

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 04/21/2020 09:04 AM

Council File No: 20-0407

Comments for Public Posting: To whom it may concern, I strongly oppose motions 37, 38, 39, 66. The COVID-19 impacted all people and all sectors of our society, not only the renters. I understand that you are trying to help renters by considering motion #37, motion #38, motion #39 and motion #66. You have to understand that the housing providers have many expenses and use the rent money to pay these expenses including paying the mortgage, taxes, maintenance, utilities and more. Without the rent, the housing providers will NOT be able to pay these expenses and will NOT be able to maintain these properties which will also affect the tenants. By considering these motions, you are helping one sector by punishing another sector and by making another sector, the housing providers, pay for all the COVID-19 damages. By approving these motions, you are creating another problem in the economy: many house owners will not be able to keep their properties and many properties will go into foreclosure. For all the above reasons, I urge you NOT to approve these motions. AGAIN, THE RENTERS ARE NOT THE ONLY SECTOR THAT IS AFFECTED BY COVID-19. Thank you, Adam Greenberg 972 S Wellesley Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90049

Communication from Public

Name: Deborah Downey

Date Submitted: 04/21/2020 01:49 PM

Council File No: 20-0407

Comments for Public Posting: I strongly object to item 37 item 38 items 39 and I wish to request a more fair and equitable approach to renters and housing providers like myself because I'm struggling to to pay my mortgage and Expenses incurred with keeping the building working properly and looking good. My 15 unit building is located in LA 1744 Butler Ave., Los Angeles, CA 90025. My phone number is 530-902-7663 I live in Northern California in Camino California.

Communication from Public

Name: Thomas H Daniels
Date Submitted: 04/22/2020 06:56 AM
Council File No: 20-0407

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Councilmember O'Farrell and Ms. Min, I urge you to ask Councilmember OFarrell to vote NO tomorrow on the items 37, 38 and 39 on tomorrow's agenda extending even more renter protections at the expense of owners and property rights. Yes these are extraordinary times. But taking rights away from owners will further endanger RSO housing stock. The proposals are not balanced. Owners would lose even more control of property and the ability to provide safe RSO units. These motions seem to pander to renters at the expense of owner rights. Renters certainly already have protections for non payment of rent due to the Pandemic. However the owners also need protections for non-Covid19 violations, nuisance, etc. These measures take away even more apartment owners' rights. There aren't enough protections for small owners like myself. Please ask Councilmember O'Farrell to vote NO or at least study these issues further to get more balance between renters and owners. To be balanced, we need TENANT VOUCHERS, so more tenants can pay rent. not more ways owners need to shoulder the burden. We need mortgage assistance for owners. We need balance. HCIDLA has a \$80m budget. How about some of those funds and other City funds for TENANT VOUCHERS in this time of crisis? The budget is still pending. It's not too late. Thank you. Respectfully
Thomas Daniels 1013 Hyperion Ave, Los Angeles, CA 90029
----- Forwarded message ----- From: Thomas Daniels
Date: Tue, Apr 21, 2020, 2:22 PM Subject: No on 37, 38, 39 ..No on stronger Rent Freeze, evictions. Need more balance for owners
To: Cc: Mitch O'Farrell Dear Ms. Min, I urge you to ask Councilmember OFarrell to vote NO tomorrow on the items 37, 38 and 39 on tomorrow's agenda extending even more renter protections at the expense of owners and property rights. Yes these are extraordinary times. But taking rights away from owners will further endanger RSO housing stock. The proposals are not balanced. Owners would lose even more control of property and the ability to provide safe RSO units. These motions seem to pander to renters at the expense of owner rights. Renters certainly already have protections for non payment of rent due to the Pandemic. However the owners also need protections for non-Covid19 violations, nuisance, etc. These measures take away even more apartment owners' rights. There aren't enough

protections for small owners like myself. Please ask Councilmember O'Farrell to vote NO or at least study these issues further to get more balance between renters and owners. To be balanced, we need TENANT VOUCHERS, so more tenants can pay rent. not more ways owners need to shoulder the burden. We need mortgage assistance for owners. We need balance. HCIDLA has a \$80m budget. How about some of those funds and other City funds for TENANT VOUCHERS in this time of crisis? The budget is still pending. It's not too late. Thank you. Respectfully
Thomas Daniels 1013 Hyperion Ave, Los Angeles, CA 90029

