

From: Bijan Amini <bijan@questrealestate.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 22, 2018 10:43:26 AM
To: Diane Papan
Subject: Mandatory "Relocation Payments"

Honorable Deputy Mayor Papan,

I am writing to you to let you know how "relocation payments" and "economic displacement" will hurt and cause hardship for most of us as "everyday mom and pop landlords".

- Most of rental properties are owned by small investors (mom and pops who live in this are).
- These rental properties are primary if not the only source of income for our retirements.
- If as a landlord we have to pay "relocation payment" and "economic displacement" either will put us out of business or the rent prices had to be increased. either scenario will neither help the renters nor the moms and pops landlords nor the economy of the City.
- San Mateo voters spoke clearly in 2016 (over 61%) rejecting the rent control and "relocation payments".
- Mandatory "relocation payment" will hurt the small property owners, taking their retirement from them.
- Mandatory "relocation payment" will be forced to sell their property – which will be purchased, remodeled, and the rents will be raised, forcing out long-time San Mateo residents.
- Relocation payment policy does NOT create more housing. It only serves to solve a problem created by a handful of people.

Respectfully,
Bijan Amini



Bijan Amini
Broker
Cell: [\(650\) 888-7888](tel:6508887888)
e-Fax: [\(650\) 352-9055](tel:6503529055)
Office: [\(650\) 343-4824](tel:6503434824)
www.QuestRealEstate.com
Quest Real Estate
1201 Howard Ave, Suite 102
Burlingame, CA 94010
CalBRE 01717506

From: Vickie Banti <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, August 22, 2018 3:04:00 PM
To: Diane Papan
Subject: tenant relocation

Dear Deputy Mayor Papan,

It has come to my attention that the council is considering relocation payments for tenants of rental property. I own a duplex in San Mateo, It is my retirement investment. Other than my home in Foster City (I was born and raised in San Mateo) this is the only property I own. I am nearing retirement. My cash savings are minimal. If I were to have to pay relocation payments to a tenant representative of 3 or more months of market rent, it would profoundly effect my financial being. After measure Q was defeated soundly, I do not understand why this is being brought up again. Large, multi-family corporate owners are one thing, but to put this burden on someone who simply chose to invest in real estate vs. the stock market, is unfair. Measure Q included duplexes that were not owner occupied, again, so unfair. When considering financial impact on families, isn't it prudent to consider both sides of this issue and all families? I am a middle class citizen who works hard, pays taxes and does the right thing. I implore you and the rest of the City Council to do the right thing for all citizens. Protect the "mom & pop" property owner from losing their properties and financial well being by not imposing relocation payments or rent control.

Vickie L. Banti

[REDACTED]

From: Ray DiFruscio [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 21, 2018 6:19:40 PM
To: Diane Papan
Subject: tenant protection

- San Mateo voters have spoken about their opposition to relocation payments with a loud voice. In 2016, we defeated Measure Q – which included “relocation payments” – with 61% of the vote.
- Most “Mom & Pop” landlords **cannot** afford expensive relocation packages.
- Mandatory Relocation payments will increase rental rates substantially, which will increase the cost and decrease the availability of affordable housing in San Mateo.
- Small property owners, with low rents, will be forced to sell their property – which will be purchased, remodeled, and the rents will be raised, forcing out long-time San Mateo residents.
- For many Mom & Pop owners, their small building is their retirement. Forcing them to pay relocation payments is taking their retirement from them.
- Relocation payment policy does NOT create more housing. It only serves to solve a problem created by a handful of people.

Ray DiFruscio
Realtor
P.O. Box 4097, Foster City, CA 94404

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: Manuel Grech [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, August 23, 2018 12:54:03 PM
To: Diane Papan
Subject:

Dear council member

We are writing this letter to let you know how we feel about the tenant protection measure being considered for San Mateo renters

We are retired and on a fixed income , our monthly social security does not even come close to able us to stay in our home in San Mateo
if it were not for our long term planning and hard work to purchase our rental property over twenty years ago we would have to move out of San Mateo.

