

Rent Ordinance Community Meeting

June 6, 2019 – Alameda Elks Lodge

Exhibit 1

Annual General Adjustment (AGA):

The maximum allowable rent increase that a landlord may impose annually.

YES

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| 4 % Flat Rate | 1 |
| 100% of Consumer Price Index | |
| 1% Floor & 5% Ceiling | 2 |
| No Floor/No Ceiling | 1 |
| 65% of Consumer Price Index | |
| 1% Floor & 5% Ceiling | 7 |
| No Floor/No Ceiling | 1 |

NO

| | |
|--|----|
| Keep status quo with current regulations | 68 |
|--|----|

Banking Rent Increases:

A landlord may defer some or all of an annual general adjustment by "banking" what is not used in that year and carrying the unused portion to a future year or years.

YES

| | |
|---|----|
| Banking with no cap on imposing accrued "banking" increases | 36 |
| 7% annual cap on imposing accrued "banking" increases | 3 |
| 12% annual cap on imposing accrued "banking" increases | 8 |

NO

| | |
|----------------------|----|
| No Banking permitted | 12 |
|----------------------|----|

Pass-Through Costs in addition to Annual General Adjustment:

A landlord may pass through to tenants certain costs on top of the amount of the annual general adjustment.

YES

| | |
|--|----|
| 50% of Rent Program Fee | 36 |
| Additional Occupant Not on Lease (with landlord permission & not including certain family members) | 41 |
| Portion of Increases in Utilities (if included with rent) | 42 |
| Portion of Capital Improvement Costs (amortized over the useful life of the improvement) | 52 |
| Bond & Special Assessment Measures | 42 |

NO

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| No Pass-through permitted | 8 |
|---------------------------|---|

Petition Process:

Establish a process for a landlord or tenant to petition for an upward or downward change to the Annual General Adjustment.

Order of Petition Process

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Staff Decision | 7 |
| 2. Option to Appeal Decision to Hearing Officer | |
| 3. Option to Appeal Decision to Rent Review Advisory Committee (RRAC) | |
| 4. Option to Appeal Decision to Court | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Staff Decision | 0 |
| 2. Option to Appeal Decision to Hearing Officer | |
| 3. Option to Appeal Decision to Court | |

**Rent Ordinance Community Meeting
June 6, 2019 – Alameda Elks Lodge**

Exhibit 1

Order of Petition Process continued

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----|
| 1. Hearing Officer review | 48 |
| 2. RRAC | |
| 3. Option to Appeal Decision to Court | |

Relocation Assistance Required for Constructive Eviction:

A landlord must provide relocation benefits when a tenant gives notice to vacate within 30 days of

YES

| | |
|---|----|
| 7% rent increase threshold for relocation benefits | 11 |
| 10% rent increase threshold for relocation benefits | 1 |
| 8% + Consumer Price Index rent increase threshold for relocation benefits | 2 |

NO

| | |
|--------------------------------|----|
| No relocation payment required | 53 |
|--------------------------------|----|

Rent Ordinance Community Meeting

June 6, 2019 – Alameda Elks Lodge

Comments:

- 1) "No Registry"
- 2) "Debbie: Just a technicality in your presentation: Review by RRAC is not "mandatory" over 5% increase. Instead, tenant has the right to request it. However, if tenant doesn't do so in a certain (very short) time period, they lose that right. Also, negotiations outside of RRAC are not required to be reviewed by RRAC. – Toni G."
- 3) "Rent cap it like San Jose and Hayward"
- 4) "Forget the bureaucracy. Leave 3148 as is!"
- 5) "Get the facts about what rates are working. CPI or flat. What & how has that changed available # units"
- 6) "I expected this meeting to be equally comprised of landlords and tenants. My impression is that the majority of those in attendance are landlords. Without knowing demographics of those voting, my concern is that the "voting" is not fairly representative"
- 7) "Rent control does not work. I will pull my property off the market and go with Air BnB if these pass, as will many other landlords = lower stock of rental units."
- 8) "All of these proposals were voted down by Alameda voters in 2018. Rent Cap is extreme and unnecessary! And it will create a significant bureaucracy. And a huge burden on landlords – the majority of whom are very reasonable and respectable members of the community. The current ordinance is working! Leave it alone."
- 9) "CPI to help renters. Note there's not a lot of renters tonight. The opinions do not reflect the 14,000 renters not present. Pass rent control!"
- 10) "Filipino Advocates for Justice is asking for an AGA at 65% of CPI, we work with a large population of Filipino seniors who receive social security benefits. Their increases are usually under CPI, but more commensurate with the 65% of CPI statistics. Seniors are among the most vulnerable to become homeless especially as many of them receive rent increases while also dealing with other costs like long-term medical expenses and being displaced from family/adult children. Please take Alameda's most vulnerable renters into consideration when deciding on the projected AGA. Thank you!"

- 11) "When City holds a meeting and only brings 100 envelopes for votes, it shows they only want a "little" feedback from a few. There are 14,000 housing units. We should get 1 vote per unit! We pay Admin fee per unit!"
- 12) "I am an intern at the Filipino Advocates for Justice, after reviewing data we believe that 65% CPI is a fair rental cap for Alameda. *When taking into consideration of the elderly/senior/ disabled person we feel as though we must take fixed income into consideration. The Social Security increased in 2018 was 2.535, in 2017 SS was 2.0 and 65% of CPI was 2.8, we see how these align. 65% of CPI."
- 13) "Need meeting agenda. Need facts as to comparative analysis."
- 14) "Forget all the new layers of bureaucracy. The voters of Alameda decided in 2016 what they thought was fair. Leave the ordinance as it is with no changes."
- 15) "Process for collecting input is totally flawed. There should be an option for "None of the above" or "Make no change to existing ordinance on every proposal. I did not put stickers on some of these options because I don't support at all."
- 16) "We all want increased affordable housing! BUT the methods presented do not help to achieve the goal. "Just Cause" limitations is a sound bite. It is not just. It does not particularly help the poor or middle income. It just makes it harder to provide good housing because it is harder to have bad tenants leave. It gives a lifetime lease to every tenant, no matter how well-to-do. Do not do it. In SF, it has reduced housing. People are so scared of bad tenants, that they keep housing vacant. Please do not enact this failed idea."
- 17) "By revoking no cause eviction there is the risk of depleting the rental market. When rent ordinance 3148 went into effect, owners relocated their tenants and sold their units because they were afraid what may happen with the restrictions. Those owners may have made the correct decision. Alameda is going Pro-Tenant. Explaining the "new rules" will frighten home owners. Those home owners will sell their homes. Whether they are withdrawing from the rental market or not, expect the rental market rates to raise with vacant units. It is a contradicting theory by revoking the "no cause". With removing rentals from Alameda many more families may be displaced because the sale of a property. That will eliminate and push families to located elsewhere. As a real estate agent working for a property management company, many Coast Guard families will be at risk. A short notice has been given to owners during a busy time of the year with home owners going to graduation and or traveling. That is forcing home owners to make a decision about their property that they may have inherited from loved ones, but may not be able to live in the unit for their own hardship or situation. Some rentals are used for elderly income for assisted living expenses. Rent income does not cover those expenses alone with raising rates of HOA, insurance and maintenance. We had an owner who had to pay thousands of dollars to relocate their tenants to sell their property to spend the last few months with their family because they have stage 4 cancer. Please reconsider the revocation of "no cause" eviction. Thank you."