

Mediation & Binding Arbitration Program

- 5% seems reasonable because already receiving notices for 10%
- Are landlords responsible for fees to enter arbitration or mediation?
- Is there appeal process for arbitration determination?
- Do landlords hire lawyer or is representation provided?
- Is “banked money” justification to raise rents? Above 5%?
- Should place a time limit on landlords’ ability to recoup “banked money” and should be spelled out in ordinance.
- How is 5% established? Is this tied to property tax increases? Would like to see economic analysis
- There should be process for either party to identify? in mediator and arbitrator
- Who hires/selects arbitration company?
- Believes rent increase should go to City first instead of tenant because landlord could intimidate tenant into compliance and not initiating mediation/arbitration process out of fear
- Evaluation and communication about policy is essential to have people understand rights
- Good solution
- What qualifies as reasonable justification for 5% increase? New paint? How do you keep track of paying off improvements – needs a plan
- 5% increases year after year add up and is unsustainable for the tenant
- Is there a timeline involved in process?
- Who covers rent increase? Is decision retroactive? What rent in effect at ties of mediation/arbitration process?
- Supports this policy – getting rent increases in \$ not % and believes increases exceed 5%
- Supports this policy and needs retaliation and education of tenants
- Tenants are afraid to speak up
- Language barrier – need policies and programs to be available in various languages
- Would like to ensure and include landlord protection if tenant damages unit
- Is rental inspection program applicable to Section 8 properties?
- If rent increases above 5%, the landlord should submit request for City to review
- Tie into reporting program so when rent increase occurs, City would have in reports. Would require City to know rents for all units in the city.
- Concerned about power imbalance in mediation and arbitration process
- Is arbitration applicable – disadvantages tenants
- Consider having a rent board to review disputes
- How does a family make it through this process?
- What are landlord charges for utilities – would like to see an itemized breakdown of the cost for each utility type.
- Can landlord increase rent if complex is not completely occupied a lot of vacancy?
- Is there a limit to investor profit?

- Is there a timeline for initiating rent review?
- Landlords sometimes rely on ignorance of law to raise rents. Didn't even know laws changed- how do we let people know about their rights?
- Impedes free market
- Expenses for landlord is not predictable
- In economic downturn, landlords need to defer maintenance due to loss of margin. This causes property depreciation and determination for tenants
- What is an unjustified increase?
- Government should reduce regulations
- Impedes on free market
- Discourages people in investing in rental real estate in Hayward
- This policy would make it fair for both tenants and landlords, so long as landlord is not singled out or penalized
- SF has good example – this policy lead to too much of unintended consequences and will scare off people from being landlords.
- In favor of this proposed policy
- Consider using HACA standards?
- City should not be involved in landlord and tenant issues
- Proper education about landlord responsibilities needed
- Rent increase is necessary as property taxes – insurance city fees and maintenance cost will go up and the tenants unfortunately need to pay for it
- Landlords should be responsible to submit proposed increase to City and City should verify that increase is acceptable and complies with ordinance.
- This policy would be disadvantage to tenants throughout the entire process and includes several barriers including cost, administrative, and information burdens
- This policy should be changed to rent control cap with rent review for increases above cap. The burden should fall on landlord to request increases beyond cap threshold.
- The policy that creates database of all evictions and rent increases shouldn't be tied explicitly into a rent control and rent review program.
- Rent should be increased according to CPI not on landlord's likability or whim
- Rent prices should be universally averaged nationwide
- In favor of policy because it is a good way of keeping tenants and having fair amount of living for landlords and tenants
- Arbitration team – 5 landlords, 5 tenants to hear issues and help with process
- Rising utility costs to landlords and rising labor does not compensate the owner for increased costs of 5% increase limit
- There are no remedies for landlords whose tenants are in constant violation of their lease
- City should consider enacting a rent review and mediation process only for at least 12 months, collect data and determine if there is a need for binding arbitration element.
- Mediation works

