

Peter Muzio  
P.O. Box 1729  
Alameda, Ca. 94501

December 31, 2015

Trish Spencer, Mayor of Alameda  
2263 Santa Clara Avenue  
Alameda, Ca 94501

Dear Mayor:

Pressure to institute Rent Control.

I do not own any rentals in Alameda. I own a rental in Oakland. This year (2015) the Oakland City Council allowed me a generous (sic) 1.7% rent raise. The city negotiated a new garbage contract which raised my bill by 25%. The drought increased the amount I pay for water 12%. The property tax in Oakland went up 4.35% (it went up 6% in Alameda). I was required to install smoke detectors in every bedroom. The net result was a NEGATIVE cost of living increase. In the mean time the city gave the city employees a 4% cost of living increase. If you call this fair you live on another planet. I worked a blue collar job at the base in Alameda. I get a 1.9% retirement. The city of Oakland gives the city employees a 2.7% retirement. I have to pay taxes to the city so the city employees can get higher pay than I got and a better retirement than I get.

Rent Control has only one objective: to suppress the rental rate to a below market amount. Poor people, middle class people and well to do people all get their rents suppressed. This is a different concept than "Affordable" housing for people of modest means. My rents are now considerably below market rates. That means if I were to sell my investment now I would have to sell for a below market price. Again, the city that pays their employees a better retirement than I get would stiff me out of some of my retirement. This is not right! It is one thing to limit rent raises during the spikes which occur when the economy is booming, but it is not right to suppress rents so they are below market forever. The rents should be allowed to rise at a rate that keeps them approximately at market over the long term.

Rent control is always accompanied by Vacancy control. Once rent control is begun there are no more month to month tenancies or yearly leases. Renters are given a "life estate". Only the renter gets to decide if or when they will move. This in effect is to decide that people who were here first get to stay close to work and the "new comers" are the ones who have to commute. If you move into a retirement community you have to pay lots of money to be entitled to a "life estate". Yet renters in a rent controlled city get a life estate for nothing. This is not right!

RECEIVED

2016 JAN -4 P 10:52

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

Shafting small unit owners will do nothing to solve the problem. Ask yourself, why has rent control become such a hue and cry? It is simple; nobody wants to commute from Antioch or Manteca. Rent control only masks the problem of gridlock on the freeways. Rent control only masks the failure of the city governments in the Bay Area to use their power to Zone and Permit a housing supply that matches the job supply.

Monopolies (like city governments) are the ones who need to be highly regulated. I am a small unit owner amongst thousands of small unit owners. I am not a monopoly. I have no control of the rental markets. The city does not have one dime invested in my property and yet they deliberately stiff me out of a reasonable cost of living increase and stiff me out of being able to sell my property for a market rate while feathering their own nest.

At the January 2016 Oakland City Council meeting one of the topics for discussion will be to charge the property owner tens of thousands of dollars if they want to go out of business. Think of it - the city has created a situation such that instead of people wanting to become landlords and invest in the city, they want to raise there hands above their heads and say "I give up" and go out of business. Now the city is scheming how best to kick them really hard while they are down. This is not right!

If you truly want "reasonable" rents, force the cities in the Bay Area to balance the beds with the desks. Rent Control is an abomination. With only the power of the pen the city and the tenants take over the rental properties without investing one dime. Naturally the tenants want this, but it is not right!

Very Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Peter Mezic". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

## LARA WEISIGER

---

**From:** María D. Domínguez <mariaddominguez@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 04, 2016 9:43 AM  
**To:** Trish Spencer  
**Cc:** City Clerk; alamedarenterscoalition@gmail.com  
**Subject:** Support Alameda Tenants by Rejecting the Three Ordinance Recommendations on Tuesday, January 5 and Extend Moratorium

Dear Mayor Spencer:

I am an Alameda resident. I voted in the last Alameda election and plan on doing so again this coming November.

I am a very active member of my community who supports local businesses and gives back to her community. For example, I am a member of the League of Women Voters of Alameda where I have participated in voter registration. I am also a member of the Alameda Renters Coalition, an advocacy group for tenants.

I work for a non-profit organization in Oakland that serves foster care youth, youth on probation, and teen parents throughout Alameda County. Some of my youth clients live in and attend school in Alameda. These youth clients are extremely at risk of losing their stable housing because of the rising rents. This means they are also at risk of losing their family and support system connections, dropping out of school, recidivating, becoming poorer, homeless, or all of the above.

I support renters in Alameda and am myself a renter. In late November, I received a 16.25% rent increase in spite of Alameda's 65-day moratorium on rent increases. After reaching out to the City of Alameda Housing Authority and the City Attorney's office, I contacted my landlord to make them aware of how the proposed rent increase violated the 65-day moratorium.

On Tuesday, January 5, city staff will present three ordinance recommendations to you concerning rent review or rent stabilization and other tenant protections. I urge you to extend the moratorium and reject the three ordinance recommendations and to instead direct staff to present an alternative ordinance that helps bring housing stability to Alameda and includes the following:

1. Tie rent increases to a relevant measure of inflation, specifically, 65% of the Consumer Price Index (CPI) with a cap of 4% in any given year.  
Allowing 8% rent increases is unconscionable.
2. Put an end to "no-cause" evictions and create a "just cause" eviction policy.
3. Created an elected Rent Board.
4. Provide relocation payments for "no-fault" evictions that are rationally related to the true costs of relocating.
5. Provide written notice to all new tenants of their tenant rights.
6. All rent increase and eviction notices must be filed with the Housing Authority (or Rent Board).
7. Security deposits must be kept in a separate interest bearing account and returned with interest to tenants at the end of their tenancy if no lawful deduction has been made.
8. Attorney fees may be recovered by tenants if there is a violation of the ordinance. This is the standard in other rent ordinances throughout the state.

Thank you for your consideration. I look forward to speaking during public comment on Tuesday night to express my concerns as a renter and to advocate for a comprehensive rent stabilization policy.

Sincerely,

María D. Domínguez, J.D.

Mobile Phone (510) 967-3916 | Email [mariaddominguez@gmail.com](mailto:mariaddominguez@gmail.com)

Confidentiality Notice: This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.