



Agenda Item Report

City Commission - Jan 17 2023

Department

Equity & Inclusion

Staff Contact

Kalenna Coleman, Organizational Equity
Coordinator

Recommendations

Consider adopting on second and final reading Ordinance No. 9960, amending City Code Chapter 10, Article 1, Sections 10-101, 10-102 and 10-111, to provide equal opportunity to obtain housing regardless of source of income or status as a survivor of domestic violence, sexual assault, human trafficking, or stalking.

Executive Summary

The City Commission directed staff to return to the City Commission on January 17, 2023 for further discussion on Ordinance No. 9960, amending City Code Chapter 10.

At its meeting on December 13, 2022, the City Commission considered Ordinance No. 9960 amending Chapter 10 of the City Code to prohibit discrimination in housing on the basis of source of income or status as a survivor of domestic violence, sexual assault, human trafficking, or stalking. The concept of such an ordinance was included in a package of policy recommendations made by the Human Relations Commission, a City advisory board. The Commission adopted Ordinance 9960, as prepared by City staff, on first reading. The City Commission directed staff to engage the public, particularly landlords, about the ordinance and to return the ordinance to the Commission on January 17, 2023.

On January 5, 2023, staff held a meeting regarding Ordinance No. 9960 in the City Commission room and on Zoom. Approximately 120 people attended, either in person or virtually. City staff, representatives of the Lawrence Douglas County Housing Authority, and the Human Relations Commission attended and answered questions. A summary of the comments and questions are provided below. Interested parties could also submit comments to the City Clerk's office. Comments received by the City Clerk are also provided below. A video of the public meeting can be viewed at: [01/05/23 Meeting for Landlords - Source of Income Status Ordinance No. 9960](#) on YouTube.

Alignment to Strategic Plan

Strong, Welcoming Neighborhoods

Fiscal Impact

The recommended action will not result in a specific cost impact, although enforcement of the ordinance will result in a cost impact on a case-by-case basis.

Action Requested

Adopt on second and final reading Ordinance No. 9960, amending City Code Chapter 10, Article 1, Sections 10-101, 10-102 and 10-111, to provide equal opportunity to obtain housing regardless of source of income or status as a survivor of domestic violence, sexual assault, human trafficking, or stalking.

Previous Agenda Reports:

[Agenda Item Report 22-855 - Pdf](#)

Attachments

[FAQ Source of Income landlords \(003\)](#)

[Comments -Source of Income - Landlords](#)

[Landlord Questions with Answers](#)

[Public Comment Source of Income 1.12.2022](#)

[Public Comment - Added 01/13/23](#)

1. Question: Will the landlord's screening requirements for tenants be restricted with the adoption of Ordinance 9960 and amendments to Chapter 10?

Answer: Landlords can set any screening criteria they want to allow renting of the unit, as long as it is not discriminatory. This includes the protected classes already in the ordinance as well as the criteria that would be added by this ordinance: source of income.

2. Question: Would this ordinance require landlords to accept a tenant with a voucher over a tenant without a voucher?

Answer: The ordinance would not force a landlord to rent to a particular tenant. Any landlord could choose a tenant without a voucher over a tenant with a voucher, but a repeated behavior could potentially be considered a discriminatory action if that was why the landlord was choosing non-voucher tenants.

3. Question: Does this ordinance change the ability of a landlord to evict a tenant?

Answer: No. Both Landlord and tenants have rights under the Kansas Residential Landlord and Tenant Act (K.S.A. 58-2540 *et seq*). So, in the example provided where a tenant was told by the landlord to leave but did not, this may have been protected under the Act. Landlords have to go through the courts to evict people. The Housing Authority collaborates with both the landlords and tenants.

4. Question: How would a violation of Chapter 10 be enforced?

Answer: Prior to reaching the Court, any alleged violation of Chapter 10 goes through a complaint process with the Human Relations Commission. This entails a series of meetings and conciliations to try to resolve the situation. This does not go to court until after the City processes the violation as it would any other violation of Chapter 10.

5. Question: If this ordinance were passed, would landlords still be able to ask about someone's source of income before the lease is signed?

Answer: There is no restriction on asking questions. If you are asking all questions uniformly of all applicants, that is acceptable. If there is discrimination based on the source of income of the applicant, then it would be a violation.

6. Question: In future revisions to Chapter 10, will there be restrictions for running credit checks on rental unit applicants or turning an applicant away because of a bad credit check?

Answer: That is not a part of this ordinance. Credit checks are not prohibited by this proposed ordinance. There is no prohibition of looking at rental references as a part of this ordinance.

7. Question: How does a voucher, as a source of income, work with regards to lease terms?

Answer: A voucher is a subsidy. A subsidy is received on a monthly basis based on several factors including income and household size. The Housing Authority asks for the initial lease to be 12 months. After that, if tenant and landlord agree on something else, the HA reconsiders that. The Housing Authority does not dictate a lease. A landlord will sign a housing assistance payment contract that is a contract between all three parties (Housing Authority, tenant, and landlord). It essentially states that there is a subsidy that the landlord will get on a monthly basis and that both parties should uphold and maintain the lease. With this the landlord will receive a subsidy every month on the first of the month. The payment is guaranteed in the form of check or direct deposit.

8. Question: When a landlord accepts a tenant with a voucher, is there a guarantee in damages over the deposit rate? Does the Housing Authority act as guarantor?

Answer: The Housing Authority does not act as a guarantor. The Housing Authority treats the tenants on subsidized housing the same as they would those without. Accordingly, the risk factor that a landlord takes is the same with any tenant regardless of voucher status. However, the Housing Authority has funding to incentivize landlords as well as programming around damage mitigation.

9. Question: Why and how was this ordinance proposed?

Answer: The proposal came up from the Human Relations Commission, and the City Commission decided to take up the issue of Source of Income as a protected class to Chapter 10. The City Commission asked for a draft of the ordinance.

Housing issues in Lawrence became apparent to the Human Relations Commission. When the City Commission and other groups studied the issue of housing, this was one of the solutions that were proposed, that other West Coast and central states have done. The Human Relations Commission found that 50% of tenants are renters in the City of Lawrence, and 80% of landlords do

not accept vouchers. The Human Relations Commission researched the housing issue and decided to move forward with a proposed change to Chapter 10.

10. Question: Why might a landlord, previously accepting of vouchers, decide not to?

Answer: The Housing Authority sees landlords come of the program and go back on the program due to cyclical reasons such as landlord changes of the rental units. When such transitions happen owners may say “no” to continue vouchers or will continue. This is the biggest loss of landlords accepting vouchers.

11. Question: With accepting vouchers, what happens when the tenants allocations of subsidy changes or rent increases?

Answer: Landlords are able, during the renewal period, to ask for an increase in rent. The landlord is asked to provide comparable rental data to support the increase in rent, and Housing Authority inspectors will also research the typical renting prices. If the increase is determined to be reasonable, the subsidy will be increased. Tenants still may have a portion to pay out of pocket. If the Housing Authority does not find the increase reasonable and does not provide the subsidy, landlords have the right to a mutual termination or non-renewal of lease. In either case, the landlord can then increase the price of the rent if they so choose.

12. Question: Why didn't the Human Relations Commission provide a public meeting, similar to the one held for landlords, and reach out to the landlords in a similar way in the past two years of researching the proposed ordinance for housing relief?

Answer: The meetings around Lawrence held with regards to the topic of housing were promoted and open to the general public – not specifically for tenants or landlords.

13. Question: What is the timeline (history/future) of Chapter 10 with regards to the City Commission?

Answer: In reference to the timeline of this ordinance being passed – this was first heard by the City Commission at their December 13, 2022 meeting. At that time, the City Commission passed the ordinance on first reading and directed staff to have public engagement. The landlord/public meeting was held, and the ordinance will be back on the City Commission's agenda on the January 17 meeting. At the time, the commission has several options: pass the ordinance as it is drafted, ask for amendments to the ordinance for further consideration, or vote down the ordinance.

14. Question: If landlords do not accept the voucher from the applicant, and the applicant complains, can landlords get a \$10,000-\$50,000 fine?

Answer: The way source of income would be enforced through the Chapter 10. This would go through a complaint process with an investigation by the Human Relations Division. The investigation process proceeds as follows: if there is a finding of probable cause that the landlord performed some discriminatory action, the complaining party has option to elect whether to have the matter decided by the Human Relations Commission or go to District Court to have the matter decided there. If discrimination exists, there are fines as well as damages that could possibly awarded under Chapter 10. Penalties will not be imposed until there is due process and an investigation. Sometimes complaints are filed, and there is no evidence to support the allegation.

15. Question: From a local standpoint, is there anything legally that prevents Lawrence from creating a neighborhood revitalization area based on a housing type – where we could do a tax abatement based on houses that are Section 8?

Answer: It is possible that the City Commission can look at an incentive program along with the proposed Chapter 10 revision or instead of passing this ordinance.

16. Question: Of the other states and cities that have implemented Source of Income as a protected class, how long have they implemented it for and how long has the study been going with them?

Answer: The very first source of income non-discrimination ordinance was in 1971. More research and information is available on the research packet attached to the December 13, 2022 City Commission meeting.

17. Question: What are the various types of vouchers in the Housing Authority's program?

Answer: Within the program there are various reasons behind vouchers (homelessness, disability, fixed-income, etc.). The most important piece with regards to landlords is that it is a subsidy regardless of the program. There is no difference in how the contract or payment occurs. There is just one subsidy/voucher.

18. Question: Are landlords of lower priced units the target of this ordinance?

Answer: The ordinance is not targeting any specific type of landlord. The Housing Authority provides subsidy at about 40% of the fair market rental rate.

Therefore, there is a payment limit set by the federal government of what can be subsidized. Due to this, vouchers are typically for what can be considered affordable housing.

19. Question: How are payments of vouchers made to landlords via the Housing Authority?

Answer: Housing assistance payments process through direct deposit and check. With direct deposit, the voucher processes on the 1st of the month. With check, it is mailed out no later than the 2nd of the month.

20. Question: Is the Housing Assistance Payment Contract available for viewing?

Answer: Yes. It is available for viewing on the [LDCHA website](#).