- 5% barely accounts for inflation. If you want owners to make improvements and keep up their properties, owners have to be able to offset rising costs for public utilities and increased taxes.
- Recommends 5% plus CPI with a cap of 10%
- Who will facilitate mediation process?
- Recommends giving tenant sufficient notice of rent increase – 90 days – which would allow them to search other rents.
- Mediation would allow tenants and landlords a voice.
- Recommends Home Association with yearly fee so people can up keep their yards
- Operating expenses are high
- Landlords should be able to increase higher than 5% every year for improving property
- Believes that this policy would cause further deterioration to pre 1979 housing stock in Hayward
- This policy destroys what little good faith Hayward had with rental housing community and makes Hayward poor place to invest in
- Would like the City to use another jurisdiction's ordinance as a model so it would be easy to measure the effectiveness of policy
- Rents shouldn't be based on percentages of existing rent because it is not fair to landlords who have been keeping rent extremely low for the tenants
- There should be a base rent for 1,2, or 3-bedrooms. Only rents that are greater than the base rent should be addressed
- Instead of 5%, rents should be able to increase at least 7% yearly
- This policy is fair.
- I think your limiting the increases on rents is terrible, as an owner it limits us on improvements for our buildings, apts, and units houses or whatever, and you forget the existing tenants make most of the problems and don't care about our properties and how much they destroy them.
- Everything, as an owner you are forcing us to get out of the business, and giving control of our own investments to the city and county. We are taxed, we as owners have to clean up the messes the tenants make, they are not the owners and they don't care what it costs us.
- Leave us owners to manage and improve our own properties without your input and restraints on what we can do.
- There is already those things in place through the court and county. For older units we have a lot of maint. If it's not cost effective for the properties to cover that and taxes, mortgage, employee salaries, insurance, court costs and tenant issues we would not be able to do upgrades and would have defer a lot of maint. It will also cause owners to sell their properties to developers who buyout of affordable housing and put up condos.
- I think City Counsel should go to eviction court and see what the reality is.
- Seems reasonable instead hard-line limits.

- Limits on rent increase should not apply to vacant properties when tenant leave on their own or due to just cause eviction. I NEVER raise rent on good tenants so I need to adjust rent to market value when they finally leave.
- It needs to be more specific as to what property types. If it's more than 4 units, then this is considered commercial.
- Why is this 1979 age range relevant?
- I think the process looks good but in the meantime while the tenant and landlord goes through this lengthy process. Does the tenant remain living in the apartment or house and keep paying the same rent? If the tenant loses the arbitration, the increase is established so would the tenant have to pay retroactive pay or just the new increase amount?
- How is it justifiable that the tenant has to contribute to paying for the upkeep of the apartment or house twice. What I mean is the portion of the monthly payment should have gone to the upkeep. Therefore, the tenant is paying for this lack of foresight by the landlord twice. This doesn't seem fair.
- There should be laws, regulations, and loans for landlords to keep their properties updated, clean, and can pass safety standards/codes.
- Should be 10% increase.
- Is there control on tax increase, insurance increase, utility building materials cost too? Which is not accounted for?
- Control is ok, if increase on everything else is also controlled from increases.
- Excellent
- What Alameda has and it works.
- My rents are at least \$400 below market. We have purposely kept our rents low while continuing to make improvements to our property. This action will put a halt to any non-essential repairs to our property.
- If you want property owners like myself to continue to make upgrades to our property you should NOT impose this restriction on landlords who have purposely kept rents at an affordable level. I might suggest putting a 5% cap on those rents that are at or above the average rents in the city. Punish those who abuse. Not those of us who have always been mindful of our tenants.
- I have not raised rents every year, but with rent control I feel I would have to keep up with going rate!
- I don't like group punishment because of landlords that abuse tenants.
- We purposely keep our rents low to keep our tenants. If this policy is put in place we will be forced to raise rents every year to the max allowed. Currently our 2 single family homes are 30% below market.
- You don't need rent control in Hayward.
- I support the policy as it excludes single family homes and condominiums. We have tried to keep the rent reasonable on our SFR for the interest of our tenant. We do our best to work with the tenant.
- Five percent is high, most jobs do not provide a salary increase of 5% each year.
- Yes, after you live in an apartment for 5 plus years there should be automatic upgrade.

- If you are not investing in the upgrade of the units why should there be an increase?
- I think it is fair.
- Large corporations that own hundreds of apartment complexes are the ones that increase rents without consideration for their tenants. Landlords with 2 or 3 units, who manage their own units, and deal with their tenants on a personal basis are more caring and fair.
- As Owner's expenses increase and tenants don't take care of the property, they will not be able to charge enough rents to keep the properties in good condition.
- Free Market Rents have always worked better than government controls.
- Why would Rent Control only affect Pre-1979 property?? Why punish some Owners and not others who have spent their money to provide homes for others?
- Owners should have the right to set their property rental increases at whatever they choose. Why should the city of Hayward be involved in a personal business decision? The city certainly wasn't there to mediate a lower price on the purchase of my property!
- Will this also affect how much the rent can be raised between tenants?
- I don't understand why Hayward is suddenly being targeted as if their rents are so outrageously excessive. Rental rates in just about all neighboring communities (Castro Valley, Fremont, Dublin, Pleasanton, San Ramon, etc...) are much higher and there doesn't seem to be any concern about excessive rent increases in those cities?
- The city makes a rent control plan that encourages property owners to invest in Hayward properties by doing improvements that raise the value of the community and the quality of the rental unit then you are going to turn around and change the rent law that brought in responsible property owners losing the trust and the future investment.
- Don't kill the Goose who lays the golden egg or the renovated unit!
- Work with owners and stay true to your word.
- Have to see what market rents are. If tenant is paying say 20 or 30% lower than market then maybe a larger increase such as 10% should be allowed to catch back up a bit to market rates.
- Seems reasonable to not have price increases that are too dramatic.
- The property values would go down and market would crash. No owners are int'd in Gov't control. That is why you see a mass exodus of all those who are makers leaving their California investments and purchasing in other states.
- Not letting the free market exist, people live where they can afford it. If not Hayward, then move a bit farther out, that is what most people do.
- Maybe more time on Homelessness, cleaning up the cities, getting those in to drug rehab and in job training. Not putting the burden on those who work hard to own property, but help people become self-reliant.
- Policy appears to be ripe for legal opposition. Especially since all parties have not consented to either mediation or binding arbitration. Who is the mediator and arbitrator to be? Are these uninterested third parties?