Communication from Public

Name: Francois Vaillancourt

Date Submitted: 04/21/2020 08:09 PM

Council File No: 20-0407

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing to express my opposition to agenda items 37,38 and 39. If adopted by the City this will disproportionately impact the small apartment business owners. I am one of those. I have three small buildings in the City and I have long term tenants. Hence, some of my rents are already substantially below what is required to maintain buildings which are older. I recently spent \$25,000 on a small 6 Unit building to replace wooden rotten steps with steel and concrete inserts. This expense was unforeseen but safety was a concern and I took care of it. Let's face it: there are many older buildings in the City which need additional maintenance;and, cash flow is critical. You need us and we are here to provide a fair service to the community. The only alternative is public housing and that is not, in my opinion, a cheaper alternative. The cost of section 8 programs will skyrocket as apartment businesses are driven out of existence.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 04/21/2020 11:56 AM

Council File No: 20-0407

Comments for Public Posting: 4/21/2020 Item 37 Item 38 Item 39 This is another effort to further diminish the capacity of housing providers to own and maintain rental property. Private housing is not Public housing! There is a limited amount of resources to maintain housing as necessary. Private housing is not supported by public funds! The L.A. City Council, some of which own rental housing including Mayor Garcetti will eventually experience more mass redevelopment of so called "housing stock." It's time to build something else! We have the right to Quit! Ellis Act Now! It's just not worth it.

Communication from Public

Name: Elaine Maike

Date Submitted: 04/21/2020 11:57 AM

Council File No: 20-0407

Comments for Public Posting: I Strongly oppose your items: 37-38-39 that will effect my income property. I have been a housing provider for 25 years & what you are attending to do is not acceptable.

Communication from Public

Name: Michael Gonzales

Date Submitted: 04/21/2020 10:06 AM

Council File No: 20-0407

Comments for Public Posting: Items 37, 38, 39 and 66 are all unfair burden's placed solely on the backs of the housing provider. The tenants don't even have to prove hardship attributed to Covid 19. This can lead to unscrupulous abuse. I foresee many foreclosures and the devastating affects of the real estate market due to the Los Angeles city councils lack of fairness and dealing justly with all parties involved. What reprieve are you offering housing providers? The city counsel is so business UNFRIENDLY you are driving investors out of Los Angeles & California. Stop voting in laws to get re-elected and vote for what's best for the whole economy

Communication from Public

Name: Carl Farless

Date Submitted: 04/21/2020 10:07 AM

Council File No: 20-0407

Comments for Public Posting: I'm writing in regards motions #'s 37,38, 39 and 66 that are scheduled for hear 4/22/2020. It's time government agencies at all levels stop treating property owners as if they can finance solutions to housing shortages in general and now with renters potentially having issues paying current rent. A solution like motion 66 in which property owners are treated like partners in a solution funded by public assistance is more reasonable. Other industries that are tasked with helping are compensated for their valuable products as opposed to them being confiscated by government agency decree. By example food security is as important as housing security but food outlets are not mandated to release food products to customers without payment. Food outlets are also owned by a variety of entities from large corporations down to "mom and pop" individuals, much like rental properties. No one industry should be asked to bear the burden that should be shared by all.

