

## Sabha, Tamer

---

**From:** Adam Bray-Ali  
**Sent:** Friday, December 1, 2023 9:23 AM  
**To:** PublicComment-AutoResponse  
**Cc:** Adam Bray-Ali  
**Subject:** Public comment - Item #17 - City Council meeting December 4, 2023

**[⚠] CAUTION:** This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you *know* the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. [Learn more...](#)

Good morning,

I read with some confusion the agenda item #17 for your upcoming meeting on December 4, 2023 related to the Rental Housing Board and their desire to rewrite the Measure H Charter Amendment and have the city of Pasadena create a new department to administer the duties assigned to the Rental Housing Board.

There is no longer a period of review to be made after 12 months as proposed in earlier meetings.

Why was that review period removed in the proposed ordinance?

As you likely know, the Rental Housing Board, appointed by your city council, have met for 6 months and has agreed to spend more than \$750,000 for consultants, legal advice and PR work in addition to their own operating expenses. They were advanced \$500,000 by the city in 2023 and appear to be preparing for another request of \$500,000 in the coming weeks.

While I applaud the goal of proper oversight and governance to this trainwreck of a law, the city is now making a decision to not follow the actual charter as voted in with Measure H and doing so without consideration of if this should be allowed or reviewed.

The entire Measure H Charter Amendment was written by tenant's rights groups as a dream measure filled with costly taxes, fees, and requirements along with a clearly damaging lack of oversight for the Rental Housing Board who remain unaware of even the most basic dynamics of the real estate industry and marketplace. In recent meetings, the RHB has appeared confused on how to find out who owns property in Pasadena. They have also chosen to adopt rules that discriminate against property owners under the age of 60 who want to move into their own home.

**I would ask that your council make 4 changes to the proposed ordinance:**

1) Require that at least 2 council members attend every Rental Housing Board public meeting to observe and report back to the larger council what is happening at that Board.

2) Require that the Rental Housing Board stop spending hundreds of thousands of dollars of government money that will be taxed to property owners through the Measure H rules, without proper financial oversight and competitive billing. The City of Pasadena has oversight rules for all other spending but the Measure H rules empower the RHB to spend without consequence and they have chosen to do so repeatedly in the past 6 months.

3) Provide a 12 month review period that requires and provides for public comment in a way that allows the people that will be paying these new taxes to participate. As of right now, only one member of the RHB has any experience as a landlord in Pasadena. The input of property owners is vital to the success of this program and proposed department. Right now, our voices are ignored and publicly belittled by the Rental Housing Board.

4) Require that the proposed Department be carefully reviewed as part of the Charter Reform in 2024.

Sincerely,  
Adam Bray-Ali

--  
Adam Bray-Ali

Coldwell Banker Residential Brokerage

## Sabha, Tamer

---

**From:** Simon Gibbons  
**Sent:** Monday, December 4, 2023 9:40 AM  
**To:** PublicComment-AutoResponse  
**Subject:** COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA ITEM 17, DECEMBER 4TH 2023

Some people who received this message don't often get email from

[Learn why this is important](#)

**[⚠]** **CAUTION:** This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you **know** the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. [Learn more...](#)

Council Members,

I write as a resident, voter, and housing provider in Pasadena.

Today's Council meeting includes the first reading of an ordinance to create a Rent Stabilization Department. **I ask that you delay the ordinance until a formal review has been carried out by the City staff.**

Setting up a new department is a complex process that takes time. This ordinance is premature for a number of reasons:

1. The existing Rental Housing Board has demonstrated poor financial management and reporting. It has published only one financial report, that is already out of date (see PRHB agenda, December 6<sup>th</sup>). In view of the lack of transparent financial reporting, it's not appropriate for the City to take on an unknown financial liability.
2. The Board has made public statements that it may not repay the money that has already been advanced by the City (including the occasion noted below). In view of the Board's unwillingness to guarantee its repayment of public money, it should not be made a City department until this matter has been clarified.
3. The future of the Board/Department is uncertain. The ongoing appeal by the California Apartment Association (in which I am a co-plaintiff), as well as other state legislation, may prevent the Board from setting up a registry to pay for the public funds that have been advanced. It would make sense to delay adding further costs of setting up a City department until the legal situation is more clear.

I write this not to "wreck" the ongoing process of managing rental properties in Pasadena, but out of a concern that this complex process is being rushed and puts the City into a risky situation.

**Additional Note** - copied from Pasadena Rental Housing Board agenda for December 6<sup>th</sup>, Item 4, memorandum from Goldfarb Lipman Attorneys:

*"FISCAL IMPACT: The request for an additional advance will enable the PRHB to continue to meet its expenses while it establishes the Rent Stabilization Department and implements the Charter Amendment. It is not clear whether the City will request repayment of the advance once the PRHB begins to collect the Rental Housing Fee, but any repayment plan will be part of the budget and must consider the needs for paying the PRHB normal and reasonable costs."*

**Simon Gibbons** (he, him)  
Finance Officer



1. What if costs overrun? Who pays? Who is liable?
2. What if there are lawsuits? Who pays? Who is liable?
3. The PRHB has already stated that it may not repay the money that was ALREADY advanced by the city. This should be clarified before any further steps are taken.
4. If the PRHB has final say over city hires for their new department (as stated in the proposed ordinance), how will this follow established city hiring processes?

All of these questions could and should be investigated and answered within the reasonable pause of six months. The public deserves to know.

Sincerely,

Tyler Werrin