

Date	Name	Opinion
7/7/2020 15:53	Scott Hesselgrave	Against
7/5/2020 5:13	Scott Hesselgrave	Against
7/5/2020 5:04	Scott Hesselgrave	Against
7/5/2020 4:41	Scott Hesselgrave	Against
7/1/2020 15:47	Katherine	For
6/26/2020 21:00	Sarah	Against
6/26/2020 20:37	Sarah	Against
6/26/2020 19:31	Sarah	For
6/26/2020 11:45	Emily	Against
6/24/2020 20:16	Charles Tiller	Against
6/24/2020 20:00	Charles Tiller	Against
6/23/2020 17:11	bMv	For
6/23/2020 16:48	Lin Qian	Against
6/23/2020 15:59	Lin Qian	

6/19/2020 13:17	Scott Hesselgrave	Against
6/19/2020 12:55	Scott Hesselgrave	Against
6/19/2020 12:43	Scott Hesselgrave	Against
6/18/2020 10:02	SharonSen64	Against
6/17/2020 22:45	Tina Connelly	Against
6/17/2020 21:31	Scott Hesselgrave	Against
6/17/2020 21:15	Scott Hesselgrave	Against
6/17/2020 21:13	Scott Hesselgrave	
6/17/2020 21:10	Scott Hesselgrave	Against
6/17/2020 19:35	Ronda Isakson	Against
6/17/2020 19:33	Scott Hesselgrave	Against
6/17/2020 19:29	Scott Hesselgrave	Against
6/17/2020 19:21	Scott Hesselgrave	Against
6/17/2020 19:20	Scott Hesselgrave	Against
6/17/2020 19:17	Scott Hesselgrave	Against
6/17/2020 19:05	Ronda Isakson	Against
6/17/2020 18:36	Scott Hesselgrave	Against
6/17/2020 18:33	Scott Hesselgrave	
6/17/2020 18:32	Scott Hesselgrave	

6/17/2020 18:30	Scott Hesselgrave	
6/17/2020 18:27	Scott Hesselgrave	Against
6/17/2020 18:26	Scott Hesselgrave	Against
6/17/2020 18:24	Scott Hesselgrave	Against
6/17/2020 16:15	Luke	Against
6/16/2020 20:38	Ronda Isakson	Against
6/15/2020 10:31	Concerned Neighbors	Against
6/13/2020 14:43	Cha Moua	Against
6/13/2020 1:12	Chelsea	For
5/20/2020 10:31	Salina Amey	Against
5/20/2020 10:31	Salina Amey	Against
5/19/2020 16:10	James Wilkinson	For
5/15/2020 0:34	Eric Lein	Against

5/14/2020 22:24	Chad Skally	Against
5/14/2020 22:24	Chad Skally	
5/14/2020 22:23	Chad Skally	Against
5/14/2020 22:22	Chad Skally	Against
5/13/2020 20:55		Against
5/13/2020 5:01	Jeff	Against
5/12/2020 16:36	Bill	Against
5/12/2020 15:48	Michael Behan	Against
5/12/2020 15:24	Chris	Against
5/11/2020 17:25	Telee	
5/11/2020 17:23	Telee	Against

5/11/2020 17:21	Telee	Against
5/11/2020 17:10	Telee	
5/11/2020 17:06	Telee	Against
5/11/2020 16:57	Telee	Against
5/11/2020 16:52	Telee	
5/11/2020 16:49	Telee	Against
5/11/2020 16:46	Telee	Against
5/11/2020 16:44	Telee	Against
5/11/2020 16:42	Telee	Against
5/11/2020 16:39	Telee	
5/11/2020 16:33	Telee	
5/11/2020 16:29	Telee	Against
5/11/2020 16:26	Telee	Against
5/11/2020 16:23	Telee	
5/11/2020 16:21	Telee	
5/11/2020 16:18	Telee	

5/11/2020 16:16	Telee	
5/11/2020 16:13	Telee	Against
5/11/2020 16:08	Telee	Against
5/10/2020 17:03	Danette Lincoln	Against
5/8/2020 5:25	Bill	For
5/6/2020 19:35	Tim B	For
5/5/2020 20:58	Simon O.	For
5/5/2020 19:09	Patty McDonald	Against
5/4/2020 17:35	Jerry Ratliff	Against

5/1/2020 16:26	Chad Skally	Against
4/29/2020 15:53	Adam Fitzpatrick	For
4/21/2020 23:41	Charles Tiller	Against
4/18/2020 16:01	Barbara Sarapas	For
4/16/2020 1:27	Bill Johnston	For
4/14/2020 18:56	Nancy Sabin	For
4/13/2020 23:09	Abdulrahman Wako	For
4/7/2020 18:44	John Slade	For
3/29/2020 21:45	Jasmine Parker	For
3/25/2020 21:42	Tram	For
3/25/2020 0:34	Ben W	For
3/23/2020 18:21		
3/21/2020 23:43	Eric L	Against

3/21/2020 14:55	Melissa Wenzel	For
3/18/2020 16:59	Alyssa	Against
3/17/2020 18:24	Terry King	
3/15/2020 4:59		Against
3/14/2020 18:49	Betsy Mowry Voss	For
3/13/2020 21:38	Barb Lager	Against
3/13/2020 20:27	Ramsey	Against
3/13/2020 19:02	Ellen	Against
3/13/2020 19:01	Danette Lincoln	Against
3/13/2020 18:27	Danette Lincoln	Against
3/11/2020 20:49	Charles Borden	Against

3/11/2020 20:15	G Brooks	Against
3/11/2020 18:41	Bob B	
3/11/2020 16:30	Tim Wheeler	Against
3/11/2020 15:36	Tou H	Against
3/11/2020 14:51	Bob B	
3/11/2020 8:36	Topper	Against
3/11/2020 5:20	Meng Her	Against
3/11/2020 5:15	Mai Bao Xiong	Against
3/11/2020 4:20	Tony	Against
3/11/2020 3:32	Adam J Wiensch	Against
3/11/2020 3:29	Adam J Wiensch	Against
3/11/2020 3:23	Adam J Wiensch	Against
3/11/2020 3:21		Against
3/11/2020 3:21	Adam J Wiensch	Against

3/11/2020 1:55	Jeffery T	Against
3/11/2020 0:52	Teng	Against
3/10/2020 23:56	Mary Vang	Against
3/10/2020 22:28	Jamie Hendricks	Against
3/10/2020 19:37	Daniel Ph.	For
3/10/2020 18:19	Chue	Against
3/10/2020 17:19	Tou Fang	Against
3/10/2020 15:52	Bruce Clark	
3/10/2020 13:39	Fong	
3/10/2020 2:00	Alisa Lein	Against
3/9/2020 23:10	Scott Hesselgrave	Against

