

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Ben Martinez

**Date Submitted:** 11/16/2021 11:31 AM

**Council File No:** 20-0291

**Comments for Public Posting:** although nobody can disagree the moratorium when originally passed was necessarily to help vulnerable tenants in that state of the pandemic, however the state of affairs are very different now. i am writing to express the how most of the country/state/county/city is allowed to resume normal business practices to help the nation recover. all sectors of business are allowed to resume normal practices except the rental housing sector which makes dealing with professional and problem tenants impossible. the city council expects housing-providers to just cover the bill in addition to having one arm tied behind their back! this greatly disincentivizes housing providers to want to put their unit(s) back onto the market because they will have no recourse if they run into another problem/professional tenant. in my network of small mom+pop housing-providers many have told me they rather just keep their units currently vacant until they have some control over a tenancy; they cannot take the risk of being taken advantage of with poor-policy and a motivated professional tenant abusing such imbalanced protections. between 3 colleagues they are keeping vacant 12 affordable units vacant because it is the only control they have until the city council decides to give them back their property rights. as much as politicians advocate for affordable housing, it seems through all their actions that their poor policies are exacerbating the problem with less housing supply and likely higher rents with all the extra patchwork policy a small mom+pop operator has to jump through. it is time to show some leadership and come up with longer term solutions instead of winning the short term news cycle.