We understand and empathize with renters in our city but we also feel that having mom and pop landlords pay for rent and relocation services is not fair and puts undue hardship on people like us who depend on our rental property for a decent living.

The rental problems are a county and statewide problem that can't be solved by singling out a group of people who did not create the problem in the first place, if the city wants to help renters by rent control or relocation expenses then it should be done by a tax on everyone including commercial properties since they are severely under charged because of prop 13 which allows them to keep the low tax rates even when properties are turned over to new owners.

Please consider the hardship you will cause small rental property owners before you act.

Thank You
Manuel & Leslie Grech
San Mateo Ca,

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, August 21, 2018 9:35:33 PM

To: Rick Bonilla; Diane Papan; Maureen Freschet; Joe Goethals; Eric Rodriguez

Subject: Tenant Protections; things to consider

Dear San Mateo Council Members;

Before implementing any new ordinances or regulations on housing providers, please consider the following:

- 1) The cities of Los Angeles, San Jose & Beverly Hills are currently facing expensive federal civil lawsuits over their rent registry ordinances and Berkeley is likely to follow suit soon. San Mateo would be wise to see how those suits are decided before going down this path.
- 2) Relocation Payments to tenants for 'economic displacement' may benefit a few renters in the short term at great cost to future renters. Owners will not fall into that trap twice and will be far more economically selective of future tenants.
- 3) Housing providers are effectively creditors and have every incentive to begin underwriting new tenants in a similar fashion to how banks underwrite borrowers. In addition to credit scores, income, employment history, and rental history, housing providers will be wise to evaluate total assets, liquid assets and total debt of perspective tenants. This will weed out those with potential future economic problems that may cause losses.

Please exercise prudence and wisdom in your decisions. Today's housing crisis is an accumulation of long-term, unintended consequences of ill-conceived zoning and housing regulations which have artificially restricted supply.

Please do not make the mistake of doubling-down on failed policies. A small percentage of owners who are Mom and Pop housing providers did not create the housing crisis and cannot be expected to carry the burden on their own.

Best regards,

Dean Hotop

From: Lamont, Jeffrey <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, August 27, 2018 5:30:35 PM
To: Rick Bonilla; Diane Papan; Maureen Freschet; Joe Goethals; Eric Rodriguez
Subject: Tenant Relocation Payments - Why It's a Bad Idea!

Mayor & Council Members,

I was informed that there is a Study Session scheduled for Tuesday, September 4th to discuss Tenant Relocation Payments...

Let me tell you why Tenant Relocation Payments are a Horrible Idea!

1. Most "Mom & Pop" landlords cannot afford expensive relocation packages. For many small operation property owners, the tenant relocation payments being discussed would be more that some landlords in annual rents. I had a property owner I know describe how all of his tenants on his 4 unit building make more money annually than he does and that paying relocation fees would be a big financial burden on him. *On a personal note*, a few years ago myself and my wife wanted to move back to our home in San Mateo from the Coast to be closer to the board and care home that my elderly dad was living at that time. At that time the Council was considering a similar tenant relocation which would have resulted in us having to pay our tenants \$32,000 in relocation fees for us to move back into our own home. A very inequitable thing in my view. I spoke passionately against the idea and thankfully the Council voted it down. We did move back into our San Mateo home and were able to spend quality time with my dad until he passed away last year.
2. Make no mistake about it Tenant relocation ordinances are a form of Rent Control... Need I remind you that San Mateo voters have spoken about their opposition to rent control and relocation payments with a loud voice. In 2016, Measure Q was resoundingly defeated – which included "relocation payments" – with 61% of the vote.
3. Mandatory Relocation payments will increase rental rates substantially, which will increase the cost and decrease the availability of affordable housing in San Mateo. Relocation payment policy does NOTHING create more housing. It only serves to solve a problem created by a handful of people.
4. For many Mom & Pop owners, their small building is their retirement. Forcing them to pay relocation payments is taking their retirement from them.