3/9/2020 22:59		
3/9/2020 19:30	Robert	For
3/8/2020 8:36	Eric Lein	Against
3/8/2020 7:56	Yer	Against
3/8/2020 3:37	Lori N Purdy	Against
3/7/2020 15:11		5 Against
3/7/2020 0:32	Diane schray	Against
3/6/2020 22:46	Richelle Schenfeld	Against

Comment
An omnibus ordinance of this magnitude should be published in full in the St Paul Pioneer Press for full transparency for a well informed proper public hearing. It was obvious from the limited selected telephoned testimonies that many people are unaware of the ordinance"s contents and context. Those most effected by economic disparity may not have access to
Since, under this new law, landlords will be mandated to rent to dangerous convicted felons, the city should provide liability protection to landlords for occurrences where they are required to rent to a convicted criminal, and that criminal
An omnibus ordinance of this magnitude should be shown transparently to all St Paul citizens by printing the full text of the ordinance in the Saint Paul Pioneer Press. Those most impacted may not have convenient access to view it. Most people are unaware of this Legistar page, and how to navigate it, especially those who lack resources. The cost of this printing should be negotiated with the newspaper, the balance should be paid from the trust fund which was provided to perform research due diligence on the issues and impacts of the ordinance. THEN, a better informed, proper, less limited public
If advance notice to the city of intent to sell any NOAH property is mandated, then that list of notices should be immediately accessible to all St Paul citizens, fully transparent for no collusion.
Housing disparities are a major way racism and other forms of oppression show up and are exasperated in St. Paul - I fully support these protections as one step toward undoing these systemic issues and creating a more equitable St. Paul!
Sec. 193.05(a)(3) allows a landlord to evict tenants at the end of a lease for lease violations. I can envision a tenant attempting to overstay by disputing warnings he received about violations. In such a dispute, would the landlord need to
Sec. 193.04(3)(c) reads "If a landlord uses a minimum income test requiring an income equal to two and half (2.5) times the rent or higher, the landlord must allow an exception to that test where the applicant can demonstrate a history of successful rent payment with the same or lower ratio of income to rent." My test is 33% of the combined income of the renters, usually three unrelated adults. This provision seems to imply that a single applicant can contest the entire income
Sec. 193.04(b)(1) provides criteria for evaluating the criminal background of applicants. The criteria are detailed enough to be useful. I plan to use the criteria and reference this section of the ordinance, should it pass, in the "how we screen"
The city is infringing on private property owners constitutional rights by using unreasonable police power to take control of their property through regulation without compensation. If they vote this ordinance in, they will only be costing its property owners and tax payers MORE money to fight it in court. WORK WITH your influential community, not against it.
As a long-time St. Paul citizen and landlord: (1) the City has no right to control tenant screening so long as I do not do so discriminatively toward protected classes based on state law; (2) the City has no right to force me to continue a private contract past the end date agreed to by the parties - for any reason; (3) the City has no right to prevent me from selling my property when I choose with whatever notice meets state statute and the lease; (4) The City does not cover the costs incurred by tenants skipping the final rent or the repairs after destructive tenants leave, so the City has no stake in controlling how I protect myself from financial risk via the security deposit; (5) the City will cause rents to rise and
I listened to a recording of the public hearing today (which skirted the very edge of open meeting laws). The most recent edition of the ordinance is hardly improved from the flawed original. The ordinance is so amateurishly drafted that it still does not even state which rental properties it would apply to or exempt. Moreover, it is a one-sided punitive ordinance directed at discouraging equity in St. Paul; guess what: no owner, no rental - affordable or otherwise. Once this ordinance passes, as the council has signaled, the City had best prepare its lawyers for the inevitable lawsuits and costly losses. Our state is quite clear on landlord obligations, and this ordinance far oversteps the city's legal authority to interfere with
If landlords are using socially and racially equitable practices, and are following the law with their efforts, these Ordinances should have no effect on how they do business. If not now, when? When homelessness increases? When more of our community members of color are evicted? When more children are sleeping in cars with their parents? The Ordinances set I've been a tenants much longer than I've been a landlord. Most landlords have been tenants at certain stages of our lives.
Providing affordable housing is one of my goals being a landlord. So landlords understand both sides. I doubt city council who proposed this has any experience being a landlord or even a property manager. I appreciate the effort of Public Housing Projects decades ago, which were true efforts to take on the problem. The failure was also the proof that
"the City created the Affordable Housing Trust Fund, with five objectives: to meet the needs of those with the lowest incomes by increasing supply; to invest in low and moderate income residents by investing in existing supply; to explore innovative approaches to meeting housing needs; to build wealth for residents and communities; and to promote fair access to housing for us all" Does this ordinance address any of these? For the last goal, could the city provide some cases

In psychological terms, the overall effect of this collection of offensive defenses will be destabilizing to the city, creating insecurity among its law abiding citizens, and it will reward irresponsibility and unaccountability by removing measures to evaluate those traits in applicants. The beneficiaries of this destabilization will be the supposedly empathic organizations referred to as "preservation buyers", who hope to buy citizen owned properties with money provided by grants from huge foundations. Of course those organizations support the ordinance which will EMPOWER them, while stealing power and opportunity away from citizens' where the American system means to preserve equal power to own real estate. If the 650+% increases in property taxes over the span of only 2 decades CAUSED the supposed "housing crisis", with unavoidable rent increases to pay those taxes. That equates to systematic oppression created BY government and politicians. Landlords could not, and did not raise rents as much nor as fast, yet are now demonized by the legislators, This ordinance will have the same effect as we saw in Minneapolis when they passed a similar law; large landlords focused on high end remodels and amenities to exceed the affordable housing threshold, and developers focus more on luxury developments. In effect, laws like this create a larger class separation and more division within the cities. Therefore, it DECREASES supply of affordable housing and creates systematic oppression, which in turn prompts city councils to propose What a Waste of Cable Time Confusing Amendments, Renters Mita and Nelsie huge Conflicts, City's override State and Federal Constitutions re USSC 10-1032 titled Magnier vs. Gallagher Dirty Dealings <http://sharangel.blogspot.com> Further ?? where the hell is it freedom of choice, to do with your property to do as you see fit. Living in apartments should be a matter of personality fits because I sure don't want to live with 5 to 150 other households that don't fit with my safety.