21. Is there a new landlord incentive program already in place with the Housing Authority?

Answer: Yes. The Housing Authority has funding available for incentivizing landlords.

22. Question: Can you clarify how zoning affects occupancy restrictions?

Answer: Rentals in single-family or unplanned zoning can have no more than three unrelated people in a unit. Rentals in multi-family zoning can have up to four unrelated people in a unit. When the number of people in a unit is calculated for these purposes, minors are not included in the number.

23. Question: How does the Housing Authority guide the tenants with voucher use?

Answer: Generally, it is advised not to pay more than 30% of income on housing. Not being “housing burdened” is promoted.

Real estate agent questions:

24. Question: Would this prohibit real estate agents from advertising or selling properties as cash-only sales?

Answer: Real estate could still be sold as cash-only sales. While there are some similarities between real estate financing and financing for rentals, there is no prohibition on specifying a type of payment received because it is not reliant on the source of income. If, for example, a buyer requested a cash-only sale but refused to accept cash from a person of a particular profession or job, then it could be unlawful under this act.

25. Question: There are some real estate transactions that, because of some aspect of the property, cannot be sold to any government-backed entity, and that could include vouchers. How would that work?

Answer: While federal and state law would supersede any City ordinance, that is a consideration for any possible amendments to ensure that there is not a violation of City ordinance as the parties involved in the sale attempt to comply with state and federal law.

Comments (verbal and written) from Source of Income: Landlords Meeting Jan. 5th

Comment 1 – My wife and I own and rent a house in East Lawrence and I think the City is going about this in the wrong way. Rather than make people and try to force people to do something they do not want to do, I think you should try to figure out exactly why landlords do not want to do it. Find a way to incentivize them or better yet, find a way to make more rental units available to more people in Lawrence. I have a recommendation on how to do that. I do things rationally based on risk, income, and those sorts of things. I imagine everybody does. To make a fact-based decision on how to change things, you should understand what the problem is. Maybe you do, and I am just not aware of that. When I read the ordinance, I thought about people who rent a house in rooms in their houses. If you were a single woman with a house and an extra bedroom or two bedrooms, would you want the City telling you that you have to rent to somebody you are not comfortable with? I would not want that happening to somebody I know. From what I can tell, this law makes you do that. I also think it would have unintended consequences of forcing rent up. If you force people to rent to people, which they see as a higher risk, landlords are just going to raise their rents to price out that risk. Everybody does that. I would like to propose a better approach. Lawrence has an ordinance that says that in most zoning districts, you cannot rent a house to more than three unrelated people. I think that is classist elitist. Maybe sexist. They want to rent a four-bedroom house in West Lawrence, why not?

Comment 2 – I am a landlord. I own 17 houses. It makes up 43 rental units here in Lawrence. My husband and I started purchasing houses in 1974. The last house we purchased was in 1999. We stopped because we liked knowing our tenants and we wanted to stay small. Each of our 17 houses was the worst on the block and we did urban renewal. We did it on credit cards and with my husband's sweat. Each house, my husband did most of the work himself. He acted as a handyman, gardener, everything for us. Since my husband's passing, my daughter has stepped in to help and we hired a part-time office manager. We also had to hire a handyman and other subcontractors, a lot of them. On average, I spent in the last month in 2022, \$6,617 on employees. \$5,318 in subcontractors, workman's comp (\$2,876), and \$13,562.80 on mortgages. That's one month. The last tax bill I got from the City was for \$62,055 – up \$7,344.88. My tax bill went up. Every other landlords who owns property, their tax bills went up. You want to impact

something, you should impact the assessments that you charge. They are really too high, and it's part of the reason rental housing has become so expensive. One of the reasons, within 35 years, the City originally wanted only three people living in a house. I thought it was discriminatory at the time. I never went to more than three people. The city does and made the law and we were lucky it wasn't a two people maximum. Then the city wanted to check health and safety to make sure there weren't more than three unrelated people living in reliance. They were counting toothbrushes and going through the houses. Then, the City began to have rental houses, which cost me approximately 15 units, for licensing. When they went to licensing and inspections every time, the City inspects and it's an additional \$55 per unit that they inspect. If I spread that cost over all 43 units, it is \$2,550 a year just for the City. We have to have one smoke alarm in every room now. We used to only have one on every level. I agree with that, actually, I think that was fine. However, I need to have an additional carbon monoxide detector in front of every bedroom. Let the City agree to building tiny houses. Let them subsidize them and build them good to code.

Comment 3 – I am a landlord. I gave my \$80,000 in property taxes this year. It goes up every time, except in the last few years, I've also been able to bear a brunt of a lot of losses; including someone that worked in Shannon's Department who gave advice to people who rented from me. They basically said, "stay there". You won't have to pay and they got 35 days of free rent. I had to tell people who were set up to go rent my next apartment. To go buzz off because these people can't be made to leave. The City isn't going to help me and until this day, our courts haven't helped me. That is the real experience that I've experienced losing \$60,000 last year. The year before and nearly the year before that too. The problem is that people who follow the rules are not discriminating to people. The people who would discriminate will continue to do so with any other pretense to get out of what they have to do. So, just like the three unrelated, I have never rented to more than three people in one of my apartments. We have one on Indiana and one on Kentucky. Landlords are making 14 rental checks renting to fraternities, and I get to make essentially three. I can't find a parking spot, because so many cars are outside of the places with many people living. There's too many people living in a place that was made for a single family home. That is what I feel the real problem is. Don't penalize the people who are already following the rules.

I don't need someone who can simply throw their hands in the air and say discrimination, and that is where I have a big problem. I don't feel like I will be protected.

Comment 4 – It is a really small change, but folks are probably not just going to be getting a single applicant for each rental, I assume. So there is still subtly the possibility for discrimination and it might be really hard for folks with vouchers to prove that. I also want to drop a quick compassionate note into this chat. I'm a medical geneticist in my professional life, and so many of my patients use vouchers. Some of these folks are not Tasmanian devils. They are families that have disabled kiddos, people who got diagnosis of ALS and can't get out of their wheelchairs. So, I'm grateful that this voucher program exists.

Comment 5 – We own five rental properties in Lawrence since 2013, and they have served us well. We've kept them up. We've paid the increase in taxes. I always run a credit check on everybody and it has served me well. A bad credit check is more important to me than any discrimination because I don't feel like I discriminate with my properties. My ability to choose my renters is very important to me. I wouldn't loan somebody that I didn't know \$20,000 without any kind of application to see where the income was coming from. Or even if they have good rental history. I follow up on that. It has served me well since 2013. I don't want to have to adjust anything in my business because of the ordinance.

Comment 6 – I don't want to question your intent on this. I think I'm sur that you have good intentions. I just think that they might come with some consequences that need to be thought through first off. One of the things in this ordinance references loans, for real estate. I believe that would come into some Federal guidelines for Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, and I'm not sure that our local city really has a whole lot of authority over what their loan guidelines are. With this ordinance, what we are doing is creating more subsidized housing, but I think that the end result is going to be less affordable housing. If I have a tenant who I've done some really thorough background checks on and I've made sure that they have all their ducks in a row, I know I can count on them to take care of my property. Well, know if I have to put myself in a risk category to where I'm not necessarily going to only be able to rent to people who have the high credit and the good jobs. I have to also make myself and my properties available for those

who are on some Section 8 vouchers and not just deal with them. I also have to deal with the Federal organization that acts as a middleman. This is more red tape. It is going to affect all renters in Lawrence, not just those with vouchers. The things we do to make housing affordable sometimes ends up making it less affordable across the board. Until we get more supply, we're not going to be able to fix the problem. It is going around town that credit checks and criminal background checks will be taken away next.

Comment 7 – I've lived in Lawrence all my life. I've rented these houses for 50 years. I've never been to court. I've never been to any court cases. I screen my renters, and then the last little house I rented, I had 35 people wanting to rent it. The first day, they told me there wasn't anything to rent in Lawrence for under \$1200. So we are going to take someone with a voucher and let them have the rent that good, hard-working people can't rent.

Comment 8 – I'm originally from Egypt. I know what poverty is all about. I came here to American and went to school in Atchison and Lawrence. I stayed married and have children here. I'm a small landlord and I brought some properties with my dad. About four or five years ago, I took a risk with Catholic Charities. They asked me to take in a tenant and they were going to pay the first two months. Obviously, after the first two months, they destroyed the place. We actually had an eviction, and when the cop/sheriff came to remove him, there was drug paraphernalia. So that is my experience with such programs. I come from a very poor background, where the government tells you what to do and how to do it and when to do it. I don't think that is America. I don't discriminate against anybody. I judge by the application and by what is on the application. I do my credit check and everything.

Comment 9 – I think we're missing a couple of points. One of which is this is not just saying you have to accept Section 8 vouchers; you also have to accept any emergency assistance. So, this would have potentially required you to accept KERA (Kansas Emergency Rental Assistance). Which, we knew was a limited source of income and did not know how long it was going to last for. Also, I've spent a lot of time watching these HRC meetings, and I am willing to bet money by the end of this next year of 2023, they will be back with an ordinance to restrict what you can and cannot ask. There was a sample application that was proposed. Those issues

are not going to go away. I know we're hearing from Housing Authority (HA) that we just have the HAP (Housing Assistance Payment) contract. Well the contract incorporates the HUD regulations, so when you go to renew the tenant, your rent has to be approved by the housing employees. So, let's say taxes go up, which they do every year in Lawrence, but the HA says well, we believe the appropriate increase is X, you are going to have to renew the HAP contract based on what the HA says. Also, by taking a HAP contract, you're agreeing that you have to renew somebody's lease. But for good cause, we know there are situations where we decide not to renew a lease under Kansas law. We're not required to disclose those but under housing contract, we would have to. I know we keep saying, well, you can accept any applicant. Well, under Federal law, you'd have to take the first qualified applicant, in addition, you know I'm hearing housing authorities. They say, well, you'll receive guaranteed payment, but the tenants allocations change and those subsidies can be adjusted at any time by the HA. Again, we come to the issue of well, just enforce your lease contract. I know every landlord sitting there knows what enforce your lease contract means. It means spending money on attorney's fees not, not receiving rent during the notice violation period, and going to court. This is only going to increase the cost of being a landlord. I'd also like to point out that information provided by the HRC in their packet has no references to any landlord.

