

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED  
AT MAY 2, 2019 COMMUNITY OPEN HOUSE

**Just Cause**

Owner-occupied units should be excluded (5)

No cause should be allowed if three or more "for cause" type violations within a 12- month period

Continue no cause evictions with 5% limitation on new rent

Allow no cause if owners intend to sell

Provide legal assistance for landlords for just cause evictions (3)

Just cause is necessary to protect tenants (generally) or because of fear of eviction if tenants request landlord to correct deficiencies (7)

Without just cause, families will be forced to leave

**Maximum Rent Cap**

Several comments noted that a 5% annual rent increase is too high

A range of suggested rent caps was made:

- Several suggested 100% of CPI
- 65% of CPI
- Tie rent increase to wage growth
- Rent cap below 3%
- Rent cap of 2.5%/year and 10% in five years
- CPI or 2% - whichever is less
- Several suggested if rent is below the payment standard (the amount the Housing Authority will pay a landlord), allow a rent increase up to 5%; if the rent is above the payment standard, cap rent at CPI
- CPI + 5%

Likes Oakland's ordinance (100% of CPI, rent "banking", pass-through of new property tax measures, material increases in utilities, etc. (these costs are amortized))

Several comments supported "banking" of rent increases

Several comments suggested that a rent cap will worsen the housing crisis by creating less housing opportunities and more expensive rents following vacancies

“Mom and pop” landlords will be hurt by a rent cap

Several comments noted that a rent cap that is less than CPI is not a realistic reflection of property expenses (increasing utility costs, cost of repairs/improvements, etc.)

Some commenters thought that the rent program/business license fees should be excluded from the cap and others thought they should be included (or excluded unless property was “in good standing”)

Several commenters supported a reduction in rent based on a reduction in housing services

### **Relocation Benefits**

A majority of comments focused on the economic burden of relocation benefits on smaller landlords, landlords who are owner-occupants, and landlords who are seniors – suggesting that these landlords be exempt from paying relocation benefits, that tenants should be “means tested”, or that the requirement to pay relocation benefits be otherwise revised

No relocation fees for owner move-ins

Relocation fees need to be increased

Average relocation benefit of \$8,773 is misleading (more tenants receive substantially less and a few receive higher and skews average)

Relocation fees should be based on “fair market rents”

Recognizing that large rent increases can lead to tenants moving (constructive eviction) and requiring relocation benefits is a “great idea”

Allow renters insurance to cover relocation costs in case of fire, flood, etc. instead of relocation benefits

### **Capital Improvement Policy**

Several comments focused on the formula that is currently used and noted that the dollar amount of work to qualify as a CIP is too high

Two comments noted that it’s hard to get plans approved/takes too long

Double relocation benefits when termination due to CIP

Transparency (perhaps requiring tax returns) is important when permitting rent increases due to CIPs

Important to have a process to determine if relocation should be temporary or permanent when undertaking CIP

Look at Oakland’s new CIP ordinance as a guide

### **Other Comments/Issues**

Ordinance is divisive; ordinance should distinguish between mom/pops and corporate landlords (2)

Eliminate RRAC and have hearing officer hear all rent increases above CPI

Rent control prevents landlords from maintaining the units; rent control discourages persons from staying in and entering the rental market

Penalties for tenants' excess use of water should be passed to tenants (2)

Revise definition of housing unit

Requiring offers of one year lease to be open for 30 days is too long

Cost of program should be identified on website

Need tenant registry (2)

Require larger rental complexes to have a certain percentage of Section 8 tenants

Place tax on landlords who keep their units vacant (2)

Oppose rent registry (too invasive)