

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Victor Caballero
Sent: Sunday, April 13, 2025 6:59 PM
To: Gordo, Victor; Rivas, Jessica; Madison, Steve; Cole, Rick; Jones, Justin; Hampton, Tyron; Masuda, Gene; Lyon, Jason; Márquez, Miguel; Jomsky, Mark; Bagneris, Michele; City_Council_District_Liaisons; City_Council; Ryan Bell; Brandon Lamar; Allison Henry; Lourdes Gonzalez; RentalBoard; PublicComment-AutoResponse
Cc: Pasadena Housing Providers
Subject: City Council Agenda Item 12

[⚠] 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. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Enough is enough.

The City of Pasadena residents deserve better for tenants and housing providers.

Several questions and concerns remain unanswered.

How can housing providers provide free rent until August (or later) with no support?
These shortsighted and punitive actions will lead to furthering the crises in housing.

Why has the Council enacted this moratorium before considering any funding to help housing providers?

Why is this report coming from the Housing Department, instead of the Rent Stabilization Department that we are paying millions of dollars for?

What is the City's plan to help housing providers keep vulnerable tenants housed? How is the city HELPING?

Why has there been NO investigation and report on half a million that was paid to consultants that money basically vanished with NOTHING to show for it.

The ongoing obfuscation by PRHB staff creating ordinances that do not help tenants or landlords. It's a complete waste of money and needs to be dismantled.

Tenants and landlords call for help and get no answers, or vague answers or FALSE information. Inconsistent direction.

Start doing the hard work of helping tenants and property owners rather than hitting the easy button and passing the buck onto small family property owners.

Regards,
Victor Caballero

4/14/2025
Item 12

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Deborah Lutz
Sent: Sunday, April 13, 2025 7:05 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: City Council Agenda Item 12

[!] **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. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Dear Members of Pasadena City Council,

Pasadena City Council's handling of the eviction moratorium related to the Eaton Fires is careless to tenants and extremely unfair to housing providers and the Housing Department's response regarding funding sources is completely inadequate.

Pasadena City Council's Actions are Unfair to Housing Providers:

1. **Unfunded Mandate:** The most significant point of contention is that the City Council imposed an eviction moratorium without identifying or allocating any dedicated funding to support the tenants who are unable to pay rent due to the fires. Although housing providers are at no fault for this crisis the eviction moratorium effectively shifts the financial burden of the crisis entirely onto housing providers. Housing providers are being forced to absorb the rental income loss without any realistic mechanism for reimbursement or relief. (private citizens shouldering the burden for City Government).
2. **Restriction on Verification:** Self Certification is absurd. By preventing housing providers from requiring tenants to provide documentation to prove they qualified for the eviction moratorium, the City Council created a system open to potential abuse. Housing Providers are compelled to comply with the moratorium based solely on a tenant's assertion, without the ability to verify the legitimacy of their claim. This lack of due diligence places housing providers at a financial disadvantage and increases the risk of non-payment by tenants who may not meet the criteria for eviction protections.

City staff working for the Pasadena Housing Department should be tasked with the responsibility of processing applications for eviction protections. Staff compensation should be paid by Pasadena's general fund.

3. **Forced Legal Action for Information:** The stipulation that housing providers can only access information about a tenant's qualification for the moratorium by filing an eviction is particularly problematic. This forces housing providers to incur significant legal costs and navigate the stressful and time-consuming eviction process simply to ascertain whether a tenant is legitimately protected by the moratorium. On top of not collecting rent this is an unreasonable and costly hurdle placed on housing providers.
4. **Lack of Proactive Solutions:** The City Council implemented the moratorium without a proactive plan to mitigate the financial impact on housing providers. In collaboration with the Pasadena Housing Department funds should have been set aside from the millions of dollars

distributed from FEMA and other sources to the City of Pasadena. A fair approach would involve simultaneously exploring and establishing funding mechanisms to compensate housing providers for the rent owed by eligible tenants. The absence of such a plan suggests a disregard for the financial well-being of property owners.

The Pasadena Housing Department's Response Was Inadequate and an Insult to Tenants and Housing Providers.