Comment 10 – I want to bring a little different perspective to this. I'm a new landlord to Lawrence. I purchased a 162 unit in the last six or eight months. I specifically target places like Lawrence because of the overall investment opportunity that existed. I guess what I want to leave a mark on everybody on the board there is that you enact small laws and as you pass along more responsibility to the landlords, in turn you are somewhat harming the area for future investment. You mentioned the studies on how things like this work in places like Oregon and Washington. Well, I owned over 300 units in both Oregon and Washington, and let me tell you, it's not working - especially in Seattle through ordinances like this. This is just the start, and I think there is a bit of disingenuous answers in regards to what is next and foreseeing the future. I've seen this play out, over and over again. The buck always seems to stop with the landlords. This may not be a popular view, but we, as landlords, provide lots of housing for lots of people in all of these cities that we choose to invest in. We pay a lot of property

taxes which you know we should, that's part of the game. However, I feel like this is just the tip of the iceberg of what I've seen in all of these other places that I've invested in. I hate to say that because I am still very optimistic, not only about our investment, but about providing an excellent level of service for our tenants. And, to be a good steward for Lawrence, Kansas. I'm very excited to be there, but this just has a feel of something that I have seen where you guys are developing these ordinances in a bubble. You're not looking at all of the overall picture that something like this can affect (property values, all sorts of different things that have to be taken into consideration). There is not a landlord in Lawrence that would tell you that they're actively trying to discriminate. However, we also have an investment that we have to protect where it's just us or whether it's the people that invest in us. There has got to be a better way to do, what you guys are doing, without the Buck always having to stop with the landlords.

Comment 11 – I found out that you shouldn't refer to tenants with vouchers as "those tenants". But, at the last Commission meeting, it was stated and I quote "those blood sucking landlords". Now that is a pretty strong reference to landlords. You know, if you were there, you know it was said. It was inferred and said many times there. Most people were talking about how bad the landlords are. Most of them were a lot of homeless people. I understand where that is coming from, but I just think as you're getting in a hurry to do this, it should be postponed for a month or so. Landlords could weigh in on it more than they are today. I don't think landlords have been given a chance. And someone pointed out consequences. The unintended consequences are going to be bad for landlords. It's also going to be bad for tenants because it's going to force up rents. I'm entrusting a \$100,000-200,000 property to them and trusting that they're going to take care of that property. I need to ensure this through an application process.

Comment 12 – From the way the ordinance is written, it can't work in a real life situation relating to the real estate agent section. It talks about bona fide offers and presenting them when we cannot discriminate based on source of income (which is hard to do). When a seller is the one making the decisions on a bona fide offer, they may have constraints on their side. They need to sell quickly, so they may choose a cash offer over a government-backed person or other income. For us (realtors) to be the ones to be specifically called out, in that situation, it is not our decision to make. The other thing it talks about is advertising and

disseminating this information out. There may be homes out there that we are selling that are rental properties or that may have conditions that would not allow us to sell to a government-backed person. The home is full of mold, then the only buyer has a cash offer. It's written basically straight up that we cannot stop someone from, because of their source of income, buying it. Now we would be in trouble for advertising in the direction of cash offer only. It also talks about membership and use of the multi-list system. The multi-list system is not a public Source. It's a communication between realtor associations and realtors themselves. To let us know the basics of the house, by talking about it as if it's something that a regular person on the street would use, is inaccurate. We can't talk about discrimination again. We may have to market a property through this system.

Comment 13 – My wife and I, we own five house right now in Lawrence. I'm a little disappointed that the City Commissioners are not here because what is said between us, you, and your answers back - sometimes they don't always get back the same way. With regards to Section 8 vouchers, my wife would call down to the tenant and go down to the office of the Housing Authority, and no one would ever make contact back with us. You are not going to like what I have to say. You guys give me a very bad taste in my mouth when it comes to Section 8 housing. The tenant was great, we had no problems with her, and we decided to sell the house. We actually gave notice. It took almost six months for you guys to get her into another house.

Comment 14 – We've been 40-yr landlords of Section 8 housing. My father got into it in the 1980s. We don't have a lot. It's trimmed down a bit over the years. But, I've been happy to continue to do that. We've had overall a pretty good experience. We have challenges regardless of who the tenant is. We have an original tenant from back when I had an afro and managed properties 40 years ago. My day job at the Chamber of Commerce, I worked as well with the housing stabilization collaborative, the Housing Authority (HA), tenants to homeowners, and Family Promise. So I know it does work. When people have bad experiences, that gets passed around. That is why it is a challenge for the landlords. You are going to hear those experiences and anytime that something is brought to you as an ordinance or enforcement piece, it is not welcomed very much. This is why I think we need a more concerted effort. Whether as convening and really having

an ongoing process of looking at what can we do from an incentive standpoint. The unintended consequences of the ordinance is going to be risk mitigation. There is going to be something I'm going to offset this with, and I think we're going to see some increases in rents as a response.

Comment 15 – My husband and I have rental properties for over 20 years. All of our houses are on the east side of town. I want to make note that we knew nothing about this ordinance until we got the postcard in the mail. You guys have our email and phone numbers, and until two days ago, we knew nothing about this. I strongly believe something should have been done to notify us, especially, within two years somebody dropped the ball on that one.

Comment 16 – I would also like to agree with a couple of people, that they're disappointed that the City Commission isn't present. I'm pretty upset about that too. I've emailed them last month, after the first meeting, and I received responses from two people. So let it be known when they go through the records, which I doubt they will, that I'm really disappointed three of those people couldn't even be bothered to get back to me – even with just an email. This proves the need for a landlord's association in this town. Anybody that is listening to this, I think, we should get tougher and have a talk. The failure to get the message out about the meetings to everybody has been really problematic. We got a post card, which is great, but snail mail is not always reliable. I hate relying on the USPS. We have emails, we have phones to get ahold of us. I have three jobs. My husband has at least three jobs and he is working right now. He is picking up our kids, so this is the worst timing. I'd also like to fill you in on my perspective on having worked with Douglas County Housing Authority (HA). I have very mixed feelings about it. We were failed for inspections for a shed. I have some big hesitations with how these inspections are going to work, but I'm willing to work with it.

Comment 17 – We do not take the paper and, we as landlords for 20 years, knew nothing about this law until the post card around by mail.



City of Lawrence

CITY COMMISSION

MAYOR
LISA LARSEN

COMMISSIONERS
NATHAN LITTLEJOHN III
BRADLEY R. FINKELDEI
COURTNEY SHIPLEY
AMBER SELLERS

CRAIG S. OWENS
CITY MANAGER

City Offices
PO Box 708 66044-0708
www.lawrenceks.org

6 East 6th St
785-832-3000
FAX 785-832-3405

These answers were compiled by the **Lawrence-Douglas County Housing Authority, the City's Planning and Development Services Department, and the City Attorney's Office.**

1. All my rentals currently are enrolled in the City's rental license program and are inspected in accordance with the program. How much more frequently are properties inspected if vouchers are used as a form of payment?

Properties on the voucher program are inspected by LDCHA at initial lease signup and then annually thereafter as part of participant recertification. If a voucher is issued by LDCHA, the City of Lawrence does not conduct inspections during the time the dwelling unit is under the voucher program. However, the property must maintain an annual license (no fees) with the City of Lawrence.

2. My properties consistently pass the city mandated inspections. Are the HUD inspections the same? If not, please specify all the differences.

Housing Quality Standards (HQS) is not a code, but a standard, and is less stringent than the International Property Maintenance Code (IPMC) that regulates the inspection criteria for the rental assistance program. However, HQS does adopt city variances that are health, life and safety in nature. For instance, requiring carbon monoxide detectors in the unit where required and smoke alarms in all sleeping areas – which is not required in HQS, but is in IPMC. The inspections do mirror each other in the sense that if a property passes IPMC consistently it will have no issues in passing the HQS inspection. In summary, the inspections closely mirror City of Lawrence Rental Licensing inspections.

3. Assuming there are differences between the City and HUD inspections, what happens if a property of mine, which meets the City requirements, does not pass a HUD inspection? Is an owner required to modify the house to make it compliant? For instance, if I saw correctly, the requirements mentioned by HUD is that there must be a working ceiling light in the living room. I'll use my personal house as an example which was built in the late 50s. My living room has zero ceiling lights, and I must rely on lamps. My interpretation is that this doesn't meet the HUD requirements but given that the City inspection seems to be focused on safety items, I'm willing to bet this still passes the City inspection requirements. Would an owner be expected to add a ceiling light at the owner's expense?



Housing Quality Standards (HQS) is not a code, but a standard, and is less stringent than the International Property Maintenance Code (IPMC) that regulates the inspection criteria for the rental assistance program. If a unit is deemed to meet city requirements, HQS will not be an issue in meeting the standard unless deficiencies were not identified or developed between the two inspections. Fixed lights are not required in a living room, but rather: A living room for HQS requires: Two outlets, OR one outlet and one permanently installed ceiling or wall light.

4. What other instances of differences between the city inspections and the HUD inspections do you see potential issues?

Housing Quality Standards (HQS) is not a code, but a standard, and is less stringent than the International Property Maintenance Code (IPMC) that regulates the inspection criteria for the rental assistance program. The inspections do mirror each other in the sense that if a property passes IPMC consistently it should have no issues in passing HQS. It is also important to mention that inspectors from LDCHA and the City have had, and continue to have a collaborative working relationship and communicate regularly on code compliance issues respective to both the HQS and City's rental licensing and inspection program.

5. 2023 Fair Market Rent according to HUD for a 3 bedroom is \$1458. If the rent is over that amount for a 3-bedroom property, what happens then? Does this mean the property is not eligible for a voucher payment?

LDCHA Payment Standards are higher than FMR. The LDCHA adopts a payment standard of 110% of the FMR. If the rent charges exceed the LDCHA payment standard, the participant can elect to pay the overage outside the payment standard if the unit meets the rent reasonableness standard.

6. I have some tenants that have previously preferred to sign leases for longer than a year. How would the tenant and I know what an acceptable rent increase would be for the second year of the lease without HUD data if they were paying with a voucher?