Communication from Public

Name: Arthur E. Border

Date Submitted: 04/21/2020 10:47 AM

Council File No: 20-0407

Comments for Public Posting: ITEMS 37, 38, & 39 My wife and I are retired with a eight unit apartment building that provides us minimal additional income. We have owned the building for over 30 years and do not have the ability to maintain operations with the taking of our property rights and the suspension of contract law "eliminating the unlawful detainer process" and "eliminating nearly all types of eviction proceedings" hat is being proposed in Items 37, 38, & 39. Enough is enough, in addition to the attacks on property owners by local governments, the State in AB 828, is proposing to role back rents by 25%. Our costs to run this property are over \$100,000 per year and they continue to go up. Manipulating our ability to manage our building properly must stop. When tenant rents are no longer required to pay rents, who is going to cover our expenses! As an owner of rental property in the Los Angeles area since 1972 my wife and I rely on our single 8 unit apartment building to provide us needed income in retirement. AB 828 if approved would reduce our rental income by 25%. In our case our gross rentals are currently \$185,000. A 25% reduction in our rents would reduce that by \$46,250. The buildings expenses are about \$100,000 / year. The remaining pre-tax income would be \$38,750. After tax income would be \$20,000. This is unsustainable for the liability that income property presents. At the current multiplier (14.7) for apartments in our area this would amount to a unlawful taking of \$679,875 in property value. Not to mention what devaluation has already been incurred through your statewide mandatory rent control law. If desired by the legislators rental subsidies, on the basis of need, should be borne by all taxpayers, not a blanket approach to all renters, and not solely only on the backs of property owners. As a resident in a State with the highest taxation in the nation, with what seems to be a very unfriendly business climate, I am more frustrated than ever.

Communication from Public

Name: MICHAEL J WINN

Date Submitted: 04/21/2020 08:37 AM

Council File No: 20-0407

Comments for Public Posting: As a Los Angeles City landlord I am against any more rent control measures. Specifically items 37, 38, and 39 that will be considered today at the Los Angeles City Council meeting. Punishing landlords for situations such as the Corona virus' outbreak that are totally out of the landlords control is unfair and not in the interests of tenants, landlords or the City of Los Angeles. Sincerely, Michael J. Winn

Communication from Public

Name: Peter Preteroti

Date Submitted: 04/21/2020 08:47 AM

Council File No: 20-0407

Comments for Public Posting: Strong OPPOSITION to LA City Council meeting items 37, 38, and 39, for April 22, 2020. I am a Nurse struggling to maintain a small mom and pop rental business. I saved for nearly twenty years to purchase a multi family property and to provide a small income for my children. I have only three units, and the rental income barely covers my mortgage. I take pride in providing high quality housing at a reasonable price. These agenda items may easily cause a devastating blow to my lifetime investment. Please do not rob me of my years of hard work and savings. Thank you!

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 04/20/2020 01:58 PM

Council File No: 20-0407

Comments for Public Posting: To whom it may concern, The COVID-19 impacted all people and all sectors of our society, not only the renters. I understand that you are trying to help renters by considering motion #37, motion #38, motion #39 and motion #66. Again, the renters are NOT the only sector that is affected by COVID-19. By considering these motions, you are helping one sector by punishing another sector and by making another sector, the housing providers, pay for all the COVID-19 damages. This is unreasonable! You have to understand that the housing providers have many expenses and use the rent money to pay these expenses including paying the mortgage, taxes, maintenance, utilities and more. Without the rent, the housing providers will NOT be able to pay these expenses and will NOT be able to maintain these properties which will also affect the tenants. Also, by approving these motions, you are creating another problem in the economy: many house owners will not be able to keep their properties and many properties will go into foreclosure. For all the above reasons, I urge you NOT to approve these motions. Thank you, Orly Bar-Greenberg 5158 Clareton Dr.#415 Agoura Hills CA 91376-0415

Communication from Public

Name: Michael Stein

Date Submitted: 04/20/2020 05:50 PM

Council File No: 20-0407

Comments for Public Posting: I oppose Agenda Items 37, 38, 39 appearing on the April 22, 2020 LA Council Agenda. These Motions will severely impact our rental properties and owners abilities to properly maintain their properties. While the Covid-19 Crisis has placed sever economic strains on ALL citizens, it is not appropriate to place the burden on a single industry. Housing is critical and Housing Property Owners have already been asked to shoulder a large burden of the economic stress by with the current Covid-19 rent actions currently in place. Property Owners should not be forced into additional sacrifices. The long term effects could be large number of small owner bankruptcies and properties falling into disrepair as the property owners will not have the funds to affect timely repairs. I do support Agenda Item 66 which would provide Renters funding to assist renters to pay the monthly rents.