- Consent from all parties (tenants and landlords). Binding arbitration is a reach and potentially unenforceable. Current policies and laws are in place and are actively enforced by the City and the Courts.
- Why not offer mediation in an effort to assist both tenants and landlords communicate in a constructive manner? This proposed policy will continue to remove units from the rental market as landlords will continue to leave the rental industry (at least in the City of Hayward) and potential new landlords will shy away from the City of Hayward as the environment will become too difficult/onerous to operate.
- I think the policy should be increased to rent increases exceeding 10%.
- Why does this only apply to “Pre-1979” units???
- This will negatively effect units/landlords that are renting for under the HUD Fair Housing Rents as my units are. This has to be more specific or you will push fair landlords out of the rental business. That’s how I’m feeling about my 10 units now.
- This is all focused on owners/landlords and no one else.
- Not only does rent control have an effect on the housing that would be developed, but the housing that currently exists is either reduced in quality or eliminated entirely. Because some owners no longer profit from their property, they are no longer able or willing to make necessary repairs.
- If the government imposes a price ceiling on the apartment the quantity and quality of available housing declines. Low prices increases the demand for housing, meaning that there are less housing options for those with limited incomes. Additionally, maintaining low prices in one section of housing typically means increased prices for housing in the surrounding or other areas. By lowering rents on some units or forcing landlords to maintain renting units a small or no profit, landlords will recoup profits on newly vacated units, charging more to new tenants.
- I hope the City realizes that onerous or overly restrictive rules will decrease the number of rental units making the rental market tighter. Such policies are counter productive.
- I think rental increases should be based on the market in the area and not be controlled by a rent board.
- Interferes in the free market pricing.
- Promote ownership instead.
- People will stop investing in Hayward.

Eliminating Vacancy Decontrol

- Rent stabilization is regional issue and applies differently in different places
- Rents change when property management change
- Concern that landlord has to sell property for less than market value because of existing tenant.
- Disconnect between landlord and tenant – tenants expect improvements done in timely manner and tenants think landlord make a lot of \$\$
- In favor of eliminating decontrol
- This policy is an incentive for landlords to make improvements
- Market-rate rents are decreasing so landlords need incentive to make physical improvements.
- Fear that what happened in Oakland will happen in Hayward
- Request to research if stricter policies discourage people from investing in rental properties.
- Need balance between tenants' and landlords' needs
- Seems fair as long as rents can be increased between tenants.
- New property owners should be required to have owned a property for x-amount of years before raising rents.
- Request for information as it relates to tenant rights – rent increases
- Eliminate decontrol
- ADUs – Get rid of owner-occupied rule. It is an issue of supply and demand. These units are valuable for elderly, teachers, etc.
- When landlord sells complex, new landlord might not be able to keep rents of existing tenants low. New landlord should be able to increase rents at new ownership.
- These policies create burden on tenant such as requiring the tenant to initiative the process. This should be changed.
- Decontrol shouldn't be allowed just for doing simple improvements.
- Reversing decontrol is unfair to future tenants and is a loss of affordable housing stock
- Do not completely remove elimination – raise the bar of value of improvements to qualify for decontrol.
- Discouraged people to invest and develop rental properties in Hayward.
- Let free market determine rent prices.
- Leave decontrol units alone
- Freeze the remaining 1,000-1,600 units and increase the dollar amount for improvements
- Do not consider re-control of previously decontrolled units
- Excessive rent increases such as 10% should be sent to mediation
- If Hayward is seeking a disincentive for financially motivated evictions, Alameda Ordinance 3148 is a good example of compromised between landlords and tenants
- This is unfairly working against owners of 1,000-1,600 units that are still under rent control