Initial leases are only required to be at least 12 months and may be longer if desired and agreed upon. LDCHA has comparable units in each census tract across the county to assist landlords requesting a rent increase, and to be compliant with rent reasonableness. Likewise, it is also the landlord responsibility to review and provide comparables of like units in the general area when requesting a rent increase.

7. Do current tenants not paying with a voucher have the right to refuse entry into their house for a HUD inspection that may be needed for a future tenant? What happens if they do?

The Kansas Residential Landlord and Tenant Act covers right of entry. Under K.S.A. 58-2557, landlords shall have the right to enter the dwelling unit at reasonable hours, after reasonable notice to the tenant, in order to inspect the premises, make necessary or agreed repairs, decorations, alterations or improvements, supply necessary or agreed services, or exhibit the dwelling

unit to prospective or actual purchasers, mortgagees, tenants, workmen or contractors. That would include a HUD inspection.

If a tenant refuses the landlord entry under the above conditions, the landlord may seek a court order to enter the unit or evict the tenant.

LDCHA notes that usually an inspection will not be completed while a unit is occupied by someone not receiving assistance.

8. If a tenant using a voucher as a payment damages a property, what is the process to recuperate the expenses if different than that of a tenant not using vouchers? What assurances do landlords have that the funds will always be available?

There is no difference, and landlords will enforce the lease as they would with any other tenants. Currently there are incentives offered through LDCHA to support landlords in housing various clients. These funds are limited but can be utilized for potential damage mitigation. There is an assumed risk when taking on any tenant for the potential of property damage. We encourage all landlords to enforce their lease as they would any other tenant and follow the necessary steps if a violation occurs. For more information on the current incentive programs, please contact LDCHA's landlord liaison for requirements around participating.

9. Part of the testimony in the previous City Commission meeting mentioned funding available to encourage landlords to accept vouchers. In the same meeting, it was later mentioned that the number of properties accepting vouchers is on the decline. What reasons have been provided as to why fewer properties are accepting vouchers? What action items have been proposed/implemented to address the concerns raised?

LDCHA has worked diligently to bring new landlords onto the voucher program, and can only speculate what reasons as to why fewer properties are accepting vouchers. In order to better serve our participating landlords, LDCHA is committed to providing education on our programming and process, direct deposit for Housing Assistance Payments, our agency's Landlord Liaison to answer questions provide support and incentive programming.

10. Is the eviction process different since Federal funds are involved? If so, how?

Landlords will enforce the lease as they would with any other tenants. The only difference is that a landlord should also direct any notices of lease violation or eviction to the attention of LDCHA so that program obligations can be enforced, which usually assists the landlord in achieving lease compliance.

11. If I've had a City inspection in a year, are we required to have a HUD inspection in that same year if later we rent to a tenant paying with a voucher? How much does each inspection cost and is anything refunded if two inspections happen in a single year?

LDCHA is required to complete an initial inspection before a unit comes onto the program. There is no cost for Housing Quality Standards Inspections.

12. If I have paid my City rental license fee and then later in the year get a tenant paying with vouchers, will the City refund me my license fee?

The City of Lawrence does not prorate licensing fees.

13. Who is performing the HUD inspections and are there enough people currently available to perform the inspections in a timely manner if there is a large influx of required inspections?

LDCHA has two full time Housing Quality Standards Inspectors and additional certified inspector staff that can assist in cases where needed.

14. If the voucher payment is late, who is responsible for covering the late fees specified in the contract for late payments?

The Housing Assistance Payment (HAP) Contract identifies timeframes of voucher payment from LDCHA. The tenant is not responsible for any payment of rent that is LDCHA responsibility.

15. For a tenant paying with a voucher, am I still able to utilize my existing lease?

Yes. Landlords operate and enforce their lease as they would with any other resident.

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

To Whom it May Concern,

I see the landlords have been given the opportunity to provide feedback on this issue, while those who are continually denied housing, although they have the means to pay rent, are kept out of the conversation.

Having sought housing for many months with a good credit rating, good rental history and a Section 8 Housing Voucher, I remained homeless and denied even the opportunity to rent hundreds of vacant, advertised, available units in Lawrence. You wouldn't even fathom the number of times I was shut out of available housing because my money wasn't good enough and what that does to a person.

I've been discriminated against because a landlord had a bad experience with someone else, or a property management company just completely denied all Section 8 applicants. That's the definition of prejudice. The many people who currently have vouchers are belittled into homelessness because the City favors landlords who may be complaining of a bad experience in the past. This is unjust and presents the single greatest threat to gaining affordable housing in this market. Other communities, counties, and states have long ago instituted protections for the segment of the population most vulnerable to discrimination, those at the lower end of the income scale.

Why don't you allow a meeting and conversation and survey with the many people and families currently holding vouchers who are being denied housing?

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,
Joe Doe
785-764-6448
Lawrence, 66049

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

Dear Kalenna:

I am writing in reference to the proposed City of Lawrence Ordinance No. 9960. I would be in attendance today at the public meeting to discuss this ordinance but am at home recuperating from surgery.

My husband and I own and operate several duplexes and condominiums within Lawrence and have for approximately 11 years. We have been blessed to have such nice tenants and we have blessed these tenants by being caring and diligent landlords. These rental properties are our source of income in our retirement years. We have gladly rented to tenants that have been considered as being disabled or in need of special accommodations. Although most of our renters are college students we have rented to middle aged and retired individuals. During Covid, we were especially understanding and concerned for our renters who were unable to work and even eliminated rent short term or even lowered rent. We do care for our tenants and treat them like friends and family.

With this being said, we have not been approached to accept vouchers from anyone submitting an application for renting. We do background checks to eliminate those with criminal records and we do look at their credit scores. But more importantly we look at their past history of paying rent to ensure they will

be reliable tenants. To be required to rent to an individual or family with a history of non-payment of rent or eviction would potentially put us at risk for making our own payments.

Thank you,

Joe and Donna Ketchum

PS: Thank you Kalenna for returning my phone call and I appreciate you answering my questions. Additional questions I would like clarification on are the following:

1. I was told that when the housing authority does background checks on potential renters prior to providing vouchers and they see a history of non-payment of rent or evictions, they take this risk into account when deciding how much the voucher will be. If these tenants still fail to make their monthly rent payments then eviction would be an approved and necessary step for the landlord. How difficult would this be and how long would it take since during this time the landlord would probably not be receiving any rent payments?
2. Regarding individual disability, does the requirements of Ordinance 9960 or any other Lawrence housing ordinance mirror the requirements of the Americans Disabilities Act (ADA) or does it place additional requirements on the part of the landlord. In other words, is the ADA's reasonable accommodations the same as what Lawrence ordinances require?

Sandra Fangohr

From: AJ Lang Property Management <rentals@ajlang.org>
Sent: Friday, December 23, 2022 1:27 PM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: ordinance #9960 comment

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

under federal law, SS, pensions, alimony is non garnish-able income if not commingled with other forms of income in a bank account. Where is the monetary recourse for the rental unit owner if court action is needed? What would stop someone or a couple moving into a unit with untouchable income, paying once and then not paying at all? It already takes over 2 months to work through an eviction in Douglas County. Adopting this ordinance would force rental unit owners to work around this and make acceptable credit guidelines tighter (ie credit score must be 675 instead of 550), increase the income requirements (ie instead of 3x it would now be 5x monthly income) or require for the full contract to be paid up front, holding the monthly rent in escrow until due. Also, is it income if a full time student receives a monthly allowance from their parents or trust? How do you prove that? This is a disaster waiting to happen that will make Lawrence even more unaffordable to the working class and require cosigners that may not be willing to sign a lease.

Kansas state 58-25137 already addresses the DV, SA, HT and stalking.

Justin Lang

owner of 2 duplexes in Lawrence with reasonable rent

--

AJ Lang Property Managment
124 N. Cherry St., Olathe, KS 66061
913.782.5252
www.ajlang.org

Sandra Fangohr

From: Milton Bland <miltonbland@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 26, 2022 2:04 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Ordinance no. 9960

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

I am expressing my thoughts as a landlord of multiple Lawrence rental homes.

I do not have a problem with creating a protected class of people including survivors of domestic violence, sexual assault, human trafficking, or stalking. But I have a huge concern about passing an ordinance that makes a protected class of folks who can not pay their rent. I can only assume the person or group of persons who wrote this proposed ordinance has no idea how a business operates. If our tenant fails to pay rent, we eventually will fail to pay the mortgage and get out of the rental house business. Rental homes will be hard to find in Lawrence.

How is this any different from requiring a restaurant to feed people who can not pay for their meal? Or requiring a car dealer to provide a new car to someone who can not pay for it? Or for that matter requiring home builders to furnish homes to the homeless?

This ordinance goes too far, even for Lawrence.

Sincerely,

Milton and Joan Bland

Sandra Fangohr

From: ddorsey@sunflower.com
Sent: Tuesday, December 27, 2022 5:12 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Section 8 pending regulations

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

Dear Commission Members:

I have owned rental properties in Lawrence for 40 years. Early on I took Section 8 tenants. One was especially outstanding for 7 years or more. Other Section 8 tenants were not so good. One of the Section 8 officials who placed tenants said something like this to me.

"We know exactly who the great tenants are and which ones are sure to trash their apartments. We are forbidden to identify them to you. Many in our office have personal real estate connections but we are forbidden by law from having any professional contact with Section 8 tenants until we are out of the Section 8 office for at least a year."

This approach is guaranteed to undermine trust between the Section 8 office and landlords.

We mom-and-pop operations are like most small businesses; if we can meet payroll, pay taxes and do maintenance we can break even or a little above. The real benefit of small business ownership is only realized after selling out and retiring. All rentals require a great deal of maintenance compared to private homes. The best way to keep afloat is to find the best tenants possible so maintenance costs can be contained.

Anyone who has been a landlord knows to expect one bad tenant out of 5 or 6. Most of my tenants have been solid, but several have also trashed entire units costing up to \$10,000 and creating a 3-4 month vacancy. When those occur any profits are lost for at least a year.

Small landlords are going the way of small farmers, something you must have observed as more Lawrence properties become corporate. Of my 3 duplex-type buildings 2 are for sale and one is being prepared for sale. The two most interested parties are corporate.

