

## Communication from Public

**Name:** LA City Resident  
**Date Submitted:** 09/29/2022 07:48 AM  
**Council File No:** 20-0291

**Comments for Public Posting:** Can the eviction moratorium expire without the vote of LA City council? I thought they were granted **\*\*temporary\*\*** powers due to pandemic. Now that pandemic is over (I know that Covid will last forever but pandemic is clearly over), shouldn't the temporary powers to enact the moratorium be removed from city council? Why should we be making major concessions to Nithya Raman and crew and give them all these permanent changes to landlord tenant law because of the pandemic? Tenants already have a tremendous amount of long term protections (see LA RSO). If any long term protections should be extracted from the post moratorium period they should be in favor of the property owners that helped all the tenants stay afloat during the pandemic (especially since large % of tenants that took advantage of moratorium benefits were only effected by Covid for a small portion of the time they benefited from the moratoriums protections -- if at all). Harvard educated Nithya Raman sent out a boastful e-mail to stakeholders bragging about how homelessness #'s were stagnant during pandemic (despite fact that she begged for funds during the pandemic because she said homelessness was increasing -- and LAHSA homeless count #'s have been questioned <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2022-09-24/doubts-raised-over-the-los-angeles-homeless-count-is-it-time-for-a-new-way>). In her e-mail Raman essentially wants to draw an association btw moratorium and flattening of the curve of homeless and evictions as a reason all of the protections should be made permanent (If you made killing people legal murders would drop too btw). Raman, as usual, cherry picks stats. How have rents fared during the pandemic? They've skyrocketed. The liability and financial risk of renting in the city of LA has become so perilous that property owners don't want to participate unless they are highly compensated. Why can't anyone get this through to Nithya Raman? If high rents equate to more homeless Ramans crusade against property owners have made things way worse in a really short period of time for tenants. RSO needs to be completely overhauled, not removed, tenants do need protections against unscrupulous property owners but there has to be a modicum of common sense re-introduced to the landlord tenant laws in the city of LA. How is it even legal for someone with such a 1x sided agenda to be on the Housing committee? In her short term quest to be a hero, like Trump appointing 3x supreme court justices, Nithya Ramans legacy on the housing committee will be to create many long term unforeseen negative effects for tenants. If things continue in the path we are headed, majority of rental housing will be dangerous crime filled public housing projects or extremely expensive higher end luxury housing owned by private equity funds and all the people supporting Raman now will be complaining that there is no place for the middle class in LA