

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jaime S

**Date Submitted:** 12/23/2021 11:25 AM

**Council File No:** 20-0291

**Comments for Public Posting:** with all the added protections for tenants during these tumultuous times it has created an unlevelled playing field. additionally with loosely written broad language anti-harassment ordinances for tenants on top of blanket moratoria, it has bred an environment of for-profit tenants. this is the last thing our world needs, for-profit tenants taking advantage of well-intentioned policy designed to protect the most vulnerable. frivolous claims of tenant-harassment and naturally monetary extortion against housing-providers are what is not being talked about. housing-providers just want to comply with city ordinances and eventually have their rights returned but are being placed in vulnerable positions with tenants seeking to take advantage of imbalanced 'local emergency rights.' for the next phase of recovery, the city council needs to consider ordinances of anti-harassment against housing-providers who were forced to give free housing for 20+ months (and counting). why should providers be subject to harassment and extortion from tenants? perhaps the city should also consider caps on any cash-for-keys proposition for tenants, and also a higher threshold for tenants to seek any claim of 'harassment.' but what should actually happen is the city should be liable for any of these liabilities and extortion from tenants as it was the city that caused this mess with poor patchwork policy. the city refuses to even acknowledge it's own imbalance policies and create real solutions. instead the city is seeking to burden the entire pandemic on mom & pop housing providers and try to get re-elected with inexpensive votes. you are failing us small mom & pop providers.