both homeless prevention and affordable housing production. Unfortunately, the design has had unintended consequences that have blunted its effectiveness in addressing LA's severe housing crisis. Although the measure was framed as a mansion tax, its structure taxes all real estate transactions over $5 million, including desperately needed multifamily housing, and this feature's impact has been more profound than many supporters had imagined. As was presented to your committee in April, research from both the UCLA Lewis Center and the RAND Corporation demonstrates clear evidence that ULA has decreased multifamily housing production in LA, including deed-restricted affordable housing units delivered as part of privately financed mixed-income projects.

As a member of the Mend It Don't End It coalition, we have witnessed ULA's unintended consequences on the multifamily and commercial sectors. These challenges threaten not only the measure's effectiveness but also its very existence, with a new draconian statewide measure having already qualified for the November ballot. Additionally, members of the coalition have raised important concerns about the impact of the policy design on revenue for local city schools. It is a core priority of Abundant Housing LA to make essential fixes to Measure ULA which would reduce the impact on beneficial multifamily and commercial projects while retaining the majority of ULA revenue. For these reasons, we are proud to support CF 26-0782 and request the following amendments:

1. Cap the maximum tax rate on multifamily and non-residential properties at 1.5%-2%
2. Exempt new multifamily and non-residential properties from the tax for a period of 15 years

Thank you for your consideration, and we respectfully urge your continued support for critical reform to create the policy change needed to create more housing options and affordability in the City of Los Angeles.

Sincerely,

Azeen Khanmalek
Executive Director
Abundant Housing LA

Communication from Public

Name: Takao Suzuki, Little Tokyo Service Center
Date Submitted: 05/28/2026 12:12 PM
Council File No: 26-0782
Comments for Public Posting: TO: Los Angeles City Council ULA Ad Hoc Committee Little Tokyo Service Center (LTSC) would like to register our opposition to Councilmember Lee's motion to put a measure on the November 3 ballot that would significantly cut Measure ULA revenues, pursue an ill-conceived bonding strategy, and divert affordable and supportive housing dollars away from housing construction, preservation, and tenant protections. LTSC has developed over 1,300 units of affordable and permanent supportive housing throughout the City of Los Angeles. The recent Homes for LA NOFA awarded funds to LTSC projects that will be critical to preserve and sustain our existing affordable housing buildings, and for new, innovative projects that will provide new homes for low income families and unhoused neighbors. ULA is the only ongoing, local City source for building new, permanent affordable housing, preservation of existing housing, and homelessness prevention. It must be protected, as federal funding is being cut, and state funding for housing and homelessness is uncertain due to budget constraints. We are very concerned that the proposed rate decreases will significantly reduce Measure ULA revenue. Additionally, this policy proposal was only recently introduced, and therefore not included in the recent LAHD report assessing proposed ULA amendments, meaning that we don't know the extent to which this funding reduction would harm Measure ULA's program outcomes. We are also concerned about proposals to pursue a bonding strategy with Measure ULA revenues. Bonding Measure ULA revenues would create pressure to recycle capital at a quicker rate, which creates pressure for Measure ULA funds to be utilized in hard debt loans, as opposed to soft debt loans. Soft debt loans are loans where repayment is based on net cash flow rather than a fixed amount of debt service payment as in hard debt loans. This is a crucial financing method enabling developers/operators of affordable housing like LTSC to keep rents low enough to be affordable to low income residents and especially to those emerging from homelessness. Lastly, it is of the upmost importance to note that voters passed Measure ULA based on the promise that funds be spent on permanent housing solutions, including affordable and supportive housing development, housing rehabilitation, and tenant protections, not interim

housing. Though interim housing serves an important function, all of the data, research and studies about addressing homelessness all point to permanent supportive housing as the fundamental solution and what has proven to work to enable formerly unhoused to stay housed and build new lives. Individuals are already staying, on average, over a year in interim housing and shelters because there aren't enough permanent housing units to place people in. The rates of people leaving interim housing and shelters has made a lot of headlines, casting much public concern about the effectiveness of the homelessness services system. This is why it is all the more important to protect ULA funds and for those funds to focus on building permanent housing to ensure a faster pathway from homelessness, shelters and interim housing into stabilized lives and homes. For these reasons, we strongly encourage your NAY vote on this motion. Takao Suzuki
Co-Executive Director Little Tokyo Service Center

Communication from Public

Name:	Araceli Palafox
Date Submitted:	05/28/2026 04:28 PM
Council File No:	26-0782
Comments for Public Posting:	On behalf of Enterprise Community Partners, we write to oppose the proposed changes to Measure ULA in motion 26-0782 (Lee-Harris-Dawson) and urge the Committee to reject all efforts to weaken Measure ULA. See comment letter attached.

May 28, 2026

Los Angeles City Council Ad Hoc Committee on United to House LA
Van Nuys City Hall
14410 Sylvan Street
Van Nuys, CA 91401

RE: Motion 26-0782 (Lee-Harris-Dawson) ULA Amendments via November 2026 Ballot

Dear Members of the Ad Hoc Committee,

On behalf of Enterprise Community Partners, we write to oppose the proposed changes to Measure ULA in motion [26-0782 (Lee-Harris-Dawson)] and urge the Committee to reject all efforts to weaken Measure ULA. 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. ULA is the city's most significant and sustainable funding stream dedicated to affordable housing production and homelessness prevention, including legal defense, tenants' rights education, and direct support for vulnerable renters. Weakening measure ULA would undermine the city's progress and put at risk one of the City's few tools for keeping people housed and investing in affordable housing.

We are concerned that the proposed changes in motion 26-0782 would undermine ULA's effectiveness and harm ULA's program outcomes. We are particularly concerned by the proposed rate reduction which would significantly reduce ULA's revenue. We are also concerned by the proposal to apply the proposed rate reduction caps to single-family property transactions. Given cited concerns about measure ULA's negative impacts on multifamily housing construction, a rate reduction on single-family transactions is inconsistent with this argument and would do nothing to remedy these concerns.

Measure ULA is helping the city invest in prevention, stability, and affordability at a moment when too many Angelenos remain one emergency, one rent increase, or one eviction notice away from losing their home. As the City continues to face a housing and homelessness crisis, we must protect this vital funding source. We urge the committee to uphold the will of the voters and safeguard Measure ULA from efforts to weaken it. Los Angeles cannot afford to step back from homelessness prevention, tenant protections, or affordable housing—it must strengthen these commitments.

Sincerely,

Jimar Wilson

Jimar Wilson
Vice President and Market Leader, Southern California
Enterprise Community Partners

CC: Araceli Palafox
:apalafox@enterprisecommunity.org