90 day sale notice to city enables insider real estate trading by city council members, city employees, and their cohorts

Prohibiting payment of last month's rent in advance will eliminate an option which is used to accept applicants with questionable housing or credit history. That clause is systematically oppressive

Prohibiting payment of last month's rent in advance will eliminate an option which is used to accept applicants with questionable housing or credit history. That clause is systematicaaly oppressive

Stripping private housing providers of their right to discern who may occupy their private property opens them up to lawsuits from any party injured by those whom they are forced to accept into, and provide keys to common areas of their properties. Risk insurance rates will increase, thereby destroying more affordability. The Title of this ordinance is a bold LIE

One months rent does not even come close to covering turnover expenses, especially if FORCED to file for eviction. No landlord decides not to renew a lease for good tenants that are, paying rent, good neighbors and not destroying the property. Those people are encouraged to stay. If the City feels that problem tenants need extra breaks then the city should foot that bill themselves instead of pushing it off to landlords which WILL raise rents; failing to "protect" non-problem tenants. Programs exist to assist with deposits. There is no "TENANT PROTECTION" for good tenants to help them

Stripping private housing providers of their right to discern who may occupy their private property opens them up to lawsuits from any party injured by those whom they are forced to accept into, and provide keys to common areas of their

501c3 tax exempt nonprofit organizations are prohibited from "spreading propaganda". Supporting this ordinance with its obviously dishonest title should revoke their tax exempt status, especially after Mitra Jilalli announced in her zoom interview with Betsy Voss that her intent with this ordinance was to replace "for profit housing" with "nonprofit housing", City council should be required to perform due diligence research on the issue they legislate about, especially since they received over a half million dollars for that research

90 day sale notice to city enables insider real estate trading

The 'Just cause' clause eliminates mutual contracts. Only one party may sever the relationship when the relationship is unfavorable. It will INCREASE faster evictions'

It is unfathomable to me that the Council would even consider forcing any individual into signing a contract against their will, lease renewal cannot be a totally one sided option. Please provide the constitutional reference or any justification that City council states that there is a "housing crisis", while avoiding the cause of high rents... 666% property tax increase since the year 2000. THAT is systematically oppressive

'Just cause' provision will increase eviction filings

90 day advance notice to city of all affordable housing sales gives politicians and their supporting nonprofit cronies unfair market advantage. That clause should be eliminated based on conflict of interest.

City council should be required to perform due diligence research on the issue they legislate about, especially since they received over a half million dollars for that research

Owner occupied apartment buildings should be allowed to restrict residence to predatory felons

Apartment buildings fewer than 10 units should not be required to rent to predatory felons

Rental applicants should meet the same standard as employees living onsite.

I am adamantly AGAINST this proposed ordinance as it will: 1) INCREASE the cost of rental housing in St. Paul by forcing landlords to substantially increase rents to keep irresponsible tenants out. 2) INCREASE the number of evictions by not letting landlords properly screen tenants to determine if they are responsible enough to afford or decide to pay for the apartment or home. 3) INCREASE crime and drugs in rental housing and our neighborhoods by turning St. Paul into a magnet for felons and other criminals. 4) INCREASE the difficulty of removing problem tenants from apartment buildings

PLEASE WAIT – IT IS NOT THE TIME! Not only is the entire world dealing with its largest Pandemic and the resulting socioeconomic uncertainties but the United States of America is dealing with MAJOR racial unrest that was sparked right here in Minnesota. Thousands of people have lost their lives or family members and have been left with lifelong health issues due to COVID 19. The numbers WILL continue to rise. Jobs have been lost at record rates. Businesses closed. The Federal Government has issued both payments and collection restrictions that impact housing on a national level. Our Sister City is faced with an immediate crisis regarding its police force. Riots and protest continue throughout the state and

Dear City Council members, I am against this proposed ordinance. I was born & raised in the city of St. Paul. We want an ordinance that will ensure all our neighbors & community stay safe with lower crime rates. Recently, my father who has resided in the city of St. Paul, for the past 35+ years has decided to sell his home due to increase crime & violence in his neighborhood block. His particular block had seen a dramatic increase in rental properties. The tenants residing in those rental properties were dealing in narcotics & crime. These so called tenants were bullying the neighborhood block & Having experienced working with landlords and tenants I have seen both sides of this coin. In my experience, I have never met any tenant who had issues that were not brought up. All tenants who needed further accommodation for bills were also considered and even picked in some cases. I believe that the sample population used does not clearly reflect the true overall data you are trying to represent. I would argue that instead of forcing this new ordinance onto private business

Please VOTE YES on the SAFE ordinance as written and VOTE NO on any amendments that would reduce tenants protections. I support this ordinance in solidarity with the members of the Equity in Place Alliance, the City of Saint Paul HREEO Commission, the Teamsters Local No. 120, the Saint Paul Regional Labor Federation, and many Saint Paul residents including both landlords and renters, for all the reasons expressed so well in the Pioneer Press op ed written by Hernandez, Mowry Voss, and Swift: "If you're serious, St. Paul Council, approve these housing protections." Please consider that the

When pockets of neighborhoods deteriorate due to bad neighbors, good neighbors flee and the deterioration of safety and quality of life escalates. Don't make this choice for St Paul. Don't make St Paul the dumping ground for problem tenants. People who own rental housing should not be micro-managed by the City of St Paul with burdensome legal rules that will result in them being subject to lawsuits that can destroy their economic stability. We need stability in St Paul, and this is not achieved by weaponizing ordinances such that the courts will become arbiters on a regular basis. Changing St Paul rules such that there will be a constant trend toward rental properties being full of tenants that the landlords are experiencing as problematic, but the landlord's hands are tied in terms of what they can do about it. Neighbors are impacted, as well. This ordinance seeks to open the gate for more troubled people to become St Paul residents, and

Please see my detailed letter and others setting out the reasons for supporting this ordinance. The online comments are largely negative on the proposal but the written comments show much greater support. See attachment 11.

A different item, RES 20-745, highlights barriers to personal safety and cites: "WHEREAS, perpetrators of domestic violence are often gone from the scenes of their crimes prior to arrival of the police, 'gone on arrival cases,' making investigation and successful prosecution of such cases very difficult.." ••• NOW THEREFORE, today is a good time to consider how "just cause tenant protections" will restrict landlords' ability to maintain rental properties that are not neighborhood nuisances. When trying to collect evidence that proves in court that a tenant has engaged in disruptive or illegal activities, 'gone on arrival cases' will subject neighbors to long periods of aggravation. Reluctant witnesses will be called to testify, successful

what are other options? If people are not able to rent an apartment because they have poor credit, then the City should find ways to help these people improve their financial habits and credit through community outreach and education. If specific landlords are constantly evicting residents, then the City should address any issues with those specific landlords. If the City wants to increase housing for people with criminal backgrounds then the City should develop incentives for property owners to rent to these people. If there is not enough affordable housing, then more should be built. If rents are too high, then property taxes on multifamily properties should be lowered and charged at the same rate as residential

what are other options? If people are not able to rent an apartment because they have poor credit, then the City should find ways to help these people improve their financial habits and credit through community outreach and education. If specific landlords are constantly evicting residents, then the City should address any issues with those specific landlords. If the City wants to increase housing for people with criminal backgrounds then the City should develop incentives for property owners to rent to these people. If there is not enough affordable housing, then more should be built. If rents are too high, then property taxes on multifamily properties should be lowered and charged at the same rate as residential

Will this proposed ordinance cause more harm than good? As can be seen from the University of Washington's research on a similar ordinance in Seattle, 1) rents went up, 2) local owners sold their properties to larger owners, and 3) larger owners spend less in the local economy and are more likely to have higher rents. This will decrease the amount of affordable housing in Saint Paul. (<https://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/CityAuditor/auditreports/UWSRHSFINAL.pdf>) Based on the fact that 80% of the online public comments are against this ordinance, it is apparent that zero input from stakeholders were used from the "public meetings" held last April and October in developing this proposed ordinance.

