

**From:** [Marvalyne Tripp](#)  
**To:** [Greg Weiner](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Rent Stabilization amendment AND Tenant Protections - Thank you ....  
**Date:** Thursday, April 10, 2025 3:33:26 PM

---

Hi Greg, Dan would like his comment added to the public record.

Thanks,  
Marvalyne

---

**From:** Dan Krivit <Dan.Krivit@outlook.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 10, 2025 3:19 PM  
**To:** Saura Jost <Saura.Jost@ci.stpaul.mn.us>  
**Cc:** Tom Basgen <Tom.Basgen@ci.stpaul.mn.us>; #CI-StPaul\_Ward3 <Ward3@ci.stpaul.mn.us>  
**Subject:** Rent Stabilization amendment AND Tenant Protections - Thank you ....

**Think Before You Click:** This email originated **outside** our organization.

Councilmember Jost,

Thank you for your leadership in sponsoring the proposed amendment to the Rent Stabilization ordinance. Also, thank you for co-sponsoring the proposed new Tenant Protections ordinance.

In 2021, I was a volunteer that supported and solicited signatures on the original Rent Stabilization ballot initiative petition. Once formalized on the ballot, I also volunteered to door-knock in my neighborhood for its adoption. Although we are home owners in Saint Paul, I believe strongly that our whole City is better off due to the passage of the Rent Stabilization ordinance. Such a policy is just one tool to address our significant housing challenges. It MAY also be just one of the many reasons for a housing supply shortage. Nonetheless, I support the proposed Rent Stabilization amendment, in part to allow our housing policy discussion to move beyond the current blame game about 'rent control' to the more significant issues such as the root causes of homelessness in our City.

I also support the strategy to link the Rent Stabilization amendment with the proposed Tenant Protection as a package. While both proposals have merit on their own as individual policies, I think the package approach helps broaden the discussion to incorporate consideration of larger harms to renters in Saint Paul. These harms are often due in part to the significant imbalance of power between tenants and landlords.

Saint Paul as a whole needs both the proposed amendment to the Rent Stabilization ordinance AND new Tenant Protections. Please continue your excellent and consistent work to pass both. We appreciate your clear voice of reason.

Beyond policy *adoption*, I also hope the City fully *implements* and *enforces* the changes. Passing ordinances is not the end goal. The goals should include increased housing supply, AND more

equitable and fair treatment of tenants on an ongoing basis. Objective measurements should be established with annual reports back to the City Council with opportunities for public comment on implementation progress.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Dan Krivit  
1071 Cleveland Ave. S.  
Unit #104  
St. Paul, MN  
[Dan.Krivit@outlook.com](mailto:Dan.Krivit@outlook.com)  
Cell: 612-616-7739

**From:** [Steve Gjerdingen](#)  
**To:** [CouncilHearing \(CI-StPaul\)](#)  
**Subject:** Renter Protections ordinance  
**Date:** Thursday, April 10, 2025 9:01:47 AM

---

You don't often get email from segjerdingen@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi St. Paul City Council,

I understand that you will soon be voting on a new Renter's Protections ordinance in the city. I would discourage you from passing this ordinance anytime soon in its current form for multiple reasons:

1) I rent out one bedroom in a SFH to a stable tenant and to me it's entirely unclear whether this ordinance is written for big corporation landlords or someone like me. It needs to be clearly articulated whether or not small owner-occupied rental housing falls under these types of laws. This council made the same mistake of not defining that when they passed the rent control ordinance.

2) If this ordinance does include small owner-occupied landlord situations, I have concerns about its wording, particularly in the section about screening tenants. 193.03a states that all screening requirements must be made available in detail to all applicants prior to accepting an application. The Fair Housing Act states that owner-occupied properties with 4 units or less do not need to adhere to the same principles of screening as larger rental operations. The way your ordinance is currently worded (under bullet point subsection A) sounds more strict than the Fair Housing Act.

This is problematic. I should be allowed to interview a potential renter face-to-face and 'feel the air' regarding them without having to base my decisions entirely on a checklist that I create and then publish. I should be allowed to evaluate their fit in my home using intuition as much as logic. Being forced to share a kitchen/bath/living-room with someone just because they pass some checklist is not right. The city shouldn't have this level of business in personal affairs.

3) I understand the city may be removing rent control for new properties in the very near future. Why are we potentially making multiple changes to renting policy in St. Paul (by also introducing a renter protection ordinance) at once after the one rent control change made in 2021 by itself already had a very damaging effect on development in St. Paul for several years after? I think undoing the harm from that one ordinance and waiting a few years to look for a positive impact on development (before introducing any new restrictive laws to landlords) is the way to go.

--Steve