Communication from Public

Name: Peter Ronay

Date Submitted: 04/20/2020 08:28 PM

Council File No: 20-0407

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Council Members: I am a landlord with units in the city of Los Angeles and also represent numerous clients in the city of L.A. both as landlords and tenants. I strongly urge that item numbers 37, 38 and 39 be denied. My primary objection is as to Item 38 – the Motion for the City Attorney to proceed with an ordinance to classify unpaid rent as consumer debt, not subject to the unlawful detainer process. 1. The proposal is definitely NOT a “measured response” to the current status of C-19. 2. The proposal is an interference with the unlawful detainer statutes which are provided as a statewide solution to problems landlords face when they have tenants who are not complying with their lease obligations. 3. The proposal unilaterally and retroactively alters the contractual terms of all lease agreements. 4. Rent is a property right that accrues from the owner’s decision to give possession to another. So the effect of the proposed item 38 is to take the property right of a landlord without due process. 5. The intent of the proposal is to assist Tenants. 6. The long term effect of the proposal is to drive landlords out of the market. The above is my objection. If you have the time or inclination or willingness to send this to a staff member to review the detailed reasons supporting my objection, please see the appended pages. Sincerely, PETER E RONAY

LAW OFFICE

PETER E. RONAY

530 SOUTH LAKE AVENUE, SUITE 391
PASADENA, CALIFORNIA 91101

TELEPHONE (626) 792-4730
FAX (626) 628-3162

April 20, 2020

LA City Council

BY EMAIL TO:

<https://cityclerk.lacity.org/publiccomment/>

Re: Items 37, 38 & 39 - City Council meeting agenda for April 22, 2020

Dear Council Members:


I am a landlord with units in the city of Los Angeles and also represent numerous clients in the city of L.A. both as landlords and tenants. I strongly urge that item numbers 37, 38 and 39 be denied.

My primary objection is as to Item 38 – the Motion for the City Attorney to proceed with an ordinance to classify unpaid rent as consumer debt, not subject to the unlawful detainer process.

1. The proposal is definitely NOT a “measured response” to the current status of C-19.
2. The proposal is an interference with the unlawful detainer statutes which are provided as a statewide solution to problems landlords face when they have tenants who are not complying with their lease obligations.
3. The proposal unilaterally and retroactively alters the contractual terms of all lease agreements.
4. Rent is a property right that accrues from the owner’s decision to give possession to another. So the effect of the proposed item 38 is to take the property right of a landlord without due process.
5. The intent of the proposal is to assist Tenants.
6. The long term effect of the proposal is to drive landlords out of the market.

The above is my objection. If you have the time or inclination or willingness to send this to a staff member to review the detailed reasons supporting my objection, please see the appended pages.

Sincerely,



PETER E. RONAY

All of us are exposed to the consequences of COVID-19. Unfortunately, it appears that the measures you are putting into effect and have already put into effect as a “cure” is worse than the disease.

That is particularly true of Item 38 - the Motion for the City Attorney to proceed with an ordinance to classify unpaid rent as consumer debt, not subject to the unlawful detainer process.

The proposal is definitely NOT a “measured response” to the current status of C-19.

You have already implemented a rent deferral. The rent deferral is up to 12 months and gives very little consideration to the needs of “smaller” landlords.

What the council proposes is to unilaterally and retroactively alter the contractual terms of all lease agreements

My landlord clients have their own obligations over and above the payment of the underlying mortgage on the rental units. The other obligations include but are not limited to maintenance of the common areas, provision of utilities, payment of taxes and insurance. I think it is interesting that L.A. County, which implemented the rent deferral affecting both residential and commercial properties, did not “defer” payment of the real estate taxes and seems to have not even considered deferring penalties and interest.