Is this proposed ordinance needed? I believe most landlords in Saint Paul are actually doing a very good job. If you look at the some of the "whereas" statements in the proposed ordinance they imply a problem that does not exist, specifically: 1,071 evictions in 2017, comes to 0.2% of renters being evicted every month. This means 99.8% of renters are not evicted. Over 90% of evictions are from non-payment of rent, which would not change with this ordinance. "Stagnant wages" is not a true statement because over the last 5 years wages have gone up on average 2.6% per year, while inflation has average

Interjecting convicted criminals into safe communities will destabilize their security. Removing those boundaries is sociopathic. This legislation, with its efforts to create a protected victim class of felons, is a sociopathic law, and all city

This ordinance was written from a moral standpoint; housing is a human right. Landlords and property managers must use a practical application standpoint; "how can I apply these rules and what changes in my day-to-day operations?" The section about Just Cause For Lease Termination turns all leases into lifetime agreements on the landlords part, but not on the tenant's part. This is not equitable. Mandating lifetime contracts while also limiting the information landlords can use to determine if a tenant is qualified increases risk for the landlord and neighboring tenants. The section on Relocation fees provides a powerful disincentive for property owners to update their apartments, which leads to worse living conditions,

I've owned a duplex on the West Side for 54 years. I charged my last tenant less than \$800/mo. for a 2-bedroom unit of 1,000 square feet. I believe this puts it in the affordable range. It's currently vacant and will remain that way until this legislation is no longer a threat. The trash hauling fiasco was enough of an insult but this crosses the line. If the St Paul City

Putting restrictions on the financial and criminal screening of tenants adversely increases risk and disincentives buying, maintaining, or improving property in St. Paul. The City will become a safe haven for tenants with delinquent payment or rental damage history. One bad tenant can send a small landlord into bankruptcy. Normal financial screening of prospective tenants is a valid, non-discriminatory practice that has been upheld by the courts. Government units across the country have attempted similar measures and have experienced poor outcomes. Exorbitant annual levy increases (~10%) and ballooning budget proposals are directly affecting the affordability of St. Paul's housing stock. Putting restrictions on

This will have the opposite reaction of its intention. It will reduce affordable housing. Unless that is the intention. It also violates the Constitution as AGAIN you are trying to compel speech, which the Courts already ruled against ('voting-information' ordinance). All of these "protections" are already covered in Minnesota state. This new proposal simply increases the difficulty to operate or invest in Saint Paul, making it more difficult than even Minneapolis. You seem to be pulling wishes out of thin air. 90 days notice versus 60 or 30, 3x month rent as a relocation penalty, limiting deposits, and background checks, and eviction causes. Again, stuff is already covered in other laws. You are creating a divide between

Amendment: Pg. 8 Sec. 193.05 Just cause notice for tenants. Part d Notice requirements - Once again, this is forced speech. We are not the mouthpiece of government. This is NOT the responsibility of landlords to communicate out government policies. If we are mandated to take a unit out of the rental pool, it should be up to the government to notify those citizens

Amendment: Pg. 8 Sec. 193.05 Just cause notice for tenants. Part b Landlord responsibilities - Delete this section. This is forced speech. We are not the mouthpiece of government. This is NOT the responsibility of landlords to communicate out

Amendment: Pg. 8 Sec. 193.05 Just cause notice for tenants. Part b Landlord responsibilities - This is forced speech. We are not the mouthpiece of government. This is NOT the responsibility of landlords to communicate out government policies

Amendment: Pg. 8 Sec. 193.05 Just cause notice for tenants. Part a7 - Change notification period for rehab and renovation to 60 days. Getting contractors and workmen in place too far in advance is not realistic for small owners since many of us do not have in-house plumbers, carpenters, electricians, etc. Many of these other small business owners operate in 1 - 2 month scheduling timeframes. (7) Rehab and renovation. The landlord seeks, in good faith, to recover possession of the dwelling unit that will render the unit uninhabitable for the duration of the rehabilitation or renovation. The landlord must provide 60 days' written notice to the tenant, and shall provide Relocation assistance to the tenant upon delivery of the

Amendment: Pg. 7 Sec. 193.05 Just cause notice for tenants. Part 2a - Change the minimum times a late payment can be made before a lease can be terminated. It also makes accommodations for shorter lease periods. If a tenant is late only twice so far but has only been in the unit for two months, it is very likely that they will continue to be late. (2) Repeated late payment of rent. The tenant repeatedly makes late payments of rent, no fewer than three times in a 12-month period or 50% of the time spent in the lease. The landlord must provide the tenant with notice following a late payment that a subsequent late payment may be grounds for termination of tenancy. If the tenant continues to make a late payment on

Amendment: Pg. 6-7 Sec. 193.04 Applicant screening guidelines for prospective tenants. Part 3c - Change the minimum income test to 3 times the rent. This will be more in line with how most financial planners recommend people to live within their means for financial success. If a tenant is spending more than half their income on rent, they really can't afford that place. This is an example of how well meaning intentions setup tenants to further fail with unrealistic expectations. c. If a landlord uses a minimum income test requiring an income equal to three (3) times the rent or higher, the landlord must

Amendment: Pg. 6 Sec. 193.04 Applicant screening guidelines for prospective tenants. Part 3a - Like bankruptcies, evictions should stay relevant for similar time frame or 7 years. a. An eviction action pursuant to Minnesota Statutes Chapter 504B or other equivalents in other states if the action occurred seven (7) or more years before the applicant submits the application; however, eviction actions resulting in a judgment against the tenant may be used to disqualify a tenant if such

Amendment: Pg. 6 Sec. 193.04 Applicant screening guidelines for prospective tenants. Part 2a Credit History - adds an accomodation for medical debt and allows UD's to still be a part of our credit evaluation a. Credit score without

guidelines, it makes part I and J redundant

Amendment: Pg. 6 Sec. 193.04 Applicant screening guidelines for prospective tenants. Part h - same as last comment. this is unnecessarily confusing and with HUD already having clear guidelines, it makes sense to just use them... h. Any conviction for misdemeanor, gross misdemeanor, or felony per the HUD guidelines offenses for which the dates of release are older