- If rental price controls are to be put back on previously de-controlled units, City should refund the costs plus interest to the impacted property owners
- Rent control will attract more people to Hayward
- Preserve remaining 1,000-1,600 rent controlled units.
- I don't understand it.
- Is the city prepared to refund the monies to owners who bought out of rent control with interest?
- Seems reasonable.
- Again, I would strongly object to any restrictions on rent when unit is vacant because I NEVER raise rent on existing tenants. If the law prevents me from renting a unit at market value when it goes vacant, that would be patently unfair for landlords like me who never raise rent, sometimes for years! Don't punish landlords like me who never raise rent until unit goes vacant!
- There still should be a process that landlords can't increase the rent above 5%. The fact that the corrects for a unit is above 1500 or 3000 has nothing to do solely by the tenant. It is because of our society, laws, and increase cost on everything which impacts both tenants and landlords. But, once the unit is rented out the landlord will start recouping his/her loss unlike the tenants.
- The increased cost should not totally fall on the tenants.
- Rent should remain at increasing no higher than 5% which is a lot for most tenants.
- Rent control should be 5-10% on all units.
- Consider maintenance cost too.
- Should be more than 5%.
- Good
- This is total BS. I have two rent controlled units. Those rents are almost \$900 below current market. If either of those tenants move (they have been their 40+ years) why should I be punished and FORCED to keep those rents where they are. They are great tenants and I have no intention of making them leave but if they move on their own accord I SHOULD NOT be punished.
- Not needed.
- It has its good points and its bad points.
- It always starts small and a couple years in, it is like Berkeley or SF.
- Do not know enough about rent controlled units.
- Do any of the people making these Rent Control provisions actually own Investment Property?
- [The City is missing] common sense.
- Will it make any difference to make comments as it appears you've already made up your minds? This is just a formality.
- The issue mentions "large rent increases" ...need more specific information on what is considered a "large rent increase".
- If you want to make more lower rent units find more housing assistance such as sec. 8 and let all of us contribute to making housing more affordable not just the property owners!

- Landlords will go somewhere else, another city, values drop, tax revenue drop. I would never own property in a rent control district, you are punishing the makers.
- Devaluing the property, landlords leaving, prices dropping. Owners selling and moving tax revenue out.
- Should be left in place to provide better housing stock for future tenants.
- The state of CA will bring new overlaying rent controls into being in the coming months that will alleviate the potential for large rent increases.
- City should wait to see what the state of CA will put in place to see if these new laws will have an impact on the City of Hayward and assist in capping large rental increases. Currently the State has a 10% overlay over the entire state (per the CA State Attorney General Office) which is being enforced statewide.
- This is not a good policy. Owners will not invest in property improvement if they cannot be assured a return on their investment.
- This is awful! With all the rental units in the City of Hayward you are going to eliminate the decontrolling process even though it ONLY effects 1,000 to 1,600 units??? That is outrageous that the City would try to push this through to adversely effect the owners of these few units.
- Big time [the City is missing something]! If you are going to implement your different types of rent control, it should include every rental in Hayward including these rent controlled units and all POST 1979 apartments or it should effect NONE OF THEM!!!!!!!!!!
- I, as a small apartment owner, am feeling victimized as this moment with the misguided attempts to solve this housing problem on the backs of apartment owners like me. I am truly considering selling them all.
- If the owner is willing to invest their money into improving their property, they should have the ability to increase the rates to regain their investment on the property.
- This policy is an ideal way to create “slumlords” which the COH does not need.
- Sounds reasonable and fair to landlords and tenants.
- Not sure. I don’t know enough to comment.
- That is outrageous as the turn over cost to an apartment home excluding the marketing and time spent is under \$1,000 in most cases.
- Build more BMR or low income housing in your city.
- Interferes in the free market pricing.
- Let investors invest, the market determines pricing.

