

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Dt  
**Date Submitted:** 11/07/2022 09:49 AM  
**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear committee, The election moratorium and the rental fees has really hurt my husband and I who are mom and pop owners. Our tenant hasn't been paying rent and we have negatively been impacted. She is constantly asking for repairs that which we've done within three days. With no rent collected, this has been very hard on us. We have tried to sell the building but no one wants to buy it with a non-paying renter. We have no recourse! Please: Small business rental housing providers are enduring severe financial distress caused by the City's COVID-19 mandates resulting from years of challenging rent collections, ban on rent increases, and enormous increases in building and operational costs which continue to rise during this hyperinflationary period. Simultaneously, over the last more than two years, City rates and fees including for the Systematic Code Enforcement Program (SCEP), RecycLA, and Los Angeles Department of Water and Power have also significantly increased. No other jurisdiction including Los Angeles County's unincorporated areas are ENTIRELY banning rent increases through 2023! The rent increase freeze must end in 2022! Rental housing providers are already struggling to collect rent owed. The imposition of new monetary threshold restrictions on evictions for non-payment of rent will place permanent hurdles on housing providers' ability to collect rent due and result in further challenges in collecting monetary judgments through Small Claims Court. The City's RSO was established in the late 1970's and even in the last decade has not been subject to a thorough evaluation and stakeholder engagement. The City should first properly assess the existing RSO before imposing these decades old housing policies on more City buildings. These moratoriums were intended as temporary emergency measures in response to an unprecedented event and must not be used as the impetus to hastily advance permanent housing policies without thoughtful deliberation. Any permanent housing policies must only be considered separately after thoughtful analysis and meaningful stakeholder input and not be combined with the termination of the emergency actions put in place temporarily. Thank you, Deborah

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Cassidy Bennett  
**Date Submitted:** 11/07/2022 10:33 PM  
**Council File No:** 21-0042-S3

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am a tenant and I live in district ten. As a renter, I want to urge you to vote NO on ending emergency eviction protections on 1/31, and instead keep those protections in place until you can adopt and implement strong permanent tenant protections. The 1/31 date is arbitrary and does not reflect the adequate amount of time it will take to implement permanent protections. The motion to end emergency tenant protections was passed by an illegitimate council whose leadership was clearly anti-tenant. I also urge you to fix the just cause ordinance language so that it reflects the council's directive and doesn't leave some tenants out. The directive called for an ordinance that would apply the 14 just cause reasons for eviction under LARSO to apply to all renters in the city and this ordinance is far from that. This ordinance creates additional just cause reasons that are not found in LARSO, and it arbitrarily exempts groups of renters. This version of just cause would be the city sanctioning different classes of tenants based on housing typology. There was a need for tenant protections prior to the pandemic, and there is an even greater need now. Lifting emergency protections before implementing strong permanent protections, is reckless and inhumane and will result in thousands of evictions.