

Jomsky, Mark

From. Paul Little <Paul@pasadena-chamber.org>
Sent. Monday, February 06, 2017 10:49 AM
To: City_Council
Cc: Mermell, Steve, Jomsky, Mark
Subject. Revised quorum proposal

Good morning,

I agree there can be problems with some City Council subcommittees being able to reach (or maintain) a quorum of members to do business. This is not a new problem, as I am sure you are aware.

It seems to me, personally, that the proposal to revise the quorum requirements for City Council subcommittees is moving in the wrong direction.

Rather than revise the number of participants that make up a quorum, why not revise the number of Council members on affected committees?

Just my thought.

Thanks,

Paul

02/06/2017
Items 3 & 11

232 Avenue 64
Pasadena, CA 91105

February 6, 2017

RE Consent Item 3 on tonight's agenda concerning Quorums

Honorable Mayor and City Council

I am happy to see this proposal on the agenda, and I would like to share with you my reasons. Almost two years ago, I learned that Fuller Seminary students were being displaced from their apartments on Los Robles and Oakland Avenues just north of the campus. We members of the Greater Pasadena Affordable Housing Group were contacted by some of the students because they were receiving no relocation benefits, even though there was already a PPR application showing their units would be demolished in favor of new condominiums. This sounded like a clear violation of the City's Tenants' Protection Act.

In researching their situation, we learned that a sentence that landlords asked for at the last moment in 2004 exempted Fuller (and most landlords) from paying the relocation payments because these students were evicted "in accordance with State law." We learned this State law meant the landlords just need to let their leases expire and then tenants can be evicted with 30-days notice. Astoundingly, this is what landlords were doing in Pasadena for eleven years to avoid paying relocation payments to low-income tenants even though the landlords were making a huge profit selling to developers.

I mention again that we learned this almost two years ago. We swiftly spoke with individual Council members, who were also astounded to hear about the weakness of the City's ordinance. We spoke at Public Comment in the summer of 2015, and Council members quickly asked for the Housing Department to fix this law. (We thought only one sentence would need to be deleted.) In April, 2016, the Housing Department brought back a proposal, but a member of the Apartment Association spoke at the public hearing and got it delayed for more study.

In the 18 months that the ordinance fix has been considered by the Housing Department, I have been told that they were ready to go to EdTech numerous times to move an ordinance forward, but that a quorum of EdTech could not be obtained. I can only imagine how many scores of tenants have lost relocation payments due to these delays.

Therefore I am in full support of reducing the quorum for City Council committee meetings. (An even better idea would be to have an Affordable Housing Commission as the intermediary between staff and the City Council.) Thanks very much for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Darrell Cozen

Cc: Bill Huang, Housing Director

02/06/2017
Items 3 & 11