Filing Rent Increase/Eviction Notice

- In favor of policy / Could potentially help develop more in city and protect landlord and tenant
- In favor of policy but not strong enough
- Landlord should submit to City first and not make burden on tenant to prove unfair
- Rent should not be increased and have a threshold
- People shouldn't be charged for rent
- Current rents are very high
- Rent prices should be controlled when new management buys units and increases rent prices
- Rents are above minimum wage
- Rent stabilization needed
- Stop landlord from retaliation and tenants being harassed
- How much of a rent increase would trigger this policy?
- Additional administrative work will increase operational costs for rental unit.
- City of Fremont has rent control and rental inspection program, but Section 8 units are exempt from City ordinance. Hayward should consider exempting Section 8 units from City ordinance
- Ability for either the tenant or landlord to file with City
- Biggest problem is no trust between landlord and tenant
- Can rent increase due to tenant improvements for disabled tenant?
- Disagreement with policy because too much regulation for private property. Violation of property rights.
- Disagreement with policy because it could create additional administrative work for property managers which then leads to increasing operating costs for property management.
- Request for information related to tenant evictions and rent increases on City's website. Trends and causes.
- Request for information related to fair trade love income and rent control.
- Request for information on evictions and rent increases.
- Rent increase necessary for operating expenses and costs.
- Rent control hurts landlords who need to increase rent to maintain property and provide safe, comfortable, and affordable housing.
- Look at Berkeley to see how dysfunctional this is.
- Rent increases out of control
- Landlords have expenses as well
- Information can be gathered from other sources
- Who pays for program?
- This would cause an increase in property management expenses for the property which would eventually lead to increasing the tenants rent to supplement the property management expenses in the property budget.
- Doesn't like Government to get involved

- Punishes good landlords
- Discourages investment/development in Hayward
- Both landlords and tenants should provide information such as tax returns or pay stubs to prove hardship.
- The current 6 month mask on UD's by the County, enables tenants to go out and find housing after a UD without prejudice for 6 months. You will be taking this away from the people you are trying to protect.
- Policy should only apply to property owners with 5+ units.
- Concerns about how City will pay for additional administrative tasks
- Concerns about property values dropping in Hayward
- Will this policy cost additional \$ for landlords?
- In disagreement with proposed policy – supply and demand should control the price of rent
- How will this policy be monitored and enforced?
- If mechanisms are expensive, consider using city funds to offer rent subsidies to those most in need
- Need tracking for big corporations
- I don't like it. It makes an eviction process even more complicated with an additional step to complete. Same with lease renewals. If the city needs data, ask the local real estate offices.
- I think it will cost the landlords more money. Who pays for this?
- You can see what rents are via numerous websites. This will add more work to owners/managers and as you don't want rents to go up how will that work?
- As long as it is for collecting statistics, no problem.
- Yes, let's enact this policy immediately!
- How can I help this policy establish!
- No! Let landlord and tenant deal with it.
- Why should city get involved creating bottleneck in the legal process.
- Let things stand as it is, with approved rent increase within the city.
- Unwieldy and landlords will pay.
- I dislike rent control.
- This is just more government imposed paperwork put on landlords. If I'm going to raise rents I give the tenants 60 days notice. If I have to notify the city, so be it BUT I DO NOT want this process to extend my ability to raise rents past the already imposed 60 day requirement.
- The city should all those college students that worked on rent control to work on system that creates housing that can be built fast without fees that large amounts of time.
- Who is going to pay for the added city office? Are tenants?
- You are trying to screw the very people who provide rental units in the city.
- I am against this policy. City government does not need to get bigger via data collection.
- [I think the proposed policy] sucks.

- Yes [the City is missing something], you will destroy the desire to own rental property in Hayward.
- Don't implement any of them.
- Too much control on the part of the City.
- City would be taking over decisions regarding rent.
- [This is] Invasion of privacy rights for the Owners of Real Property.
- [The City is missing] again, common sense.
- Is this going to cost more money (i.e...head count, man hours, etc...) for the city to set up this program and monitor it? What are the consequences of not filing this paperwork?
- Rental trends are very fluid. By the time the city identifies some trends they could be obsolete.
- If it becomes too difficult to own and manage rental property in Hayward then owners will simply sell their properties and go elsewhere to purchase rental units and that will further affect the rental housing availabilities in the city.
- If this is required, it should be free to landlords. It should also be available online to upload.
- How will this data ultimately be used. Need limits to prevent mishandling and abuse.
- These policies are ANTI owners and will have unintended consequences. NO owner after working so hard all their life to own property for some govt entity to control how much to rent for...
- There is already record numbers of sellers/owners taking out their equity and leaving the area/state. More control will not work...housing affordability is a PERSONAL issue, not a CITY issue? If you cannot live in an area then you either share rent w/someone, GET A BETTER job or get a 2nd job or MOVE to an AREA that you CAN AFFORD...that is called PERSONABLE RESPONSIBILITY.
- Very expensive way to collect data. This information can be provided through alternative means rather than building new agencies specifically for data collection...monies that could and should be spent on tenant housing assistance.
- Why not have the agencies (e.g. HACA, Eden Housing) already in place that make up a large percentage of rents in the City of Hayward provide the information.
- Too expensive. Find alternative method for data collection.
- I do not like this policy. It will create a logistical challenge for both the city employees and the owners of the properties.
- Disgusting. More senseless paperwork required by the City of Hayward who can't handle the paperwork and requirements they have placed on Apartment Owners through the years with no progress to ever show for it. Just more burdens.
- Yes [the City is missing] the big picture of all these "ideas".
- I am strongly opposed to this proposed policy. I feel that it is a violation of privacy for both the tenant and the landlord.
- We would need the tenants consent prior to releasing copies of any letters or notices that have been issued to them.

