

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Kaitlyn Quackenbush

**Date Submitted:** 09/23/2020 03:09 PM

**Council File No:** 20-0922

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please approve SCEP fee increase but 100% of the fees should be paid by landlords; no pass-through to tenants. It makes sense that SCEP needs a fee increase The City needs a strong, proactive Systematic Code Enforcement Program. A fee increase makes sense when there hasn't been one since 2012. However, landlords should pay 100% of the fees. As the regulated industry, landlords should pay for SCEP. Typically, the regulated industry pays the fees. For instance, with lead poisoning prevention, the lead industry pays the fees that fund the State and county lead poisoning prevention programs. In this case, landlords are the regulated industry: The inspections ensure that the landlords comply with State and local habitability laws. Landlords benefit from the program and they have said so. As part of the City's 2009 Economic Study of the RSO, there was a survey of landlords in which 60% of landlords reported that they benefit from SCEP. See chart on page 161 of the Study. Most urgently, tenant incomes have been decimated by the pandemic. Imposing a fee increase of only \$6/month, on tenants who are already being forced to choose between food and healthcare and housing, will push many beyond the brink. Now is not the time for more fee increases on tenants. In addition, Council should make it explicit in the LA Municipal Code that SCEP fees are not rent and must not be the basis for eviction. Currently, the LA Municipal Code is not explicit about whether the fee is rent. Some landlords seek eviction based on unpaid SCEP fees, as if it were rent. Some judges catch it and dismiss the cause of action. Other judges don't catch it. And we don't know how many times tenants move without fighting the eviction because they don't know that SCEP fees aren't rent. Making it explicit in the code could help minimize these improper evictions.