Amendment: Pg. 6 Sec. 193.04 Applicant screening guidelines for prospective tenants. Part g - this part is confusing and the wording should be simplified. my suggestions is... g. Any misdemeanor, gross misdemeanor or felony conviction stemming from the following traffic offenses: reckless driving and other moving violations that did not result in additional charges for

Amendment: Pg. 5 Sec. 193.04 Applicant screening guidelines for prospective tenants. Part b - As explained to me many times by legislative staff and proponents of the ordinance, the wording was confusing. It had orginally stated that landlord cannot disqualify for ANY of the followiing reason when it was explained that it should have been for SOLELY only one of the following reasons. I believe you meant to word it this way instead. (b) Uniform screening criteria. A landlord must apply

Amendment: Pg. 5 Sec. 193.04 Applicant screening guidelines for prospective tenants. Part a - make the ordinance relevant to the times and technology by changing the screening criteria to be posted or made available (a) Screening criteria made available. Before accepting applications for rental housing, a landlord must post or make available screening criteria to all

Amendment: Pg. 5 Sec. 193.03 Security Deposits. Part a Change the security deposit to 2 months rent but makes exception for cases with extremely low rent, allowing for 3 months security deposit if the owner is charging less than 60% AMI (a) Limit on security deposit amount. No landlord shall demand, charge, accept, or retain from a tenant more than two

Amendment: Pg. 4 Sec. 193.01 Definitions. Part 15 Change the tenant protection period to 60 days (1415) Tenant Protection Period shall mean the period that commences with the transfer of ownership of an affordable housing building and runs through the end of the sixty (60) calendar days following the month in which written notice of sale is delivered to

Amendment: Pg. 4 Sec. 193.01 Definitions. Part 14 Defining Tenant to include a WRITTEN notification, lease, or contract. As it currently is written a trespassing squatter on the property could be considered a tenant. (1314) Tenant shall mean an

Amendment: Pg. 4 Sec. 193.01 Definitions. Part 13. Clarify the Single Month Rent to be more straightforward 13) Single Month Rent shall have the following meaning: Rent amount will cover from the first day of the month to the end of that agreement creating a tenancy in real property.

Amendment: Pg. 3 Sec. 193.01 Definitions. Part 2. Change the AMI to 60% (2) Affordable Housing Dwelling Unit shall mean a rental dwelling unit in an affordable housing building that rents for an amount that is affordable to households at or below sixty (60) percent of Area Median Income, as most recently determined by the United States Department of Housing

Amendment: Pg. 3 Sec. 193.01 Definitions. Part 1. Change the the definition of Affordable Housing Building to apply to 5 or more units and changing threshold of AMI to 60% (1) Affordable Housing Building shall mean a multiple-family rental housing building having five (5) or more dwelling units where at least twenty (20) percent of the units rent for an amount that is affordable at no more than thirty (30) percent of income to households at or below eighty (60) percent of area median income, as most recently determined by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development for

I believe in fair housing and real world tenant protections. The best way to protect tenants is to promote good rental property ownership, promote good tenants, and increase the supply of available units to rent. The ordinance in its current form does NOT do any of this. Instead it is punitive, unrealistic, and undermines good tenants and owners. The ordinance

After reviewing the proposed ordinance as second time, it has been brought to my attention that if a property owner wants to make substantial repairs to a rental unit that would require a renter to re-locate, two things are required: 90 days notice to vacate and re-location fees. I really have no objection to lengthy notices; however, as far as requiring re-location fees, I believe the ordinance proposal has gone too far. I maintain an A property and in order to do so, I need availability to my units. If I can do minor, small repairs while the renter is occupying the unit, I will do so; however, it has been my experience that renters are often extremely annoyed by the inconvenience. So how to address large repairs that require an

Some may claim that this hurts small landlords. The reality is that the majority of renters in the city are leasing from small landlords. If we believe we need renters rights (which I do), then we also must come to terms with the fact that renter issues are located with less than adequate small landlords. I know this might not be a popular or politically nice statement, and I think we must confront the reality. I am not saying all small landlords are bad - I am a small landlord and believe I am a good landlord. I'm saying these tenant protections will without a doubt protect renters who live with small landlords who get in to this business for supplemental income, might be over their head, and often are not educated on the state and

I have a good friend who works as a case worker for a social service agency in St. Paul, and based on the stories that I hear from her about how difficult it can be to help people find housing, I fully support these ordinances. Families facing homelessness are asked to pay multiple months worth of rent for a security deposit, but they're earning just enough to make it by each month and can't save up for large deposits. The cap would help so many. Also, the homeless people that we see in our neighborhoods frequently get cited for loitering or public indecency (often for public urination) - because they have no where else to be! I don't understand why we are letting crimes stemming from homelessness further

When I first read these ordinances, I was surprised that they weren't already in effect. Limiting security deposits to one month's rent just makes sense. When I was paying student loans, I wasn't able to save up for large purchases (or large security deposits) but that didn't mean I couldn't pay my rent on time. Also, giving people 90 days notice when their building is going to be sold and they could potentially be forced to move out is the humane thing to do. I wouldn't want to have to pick up my life and move with 30 days notice. I need time to make plans and find safe and stable housing. Just cause notice is another one that just makes sense, because I should be given a reason why I have to move out. I've been

I am against the "Just Cause Notice" I am a landlord with 4 single family homes. We take great pride in the condition of our rentals and are very conscientious landlords. We also care a lot about the neighborhood and the people that live next door to these houses. The home owners are there to stay and it is our duty to contribute positively to the neighborhood. That includes being able to not renew a lease if the renters are not good neighbors. Renters have the ability to not renew their lease, they don't have to give a reason - why do landlords? Isn't that why we have a lease? I would be okay with a 60 day

In 2020 it is amazing to me you are using language like landlord and tenant- try renter and RPO (rental property owner) that are not derogatory and gender neutral. We live on a block with 5 rental homes and would like to not have any more due to the impact from the renters: noise, overcrowding allowed by inspectors, too many cars on street & not moved when needed, trash left on street and blvd. I meet with renters every fall with info for them. We did not see these issues addressed- why? When government takes sides on an issue, you take on a lot. Perhaps having an RPO rights and responsibilities would be a start. Owning rental property is a high risk business. That needs to be balanced with the need