Landlords are staying away from Section 8 in droves because working with Section 8 for any time guarantees large losses.

If you expect landlord participation in any such program here are some suggestions.

1. Develop trust by being honest about tenants.
2. Fully indemnify landlords for all true costs of participation.

About 2 years ago the Journal World ran a column from the Manhattan Mercury on affordable housing. It was written by a K-State econ professor. He showed that the demand for public housing was unlimited and no amount of public support could ever meet the need. He made the point that

affordable housing was a problem of low wages. Even apart from the affordable housing issue, Lawrence should also address the issue of low wages.

Don Dorsey
1726 Indiana St.
Lawrence

Sandra Fangohr

From: Mike LaBonte <mlabonte9199@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 27, 2022 7:13 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Ordinance # 9960

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

More Government control tends to cause more problems . The City needs to focus on running the city rather than seeking more control. If the City would like to own our Property then they may do as they like with it.

Mike & Karen LaBonte.

Sandra Fangohr

From: Holly Krebs <hollykrebs@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 28, 2022 10:18 AM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Support for Ordinance 9960

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

To whom it may concern,

As a local landlord, I received notification of the upcoming discussion on Ordinance No. 9960. I would like to voice my support for this ordinance.

Thank you,

Holly Krebs

Sandra Fangohr

From: Nathan Ensز <nathanensz@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2023 2:53 PM
To: City Clerk
Cc: theresa; Lisa Larsen; Bart Littlejohn; Brad Finkeldei; Courtney Shipley; Amber Sellers; Human Relations
Subject: Re: Source of Income - Questions from a Landlord unable to attend the Jan 5 meeting

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

Greetings all,

My property manager provided me a link to an audio recording of the January 5th meeting I was not able to attend. In that meeting it was mentioned that the City believes they have excellent customer service and partnership with landlords. Given I've heard zero response to this request for additional information from the only email address provided in the postcard to me, I'm feeling a complete lack of customer service or partnership as I try to educate and prepare myself for the upcoming City Commission meeting. This seems to be a great example of something landlords are concerned about when the City is proposing an Ordinance that would require greater timely collaboration between the landlord, resident, and City. If the City isn't able to provide a response to an email sent 12 days ago, what is the likelihood enough resources are in place to handle an influx of additional interactions? Not only have I not heard a response, but I echo the concerns other landlords have voiced which is not being at all involved in any discussion over the last 2 years of research on this topic. Again this does not seem to indicate collaboration.

I'm disappointed in the lack of communication from the City regarding this. Please expect a future email to be sent to the appropriate email address for content to be provided to the Commission for the upcoming Commission meeting.

Regards,
Nathan Ensز

On Fri, Jan 6, 2023 at 9:15 AM Nathan Ensز <nathanensz@gmail.com> wrote:
Greetings all,

Following up on this to ensure you're on track to have the information to me by EOD Monday, January 9. If you could provide an update that would be appreciated.

Thanks
Nathan

On Thu, Dec 29, 2022 at 4:18 PM Nathan Ensز <nathanensz@gmail.com> wrote:
Greetings all,

Being a landlord of a few rental properties in Lawrence since 2008, I recently received a notification of an upcoming discussion. After hearing about this from the last City Commission meeting, I was looking forward to providing my input, but will be unable to do so since only a single meeting is provided, and it is squarely in the middle of a

workday. I'd imagine quite a few other landlords fall into my situation where we have full time professions other than the rentals we have and cannot, on short notice, shuffle schedules to attend a meeting in the middle of an already busy workday. It seems an opportunity was missed to not only meet the request of the commission's ask to involve landlords but also the spirit of it by hosting more than one instance and at different times, such as after normal work hours, to ensure you get the most involvement possible. Additionally, it seems another opportunity was missed by not involving the Resident Agent who is also my property manager I have assisting me with the management of my rental properties to ensure the best possible experience for my tenants. It seems you are not truly after the involvement of landlords or the property managers in this discussion. This is exacerbated by the fact that the statement that the Zoom link will be available on the City's website in advance of the meeting. Where on the City's website and when to expect to look for that link are unknown.

Since I will not be able to attend the meeting and this is the only email address provided in the notification I received, I'm going to submit my questions here and would appreciate a response by end of day January 9th so I have time to prepare any written remarks prior to the January 15th deadline. Please reply all so both myself and my property manager can see the responses.

1. All my rentals currently are enrolled in the City's rental license program and are inspected in accordance with the program. How much more frequently are properties inspected if vouchers are used as a form of payment?
2. My properties consistently pass the city mandated inspections. Are the HUD inspections the same? If not, please specify all the differences.
3. Assuming there are differences between the City and HUD inspections, what happens if a property of mine, which meets the City requirements, does not pass a HUD inspection? Is an owner required to modify the house to make it compliant? For instance, if I saw correctly, the requirements mentioned by HUD is that there must be a working ceiling light in the living room. I'll use my personal house as an example which was built in the late 50s. My living room has zero ceiling lights, and I must rely on lamps. My interpretation is that this doesn't meet the HUD requirements but given that the City inspection seems to be focused on safety items, I'm willing to bet this still passes the City inspection requirements. Would an owner be expected to add a ceiling light at the owner's expense?
4. What other instances of differences between the city inspections and the HUD inspections do you see potential issues?
5. 2023 Fair Market Rent according to HUD for a 3 bedroom is \$1458. If the rent is over that amount for a 3 bedroom property, what happens then? Does this mean the property is not eligible for a voucher payment?
6. I have some tenants that have previously preferred to sign leases for longer than a year. How would the tenant and I know what an acceptable rent increase would be for the second year of the lease without HUD data if they were paying with a voucher?
7. Do current tenants not paying with a voucher have the right to refuse entry into their house for a HUD inspection that may be needed for a future tenant? What happens if they do?
8. If a tenant using a voucher as a payment damages a property, what is the process to recuperate the expenses if different than that of a tenant not using vouchers? What assurances do landlords have that the funds will always be available?
9. Part of the testimony in the previous City Commission meeting mentioned funding available to encourage landlords to accept vouchers. In the same meeting, it was later mentioned that the number of properties accepting vouchers is on the decline. What reasons have been provided as to why fewer properties are accepting vouchers? What action items have been proposed/implemented to address the concerns raised?
10. Is the eviction process different since Federal funds are involved? If so, how?
11. If I've had a City inspection in a year, are we required to have a HUD inspection in that same year if later we rent to a tenant paying with a voucher? How much does each inspection cost and is anything refunded if two inspections happen in a single year?

12. If I have paid my City rental license fee and then later in the year get a tenant paying with vouchers, will the City refund me my license fee?
13. Who is performing the HUD inspections and are there enough people currently available to perform the inspections in a timely manner if there is a large influx of required inspections?
14. If the voucher payment is late, who is responsible for covering the late fees specified in the contract for late payments?
15. For a tenant paying with a voucher, am I still able to utilize my existing lease?

Vouchers as a payment are fine by me IF they truly are equal in effort as well. I'd be happy to accept it as a payment if all of my questions above prove out that it truly is equal in effort and time, but it seems to me that they are not equal. Inspections are different. Per testimony at the last Commission meeting we'll be required to do additional work and provide additional documentation which takes time and effort. To ensure we're on the same page, time and effort are not free and cost money. I can see how it would be discriminatory to charge more for a voucher payment, but it seems the required time is greater. Why should I and my property manager be required to take on more effort, documentation, finding comparable properties to back up rent prices, and threats of lawsuits without the ability to be compensated for the increased time and effort required along with greater risk? I could be wrong, but I'd think fewer and fewer people are interested in voucher payments because they are already busy enough and the time and effort needed to accept the voucher payment isn't seen to be worth the effort.

As a side comment, if the city is looking to make housing more affordable, one option readily available would be to allow more non-related people to live together. The explanation given to me when this requirement went into place is that it was designed to reduce the parking congestion. If providing more affordable housing is a priority for the City of Lawrence, perhaps allowing more people to spread the cost of a rental out to a greater number of unrelated people should be allowed. For instance, a 3 bedroom property according to HUD is \$1,458 in 2023. Assuming an equal split, that's \$486 per person. A 4 bedroom is \$1,733 or 433.25. This is a reduction of nearly 11% per person compared to three people in a 3 bedroom property and it gets even greater if four unrelated people choose to rent a 3 bedroom place (or smaller) but this currently isn't an option.

I appreciate your response to the questions by January 9th so I can have this information in advance of the January 15th deadline.

Thanks for your consideration.
Nathan Ensiz

5. 2023 Fair Market Rent according to HUD for a 3 bedroom is \$1458. If the rent is over that amount for a 3 bedroom property, what happens then? Does this mean the property is not eligible for a voucher payment?
6. I have some tenants that have previously preferred to sign leases for longer than a year. How would the tenant and I know what an acceptable rent increase would be for the second year of the lease without HUD data if they were paying with a voucher?
7. Do current tenants not paying with a voucher have the right to refuse entry into their house for a HUD inspection that may be needed for a future tenant? What happens if they do?
8. If a tenant using a voucher as a payment damages a property, what is the process to recuperate the expenses if different than that of a tenant not using vouchers? What assurances do landlords have that the funds will always be available?
9. Part of the testimony in the previous City Commission meeting mentioned funding available to encourage landlords to accept vouchers. In the same meeting, it was later mentioned that the number of properties accepting vouchers is on the decline. What reasons have been provided as to why fewer properties are accepting vouchers? What action items have been proposed/implemented to address the concerns raised?
10. Is the eviction process different since Federal funds are involved? If so, how?
11. If I've had a City inspection in a year, are we required to have a HUD inspection in that same year if later we rent to a tenant paying with a voucher? How much does each inspection cost and is anything refunded if two inspections happen in a single year?
12. If I have paid my City rental license fee and then later in the year get a tenant paying with vouchers, will the City refund me my license fee?
13. Who is performing the HUD inspections and are there enough people currently available to perform the inspections in a timely manner if there is a large influx of required inspections?
14. If the voucher payment is late, who is responsible for covering the late fees specified in the contract for late payments?
15. For a tenant paying with a voucher, am I still able to utilize my existing lease?