- A bit mixed on this. I see the value in having the data this would generate. It might well show that the vast majority of landlords are very judicious about raising rents. But I don't really like sharing my business decisions.
- 99.9% of landlords are already following extremely strict guidelines when terminating a tenancy and some are even afraid to terminate tenancies due to the repercussions which causes neighboring tenants to move out and the landlords to lose money.
- Pay IREM, CAA, or REIS for their current market trends.
- Too much paperwork and regulation.
- Don't do it.

Relocation Assistance Program

- Great disincentive for people to purchase investment property
- 60-90-day notice should suffice
- First time homebuyers cannot move into their own home.
- X3 FMR is too high
- Request for information related to tenant and landlord laws should be on City's website
- In favor of this policy
- Eliminate the ability for landlord to recoup "banked" money.
- Burden must be landlord to bring this to city, not tenant
- Disagreement with policy. Landlord shouldn't have to pay anything for tenant relocation to move into their own home.
- Fear of "professional tenant" who tries to take advantage of this policy.
- Concerns about subleases become permanent lease.
- Recommendation to lighten regulations
- What if landlord is charging rent that is below FMR?
- Provide landlord workshops and tenant workshops on a regular basis to keep everyone on the same page.
- This causes financial burden to owners of single-family units whose property is an investment for retirement.
- In favor of policy and would be very helpful
- X3 FMR is too much for relocation costs
- In disagreement with landlords paying relocation costs
- This policy discourages people to invest and development in Hayward
- If a property is damaged due to natural disaster such as an earthquake would this policy apply and require landlord to pay relocation costs for tenant to find temporary or permanent housing?
- Consider exemptions such as SFH
- X3 FMR is too high. What is I am renting my property for below FMR and now the policy is asking that I pay x3 the FMR to move into my own property?
- When does the landlord have to pay relocation cost/fee?
- X3 FMR is not enough to relocate
- This is unfair financial burden to owners of SFH who make purchases as investments for retirement
- Is tenant relocation assistance tax deductible for landlord?
- There is no protection for landlords. Should provide protection for both landlords and tenants.
- Believes landlord shouldn't have any right to evict tenant at no fault.
- Recommends no loop holes for landlords
- How will you implement enforcement of this program/policy? How will you verify that the landlord is doing what they say they were going to do?

- Consider either or option such as providing advance notice to move-out 3-6 months/ 6 months?
- Propose time instead of financial assistance
- 30- or 60-day notice of eviction is ok, but not financial assistance
- Request for landlords and property managers workshop in Hayward
- Does this apply to month-to-month properties?
- City's website should include tenant and landlord rights
- What is you're selling your rental property? Does this policy apply? Exemption?
- Relocation costs shouldn't cost more than the current monthly rent
- If you can't evict someone for no cause (just cause eviction), then why would you need this policy?
- This is counter productive to the emergency ordinance (just cause eviction) that just passed
- Tenant should prove hardship before collecting relocation payments
- What if tenant exceeds their deposit in damages ... who pays for that?
- Recommends that if a natural disaster occurs or fire caused by resident, landlord should not be required to pay relocation costs
- Recommends that relocation costs be subject to income tax and tenants should receive a 1099 for amount of payment
- Not all landlords have "deep pockets"
- The owner should not be penalized for having to notify tenants that they must move due to certain circumstances. Providing tenants with 2-3 months to find another home should be adequate rather than requiring owners to pay three times the FMR
- This policy allows lawyers to abuse the system
- I think if this were to go thru, it should not be based on the fair market rate if the tenant is paying lower than fair market rate, it should be based on the current rent tenant is paying. Not many landlords charge first, last and deposits, my thought first and deposit are sufficient. I'm also not understanding the compliance with Government regulations, that needs to be made clear. For example eminent domain?
- What if a landlord falls on hard times, is old or ill and needs to move into one of their units and doesn't have the money to pay the tenant? Hardship clause?
- Can we do this across the board? If gas prices go up can they pay me? If I lose my job can they pay me?
- Totally against such a draconian law, especially if the owner simply wishes to go out of the rental business. Instead require a long notice (say 180 days) to give the tenant time.
- Great policy! Let's make it happen.
- Thanks and let's make this happen!!! How can I help.
- No relocation if tenant violates lease.
- Why 3 times?
- Tenant should relocate to cheaper location if unable to pay current rent.
- It is the trend.