This ordinance will cause: 1) less affordable housing, 2) lower rental property values, and 3) higher property taxes for homeowners, because: 1) setting screening & criminal criteria for management companies will cause rents to go up, 2) with just cause notice respectful renters will move out of St. Paul, because residents who cause conflict will be more difficult to give notice to move, 3) limiting security deposits & pre-paid rent will cause an increase to monthly rents to help offset future non-payments, and 4) having to give 3 month notice & pay a resident to move in order to renovate an apartment will cause less improvements to rental properties in Saint Paul. In Seattle they are already seeing less affordable housing information asymmetry is really challenging when it comes to figuring out the terms of this debate and figuring out how to navigate the housing landscape in general. The landlords have one perspective, the housing advocates have the opposite and it's hard to find what is accurate. It's the same challenge when trying to rent or buy a place, a wealth of information exists that most people don't have access to. I will say this, housing is not the only investment opportunity present and in terms of dollar-for-dollar profit, I don't even think it is a good one especially since we've overvalued our housing stock. From my rental experience, I was lucky to only be in rental complexes with charged a 1 month or a half month security Regarding Ord 20-14 Chapter 193: I write as a 23-year St. Paul homeowner and conscientious landlord of a St. Paul rental duplex. The proposed ordinance is a textual mess, likely violates state statute, results in tangible harm to hometown investors, and won't enhance housing stability. It is strikingly unclear if the ordinance applies to specific properties or to all rental landowners. If it applies, my ability to operate a small rental property effectively and profitably will be severely compromised. If this ordinance p**es, I will likely be forced to sell my rental property this year. The prospective buyer would either hike rents 30+% or add the property to a portfolio of small-margin slumlord holdings to insulate from the

I support all five proposals of this legislation.

This legislation prevents landlords from using high security deposits as a way of de facto filtering out low-income families. It requires landlord to give a tenant 90-days to find a new residence if the property owner wants to upgrade his or her property, and to give a tenant just cause for not renewing a lease. Aren't these things that property owners should be The increased rental deposits, along with the background check fees charged for every family member, have made it much harder for families and first-time renters to find affordable housing. Most landlords are ethical, good people, however there are some who have exploited the poor by not properly maintaining rental housing stock and by retaining rental deposits after the tenants do their best to clean up the rental unit for incoming tenants. Landlords should not be

I am for the change. We have too many housing disparities especially in the rental market and many of those disparities are akin to redlining.

These are critical protections to have in times that are even harder for renters. For too long free market fundamentalists have told us that housing is an investment first. It is not. We need to respect the rights of the renter as well as the landlord, and understand that in a time of tight rentals, the landlords have the upper hand. They should not abuse this power.

Im for the change . We need more stability and access to safe housing systems. Not just with new housing developments but with the current available housing as well. The rent needs to be capped based off of the geometric location as well. Inner city renters paying suburban prices for rent. Rent spiking up due to the economy falling. .. We are the people. Hard everyday working people still stuck in the struggle because of the systemic deprivations we've already been subjected to. Currently, countless renters are barred from housing because of discriminatory screening practices and high security deposits that further harm communities of color who have already suffered disparate policing and incarceration, as well as economic marginalization. What is clear is that housing is a public health issue. Increased housing stability for St Paul residents is crucial in creating safe and thriving communities, and that only happens when we increase access to homes through systemic changes like these ordinances. As a renter, I fully support these ordinances. I don't fall for the fear-mongering narrative that's supposed to scare me into denying housing to my fellow community members. I believe that

Renters need more protections! Landlords shouldn't be getting rich by exploiting poor people.

Are you guys nuts

DO A CITY'S WELL-INTENTIONED ENDS JUSTIFY THE MEANS? Locally, hundreds of thousands of taxpayer dollars have been spent on lawsuits in which courts have said, "No." //// EXAMPLE #1: Requirements that landlords distribute voter information to tenants. Excerpts from the Court's decision: "... the government is 'putting particular messages in the mouths of private speakers,' namely, unwilling speakers. ... The Court recognizes Defendants' laudable goal of encouraging participation in such a fundamental practice of our democracy as voting. But this goal cannot be achieved by the unconstitutional means of compelled speech. ... Defendant City of Saint Paul is Permanently Enjoined from enforcing Saint

We all appreciate landlords wanting to have rights to protect themselves from bad tenants. However, landlords ALREADY HAVE a lot of protection and ways they can take actions, illegally. What we're concerned about is discrimination and illegal activity taken on behalf of tenants, which happens with enough frequency to require passing ordinances like this in the first place. Over half of our city population are renters, which means over half of our population is paying property taxes and mortgage through their rent. Many renters want a stable home and a stable life, so they can provide for themselves and their family. Providing more security and safeguards for renters (preventing discrimination, unreasonable damage deposits, AS a small landlord in St. Paul, we bear the burden of policies like this. Rents at my fourplex are affordable (50-60% AMI).

The reason I have raised the rent in the past few years has been due to the fact my property taxes have gone up no less than 15% yearly over the past 5 years and our garbage bill quadrupled with the new trash collection service. Margins are thinner than you'd think for most landlords, so increased costs impact affordable rent. I understand there are bad eggs in this business like every business. Please don't limit our ability to screen tenants based on factual criteria. Consider incentivizing landlords (especially landlords with over 250 doors) to help solve the problem of affordability and finding a

There's been no community engagements and discussions on this ordinance from City Councils. How and when is it ok for the City to mandate Sexual Predators and Murderers to live next door to me. I am an extremely concerned single mother of 3. City Councils should be ashamed of yourselves to try and pass an ordinance without engaging with your constituents.

I searched years for an apartment that I could afford and where I felt safe. I've lived in an owner occupied 4-plex on the West Side for the better part of two decades. I've been a renter for more than 30 years. I'm appalled at what the City Council is trying to pass as "Tenant Protections." I sincerely hope the Council will act in the best interests of tenant

I've heard so MANY illegal and unethical actions against renters, it's sickening. There may be honest landlords-but the immoral make ordinances a necessity. Villages on McKnight was purchased by Bigos, and at least 2 seniors had to put down 6 MONTHS of rent to stay in their units; a separate renter was reqd to put down first+last months rent, PLUS a deposit; another was given 30 days to find a new home when his bldg. sold(which he was unaware of); another has had basement mold in her townhome for 2+ yrs; in another, women were being sexually preyed on by the mngr, or risk losing their home. We also know that landlords don't clearly share rental requirements, and they accept high app. and "admin" fees for

My husband and I own rental properties. After reading this ordinance which deeply effects our choices, our responsibilities and finances. I was wondering where are the landlord's rights? Why were we not notify? Please do not pass this ordinance.