Vouchers as a payment are fine by me IF they truly are equal in effort as well. I'd be happy to accept it as a payment if all of my questions above prove out that it truly is equal in effort and time, but it seems to me that they are not equal. Inspections are different. Per testimony at the last Commission meeting we'll be required to do additional work and provide additional documentation which takes time and effort. To ensure we're on the same page, time and effort are not free and cost money. I can see how it would be discriminatory to charge more for a voucher payment, but it seems the required time is greater. Why should I and my property manager be required to take on more effort, documentation, finding comparable properties to back up rent prices, and threats of lawsuits without the ability to be compensated for the increased time and effort required along with greater risk? I could be wrong, but I'd think fewer and fewer people are interested in voucher payments because they are already busy enough and the time and effort needed to accept the voucher payment isn't seen to be worth the effort.

As a side comment, if the city is looking to make housing more affordable, one option readily available would be to allow more non-related people to live together. The explanation given to me when this requirement went into place is that it was designed to reduce the parking congestion. If providing more affordable housing is a priority for the City of Lawrence, perhaps allowing more people to spread the cost of a rental out to a greater number of unrelated people should be allowed. For instance, a 3 bedroom property according to HUD is \$1,458 in 2023. Assuming an equal split, that's \$486 per person. A 4 bedroom is \$1,733 or 433.25. This is a reduction of nearly 11% per person compared to three people in a 3 bedroom property and it gets even greater if four unrelated people choose to rent a 3 bedroom place (or smaller) but this currently isn't an option.

I appreciate your response to the questions by January 9th so I can have this information in advance of the January 15th deadline.

Thanks for your consideration.
Nathan Ensز

Sandra Fangohr

From: Brett S. <bjsteinbrink@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 3, 2023 12:43 AM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Ordinance Number 9960

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing in support of the Lawrence City Commission adopting Ordinance No. 9960, which prohibits discrimination in housing on the basis of a person's source of income or the person's status as a survivor of domestic violence, sexual assault, human trafficking, or stalking.

I was fortunate enough to purchase a home here in Lawrence during the summer of 2021 after years of saving. Prior to that, I had rented from various places around Lawrence since 2014. I'm fortunate that I've always had a stable income making it fairly easy to get a lease, however many of our Lawrence neighbors are not so lucky. Much has been said lately about the houseless community and as our community struggles to assist our most vulnerable members, it seems to me to be a very easy first step that the city commission can take in order to directly help the situation. I have heard from landlords in town before about being unable to fill a certain amount of units every year. To me, adopting this ordinance is a win-win for landlords and those seeking affordable housing alike. Accepting housing vouchers makes sure that landlords are not losing money, and qualifying renters have a much easier time finding housing. Additionally, I have helped more than one friend move out of unsafe living arrangements in the wake of breakups or divorce, and I know how important having some abuse protections in place for tenants would be when seeking what is often housing on a short notice.

Thanks,

Brett Steinbrink

Proposed City of Lawrence Ordinance No. 9960

My employment prevents me from attending meetings during normal business hours, so I am submitting my input via the City Clerk. I am neutral on this proposal, but do have some recommendations, questions, and concerns. ~ John Martello, 2709 Meadow Place, Lawrence KS 66047

1. The ordinance must be specific and not open-ended.

On pages eight and nine, the proposed section 10-102.32 defines Source of Income using the term "not limited to" repeatedly. This open-ended clause is too broad for interpretation and will lead to potential conflict. The city must specifically spell out what is and is not considered a source of income at this time. If in the future, this section must be amended to expand the definition, then a process similar to what is being conducted today will be needed, versus allowing internal administrative interpretation.

2. There needs to be some assurance that ANY qualifying source of income is predictable and dependable.

Gambling is a lawful activity and some actually are successful at making a living at this risky endeavor. A potential tenant with a large bank balance today does not mean this source of income will be available for the entirety of a lease agreement. This is an extreme example, but possible as currently defined. The point is this – 72.5% of landlords are individual owners with one or two rental properties. And of this group, approximately 60% have mortgages on their rental properties, and they are required to show predictable and dependable sources of income when obtaining and maintaining their commercial loans. The remaining 40% of these small-time landlords may no longer have a bank mortgage to satisfy but rely on timely rent payments for their livelihood – with the majority of this group consisting of retirees. Again, specifically defining what is and is not a predictable and dependable source of income is needed so mortgage payments and livelihoods can be maintained. Please replace the wording ANY QUALIFYING SOURCE with actual specifics to help everyone. If in the future, this section needs to be amended, then it can be at that time.

3. Is the City of Lawrence open to establishing a fund to assist landlords?

As the City of Lawrence moves the rental industry towards a more structured and bureaucratic process, consideration needs to be given to strengthening safeguards for those providing the majority of the rental housing stock within the city limits. To be successful in maximizing eligibility of tenant occupancy, it is important that properties currently rented remain rentals during a time of tight housing inventory. Yes, the housing market could use more single-family and condo properties listed for buyers, but any loss of rental spaces would undermine the proposed changes of this ordinance.

The previously mentioned 72.5% of small-time landlords do not have deep pockets and are unlikely to shoulder unplanned expenses and/or delayed income. Yes, the current market-based model has this risk, but there is a degree of control and planning that successful landlords can account for. In the case of HUD Housing Choice Voucher, at present, a landlord currently accepting or considering a relationship with HUD for a particular property understands that there will be initial tenant occupancy without receiving full payment, and there will be month(s) delay before the first rent payment is received. This income delay (a financial float) is factored into how many properties they are willing to absorb. The proposed amendments take away such control and planning, in that all properties will now be subject to demands, stipulations, requirements, and potential income delays that cannot be anticipated or known

depending on which Source of Income (HUD, VASH, various grant underwriters, etc...) is presented, adding a new level of complexity and financial risk for landlords.

So, I propose the City of Lawrence consider something to off-set this added risk, by assisting landlords with a small fund that qualifying landlords (those that consist of the 72.5% mentioned before) can make a claim regarding significant hardships with potential compensation to cover a percentage of the cost of extraordinary losses related to major tenant property damage not covered by insurance, extensive delinquent payments and/or uncollectable judgments, free legal services and supports up to a defined cap, and such. Just something to show support for landlords. A strong and stable rental industry is a win for tenants and landlords. I agree with the spirit of the Lawrence City Commission to think boldly about the rental industry and ask consideration also be given in support of landlords too.

Source: National Association of Realtors 2018 Rental Housing Finance Survey

Sandra Fangohr

From: Brian McFall <BMcFall@banklandmark.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 4, 2023 11:34 AM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Ordinance No. 9960

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

Thank you for reaching out regarding the proposed ordinance No. 9960.

When we look at potential tenants we look at many items, but overall it comes down to does their previous history indicate that they have the ability and sufficient income to pay on time. As long as they are legal sources of income, we don't really care where it comes from as long as it is steady and comes directly from the tenant. We do not want to receive rent from mom and dad that aren't living there. If there are two or three tenants, we want one check or Venmo, not two or three checks or Venmo payments. When we have to track do payments from multiple sources that adds time and record keeping. We want tenants that do not damage our property, that don't do illegal things on or inside our property, that move all of their stuff out of the property when they leave and more.

I am sympathetic to victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, human trafficking, stalking. This proposed ordinance seems like a major over reach and quite frankly very invasive to potential tenants as well. We have Federal housing protections which landlords follow, we don't need to add more to that which would be very difficult to enforce. Do you really want us to ask a potential tenant, "Hey, any sexual assaults we need to know about with your application?" I showed this proposal to one of my co-workers that rents as to what she would think if something like this were asked of her or on an application. Her response was unprintable, but in summary; "none of the property owners damn business." If these questions are on an application, I see it as a problem and invasive. If it only comes up after the property owner has multiple applicants and the landlord happens to choose one that isn't the individual that was a victim of domestic violence or one of the additional classes that are possibly being added, then that is a major concern as well.

If there is a requirement that housing vouchers be accepted it will just cause individual landlords to increase their rent to factor in the additional time spent collecting rent from both a tenant and an agency. Not all rental properties are handled by full time or on site property managers. Numerous properties are owned by individuals or couples who work full time jobs in addition to working with tenants. When something takes more time, it increases the cost and it does get passed on to the tenants.

I am not in favor of any part of the proposed ordinance No. 9960.

Brian McFall

Brian McFall Vice President
Mortgage Lending NMLS #689835
Landmark National Bank
2710 Iowa
Lawrence, Kansas 66046

Phone: Direct 785.228.8620 or 785.841.7152 or 785.841.6677 ext 3320
Fax 785.841.5101

A Four time Best of Lawrence Award Winner/Mortgage lending

2023,2022, 2021, 2020, 2019, 2018, 2017,2016 & 2015 Kansas City Five Star Mortgage Professional

Apply online or visit my website brian.banklandmark.com

To Send me files securely, please click [here](#)!

Everyone starts as a customer but leaves as a friend

The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorized and this message and accompanying documents may be covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on it, is prohibited and may be unlawful. Please delete the communication and attachments from your computers and systems. Although this communication is believed to be free of virus or other defect, it is your responsibility to ensure that it is virus free and we accept no responsibility for any loss or damage arising in the event a virus or defect exists.

Sandra Fangohr

From: M Horowitz <mhorowitz947@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 5, 2023 8:36 AM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Please Adopt Ordinance 9960 (Comment for Jan. 5 public meeting)

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

Dear Mayor Larsen and City Commissioners,

I'm a resident of Lawrence who is concerned about our community's housing issues and homelessness. I support the adoption of Ordinance 9960 because we need to decrease the obstacles to safe, affordable housing for all community members.

It is deeply concerning that a May 2021 survey of 115 rental units available in Lawrence found that 80% wouldn't accept housing choice vouchers, and all units require a minimum credit score and income check. We have nearly 2,000 community members who have received emergency rental assistance through the Housing Stabilization Collaborative or use/are waiting for Housing Authority vouchers.

Respectfully, it is obscene to allow our community members to remain unhoused through yet another brutal winter because landlords are allowed to discriminate based on how their rent is paid.

I hope you will put your 2020 campaign promises into action and decrease unnecessary barriers to housing by adopting Ordinance 9960.

