**[Relocation Fees or Relocation Benefits Form Letter]**

***This is a template that may be used to write a letter to any elected officials or editors of local papers regarding RELOCATION FEES. We encourage you to revise the letter in your own words.***

Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

*Name and/or Title*

*Company
Address
City, State Zip Code*

Re: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Agenda Item \_\_\_\_)

Dear \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_:
***(Insert “Editor” or “Hon. Mayor ‘Last name’ and Members of the ‘Name of City’ City Council” or other name)***

 My name is \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, and I am a responsible housing provider in the City of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. I am writing this letter to express my strong opposition to the City Council’s consideration of imposing **[‘relocation fees’ or ‘relocation benefits’ or ‘relocation assistance for renters’]**. Imposing any requirement to pay **[‘relocation fees’ or ‘relocation benefits’ or ‘relocation assistance for renters’]** will hurt the smaller, “mom and pop” rental property owners like me **[us]**, who simply do not have the means to pay such large lump sums. **[I have lived in the City of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_\_ years, and I wish to continue providing housing for individuals and families in the \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ community.]**

 **[Explain how long you have owned rental property and/or became a rental property owner, and how you have been a responsible housing provider.]**

**Exhibit A.**  I have been a rental property owner for \_\_\_\_ years. I have [had] worked 9:00 to 5:00 jobs my entire life, and after much sacrifice, I [we] finally saved up enough money to buy a \_\_\_\_\_\_ unit apartment building in the City of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ in \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. I have not raised my rent for \_\_\_\_\_\_ years, and I am one of the many that provide housing under market value in the area. I am [we are] not in the eviction business, and my [our] desire is to never evict renters but rather to provide housing for those who need it in our community.

 However, imposing the burden of **[‘relocation fees’ or ‘relocation benefits’ or ‘relocation assistance for renters’]** on property owners, particularly the small, “mom and pop” owners, will unfairly punish those who provide affordable housing for the city. The proposal regarding **[‘relocation fees’ or ‘relocation benefits’ or ‘relocation assistance for renters’]** simply serves to financially enrich renters who are not in need at the detriment of rental housing providers. In many cases, renters are better financially situated and have greater liquidity than the property owners themselves. Additionally, compared to large corporate owners, owners of the smaller unit buildings simply do not have unlimited financial resources to easily pay lump sums of money to their renters.

 **[Please state your opposition to the measure and explain why/how detrimental this measure would be on small rental property owners like yourself. See examples on the attached, Exhibit A.]**

Thank you for your consideration. If you have any questions, please call me at (\_\_\_) \_\_\_-\_\_\_\_ or email me at \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_@\_\_\_\_\_.\_\_\_\_\_\_.

 Sincerely,

 *Your Name*

**Exhibit A – Additional Commentary on Relocation Fees**

1. I want to emphasize that adopting a relocation assistance measure will be detrimental to “mom and pop” rental property owners like me, who have been providing the bulk of affordable housing units in \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. Why must I **[we]** be punished for being responsible property owners? I wish to continue providing affordable housing for the community, but I will not be able to continue with the Council’s excessive regulations that inflict massive financial burdens on “mom and pop” owners. If implemented, this regulation will force many to leave the industry and further deplete the already limited affordable housing supply available in \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. Therefore, I strongly oppose any ordinances or resolutions that require relocation assistance for those who do not need it.
2. Please stop this insanity and stop inflicting so much pain on the small, “mom and pop” rental property owners, many of whom are retirees, single parents and/or have lower incomes than the very renters you seem to always want to protect at great expense to housing providers in your city.Don’t make things any worse for rental property owners. Enough is enough!
3. We[I] urge[s] council members to establish a narrowly tailored relocation assistance proposal, targeted to assist low income renters in financial need. Relocation fees should be based on actual financial need (e.g., income, liquidity and assets test) and only for renters in good standing under their lease. The threshold for assessing need should include household income of either 200% Federal Poverty Level or 80% Average Median Income (AMI). The amount of relocation assistance should be based on actual rent paid or U.S Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Fair Market Rent. In addition, its applicability should be further limited to new rental property owners, during the first year following a change in ownership. Small rental housing providers with ten or fewer units should be excluded as they do not have the same resources as large corporate owners who own hundreds or thousands of units. Small rental housing providers fulfill an important role in the multifamily housing industry. Placing this financial burden on “mom and pop” owners will force many to leave the industry and further deplete already limited affordable housing available in the Los Angeles area.

Thank you for your consideration.

1. Not only does the City of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ ordinance include price controls that “cap” rent increases to some untenable amount each year, owners will be forced to make what will amount to extortion payments to renters we desperately wish to vacate our units. These extortion payments take the form of so-called relocation benefits equal to at least two months’ rent plus $1,000. Now, the authority over the management of Culver City’s rental properties, which used to be guaranteed by traditional property rights, might now be placed in the hands of that once in a while problem renter in a building who ruins it for everyone else (and who hasn’t had a neighbor like that at one time or another?).

 This proposed ordinance clearly places a giant hurdle in the path of rental property owners ending month-to-month leases with renters who are, for example, extremely abusive to their neighbors, may be conducting criminal activity at their property or creating some other type of disturbance. By requiring that we pay such large sums of our hard-earned money to nuisance tenants merely for the privilege of discontinuing an already-expired lease will flip the management dynamic in every single rental building in the City. The right to be the biggest offender and nuisance in the building, with total immunity, has now been protected by law. “Mr. (or Ms.) Jerk” will now know that the worse he or she conducts himself or herself, the closer they get to a pay day.

To make matters worse, the City of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ has compiled a list of ‘just causes’ for eviction, including standard breaches of a lease, like failure to pay rent, commission of a serious crime (like drug dealing, a weapons offence, or domestic violence), or being a nuisance to neighbors. Unfortunately, if you speak to any landlord-tenant law attorney in a city with ‘just cause’ eviction rules, the list of just causes is nearly unenforceable (and going to court in any event is far more costly and time consuming than the mere extortion money being packaged by City Council as “relocation fees” owners will now be forced to shell out on a mere 60-day notice. City Council is creating a nightmare scenario for all \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ City’s property owners.