As a renter I feel unsafe with the bill that up. I am drawn to move to an owner occupied plex on west side because I know the owners care about their tenants and it is a safe haven for those like myself. I know they care about the condition of the property. They live there and make it a safe community in which to live. The bill is completing unfair and makes me as a renter feel unsafe. It feels like an abuse of power when the only people who should have a say in who lives on their

As a 26 year resident, parent and grandparent, I am not in agreement with the proposed changes. I think the property owner should have the ability to not re-rent to a tenant at the end of the lease without penalty. I also believe the property owner has the right to determine if they rent to a newly released criminal who was in prison due to one of the listed

I would also recommend slowing this process down to allow for thoughtful deliberation and input on these ordinances. There is no rush. Let's get it right. Also, the public hearing is a concern for me as the corona virus makes it way through the community. I believe it is in the public interest to push the public hearing to a later date not only for the safety and health of attendees and council members, but so the virus will not become a barrier to those who'd like to address the council in

Although I believe tenants should have rights, the landlord has rights as well. I believe many of the proposed ordinances are an over reach of government and which only apply to certain sectors of landlords. Developers of market rate housing will not feel the impact of these ordinances as they have rental prices well beyond the reach of the people these ordinances are intended to protect. Gentrification in Ward 4 is happening with the approval of City Council. Single family homes on Marshall are being demolished to make way for higher density apartments at market rate. Additional market rate apartments are going up on University, Snelling, Dayton, St. Clair. None of it "affordable housing". Yet those landlords

These ordinances will actually decrease safe & affordable housing in St Paul. The notification & procedural requirements for every single rental turnover will create overwhelming financial & time costs. The provisions requiring proof of "just cause," & compensation for evictees are onerous. The restrictions on screening tenants block our ability to provide tenant safety. But then the ordinance imposes crushing procedures for buying & selling buildings with additional penalties & potential prosecutions? Stop! Please slow down this process long enough to get some common sense input. No renter or

I live on the West Side and have rented for 25 years. I think this ordinance is an extreme overstretch (not a first for this council!) and threatens to raise my rent to unsustainable levels (for me). How many landlords, or tenants for that matter, have you interviewed regarding this ordinance?? Like many of the councils recent decisions, I'm concerned that this, too, will have unexpected (at least by the council) consequences that will make life more expensive for many and be difficult to

MPLS and St. Paul do not exist in a rental market vacuum; i.e. people are free to move about the metro area, state and nation. Everything that is being proposed will have the opposite effect of affordable housing, these proposals will drive

Property owners should have more of a say about this issue. Gather your input then show the science behind the decision that would justify this move. Tenants families and children's safety are more important than the speed of this process

As a property owner within district 2, ward 6, I am greatly concern if this ordinance passes. I believe housing is a universal basic human need, and we all should have access to safe and affordable housing. While the overall ordinance's intention is to meet these basic housing needs, some of the language within the provision is concerning. Instead of taking a "one size fit all approach" to restrict landlord ability to mitigate risk, counsel member should reconsider passing the ordinance until all unintended consequences are considered from both renters, landlords, and residents of St Paul. If the ordinance passes, I have no choice but to sell my property. While selling my property may not have a large implication to the community, if

MPLS and St. Paul do not exist in a rental market vacuum; i.e. people are free to move about the metro area, state and nation. Everything that is being proposed will have the opposite effect of affordable housing, these proposals will drive

Abandon this STICK and find some CARROTS.

I have just finished reading the whole chapter and section of this proposed tenant protection ordinance; although for a very noble cause, I am against this Ordinance 20-14. I will be a resident of Saint Paul shortly and I sure "DO NOT" want my safety and my rent increase due to the stipulation of this ordinance. This ordinance defeats the purpose of housing affordability. Just watched a documentary on the Seattle rent crises and if that's the Road the Leaders of Saint paul wants us to go then so be it. I Fully support tenant protection right because there are bad and discriminatory landlords out there, but that shouldn't be an excuse to gun down all landlord. Leave the transaction and ramification to the people that sign

As law abiding, hard working individual that have worked tremendously to provide for my family and purchase my home. My home, safety, piece of mind has been taken away from me at no fault of mine with these ordinances I am frantically considering selling and moving out of Saint Paul completely. Sadly, my home is surrounded by numerous commercial apartments that are currently well maintained . With these new ordinances taking away the ability to properly screen and make decisions based on safety for the greater community my family no longer are safe . I have four small children under

This is not fair for the rest of Saint Paul, for you have wrongfully made a bad decision based on or less than 100 peoples opinions. I'm a young investor living here in Saint Paul, and I wanted to reinvest money back into my city so I can say that I've helped my own city by providing families with a place to stay. I am now reconsidering this because of these new ordinance laws that are being pushed to pass. Please consider the views of both the renters and landlords. Preventing landlords to conduct credit checks, running criminal background checks, and etc. just doesn't make any sense at all. How do we determine where to draw the line for our renters? These decisions will draw away investors, and local investors will

The tenant nonrenewal exception to the just cause requirement does not make sense. The language "after the lease expires" doesn't make sense. It refers to the time when the landlord requests in writing that the tenant renew or extend the lease. I cannot imagine a circumstance when a landlord would wait until after the lease expires to first offer to renew a

The time period for being able to include a criminal conviction in your screening analysis is based on the time from the "dates (sic) of sentencing." Sentencing is the date when the sentence is handed down by the judge. In the case of serious crimes the sentence will often be longer than the permissible time period for inclusion of the criminal conviction in your screening process. Example: an individual murders his landlord and burns down the duplex he lives in because the landlord filed to evict the tenant for nonpayment of rent. Sentenced to and serves 10 years. The proposed ordinance prohibits you

I am confused by the credit history language. 193.04(b)(2) says a landlord cannot disqualify an applicant for . . . "Credit score by itself; however, a landlord may use credit report information to the extent the report demonstrates a failure to pay rent or utility bills." The language about failure to pay rent or utility bills makes no sense. The word "however" implies that what comes next is an exception to the just stated general rule about credit score. But no person would think that a

This ordinance is most likely to discourage construction of lower-end market rate housing.

I am confused by the credit history language. 193.04(b)(2) says a landlord cannot disqualify an applicant for . . . "Credit score by itself; however, a landlord may use credit report information to the extent the report demonstrates a failure to pay rent or utility bills." The part about not using a credit score "by itself" is clear. It means that you cannot have an application criterion that says that you must have a credit score of at least X. Implicit in this provision is that you can use a

Tennant and community safety is very important. Please continue to allow landlords to do background checks.

Accordinging your Tenant Protections Engagement Policy Report August 2019, you had a total of 186 participants - 98 individuals in one session, another 71 additional participants in another session (could be the same individuals from the first session), and then 17 property managers and staff. According to the U.S. Census, as of July 1, 2019, the estimated St. Paul population is 307,695. Let's go with the highest number - 186. You engaged 186 participants, which is 6% of the population and created a tenants ordinance over it. If we want to play dirty, we can also take 186 landlords and create a

This ordinance is taking screening rights away from landlords, forcing them to make poor decisions, putting them at financial and legal risks and putting their tenants at safety risks. Please also put into considerations the smaller landlords, like myself, who cannot afford any financial or legal risks. As we've seen in Minneapolis, Seattle and other places with tenant screening ordinances, rents have skyrocketed. If your ultimate goal is affordable housing, this has proven not to be effective. Just like the trash issue, this ordinance was going to pass before I even became aware of it. We need

This ordinance would affect whole communities, from renters, to homeowners, to sellers, and buyers. Tenant protections should include those who wish to keep their families safe. These decisions need broader community input.