The proposal is an interference with the unlawful detainer statutes which are provided as a statewide solution to problems landlords face when they have tenants who are not complying with their lease obligations. The state obviously considers it of significant public benefit to allow landlords to regain control of their properties when the tenant fails to comply with the lease obligations. That is a public benefit to both landlords and tenants by allowing restitution of the premises so they can be quickly available to other tenants if existing tenants fail to comply.

The proposal goes beyond imposing a change to the UD statutes. What the council proposes is to unilaterally and retroactively alter the contractual terms of all lease agreements.

It can be assumed that a substantial number of residential tenants are living with restricted budgets. The probability that a tenant will be able to save the deferred rent for up to 12 months then pay the deferred rent in addition to ongoing base rent is close to zero.

Rent is a property right that accrues from the owner’s decision to give possession to another. So the effect of the proposed item 38 is to take the property right of a landlord without due process. The long term effect of the proposal is to drive landlords out of the market.

L.A. City, the County and the State have already imposed draconian restrictions without apparently considering the long-term consequences.

The illness and death imposed by the virus is significant and crushing to those affected. But that risk as shown in appended pages affects less than 1% of the population. The financial impact of the restrictions already in place affect 99% of the population. I exclude only the 1% which have been frequently referred to as not subject to financial distress.

WHY THE PROPOSED MOTION IS AN EXTREME OVERREACTION

The following was obtained on line April 20, 2020 in a short review of data presented by the State of California, LA County and Santa Clara County in the following web site:

<http://www.msn.com/en-us/news/us/hundreds-of-thousands-in-la-county-may-have-the-coronavirus-study-finds/ar-BB12W5mG?li=BBnb7Kz&ocid=U141DHP>

Gov. Gavin Newsom announced that an additional 42 people in California have died from coronavirus, bringing the death toll to 1,208. The total number of coronavirus cases in the state stands at 30,978. Newsom also confirmed that the state recorded 3,257 hospitalized patients and 1,196 COVID-19 patients in the ICU.

Los Angeles County: 13,816 confirmed cases, 617 deaths

The initial results from the first large-scale study [LA County Department of Health] tracking the spread of the coronavirus in the county found that 2.8% to 5.6% of adults have antibodies to the virus in their blood, an indication of past exposure.

That translates to roughly 221,000 to 442,000 adults who have recovered from an infection, according to the researchers conducting the study, even though the county had reported fewer than 8,000 cases at that time.

The early results from L.A. County come three days after Stanford researchers reported that the coronavirus appears to have circulated much more widely in Santa Clara County than previously thought.

The Stanford team estimated that 2.5% to 4.2% of Santa Clara County residents had antibodies to the coronavirus in their blood by early April.

Though the county had reported roughly 1,000 cases in early April, the Stanford researchers estimate the actual number was 48,000 to 81,000,

The above results can be seen as:

LA COUNTY DEPT OF PUBLIC
HEALTH
ON LINE 4/20/20

Reported infections	13,816
Deaths	617
Rate	4.465837%

Actual	Estimated	Rate
range	221000	0.27919%
	442,000	0.13959%
median	331500	0.18612%

Source of Estimated infections
LA COUNTY DEPT OF PUBLIC
HEALTH
As reported on line 4/20/2020
Comparable to Santa Clara County Study

Communication from Public

Name: Kevin Davis

Date Submitted: 04/20/2020 10:33 AM

Council File No: 20-0407

Comments for Public Posting: City Council Items 37, 38 & 39 are ill-advised motions which are punitive towards apartment owners -- particularly Item 38. Please do NOT approve these motions.