- He'll. Those "fair market rents are ABOVE what my actual rents are. You mean to tell me I would have to pay a tenant three times fair market even if their current rent is hundreds of dollars a month below what they are currently paying? Just a note I have NEVER asked a tenant to move for a "not Fault" reason.
- Against this policy. This is too one sided for tenants. If tenants leave a rental in good shape, they would have saved a month's rent (as last month's rent was prepaid) and receive their deposit back. Policy should not be 3x FMV rent.
- Policy needs to consider cases where rent is below FMV is determining the relocation amount. Tenant has benefited from below market rent so should have some savings if having to secure a new place to live.
- [I think the proposed policy] sucks.
- Don't implement the rules.
- Just stay with what you now have.
- Terrible policy. If owner cannot move back into his unit, you are taking away personal property rights. It has always been the right of the owner to move back into his/her unit if owner needs to do so.
- Yes [the City is missing something]. You are giving all the rights to the tenants and the owner of the property will have none.
- If an owner needs to move back into his property, he should be able to do so by giving the tenant enough time to look for another place. But to force the owner to pay the tenant because he/she needs to move back is to take the property rights of the owner away. A law like this does not have a place in the U.S. And you can be sure that nobody will want to rent out his/her home on a temporary basis. Selling the property will be much better option, and there will be less rental properties. It has always been the right of an owner to move back into his/her house, if owner needs to do so. It is different if the owner wants to remove the tenant to rent the property for more money. But to move back in should be a right for the owner.
- California Law is clear on giving property Notices to Vacate in the event of what you call "Not at Fault" Evictions.
- Evictions by percentage are generally the fault of the Tenants and can be traced through the Court System as they are public information.
- You're not taking into consideration the financial stability of the Owners who are being punished.
- Ridiculous! A tenant can leave with 30 days notice, putting the property owner at the inconvenience of suddenly having to incur unexpected costs due to a vacancy (repairs, painting, cleaning, temporary utility charges, key/lock changes, property management fees, etc...) yet a property owner cannot give the same advance notice to the tenant? Screams loudly of bias and discrimination against rental property owners to me.
- Rental properties simply cannot be judged solely by the number of bedrooms. This chart for "2019 fair market rents" doesn't take in effect a myriad of factors since as: size of bedrooms, number of bathrooms, location, square footage of units, quality of appliances, amenities, presence/absence of a garage, etc...

- Not all rental properties are created equal! Nor can they be placed in a box and all listed at the fair market rate. If the mortgage, property taxes, HOA fees, management fees, repairs/maintenance costs exceed the “fair market rent” as found in the above charts then landlords will sell and that will cause a decrease in available rental units at any price!
- Rent control raises rents, look at S.F. for example!
- Yes, [the City is missing] the law of supply and demand.
- Are those the only 3 no fault eviction criteria? What if the landlord is facing financial difficulties of his own and cannot afford it, so then would the landlord be forced to be homeless himself, and not provide upkeep for his tenants? If there are extra government requirements that the landlord cannot afford and would rather have the tenant move and keep the place empty or sell, how would that work?
- This doesn't help or incentivize anybody to become a landlord.
- ANGRY, its not a govt issue. MOVE where you can AFFORD AS ALL NORMAL people do.
- Not a govt issue. It's a personal responsibility issue. PEOPLE LIVE WHERE THAN CAN AFFORD TO LIVE. WHY IS IT THE OWNERS RESPONSIBILITY TO PAY THEM TO LEAVE? HOMELESSNESS IS THEIR CHOICE NOT THE LANDLORDS CHOICE? THE LANDLORD/OWNER HAS WORKED HARD TO INVEST AND WORK ON PROPERTY FOR THE GOV'T TO CONTROL IT? THERE WILL BE BACKLASH. OWNERS WILL LEAVE/SELL AND THERE WILL BE VACANCIES AND MASS DISREPAIR.
- Will increase housing costs exponentially.
- The day this policy comes into effect landlords will be forced to increase deposit amounts to the absolute maximum amount available under the law as well as max out rent rates (which will increase) due to the absolute increase of risk associated with the rental business in the City of Hayward.
- Penalizing a landlord for providing a lower rent rate (usually over the course of years) and then using an arbitrary market rent guide to determine the penalty is egregious and wrong.
- I do not like it. This will reduce the ability of the property owner to improve their properties.
- So, my rents are \$1,000 for my one bedroom apartments but you would require me to reimburse my tenants at your HUD rate of \$1,706??? Really????
- YES [the City is missing something]. YOU ARE ALL MICRO MANAGING. SICKENING.
- It is not our practice to issue eviction notices without “Just Cause”, owner occupied units, or other items mentioned. To lump everyone together and expect them to pay for relocation is unfair and unjust to the landlord.
- Very bad idea. I can see requiring 60 days notice if the unit is month-to-month. That should give a tenant time to relocate. If there is a lease, 60 days notice that the lease will not be renewed should suffice.
- It's the landlord's property, not the tenant's. If the landlord chooses to take it off the rental market, that's his prerogative.