1. **Failure to Address the Core Request:** The City Council specifically asked for potential funding sources to provide *rent relief* to tenants impacted by the fires. 30 days later the Housing Department's report, which focused on existing FEMA funds largely committed to displaced fire victims and homelessness prevention, did not directly address the request for funds to cover the rent arrears of tenants protected by the moratorium. These are distinct needs, and the report failed to identify new or alternative funding avenues for rent relief. The request was simple and the staff failed.
2. **Lack of Viable Solutions:** The report essentially concluded that there were no readily available funds, indicating a lack of proactive exploration of potential solutions. This response offers no tangible assistance to tenants or housing providers who are bearing the financial brunt of the moratorium.
3. **Insensitivity to Housing Provider Concerns:** By stating that most FEMA funds were already committed, the Housing Department's report implicitly suggests that housing providers should not expect any significant financial assistance. This can be perceived as dismissive of the financial hardship faced by tenants and housing providers, especially small property owners who rely on rental income to maintain a safe and stable living environment for the other residents of the property.
4. **Missed Opportunity for Creative Solutions:** The Housing Department's report appears to have focused solely on existing, readily available funds. A more comprehensive response would have put more effort forth in exploring other potential funding sources, such as local emergency funds, partnerships with nonprofits, or even advocating for state or federal assistance specifically for rent relief related to the fires. The lack of such exploration suggests a lack of commitment to finding a solution that benefits both tenants and housing providers.

In the face of a crisis we deserve action. Not lip service.

I urge Pasadena City Council and the Pasadena Housing Department to immediately implement a screening and approval process for eviction protection status. In addition financial resources should be reallocated from other areas within the city budget to directly address the rent relief for those that are deemed qualified by the Pasadena Housing Department. Anything short of taking these actions is an abdication of responsibility in this time of crisis.

Sincerely,

Deborah Lutz

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Shawna Saperstein 1>
Sent: Sunday, April 13, 2025 9:11 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: City Council Agenda Item 12

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. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Dear Council Members,

Please do not ask housing providers to again take on the financial burden of providing free housing to tenants who are unable to pay their rent -- this time due to the fires -- without financial support from the city. It is very unlikely that tenants who are not able to pay their rent now through the end of the August eviction moratorium will suddenly come August be able to pay all of their back rent. Six months of no rent payments is a heavy financial burden for a small mom and pop apartment owner. I absolutely believe those affected by the fires should receive some housing assistance. I just think it's wrong to force housing providers to take on that role when it should be coming from city, state, or federal government agencies. Grocery stores aren't told they have to provide free groceries. Gas station owners aren't forced to provide free gas. Like other business owners, we have our own bills to pay and families to provide for. Some housing providers won't survive the effects of this moratorium without financial assistance.

Shawna Saperstein
Small Mom and Pop Apartment Owner

4/14/2025
Item 12

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Marc Schiler
Sent: Sunday, April 13, 2025 9:00 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: City Council Agenda Item 12

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. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Why does the City Council support a moratorium on rental payments without any funding to replace those payments to the landlords? This is totally wrong and astoundingly short-sighted. How can landlords even keep-up units and make mortgage payments? This is raw confiscation.

Marc Schiler

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Blake Boyd
Sent: Monday, April 14, 2025 10:45 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Agenda Item 12 - Mon, April 14

[⚠] 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. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Council Members:

Housing providers continue to be burdened by well meaning but irresponsibly implemented policies to support tenants.

Some tenants need rent relief support due to the Eaton fire. But what is the mechanism to support landlords who are not receiving rent? How long would that support last?

As Pasadena already has an approximate \$5 million budget deficit for 2025-2026, is the Council prepared to add to the deficit by granting financial support to housing providers?

Sincerely,

Blake Boyd

4/14/2025
Item 12

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Housing Provider in Pasadena
Sent: Monday, April 14, 2025 11:55 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: City Council Agenda Item 12

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [important](#)

[Learn why this is](#)

[!] 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. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

To whom it may concern,

I am a small mom and pop housing provider in Pasadena that is barely in the positive in net rental income after expenses and I strongly oppose support only for fire-impacted tenants that leaves small mom and pop housing providers out to dry and possibly bankrupted.

I am concerned that there is no financial support for housing providers, who could be left without rent payments until August - or later, if the Council extends this program.

The report does not identify any City funds to pay for the Council's decision to allow some tenants to stop paying rent until August.

Please answer the following questions:

- How can housing providers provide free rent until August (or later) with no support?
- Why has the Council enacted this moratorium before considering any funding to help housing providers?
- Why is this report coming from the Housing Department, instead of the Rent Stabilization Department that we are paying millions of dollars for?
- What is the City's plan to help housing providers keep vulnerable tenants housed?

Thank you.

Housing Provider in Pasadena

4/14/2025
Item 12

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Christine Rodriguez
Sent: Monday, April 14, 2025 12:04 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Request to Prioritize Agenda Item #12

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [redacted] [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. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Hello,

Several renters impacted by the Eaton Canyon Fires will be attending today's City Council meeting. Due to their early work schedules, I am requesting that agenda item #12 be prioritized to be the first matter called on the agenda, in order to ensure those who attend the meeting are able to make public comment. Usually, matters related to rent in Pasadena are saved to the end; please prioritize this matter to meet the needs of the constituents of Pasadena.

--

Best,
Christine Rodriguez
She/her
Alternate Tenant, [Pasadena Rental Housing Board](#)

4/14/2025
Item 12