

Communication from Public

Name: M Gonzales

Date Submitted: 02/12/2025 04:25 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: VOTE NO ON MORITORIUM ON RENT INCREASES & EVICTIONS IN LOS ANGELES. THIS WILL BE DEVISTATING TO HOUSING PROVIDERS. IF YOU WANT TO HELP TENANTS LA CITY COUNCIL SHOULD PAY RENT THAT IS OUTSTANDING AND HELP AFFECTED TENANTS. HOUSING PROVIDERS SHOULD NOT BEAR THE BURDEN OF SUPPORTING TENANTS THAT CANNOT PAY RENT. HOW ARE HOUSING PROVIDERS TO PAY FOR INSURANCE REQUIREMENT OF NEW ROOFS AND NEW ELECTRICAL PANALS AND NEW MAIN PANELS? ALSO THE ADDED EXPENSE OF THE BALCONY LAW WITH THE INSPECTIONS AND WORK. THIS IS THE WORST THING YOU CAN DO TO NOT ALLOW HOUSING PROVIDERS TO GET SOME RELIEF FROM ALL THESE EXPENSES. SOUNDS LIKE COVID ALL OVER AGAIN. KNOWING FROM THE COVID EXPERIENCE THIS WILL BE DRAGGED OUT FOR YEARS! VOTE NO ON RENT FREEZE AND EVICTION FREEZE. IT IS UNFAIR FOR HOUSING PROVIDERS TO BE BURDENED WITH THIS!

Communication from Public

Name: James Askew

Date Submitted: 02/14/2025 12:36 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: 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: Bert Maas

Date Submitted: 02/15/2025 07:11 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: Council Members, The proposed eviction moratorium goes way beyond addressing the immediate needs for homeowners who lost their homes in the fires and workers who worked in the burn area that lost their jobs. 1. The proposed Citywide One-Year Eviction Moratorium is a blanket solution that doesn't address the specific needs of tenants affected by the wildfires. 2. What about tenants that already fell behind on rent payments prior to the fires on January 7? Would they be able to claim to be impacted by the fires, even if they did not pay the December or January rent? Those tenants would have other reasons why they fell behind, but not by the fires. 3. If you give tenants the ability to just claim they are impacted by the fires and they don't pay rent for a year and then leave, will the City Council set up a large fund for landlords to claim lost rent due to the eviction moratorium? That would be fair to compensate landlords for their losses if you prevent landlords from evictions. The number of people that are about to be evicted because they were impacted by the fires will be very small when you are asking for proof they were impacted. Tenants already have so many protections under Just Cause Ordinance and the Rent Stabilization Ordinance, having such a blunt and broad eviction moratorium goes well beyond what is needed to protect people directly impacted by the fires. Again, it is the landlords that are penalized. Will impacted tenants also have protections from their leased cars being seized if they stop making their lease payments, will they be protected from shoplifting if they go shopping for groceries and they don't pay, will they be protected from any insurance cancellations if they stop payments on their insurance premiums? That is not in this bill. In other words, why are landlords singled out yet again to be burdened by this? Funds from Household Relief grant program and Worker Relief fund, California Community Foundation, L.A. Rises, FEMA, the Dodgers, Magic Johnson, and other sources can be used to help struggling tenants that can show evidence that they are impacted by the fires. Regards, Bert

Communication from Public

Name: Marsha

Date Submitted: 02/15/2025 07:21 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: Council Members, The proposed eviction moratorium goes way beyond addressing the immediate needs for homeowners and renters who lost their homes in the fires and workers who worked in the burn area that lost their jobs. If someone wants to claim to be impacted by the fires, let them document their claim. Tenants that were already in default prior to January 7 should not be protected. If the Council wants to freeze evictions, the Council should also compensate the landlords for their losses. Funds from Household Relief grant program and Worker Relief fund, California Community Foundation, L.A. Rises, FEMA, the Dodgers, Magic Johnson, and other sources can be used to help struggling tenants. Where there is a true need, society should support the truly needy, housing providers across the city should not be the ones to carry this burden. Many housing providers have already suffered so much from the pandemic restrictions with no rent increases, eviction moratorium, while inflation was the highest in two generations. Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name: Carter

Date Submitted: 02/15/2025 08:25 PM

Council File No: 25-0006-S16

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Council Members, The City of Los Angeles has more tenant protections than most other cities in the country. Putting more restrictions on housing providers is not the solution and will actually hurt tenants in the long term. The proposed measure, item 33, is too broad and will hurt housing providers even more, and comes right after the devastating pandemic years. You should be targeting only those who are truly impacted by the fires, rather than using housing providers again to send a political message. Thank you for your consideration.