*Best Regards,
Jeff*



Jeff LaMont

San Mateo Resident, Property Owner & Registered Voter

From: Erin Macias <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, August 21, 2018 8:47:38 PM
To: Diane Papan
Subject: tenant protections

Dear Deputy Mayor Papan,

I wanted to briefly share my thoughts on this important issue. Tenant protections are incredibly important and should be carefully considered. When I was a young renter, my landlord had me sign a six month lease for \$600 a month and then he sharply increased my rent to \$950 at the expiration of my lease. As a young and single working woman who had just bought her first car, I was not able to make the adjustment and moved to a less expensive area. It was my one and only experience with an unscrupulous landlord and we all know they do indeed exist. Without question, we need various contributors to the workforce and to have a variety of income levels as a healthy diverse and inclusive community. There are a few issues that caught my attention in the Study Session for comment.

First zoning changes should simply not take place unless there is a crisis. When a family for a residence or business for profit invests in a community they expect that the zones will remain constant for those neighborhoods. The cost of housing is not a crisis, it is a result of a beautiful place to live with the best weather in the United States, fabulous food, a nice diverse climate and high paying jobs. The consequence of industry should not affect zoning. Forced socio-economic diversity in affluent neighborhoods perpetuates racism and creates a culture of entitled haves vs have-nots. We do not need to polarize our local community, our nation is already divided.

My other concern is relocation payments. Look at the legal disputes in SF and the cost of paying someone to move out of a family owned apartment. A family cannot move their adult daughter into their own apartment building in SF without a six figure relocation payment for the tenant? A wife who leaves her husband cannot move into her father's building without him paying to relocate his tenant? How about a six month or even a one year notice instead so the tenant has enough time to save and relocate? One commonly overlooked part of the discussion is that renting is not stable housing and should not be considered such. Renters are mobile by nature and it motivates people to find forever homes and invest in communities they care about. Not everyone can afford to live in this area and public transit, trains, BART and shuttles are as important to the housing conversation as housing itself. The goal is to have affordable accessible housing to residents of all income levels so they can afford to BUY and stay in one location so they can use that asset for their comfort and financial security.

Based on my own experience as a renter, I have always thought that the notice periods for rent increases were too short (and friends who rent agree). I have lost many childhood friends to rent hikes. What they always wanted was to buy a condo or a

townhouse, but they never qualified. How can we make tiny houses or condos affordable? We need to adjust the income assistance levels and require a livable wage. It is impossible for the majority of renters in any area to earn enough in 60 days to relocate. Relocating is expensive: landlords should not pay to relocate tenants, but they should not be allowed to create housing displacement either. Landlords should be required to give tiered notice for rent increases. 30 days for 1-3%, 60 days for 4-6%, six months for anything over 7%. If an owner wants to occupy their own building, they need to give fair notice. If a landlord refuses to give a tenant a lease for more than 6 months, the six month notice for rent increases rule should apply at the renewal of the lease (technical but should be analyzed for something fair). We should create tenant protections that hold landlords accountable, but also not impose six figure relocation fees with outrageous legal fees on them. In the event a landlord has a crisis and needs to increase rent, (such as cancer), six months still provides both adequate time for both parties to plan ahead.

I am firm believer in the tiered notice approach. Holding people accountable for good business practices and allowing renters to make informed decisions about their housing choices is best for the health of the community.

Warmly,
Erin Macias

From: Ron Marlin [REDACTED] >
Sent: Wednesday, August 22, 2018 1:25:44 PM
To: Rick Bonilla; Diane Papan; Maureen Freschet; Joe Goethals; Eric Rodriguez
Subject: HOUSING MEASURES

It is my understanding that the San Mateo City Council is undertaking a study of various measures that could have a lasting affect on rental units and I would like to offer my perspective. I/we are lifelong area residents and have a 40+ year background in the ownership and management of small (Mom and Pop) rental units and would like to share some of our experiences.