Communication from Public

Name: William Mark Hafeman

Date Submitted: 04/20/2020 11:15 AM

Council File No: 20-0407

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Honorable Council Member, I am a real estate broker and work in Los Angeles. I notice during the current crisis that there are a lot of buildings up for sale. Many buildings were former AirBnB's that are now closed. I am afraid that the ITEM # 38 would reclassify rent as consumer debt not subject to the unlawful detainer process would force landlords with fixed bills for water/sewer and mortgages to go into default on their bills. The primary hold landlords have to ensure tenants pay bills is the unlawful detainer process. if you eliminate this then tenants won't pay and landlords will go broke. Item 39 that eliminates nearly all types of eviction proceedings goes beyond the Judicial Council's proposals. This is likely to increase bankruptcy, foreclosure and cause a catastrophic chain of events that will poison the economy, and have a detrimental impact on housing quality, maintenance, health and safety of residents. If landlords go broke, who will pay for maintenance of buildings? Your proposals are an unconstitutional public taking of property and violate the US Constitution. Items 37-39 are a regulatory taking in which LACC limits the uses of private property to such a degree that the regulation effectively deprives the property owners of economically reasonable use or value of their property to such an extent that it deprives them of utility or value of that property. The Fifth Amendment of the US Constitution states: "No person ...(Shall be) deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation." LACC proposals threaten to change the laws in a manner that contractual relationships between landlords and tenants are no longer enforced. Tenants may stay in property without paying rent and may not be evicted from those properties. A suspension of the Landlord's right to evict a non-rent-paying tenant for a long period of time is unconstitutional. Furthermore, Item 39 is unconstitutionally vague. It seeks to extend the prohibition on evictions for 30 days following the end of the local emergency. There is no way to know when the emergency will end and 30 days beyond the end is unconstitutionally vague. If LACC adopts Items 37-39 it is likely that expensive court battles will ensue and the City of Los Angeles should be liable for each and every bankruptcy that results from landlords inability to collect rents. Passing Items

37-39 will likely increase bankruptcy, foreclosure, decreased maintenance, and reduce available housing in Los Angeles. The fact that LACC is considering these Items makes it unlikely that buildings will be sold, that will lower the chances that buildings with distressed balance sheets will avoid loan defaults. It will suppress property values. As buildings go into default, there will be fewer housing options for the people of Los Angeles. Investors are not likely to invest in Los Angeles. Sincerely, Mark Hafeman

Communication from Public

Name: Wendy Bablot

Date Submitted: 04/22/2020 11:34 AM

Council File No: 20-0407

Comments for Public Posting: IT HAS BEEN BROUGHT TO OUR ATTENTION THAT THE CITY COUNCIL WILL BE HAVING A MEETING APRIL 22, 2020 REGARDING THREE MOTIONS, 37,38 & 39. I HAVE ATTACHED INFORMATION. I HOPE YOU CAN HELP US STOP THESE MOTIONS BY CALLING AND LETTING THE COUNCILPERSONS KNOW THAT YOU OPPOSE THESE MOTIONS. WE ARE ASKING THEM TO FIND UNIVERSAL AND BALANCED SOLUTIONS THAT SERVE TO ASSIST BOTH RENTERS AND HOUSING PROVIDERS ALIKE. THE BURDEN OF TRYING TO KEEP OUR BUSINESS AFLOAT IS BECOMING HARDER AND HARDER. WHEN THE COST OF DOING BUSINESS CONTINUES TO FALL ON THE SHOULDERS OF HOUSING PROVIDERS. WE ASK THEM TO PLEASE BE FAIR. WE ARE ALSO IMPACTED BY THIS PANDEMIC THROUGH NO FAULT OF OUR OWN. I am asking that you please help and call or send a message to the City Council members of L.A. TOMORROW BEFORE 10:00 A.M. if possible and let them know you oppose these motions. WE ARE ONLY ASKING FOR FAIRNESS TO ALL. Sorry for the late notice but I did not get it until late today, as well. It does not matter if you do not have property in LA. You are a citizen and have the right to voice your opinion. This type of change is happening in many cities. Property Owners are losing their rights. More and more the City of L.A. is destroying the right to allow Housing Providers to run their own business. This has affected Mom and Pop investors and Small Businesses that have worked most of our life to provide the means to carry us through retirement from our investment. We have lost our right to charge a fair rent that would cover our responsibilities of paying the Mortgage, Insurance, Utilities, Repairs and Vendors. The LA City Board has put a huge burden on the Housing Providers by not allowing us to increase rent when needed to meet our responsibilities. Taking away our right to evict, especially when we lose good tenants due to a NUISANCE tenant or tenants that want to live free. Why has the City refused to help Housing Providers with this? Housing Providers are the ones that are being penalized at no fault of their own. It doesn't seem to end because now the city is considering passing a motion that would add another burden to pick up the balance of rent not paid within (12)

twelve months under a new motion as "Consumer Debt." Please help us by making that call per the attachments. We need an army to stop the City of these unfair motions. Thanking you in advance.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 04/22/2020 11:14 AM

