

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 04/15/2021 04:38 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0268-S13

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am in favor the tenant anti-harassment ordinance, and the recommendations proposed by council member Nithya Raman. It has been 4 years since this ordinance was first introduced, and it is high time it is passed. It should be passed with Raman's recommendations, and without being watered down or postponed. I was one of many callers on the April 14th meeting that ran out of time to give public comment; what I heard from the paid landlord lobby was the same old excuses to try to delay the implementation of a desperately needed protection. In contrast, we heard working poor tenants who currently deal with landlord harassment sharing their testimonies. These people are not paid to wait on the phone, like the AAGLA staff are; they are not paid, like CA Apt Assoc. staff, to watch for every agenda, for four years, so that they can call in and oppose protections. As a fellow tenant, I echo their moving testimonies and demand that TAHO is passed swiftly. It is long overdue. No robust protections against tenant harassment currently exist, allowing landlords to use harassment to pressure tenants into self-evicting, or influencing the outcome of an eviction case. What might previously have seemed unthinkable - leaving your housing - for many tenants can feel like their only choice, especially when they do so out of fear for their safety and the safety of their children and families. Harassment also impacts the outcome of eviction cases; with the stress of harassment and the toll on their emotional and mental health, tenants have a difficult time not only with daily life, but especially with navigating the legal process. The notion of a "right to cure" is laughable. After months of verbal abuse, threats, and intimidation, how can a landlord "cure" the lasting impact of their abuse? They cannot. It is just another attempt by the landlord lobby to put the burden on tenants. Instead, it is high time the city holds landlords accountable for their pervasive abuse and harassment. Furthermore, a "right to cure" would force tenants into further contact with their harasser, and in many cases their abuser. In no case would this be beneficial for a tenant, and give the harassing landlord further opportunity to cause harm. TAHO must be passed without some absurd "right to cure" provision. Some landlord lobbyists said the 1872 definition of harassment was sufficient. For context, in 1872 Susan B. Anthony attempted to be the first woman to vote in the US, for which she was issued

an arrest warrant, and Jim Crow laws were in place in the United States. These landlord lobbyists essentially invoked a MAGA conception of the civil rights that tenants should have, demonstrating their vile desire to maintain hierarchies that dispossess and oppress racialized and marginalized people. Harassment needs a modern day definition, inclusive of tactics like relentless cash for keys offers, to protect tenants. The recommendations offered by Nithya Raman go a long way to achieving that.