First, I would like to say that the more layers of bureaucracy that are applied to rental housing, the more expensive and cumbersome the administration becomes. That is passed on to the tenant in one form or another. Rent control itself is a perfect example. In no city that has embraced that concept, has the quality, quantity or lessening of the rental problem been solved

Personal Examples:

We own and manage a fourplex in a city that requires acceptance of Section 8 housing. In 2 instances, infractions occurred, police became involved and adjoining tenants were threatened and in one case vacated their unit. This ultimately resulted in attorney fees, tenant displacement and turnover costs. Let the owner be the sole Judge of a prospective tenant, provided that the guidelines are applied to all and in accordance with existing housing laws. I may accept a Section 8 based upon the above and my own personal assessment of the applicant, but it should not be mandatory.

Economic Displacement costs place an unfair and costly burden on the small landlord. Having recently replaced windows in a 60 year old 6 unit building to the tune of \$13,000 plus the replacement of a roof on the immediate horizon, the ongoing replacement of individual forced air heating etc.; those costs have to reflect in our already below market rents. Result: increase in the rents, and if a tenant had to move out for said increase, we would be responsible for the relocation costs. Not equitable in any sense of the word.

Rent Registry: I'm not really sure of the reasoning or need behind such a requirement. It appears to be one more layer of management, administered by what would probably be an independent department answerable to who, at what cost, and with what benefit to the parties involved?

Demolition: I'm eyeing my 85 year old duplex and analyzing it's deficiencies and the possibility of a total demolition to enhance the quality of housing I'm currently offering. What additional hoops would I be expected to leap though to accomplish that goal.

Lastly, the real estate that we own are the direct result of a career that DID NOT offer any retirement plan, thus income property is the main source of retirement funds. Any legislation that affects other people such as my myself, are threatened by such impending legislation and seems to fly in the face of both common sense and contradictory to the huge supply of rental housing coming down the pipeline in all adjacent cities. Don't forget, we have in the past, had a market place of declining rent due to over supply.

Please apply the good judgement that you have in the past and let the natural market place environment administer to the needs of owners and tenants alike.

Respectively,
Ron Marlin,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: Clare Mullin <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, August 22, 2018 1:18:43 PM
To: Diane Papan
Subject: Tenant Protections, instead senior protection as property owner

Hello,

I grew up in San Mateo, went to St. Mathews school and Mercy High School. I feel San Mateo in my heart those are where my roots are and always will be. I have been an honest property owner but was just notified of the discussions listed below.

City discussions regarding Tenant Protections, including:

- 1) Voluntary Section 8
- 2) Inclusionary Zoning Increase
- 3) Rental Registry
- 4) Relocation Payments**
 - a. Demolition
 - b. Red Tag
 - c. Construction
 - d. Economic Displacement (tenants unable to afford rent)**

Honestly, I am appalled and terribly frightened to think that San Mateo, my Hometown, could even consider doing this to me as well as many other seniors like me who live off the income we receive from our property. We cannot go to work like when we were young.

At age 77, living alone with a lifelong disability, I still have a lot of expenses to cover including taxes and expenses for maintenance and care. If you vote for these changes, I may have to move to another state and be away from my family and doctor. I live in fear as well as I am sure many other seniors do if this possibility is truly taking action. This is absolutely taking advantage of us. Please let us live out our lives in peace.

I only hope and pray that you realize how important your decision is and how it will damage the lives of those who are trying to be honest property owners.

Clare Mullin, cell [REDACTED]

From: Brian Ponty [REDACTED] >
Sent: Tuesday, August 21, 2018 6:53:44 PM
To: Rick Bonilla; Diane Papan; Maureen Freschet; Joe Goethals; Eric Rodriguez
Subject: Study Session on Tenant Protections

Mayor Bonilla and Members of the City Council:

I understand that you will soon be holding a study session on Tenant Protections and ask that you not take any of the contemplated actions as doing so will surely add to the burden of small properties owners in your city.

Our family has owned two small rental properties in San Mateo for several decades and would be financially troubled if we were required to provide relocation payments when terminating a lease upon expiration. We have only had to this a few times but in each case doing benefited not only us but the other residents in the building. The cost of renovating a unit upon a vacancy along with the rent foregone during such time is already incentive enough for property owners to rarely terminate leases.

