From: van Deursen, Anky
To: Emily Ramos; Susyn Almond; Nicole Haines-Livesay; Guadalupe Rosas; Julian Pardo de Zela; Matt Grunewald
Cc: "ktiedemann@goldfarblipman.com"; Nazanin Salehi; Kennedy, Andrea; Spikes, Jessica
Subject: Q&As for RHC meeting, January 24, 2022
Date: Monday, January 24, 2022 1:39:47 PM

Hello RHC members,

Please find below Q&As raised by RHC members with regard to the RHC Agenda for tonight (January 2, 2022).

Kind regards,

Anky van Deursen

1. I think we need to do another special meeting to renew the virtual meeting plan sometime in February so we don't end up expired. Do we propose that during the consent calendar item? Does it have to be a Monday or could we do another day since February has several Mondays that are holidays, etc?

A. We do need to schedule a meeting to renew the remote meeting policy since our next meeting is just over 30 days from today. It does not matter when we hold that meeting just that we hold it within 30 days of today.

2. On the status report for the eviction protection program, it seems like we had a lot more folks (maybe around 36) request legal aid since our last report. What types of legal aid did they need? Do we know why we saw such a spike?

A. There was a communications error in the previous report. All clients who receive termination notices are referred to legal assistance. The updated numbers reflect this correction in reporting.

3. For Chapter 8, are we requiring the landlord to provide us with notice if withdrawing the banked increase, and if so, in what section do we state that? Alternatively, how would we know the banked increase was withdrawn if we do not explicitly require notification?

A. We do not explicitly require that a notice be given to the RHC is a banked rent increase is withdrawn but we could add that.

4. If the residents and park owners decide to go the MOU route, will that materially impact budget discussions? Do we have any clarity on what the per-park impact could be, especially given there will be a FTE headcount, potentially, to administer the program?

A. An agreed upon model MOU will probably have an impact, but the outcome of this process is very unclear at this time. We do not know if a model MOU can be agreed upon, what type of administration/enforcement by City is agreed upon, and if a model MOU can be developed, how many parks actually will choose to go that route.

5. Regarding 7.3: For the hardship criteria, is it necessary or common for the criteria that is not income based (for example: families with children, senior, disability, and terminally ill) to have an additional income criteria on it? It's is possible to increase the income threshold or even eliminate it to allow more people with those hardships to file their

hardship petition?

A. The hardship criteria in Chapter 8 mirrors that which was adopted by the RHC for the CSFRA. The non-income eligibility criteria were adopted by the RHC for the CSFRA, to allow a higher income limit for these categories. The RHC may propose other criteria for hardships that would not necessarily include income. Staff recommends to keep both CSFRA and MHRSO regulations the same to avoid confusion in administrating both programs.

6. Regarding 7.5: Is one FTE enough? Are we deferring or delaying any work that can be taken on if we had more funding for staff?

A. Staff estimates one FTE for ongoing support of the MHRSO program will be sufficient, and will also be asking for one time start-up funds in FY21-22 for third party consultants, to assist implementing certain aspects of the program.

7. For banking hardship petitions, it seems that we are being more explicit in mentioning the means testing and guidelines around what constitutes a hardship in the MH ordinance than we were in CSFRA. Am I just missing the language in CSFRA that mentions means testing for hardship challenges to banked rent increases? If we are indeed being more explicitly in defining a hardship, what is the rationale for this?

A. The criteria for hardship petitions for the CSFRA – in chapter 7 of the Regulations- is identical to what is proposed for the MHRSO.

8. For the TRAO, if a means test was not included and instead any displaced resident was to receive the payout, would that effectively make the ordinance unlikely to survive legal challenge or do we think it would be feasible to have TRAO with no means testing at all?

A. There are jurisdictions that do not have a means test for receipt of relocation benefits and those ordinances have survived legal challenge as long as the relocation payments are not so significant that it results in a taking of private property.

9. Why is the 120% AMI the target in both (rough target in TRAO)?

A. 120% is considered moderate income. This standard was used with the thought that households above moderate income have sufficient income to weather a forced move.