I think this ordinance is a good start to making housing more secure in St. Paul. We desperately need to move away from market based housing and towards a more socialized structure. The first step in that is limiting landlord's ability to summarily kick tenants out of their (the tenant's) home. I would love to see this ordinance go even further in extending notice of sale and relocation assistance protections to all tenants. Not just those in affordable housing. I would also love to

This ordinance does not take the safety of other renters and neighbors in the area into consideration. This policy also force landlords to take on more risks of getting sued for negligence, if the renter with a known criminal behavior, causes harm or I. The study sited for this ordinance is flawed. It only have 98 participants out of the 304,442 in Saint Paul, which is 0.03%. That sample size is hardly a representation of the city.

<https://www.stpaul.gov/sites/default/files/Media%20Root/Mayor%27s%20Office/Fair%20Housing%20Convenings%20Report%20Aug%202019.pdf> 2. (Sec. 193.03. Security deposits) Security Deposit is a risk mitigation tool. If landlords are not allow to mitigate risk through security deposits, landlords will be forced to mitigate that risk through the rent. The tenants will end up paying for this through increase rent. YES, rent will increase. 3. (Sec. 193.04. Applicant screening guidelines for

Unbelievable! When the Council next asks "why isn't there more affordable housing in St. Paul?" perhaps somebody will hold up this proposed ordinance as an example of politicians who (apparently) have never owned rental property and had to deal with dead beat and destructive tenants. The organizations lobbying for this also probably have leaders who have no direct experience dealing with those kind of tenants either. Micromanage another industry that you know nothing about

Before you pass this ordinance, I'm asking that you have more community engagement to see if the whole community agrees with this or if it's just a select few. I feel as if you City Councils are rushing to push this through as fast as possible so those who are looking for open dialogue cannot react in time. Your actions will result in higher rents over all should the Ordinance pass. How? Property Owners are small business owners, and they will adjust their pricing to cover the risk of loss, evictions, and court fee's and liabilities. The Ordinance if passed will also result in more oversight from the City. This will require more employees to run and oversee the program, resulting in higher property taxes to compensate for the

Please hit the pause button on this ordinance. Sure, you have to start somewhere, but you don't have to pass these mandated rules so quickly after drafting up the ordinance. Now, engage in thoughtful dialogue with the public, landlords, tenants, etc and use the drafted wording now as your starting point. Don't pass an ordinance just because on it's face "it sounds good". Do it right and do it fair. Don't assume changes to wording will happen later. Let's not relive the organized trash unintended consequences drama because "oops, we forgot about XYZ". We have all been there and this is headed quickly down the exact same path. We all want St. Paul to thrive, businesses to be successful, and people to have a place

This type of legislation will lead to disintegration or affordable and well maintained rental housing. Screening processes are proven boundaries which protect all residents from unsafe prospective neighbors within their secure environments, as well as protecting them from excessive rent increases which inevitably occur whenever government inflicts additional expenses and controls. I've kept my Eastside rents as much as \$200/month under market value for 20 years. If this passes, I won't sell nor move, I'll find another use for the property, which will end its 90 year history as affordable housing. As mentioned in other objections, this legislation is an egregious overreach akin to weaponized eminent domain, sold pseudo altruistically

This type of legislation will lead to disintegration of affordable and well maintained rental housing. Screening processes are proven boundaries which protect all residents from unsafe prospective neighbors within their secure environments, as well as protecting them from excessive rent increases which inevitably occur whenever government inflicts additional expenses and controls. I've kept my Eastside rents as much as \$200/month under market value for 20 years. If this p***es, I won't sell nor move, I'll find another use for the property, which will end its 90 year history as affordable housing. As mentioned

Thanks for introducing something that will help protect renters against screening that isn't based on science and instead on prejudices. These screening practices result in many people being unable to find housing at all and I hope this will help to rectify the concerns submitted by Bill Bisanz of Real Estate Equities in his letter dated March 4, 2020 (one of the attachments to this file). My abbreviated statement of opposition distills down to the view that this ordinance constitutes an unconstitutional taking of private property without just compensation by the government to thousands of St. Paul property owners. For example: The proposed "just cause" lease termination restrictions dictate control of supposedly-private business transactions in which tenants can terminate leases for any reason, or for no reason; meanwhile, landlords are to be locked in to the mandated one-sided perpetual contracts until such time as fully-compliant (no problems) tenants

Sounds to me these cm are trying to push out privatization of rental real estate. Why are you doing that? If you get rid of all the private owners are you willing to lose millions in property tax revenue that you've been using to fund your housing Approval needs to be delayed until the kinks can be worked out of the proposed ordinances. According to Ord 20-14, Sec. 193.05(a)(7), I will have to pay \$4050.00 to my existing tenant 90 days prior to the end of their lease term if I don't offer them a lease renewal & they don't want to move because I need/want to do renovations to their 2 bedroom unit that require it to be unoccupied. Do you follow? If I, the property owner, want/need to do work to a 2 bedroom unit that requires it to be unoccupied (i.e. bathroom remodel on only bathroom), but the tenant does not want to move at the end of their lease, I have to give them \$4050 for "Relocation assistance". It contradicts to monetarily penalize (Relocation

My father is landlord of 2 properties on the east side, who rents out to section 8, and low income families. He has taken a chance on many people and has been blessed and burned on multiple occasions. My concern is that with these new ordinances you are taking away a the choice landlord have with their own properties. Which I believe is a huge overstep. I believe this will only encourage many small businesses to sell, which will bring in large companies to buy. Which will then result in higher rents. Please do you due diligence to look into rent prices in Minneapolis and Seattle. They're rediculously I've sent numerous emails to several Civi. I own 4 buildings that house 8 families with children. Many of my tenants are low income single moms on sect 8. I work with 2 investors who own 130 units. If this ordinance passes as is without any provision for owner protection or benefits I will likely be selling my units and advising my clients and other numerous colleagues to do the same. In my little sphere alone that impacts 138 units housing low income tenants. The retail market is robust and nice duplexes are commanding premium prices. I will be moving my business to the suburbs away from this socialist regime and to greener pastures of the burbs. If I tell all my colleagues and they tell their colleagues to sell in we own 2 4 prexes on the west side. My husband & I live in one & spent 22 years making them beautiful. We have wonderful tenants who pay \$200-300 under market value. I don't check credit scores & have rented to many diverse groups, single moms & dads, couples & singles & given many people 2nd chances. These ordinances terrify us! We will definitely sell one building if these pass or raise the rents significantly to reduce the # of inquiries (over 50 inquiries last vacancy) if you are to micromanage & control my choice as to who lives in my property. I have a responsibility to my other tenants & community! Huge property tax increases, trash & water costs are the biggest challenges to keep rents low. I was