

**From:** [Gerald Ratliff](#)  
**To:** [\\*CI-StPaul Contact-Council](#)  
**Cc:** [CouncilHearing \(CI-StPaul\)](#)  
**Subject:** Rental control for renters meeting May 1st  
**Date:** Sunday, April 27, 2025 3:57:33 PM

---

You don't often get email from jerratliff@comcast.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

**Got the Hamline Midway May 1st meeting notice:**

1. I would strongly encourage you to not use derogatory terms like tenant to describe renters. I thought we had gotten rid of that antiquated negative term back in the 1980s.

2. *Your approach reminds me a lot of 47 supporting Putin while negotiating a peace deal for Ukraine. No input from Ukraine. I would suggest using a win win style:*

Get educational tools for small RPOs (Rental Property Owners) so they know their rights and responsibilities. The rent control bill put the numerous small owners on our block out of business, but not the big one. It is still there with overcrowding running the home into the ground. Is this your goal?

Maybe give RPOs tax credits for maintenance, or as a minimum certificates thanking them for doing a good job in our community, or cutting their red-tape for making improvements to their property protections for small RPOs so they remain in our city. Or give them the power to remove bad renters to help the great ones stay here- maybe use number of police calls?

3. Most of the older rental properties I believe will have a 3% rent control with your new proposal, but the biggest owners go scott-free with no rent control if they are recently built. How does that help keep small owners in St Paul? How does that help keep the lower rent from stable buildings in St Paul?

4. How does that help us keep those gorgeous older homes not only well maintained, but remain rental? Maybe loan forgiveness, or only rent control on new large properties? Or freeze property taxes for neighbors on the block?

**To sum it up:** By only giving power to one side as 47 is doing in Ukraine, it does not look well for our government and may not last without input from both sides. This is what it looks like in Ukraine with 47 in charge. *It looks like hatred to me & that is not a good look.* Use education at a minimum. You owe it to the residents of St Paul.

Jerry

Jerry

**Nonviolence is the only way to truly move hearts and create change.**  
Martin Luther King

**From:** [Andrea Suchy-Shinn](#)  
**To:** [\\*CI-StPaul Contact-Council](#)  
**Subject:** renter engagement  
**Date:** Monday, April 28, 2025 8:22:31 AM

---

You don't often get email from suki\_1@hotmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

To whom it may concern, I agree we have a housing crisis, and changes need to be made. We participate in section 8, the 4D program and have extremely low, low and moderate income tenants as defined by HUD.

The current city of Saint Paul rental stabilization program is pushing out mom and pop landlords like us.

The solutions:

1. Economics 101 teaches us, the more competition we have, the lower the prices. Build, build, build. Of every new build, a percentage dedicated to low income, extremely low income, moderate income. Also, mandate a portion of each new construction project to participate in the section 8 and other voucher programs.
2. Increase density. Allow smaller buildings to be built on smaller lots.
3. Omit the 1.5 parking spaces required for adding new units to an existing building. The 1.5 parking space requirement is waived for large, new construction but not smaller existing buildings. I would argue the large new apartment buildings need this requirement more than a smaller, existing building. Reduce it to 1 parking space per unit and allow the requirement to be waived altogether with more frequency when adding another unit to an existing building.
4. The 4D program is excellent. Keep this program funded and unlimited for all units that meet the program guidelines.
5. Get rid of the debt elimination from the "Landlords can make a profit" guidelines when requesting an exemption over 8% + CPI for raising rents. The ability to use debt and the tax benefits are the primary benefits of investing in investment properties. Without those 2 benefits, it's much more passive and profitable to invest in the stock market.
6. Allow a 20-year waiver from the 3% rent limit ordinance to also include all new units not just entire buildings built from the ground up. If a landlord can add another unit in a basement, attic or garage, this will open up another unit for rent helping the overall housing crisis and giving much needed relief for the higher cost of operating a building to the landlord.

The solutions to our need for low- and moderate-income limit housing as well as the shortage of housing are the same= build, increase density, omit the obstacles that would prevent one from building much needed housing.

Thank you for your time.

Andrea D. Suchy-Shinn  
Mom and pop landlord in the city of Saint Paul  
426 Herschel St, Apt. A  
Saint Paul, MN 55104  
651-366-8737

Sent from [Outlook](#)

**From:** [Kristin Koziol](#)  
**To:** [Greg Weiner](#)  
**Subject:** Fw: In Opposition to Changes to Rent Control  
**Date:** Monday, April 28, 2025 10:59:36 AM

---

---

**From:** Mike Johnson <michael@johnson.gg>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 25, 2025 05:56 PM  
**To:** #CI-StPaul\_Ward4 <Ward4@ci.stpaul.mn.us>  
**Subject:** In Opposition to Changes to Rent Control

Some people who received this message don't often get email from michael@johnson.gg. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Dear Councilor Privratsky,

As a constituent of yours, I am writing to express my deep dissatisfaction with the proposed changes to rent control. Because of how costly and painful it is to move, landlords hold an inordinate amount of power over a tenant's life. That power needs to be regulated. That regulation should maintain a strong focus on one of the areas in which tenants tend to be most vulnerable: finances.

I'm personally already screwed by the previous butchering of this voter approved legislation: As you likely know, a previous amendment added a rolling 20-year exemption. My landlord acquired his first certificate of occupancy for this 100 year old home in the 2010s, exempting it until the 2030s. In a time when my employer is only giving annual raises of 1%, whether or not I will be able to remain in this home for more than a year is unknowable until my landlord agrees to a negotiated renewal, likely only a month or two prior to the end of the lease. Not only that, but there is a substantial gap in which my landlord can gouge me beyond what I can afford, where it would remain cheaper to accept the gouging than pay the financial and health costs of moving.

Additionally, the proposed changes seem unlikely to solve any problems. First, Saint Paul's housing supply is so small and volatile that statistically significant measures are, at best, difficult to make. Second, Minneapolis has similar trends with housing supply, yet Minneapolis has no rent control. Third, there are plenty of old homes which received their first certificate of occupancy well after the proposed 2004 cutoff date, like the one I now live in. Finally, New York City implemented this kind of policy, and it merely resulted in buildings subject to rent control being neglected or torn down so that they could be replaced with units which could be more effectively gouged due to their exemption.

The [press release](#) states (abbreviated), "[...] this slate of proposed protections are designed to provide [...] landlords a set of rules that accommodate [...] the viability of providing housing as a business." How about, instead of promoting the viability of rent seeking of the most basic human need, we focus on increasing the share of constituents who own their homes and thus increase their ability to build generational wealth?

Sincerely,  
Mike Johnson (they/them)  
[michael@johnson.gg](mailto:michael@johnson.gg)  
[\(678\) 835-8132](tel:(678)835-8132)