Sincerely,
M Horowitz
Lawrence, KS

Sandra Fangohr

From: Donna Ketchum <tonganoxie69@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 5, 2023 10:34 AM
To: Kalenna Coleman
Cc: City Clerk
Subject: Ordinance No. 9960 Comments

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

Dear Kalenna:

I am writing in reference to the proposed City of Lawrence Ordinance No. 9960. I would be in attendance today at the public meeting to discuss this ordinance but am at home recuperating from surgery.

My husband and I own and operate several duplexes and condominiums within Lawrence and have for approximately 11 years. We have been blessed to have such nice tenants and we have blessed these tenants by being caring and diligent landlords. These rental properties are our source of income in our retirement years. We have gladly rented to tenants that have been considered as being disabled or in need of special accommodations. Although most of our renters are college students we have rented to middle aged and retired individuals. During Covid, we were especially understanding and concerned for our renters who were unable to work and even eliminated rent short term or even lowered rent. We do care for our tenants and treat them like friends and family.

With this being said, we have not been approached to accept vouchers from anyone submitting an application for renting. We do background checks to eliminate those with criminal records and we do look at their credit scores. But more importantly we look at their past history of paying rent to ensure they will be reliable tenants. To be required to rent to an individual or family with a history of non-payment of rent or eviction would potentially put us at risk for making our own payments.

Thank you,

Joe and Donna Ketchum
tonganoxie69@aol.com

PS: Thank you Kalenna for returning my phone call and I appreciate you answering my questions. Additional questions I would like clarification on are the following:

1. I was told that when the housing authority does background checks on potential renters prior to providing vouchers and they see a history of non-payment of rent or evictions, they take this risk into account when deciding how much the voucher will be. If these tenants still fail to make their monthly rent payments then eviction would be an approved and necessary step for the landlord. How difficult would this be and how long would it take since during this time the landlord would probably not be receiving any rent payments?
2. Regarding individual disability, does the requirements of Ordinance 9960 or any other Lawrence housing ordinance mirror the requirements of the Americans Disabilities Act (ADA) or does it place additional requirements on the part of the landlord. In other words, is the ADA's reasonable accommodations the same as what Lawrence ordinances require?

To:
City of Lawrence Commissioners
Re: Proposed Ordinance NO. 9960
1/7/23

From:
Rick Mitchell
2804 Tomahawk Dr.
Lawrence, KS 66049

Commissioners,

I participated via ZOOM in the meeting of January 5, that was intended to hear views of Lawrence landlords regarding the proposed ordinance 9960. I have owned two rental properties in Lawrence for the past thirteen years. I am a retired senior citizen who relies on the properties to provide monthly income. I regard myself as a hands-on and responsive landlord who keeps the properties in excellent condition. I am also conscious of the shortage of affordable housing in Lawrence and strive to keep the rents I charge within the reach of tenants in our market. This has been a real challenge as property taxes have risen and insurance rates (including liability insurance), and maintenance services have increased annually.

One of my properties is a three bedroom house. This has proven to be popular among single parents with children. Affordable rental houses with three bedrooms are, apparently, rare in Lawrence. I have had six separate family tenants in thirteen years. There is a lot of transience in this business.

In the past, I have rented to several single mothers with modest incomes, often coming from a variety of sources including alimony, child support and City vouchers.

I have also rented to a single man with two daughters. In this case the man's mother approached me because the father of the girls was just coming out of jail for serving a sentence as a sex offender (not a pedophile.) The family had moved into the house before I knew of the man's full history but I honored the agreement that I made with his mother who practically begged me to give him a chance.

I rented for a time to a single mother who worked as an exotic dancer in a gentleman's club in Topeka. I wondered about the stability of her income and, with the woman's permission, I checked with her employer. Upon learning that her job was stable, I rented to her and she proved to be reliable for a time. But, after a year her boyfriend moved in and, together, they abused the property. When they finally left, there was substantial damage and piles of abandoned possessions. It took thousands of dollars and two months to get the house ready for another renter.

I'm confident that any landlord could tell you stories about renters gone wrong. For landlords like me who own one or just a few properties, these situations can be financially disrupting and emotionally upsetting. We may be categorically different than owners of large apartment complexes who rent to dozens or hundreds of tenants in that a bad renter can cause us, proportionally, more trouble. For us, having as much information about a potential tenant as possible can go a long way toward helping us find a tenant who will be reliable and responsible, but there are always risks.

So, here are my concerns about the proposed ordinance 9960:

Landlords need to protect their investments. To do that, they need to be able to gauge the risk of allowing (usually) people they do not know occupy their property. They should retain the right to check the financial backgrounds of prospective tenants and to know the sources of income. To my mind, this is no different than approaching a bank for a loan. In a lease agreement, the contract sets an amount of money that a tenant is responsible for to conclude the lease. In a bank loan, a similar agreement is made; a predetermined amount of money to be paid is established and the borrower agrees to the terms. The bank determines whether the potential borrower will have the resources to repay the loan by checking on income, credit history, acquiring references, requesting a guarantor, etc. The bank can reject a borrower if the financial information suggests the borrower is a poor risk. A landlord should be able to make the same kind of inquiries and set the same kind of requirements before agreeing to rent a property. After all, a landlord will have expenses (mortgage, taxes, insurance, maintenance) during the course of the lease and needs reasonable assurances that the funds to meet those expenses will be forthcoming. All relevant financial information should be available to the landlord. To restrict the landlord's ability to determine the sources of income of a potential tenant is a serious handicap.

As a landlord, I am aware that some tenants regard landlords as opponents and they may, at some level, resent a landlord for being (they imagine) better off than they are. But for some landlords, losing rent is like losing a job through no fault of their own. Who can blame them for wanting to enter into agreements with tenants that are based on facts understandable by all parties with no relevant information withheld or hidden?

From: Diane Stoddard <dstoddard@lawrenceks.org>

Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2023 11:29:25 AM

To: City Clerk <cityclerk@lawrenceks.org>

Cc: Brandon McGuire <bmcguire@lawrenceks.org>; Casey Toomay <ctoomay@lawrenceks.org>; Porter Arneill <parneill@lawrenceks.org>

Subject: FW: Proposed Change to Ordinance 9960

Can you please include this in the agenda packet for the Jan 17th meeting- I'm not sure who is preparing the agenda item relating to source of income discrimination, but this is related to that item. Thanks!

Thanks, Diane



Diane Stoddard, Assistant City Manager – dstoddard@lawrenceks.org

City Manager's Office | [City of Lawrence, KS](https://www.cityoflawrenceks.org)

P.O Box 708, Lawrence, KS 66044

office (785) 832-3413 | fax (785) 832-3405

From: Gayle Johnson <gjohnson@sunflower.com>

Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2023 9:33 AM

To: Diane Stoddard <dstoddard@lawrenceks.org>

Cc: rjohnson@sunflower.com

Subject: Proposed Change to Ordinance 9960

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

January 10, 2023

Diane Stoddard, Assistant City Manager

6 E 6th

PO Box 708

Lawrence, Kansas 66044

Dear Ms. Stoddard,

We are the owners of five townhomes in the city of Lawrence Kansas. We have concerns about a city ordinance that is being considered that will restrict Landlords ability to select tenants. This proposed changes to ordinance #9960 will state that Landlords may not discriminate potential tenants due to their source of income. Currently we do not accept Section 8 due to the restrictions, inspections, and resources required for participation. Currently, the City of Lawrence has a

Long-Term Residential Rental Dwelling License requirement and inspections are part of that compliance.

Although, we do not discriminate we have guidelines we follow when considering a new tenant. We operate off of credit and background checks and that is essential to protecting our investment properties. Our tenants must pass a credit and background check. And we always consider a debt to credit ratio when selecting a tenant.

We believe the restriction proposed is an absolute overreach of government and possible just a stepping stone to future restrictions. We are opposed to this change to Ordinance 9960.

Respectfully,

Rick & Gayle Johnson
5707 Wagstaff Dr
Lawrence Ks 66049
gjohnson@sunflower.com
785-979-7303



Virus-free. www.avast.com

Sandra Fangohr

From: Krista Gentry <leekris@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 9, 2023 8:49 PM
To: City Commission Agendas; Kalenna Coleman
Subject: Ordinance 9960 Comment/Question

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

Hello,

My comment/question is specific to Ordinance 9960 Section 10-102.32 (C) for Source of Income: Money derived from any benefit or subsidy program. Benefit or subsidy programs include, but are not limited to: Any housing assistance, such as Housing Choice Vouchers, Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH) Vouchers, tribal grants or vouchers, or any other form of housing assistance payment or credit, whether or not paid or attributed directly to a landlord; public assistance; emergency rental assistance; tribal or Native American benefit programs; veterans benefits; Social Security or other retirement program; supplemental security income; or other program administered by any federal, state, or local agency or nonprofit entity.

I am an employee for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. My husband, Josh Gentry, under the name Gentrywork LLC, owns a rental house at 609 E. 11th Street. My husband is prohibited from receiving "any Department subsidy provided pursuant to Section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1437f), to or on behalf of a tenant of property owned by the employee or the employee's spouse or minor child" pursuant to 5 CFR §7501.104.

We were unable to attend the public meeting on January 5th. Can you please clarify if this CFR is covered by the waiver of Section 4?

SECTION 4: If any section, clause, sentence, or phrase of this ordinance is found to be unconstitutional or is otherwise held invalid by any court of competent jurisdiction, it shall not affect the validity of any remaining parts of this ordinance. Also, what will be the process to request a waiver under Section 4?

I have spent my career working with in the homelessness and affordable housing arena and understand the need for the ordinance but also want to make sure there is an exception for this unique situation.

Thanks,

Krista Gentry

Sandra Fangohr

From: Mckayla Rodick [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2023 3:11 AM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Mckayla Rodick
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: Megan Willesen <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2023 12:07 AM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

Dear Mayor, Vice Mayor, and Commissioners,

I'm writing in support of the amendment to the city code that would prohibit landlords from denying a prospective tenant based solely on their source of income/use of housing vouchers. I feel that such discrimination is unethical and should be unlawful. As a very small-time landlord myself (I have just 2 units), whenever I have a vacancy I am inundated with requests from prospective tenants who receive Section 8 assistance and many tell me how difficult and rare it is to find a landlord willing to accept their voucher. Removing this barrier to housing will improve the lives of vulnerable people and also benefit the community as a whole by helping to decrease our population of people experiencing homelessness.