Adding more burdens to small investors will not create more affordable housing in San Mateo; only limiting new commercial development and building more housing will do so. As it becomes more expensive to deal with additional layers of regulation more owners will likely exit the market and sell their properties to developers who will build owner occupied housing. We need only look south to Mountain View to see this occurring since rent control was adopted in that city.

A rental registry will only add time and expense and will not increase the supply of much needed housing in San Mateo.

Two years ago San Mateo residents spoke very clearly that rent control is not desired in San Mateo. The proposed measures on your upcoming study session agenda only serve to resurrect this divisive debate. I encourage you to seek meaningful solutions to the jobs - housing imbalance in this area and not gravitate towards policies that punish those of us who provide much need reasonably priced housing.

I thank you for taking the time to consider my viewpoint.

Brian Ponty

From: Chuck Rategan [REDACTED] >
Sent: Saturday, August 25, 2018 9:30:12 AM
To: Diane Papan
Subject: Tenant relocation costs

Dear Deputy Mayor Papan,

Thank you for all that you do for the City of San Mateo! I grew up in San Mateo and still live nearby. I own a duplex in San Mateo, and I'm concerned that the City is considering "tenant relocation payments." A property owner should not have to add relocation payments to the cost of being in the rental business. As you know, businesses must somehow cover all of their costs. Future (and remaining) tenancies will effectively have to bear costs like relocation payments through higher rents. That will make San Mateo even more unaffordable.

Like many rental property providers, I charge much lower rent than the current market would allow. I try hard to make my apartments affordable for the existing tenants, regardless of what rent supply and demand might allow on the few open units. Relocation costs are expensive, and are not under the control of a rental property owner. Since many of us already charge below market rents, adding relocation costs to our many other costs of doing business would be very poor policy. Tenant groups speak of rental property providers as a monolithic group of wealthy people who take advantage of their tenants by charging top rent and minimizing costs. The reality is that most of us take pride in offering clean, comfortable apartments. Most of us use any positive cash flow as a retirement savings (or for schooling for my nieces, in my case). A tenant's relocation costs shouldn't be part of a property owner's cost structure. It's a cost that only the tenant controls, and it's unfair to mandate that his/her rental property provider must cover it.

Thank you,

Chuck Rategan
[REDACTED]

From: Steven Runchey [REDACTED] >
Sent: Thursday, August 23, 2018 4:15:11 PM
To: Diane Papan
Subject: Economic Displacement

Diane

I own a small 4 unit building in San Mateo. I have owned it for 30 years. I have sacrificed many, many years in making 1st and 2nd mortgage monthly payment to keep payments well below market price and to keep this building for my retirement. My wife and I can not afford this expensive relocation package for tenants. This will take my retirement from me. This is not fair.

Please vote no on economic displacement.

Thank you.

Steve Runchey

From: Cassandra Smith <[REDACTED]t>

Sent: Wednesday, August 22, 2018 9:13:14 AM

To: Rick Bonilla; Diane Papan; Maureen Freschet; Joe Goethals; Eric Rodriguez

Subject: Tenant Protections -relocation payments

Dear City Council,

I am over 60. I own one duplex. I live on one side and rent out the other side. I have owned this for 3 years and have a mortgage. I am still working.

The idea that I am supposed to pay a renter so they can leave at the end of their lease because they can't afford to move is bizarre. I realize this is an expensive area as I am paying for an expensive mortgage. When did it become a property owner's responsibility to pay for the renter's living expenses?

The whole idea of rent control is flawed for 2 reasons. One it puts hard working people who saved up and bought property at the mercy of people who haven't done that. Two, it doesn't work, just look at New York and San Francisco, both have had rent control for 30+ years and both are in the top 10 for rents.

Another serious reason you may want to consider not imposing rent control and interfering with free-market is the negative value it will have on property values. If I can't rent the unit for as much, then if I sell the investor will pay less. That means less property taxes, less money for schools, and programs to help people who need it.