- This is absurd, 99% of tenants milk this system and it is unfair to the landlords. I would propose a 60-day notice of termination to provide adequate time for the tenant to save money and move.
- Set aside funds from the city to cover moving costs. This should not be put on the landlords.
- Why do it?
- Most people are responsible for themselves.
- Don't do it.

Tenant Retaliation Program

- In favor of the proposed policy and believes City needs tenant protection ordinance.
- Proposed policy missing a clause concerning repeated attempts as a form of harassment. Other jurisdictions have recognized that one tactic that comes up often is the repeated pressure from Landlords to relocate tenants with buy out funds. This form of harassment needs to be called out explicitly. Oaklands TPO does this well by limiting landlords to offering buyout no more than once per 6 months.
- Suggest that among the proposed consequences for landlords in violation include – injunctive relief by private right of action, treble damages for deterrence, and attorneys fees for tenants if win and landlords should only get attorney fees if they can show tenant acted in bad faith
- Overall, policy is reasonable. Some small landlords like single family home or condo are not professionally known and I think applies to all rental is too strict if they do not have a chance to know. City must put more effort to educate them for both landlords and tenants. Should represent both parties to not penalize either parties.
- Because there are a lot of tenants who play the system and do not respect private property rights.
- Need landlord retaliation protection program
- In favor of proposed policy
- What about tenants harassing landlord?
- In disagreement of the proposed policy
- This is already provided via State law
- Some parts of the proposed policy is reasonable whereas others is not
- Concerns about enforcement and what steps will be take if tenants violate/abuse policy? Recommends that the tenant pay a \$100 fee to start the process and they lose that fee if claims are not substantiated
- Would like to see what other jurisdictions have done
- This policy creates loopholes for tenants
- In support of protection of tenant and landlord should be protected from false accusation
- This seems to be a fair policy.
- Yes, let's make this w
- Educate tenants to respect and take care of unit
- Tenants always rely on landlord to clean their mess and dirty living habits
- Landlords provide roof over lot of people but are always looked differently
- Who or what will be the judge?
- Yes [you are missing something].
- Tenants already have protections granted by federal, state, and city governments. This is redundant policy in my opinion and NOT NECESSARY!
- No comment as I have no experience of the type listed.
- Tenants are the reason for the problems. Owners react to what the tenants do.

- Yes [the City is missing something], penalties for the tenants who disrespect the property and the owner.
- One one, not tenants or owners deserve all this proposed protection from their evil deeds.
- I do not harass my tenants, and do not know any other landlord who would harass his/her tenants in the ways that you list.
- Yes [the City is missing something], you are identifying landlords as devils, capable of anything unfair and mean.
- There are already measure in the law to prevent harassment of tenants.
- California Law is clear on Retaliatory Evictions. There is no norms because each property, Owner and Tenants are different with different circumstances.
- This is like double jeopardy. Once with the State and then with the City.
- Yes, bad landlords should be held accountable for unprofessional and unlawful business practices.
- Let's just make sure that tenants are held to the same standards.
- It's a good idea, as long as it goes both ways.
- Also need to think about landlord rights. The fact of carrying a \$500K to \$1M+ loan is not easy. The loss for a landlord can be unexpected and almost unlimited for items such as repairs or being sued, or what if tenant doesn't pay rent for months.
- GOVT SHOULD NOT BE IN THE RENTAL BUSINESS
- HELP THE HOMELESS BY GETTING THEM OFF THE STREET AND TAKING CARE OF THEMSELVES, NOT PUNISHING THE OWNERS.
- Who is the arbiter that would make these determinations?
- These are issues that should and can only be presided over by a judge.
- Leave it to the Courts. City of Hayward is not a judicial branch and should not attempt to enter this arena. Huge potential legal liability taken on by the City of Hayward, their constituents and citizens.
- I do not like it, I think the state protections are adequate.
- No protections for landlords who have tenants who do not care about taking care of our units.
- [The City is missing] everything.
- We take great pride in the maintaining our property. We do not conduct business in any of the manners described in items 1 through 8. Again, lumping all property management companies under one umbrella is unfair and unjust.
- I'm fine with it. Treating tenants properly is good business practice. Landlords that don't give the rest of us a bad name.
- Educate your landlords and advise them on the laws.
- One sided favoring tenants.
- Not a fair policy.
- Let the existing Federal & State laws handle it.