Council File No: 20-0407

Comments for Public Posting: PLEASE OPPOSE ITEMS 37, 38 AND 39 ON THE COUNCIL AGENDA FOR APRIL 22, 2020. PLEASE SUPPORT ITEM 66 – COVID-19 EMERGENCY RENTERS RELIEF PROGRAM

We are all living through the struggle of our life-time. It is a difficult, challenging and frightening time for everyone. That is why it is so very important for you to consider the challenges that everyone is facing. The vast majority of rental housing providers in Los Angeles are individual people, not giant corporations. They are good and honest people who care about their tenants. They are also suffering during this unprecedented time. Many of those property owners are seniors for whom the rental units represent most or all of their income. If the rents that they depend on stop, they are not able to file or collect unemployment. They carry the full burden and loss. There is a call to suspend rents until the “crisis is over”. But the City of Los Angeles, while they want to suspend all rents, will continue to charge property owners for property taxes, business taxes, utilities. The expenses of property owners won’t be suspended, just the revenue needed to pay those expenses. So, the City refuses to take the same blows in income that it will put on the backs of the people. If the Council feels it is acceptable to suspend rent then the City (and County) needs to suspend all property taxes, business taxes and utility expenses until such time as rents are no longer suspended. The City also needs to include a sunset clause, instead of using an indefinite and undetermined date. It is a tough time, but there is relief for many who have been impacted. In addition to the expected unemployment benefits, there is currently an additional benefit of \$2400.00 per month available. ABC-7 News reported just last night that businesses who have received PPP loans are now finding it difficult to bring employees back to work because those employees are receiving more in unemployment benefits than they would make if they came back to work. Governor Newsom has done an excellent job during this difficult time of protecting renters, including his temporary moratorium on evictions and his mandated deferment of rents. His approach has been balanced and reasonable. He is not taking advantage of a moment of fear to push over-reaching systemic changes. I urge you to trust the Governor when it comes to protecting renters’ rights during this crisis and to follow his lead. It is vital that the City Council

advance universal and balanced solutions that serve to assist renters and housing providers alike, such as the proposal under consideration in item 66 which calls for the establishment of an Emergency Renters Relief Program. PLEASE OPPOSE ITEMS 37, 38 AND 39 ON YOUR COUNCIL AGENDA FOR APRIL 22, 2020. PLEASE SUPPORT ITEM 66 – COVID-19 EMERGENCY RENTERS RELIEF PROGRAM

Communication from Public

Name: Zachary Schlagel
Date Submitted: 04/21/2020 05:03 PM
Council File No: 20-0407
Comments for Public Posting: On behalf of PATH (People Assisting The Homeless), we are in support of items 37, 38, 39, 58, 61, and 62 on the Council agenda for 4/22. We believe these are timely and comprehensive protections that will help prevent future erosion in the gains we have made in addressing homelessness across the City.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 04/23/2020 04:35 PM

Council File No: 20-0407

Comments for Public Posting: I am in complete agreement with the following statement from one of my fellow landlords: As landlords we appreciate the efforts that council member Ryu has taken on our behalf with regard to mortgage relief and extensions. Unfortunately as you state, the local city council cannot mandate a mortgage freeze, and the extension does not help us conscientious landlords who have paid our taxes on time. We provide an essential need and we cannot shoulder the cost to house people for free. It's not possible. It is infinitely better for renters to have a small local landlord who will work with them rather than a large hedge fund owner who only cares about shareholder return and squeezing every penny out of a building. Sadly, that is what will happen if small landlords like us find ourselves losing our buildings because we just can't hold on.