Thanks for reading this, I hope you'll consider the long-term consequences (often unforeseen consequences) before making any decisions. I do understand the organized pressure of these tenant organizations you face,

Cassandra Smith

[REDACTED]
San Mateo, [REDACTED]

From: Tom Thompson <talltom@rwthompsonproperties.com>
Sent: Monday, August 27, 2018 8:56:04 AM
To: Rick Bonilla; Diane Papan; Maureen Freschet; Joe Goethals; Eric Rodriguez
Cc: Tom Thompson
Subject: Sept 4th Study Session on so called "Tenant Protections"

Honorable Council Members:

"Tenant Protections" ... again?

Maybe it's my blue collar union upbringing. I worked my way through college as a Teamster and take pride that it took me 5+ years, because I had to work. I was an SEIU union shop steward while working in juvenile hall. I'm no stranger to picket lines. So, when government talks about taking away any of my rights to negotiate with my tenant customers, it feels like taking away my collective bargaining rights. When government talks about requiring me to pay "Relocation Assistance," it's like threatening to take away some of my hard earned pension.

I have worked 45+ years as a mom & pop housing provider of 2-4 unit "fixers." I've put in around 90,000 hours of mostly hard hands-on labor to clean them up, remodel, repair, maintain, paint, landscape, rent and manage them. I've worked nights, weekends, holidays and vacations. It's not a joke that I often went to my other full time job on Mondays to rest up. I took grief from my family and friends for working too hard. I'm paying the price now with the daily pain of severe spinal degenerative joint disease from simply pushing my body too hard doing this work.

So called "tenant protections" have consistently proven to be seriously failed public policy. All of these measures were thoroughly vetted in San Mateo with thousands of citizen and staff hours in a task force the council created. Then, these failed gimmicks were overwhelmingly rejected a second time by nothing short of a voter mandate of 61% to 39% in rejecting Measure Q. Waving NO on Q signs on street corners was like a flashback to union picketing. Voters got it.

Does the vote of the people matter? Not a rhetorical question. With all due respect, did Measure Q matter? I am disappointed that San Mateo City Council is revisiting these so called "tenant protections," for a third time... following the clear "NO" voter mandate of Measure Q.

The thousands of honest and hard-working housing providers like me did not cause our housing shortage. Candidly, I believe you will agree that local government caused the problems. This didn't all happen on your watch. People needed jobs, so thankfully buildings for folks to work in were approved. Not enough housing has been built to match the new jobs. The only cure for a housing shortage is more housing. Not failed gimmicks like so-called "tenant protections" that discourage housing.

Please, don't blame housing providers for the predictable effects of supply/demand that result from our jobs/housing imbalance - that would be like blaming carpenters or programmers because they earn high wages. The talk about punishing mom & pop housing providers, like me, for the predictable effects of our housing shortage needs to stop.

Seriously, let's move on to real solutions. Let's build more housing.

Enough for now.

Tom Thompson
San Mateo Property Owner, Business Owner and Voter

Tom Thompson, MBA Broker

Thompson Properties

CA RE Broker License 01343030

177 Bovet Road, Suite 600
San Mateo CA 94402
Office 650/ 312-1819
Direct 650/ 678-0252
Fax/ 357-1327

Email: talltom@rwthompsonproperties.com

Website www.rwthompsonproperties.com

From: [REDACTED] >
Sent: Wednesday, August 22, 2018 4:50:15 PM
Subject: Relocation payments to tenants:

Please consider the following:

San Mateo voters have spoken about their opposition to relocation payments with a loud voice. In 2016, we defeated Measure Q – which included “relocation payments” – with 61% of the vote.

- Most “Mom & Pop” landlords **cannot** afford expensive relocation packages.
- Mandatory Relocation payments will increase rental rates substantially, which will increase the cost and decrease the availability of affordable housing in San Mateo.
- Small property owners, with low rents, will be forced to sell their property – which will be purchased, remodeled, and the rents will be raised, forcing out long-time San Mateo residents.
- For many Mom & Pop owners, their small building is their retirement. Forcing them to pay relocation payments is taking their retirement from them.
- Relocation payment policy does NOT create more housing. It only serves to solve a problem created by a handful of people.

Thank you.
Kathleen Turmala
San Mateo resident

[REDACTED]