During the worst of the COVID-19 epidemic one of my tenants unfortunately experienced a pandemic-related employment loss. But because of the Section 8 assistance I still received partial rent while she secured a new job. Having access to those funds helped me to cover the expenses related to the unit and took the pressure off of the tenant. We both benefited from this service.

I see the housing assistance program as a win-win for all parties involved. The required inspection for rental units is easy to pass for any property that is well-maintained (as all rentals should be) and helps to ensure safety and comfort for tenants, which they deserve. I found the certification process very easy and felt well-supported by the housing authority during that process. There are no excuses for landlords to continue to be allowed to deny housing to prospective tenants for using a voucher.

Thank you for your consideration of this code amendment.

Megan Willesen
mezzanayne@gmail.com
801 N. 7th Street
Lawrence, Kansas 66044

Sandra Fangohr

From: Jes Marta [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2023 12:06 AM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Jes Marta
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Austin Nguyen [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2023 12:02 AM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Austin Nguyen
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Carlie Clary [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2023 10:55 PM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Carlie Clary
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Lily Rapp [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2023 10:19 PM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Lily Rapp

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Grace Parker [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2023 10:03 PM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Grace Parker
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Jewel Fivecoat [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2023 9:53 PM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Kansas City tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Jewel Fivecoat
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Lauren Trimble [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2023 9:39 PM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Lauren Trimble
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: Paula Taylor [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2023 9:01 PM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am fortunate enough to 1) house a boyfriend to split rent with and 2) have a military housing benefit for being a dependent while also having the opportunity to work.

If I had to rent in Lawrence based off only the income I could make working in Lawrence would be enough to afford the bare minimums to meet the basic needs of food, shelter, and clothing.

Without allowing individuals to use section 8 or other housing vouchers you are allowing our community to further separate the high class with the lower class. You are allowing discrimination to continue when over COVID-19 Lawrence was a great town to be in with how supportive it was for moving toward a place where people can be free and safe.

The University of Kansas is even still continuing to pay respects for the discovery of Native American remains found on campus in storage. On Campus we are constantly learning new ways to defend those against discrimination. If the University is teaching it current residents renters are non renter become nondiscriminatory then the city counsel should follow in our generations food steps.

We are being taught how to make changes for the future, well this is one of them and you can choose to vote in favor of Ordinance No. 9960. Not only to protect those that need assistance with their housing, because we can never be too proud for assistance, and those that are survivors of domestic violence, sexual assault, human trafficking, or stalking.

This is a public matter and deserves to be discussed with the public that it's affecting and not the people that put the discriminatory policy in place to begin and did not change to add a clause for their company to allow them.

If we are willing to accept vouchers for those that have served our country, or had family that qualify for those benefits, then we should be willing to serve those that help make our city the wonderful place it is.

Thank you for taking the time to listen/read this. I truly hope you represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Paula Taylor

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Camille Isabella Vandergriff [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2023 8:47 PM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Camille Isabella Vandergriff

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Ellen Nangia [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2023 8:43 PM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

My 2 children are Lawrence tenants and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Ellen Nangia
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Hannah Jones [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2023 8:42 PM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Hannah Jones
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Quincy Mayden [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2023 8:42 PM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Quincy Mayden
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Andrew Fitzgerald [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2023 8:40 PM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Andrew Fitzgerald
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Grant Hull [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2023 8:39 PM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Grant Hull
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Carlie Sauntry [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2023 8:37 PM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Carlie Sauntry
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Sophia Nangia [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2023 8:31 PM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

I'm a resident of Lawrence and I'm concerned about housing issues and homelessness. Adding these additional protections for renters, who make up over half of the Lawrence population, is a solution that has my support because I have seen firsthand how homelessness affects people.

A survey of 115 available rental units in Lawrence in May 2021 showed that 80% would not accept housing choice vouchers, over 50% would not work with tenants with a criminal

history, and all units required a minimum credit score and income check. Housing is a human right, and these changes will allow for more people to be housed.

Housing is the first step to helping get people off the streets and get them the help they need. These policies that are being discussed at the meeting have been recognized by HUD, the American Bar Association, the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, the Poverty Race and Research Action Council, and dozens of additional national housing organizations as effective at improving housing outcomes and increasing opportunities for housing.

These policies are important. These policies are necessary.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Sophia Nangia

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Ana Wriedt Badillo <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2023 2:06 PM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Ana Wriedt Badillo

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Nicole Whitten <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2023 1:44 PM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Nicole Whitten

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Miranda Meyer <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2023 1:11 PM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Miranda Meyer

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Mikayla Lisher <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2023 12:38 PM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Mikayla Lisher

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Owen Barker <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2023 11:47 AM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Owen Barker

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Darby Gilliland <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2023 11:36 AM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Darby Gilliland

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Cady Jarman <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2023 11:35 AM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Cady Jarman

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Kaitlyn Black <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2023 11:22 AM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

As a college student at KU where so many of us are forced to rent, it's appalling that you choose to side with landlords. Lawrence wouldn't be what it is if it wasn't for us KU students and the fact that you side with money hungry landlords, rather than the actual people in the community is disgusting.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Kaitlyn Black

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Allison Ament <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2023 10:03 AM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I will be a Lawrence tenant in August and I have many friends who live in Lawrence now and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Allison Ament

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Ana Wriedt Badillo <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2023 2:06 PM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Ana Wriedt Badillo

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Nicole Whitten <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2023 1:44 PM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Nicole Whitten

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Miranda Meyer <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2023 1:11 PM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Miranda Meyer

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Mikayla Lisher <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2023 12:38 PM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Mikayla Lisher

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Owen Barker <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2023 11:47 AM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Owen Barker

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Darby Gilliland <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2023 11:36 AM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Darby Gilliland

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Cady Jarman <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2023 11:35 AM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Cady Jarman

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Kaitlyn Black <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2023 11:22 AM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

Categories: CC Agendas

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

As a college student at KU where so many of us are forced to rent, it's appalling that you choose to side with landlords. Lawrence wouldn't be what it is if it wasn't for us KU students and the fact that you side with money hungry landlords, rather than the actual people in the community is disgusting.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Kaitlyn Black

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Allison Ament <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2023 10:03 AM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

Categories: CC Agendas

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I will be a Lawrence tenant in August and I have many friends who live in Lawrence now and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Allison Ament

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]



January 11 2023

Lawrence City Commission
6 E 6th. St.
Lawrence, KS 66044

Dear Mayor Larsen, City Commissioners, and City Staff:

Ballard Center desires to express our support for the proposed changes to Chapter 10 of the City Code. This policy change has been recognized as effective at improving housing outcomes and increased opportunities for housing by HUD, the American Bar Association, the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, the Poverty Race and Research Action Counsel, and dozens of additional national housing organizations. We know that these changes would support Lawrence community members.

Renters in Lawrence with vouchers currently have no protections from discrimination due to source of income. This significant barrier has caused our community's Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) utilization rate to go down and frequently prevents the housing of our elderly, disabled, and working-class population.

The negative impact that strict source of income requirements have had on our clients and community is staggering. Community members who experience discrimination in the screening process too often remain inadequately housed, become homeless due to lack of protections, and can potentially lose their HCV. Housing instability puts further strain on our social safety nets including expensive shelter and temporary housing. The more we enact policy encouraging the stable housing of our clients, the more economic and humanitarian benefits we will see in our community.

We implore the Mayor, City Commissioners, and City Staff to support this vital change to Chapter 10 of the City Code. Thank you for your dedication to the health and safety of everyone in our community.

Sincerely,

Kyle Roggenkamp
Development Director
Ballard Center

Ballard Center | 708 Elm St, P.O. Box 7, Lawrence, KS 66046 | BallardCenter.org | 785-842-0729

Sandra Fangohr

From: Brookelynn Landes <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2023 3:21 PM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Brookelynn Landes

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Mercedes Roland <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2023 3:20 PM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence resident and I'm disappointed and angry!

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well-researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like my fellow Lawrence residents from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Mercedes Roland

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Eli Jost <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2023 2:59 PM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Eli Jost

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Chad Govier <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2023 10:27 PM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Chad Govier

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Jane Fergus <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2023 9:50 PM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

Commissioners,

Once again, we find ourselves in the position of needing to write to you regarding the rental income discrimination vote that is coming up. We are strongly encouraging you to vote IN FAVOR OF enacting a rental income discrimination policy.

We are concerned about the availability of affordable housing in our community. We both feel having safe, stable housing should be a human right we all strive for. We understand you are considering adopting a measure that would require landlords in this city to stop discriminating against those individuals that have alternate forms of rental payments, like vouchers. We are in favor of this change and encourage you to vote for this change!!!

We must start looking at this from both our heads and our hearts. We simply cannot continue to allow people to die on the streets when we have options available to us.

We do understand this is not a magic bullet to solve all the issues surrounding homelessness, but it can be the first of many steps to a more compassionate approach to helping those that need the help.

Thank you for your time and commitment to making our community a better place to live.

Sincerely,

Fred and Jane Fergus

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Jane Fergus

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Yasmine Jakmouj <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2023 7:42 PM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence resident and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Yasmine Jakmouj

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Nick Beasley <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2023 5:49 PM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Nick Beasley

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Ande Johnson <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2023 5:27 PM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Ande Johnson

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Curtis Nelson <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2023 5:11 PM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Curtis Nelson

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Maddie Backus <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Thursday, January 12, 2023 9:50 AM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants from predatory landlords.

I think the commission should reflect deeply on the word choice used by mega-landlords. If they own more housing that one person could use in a lifetime, are they truly invested in our community? Furthermore, what does our community stand for? Human rights or lining the pockets of the few? Overall if you choose (rightly) to house human beings the return on that investment will benefit our community tenfold. If our commission chooses to side with the investment interests of landlords it shows us that our community leaders do not value our community's health or human rights. Personally I think that the real estate investment market strategy is morally abhorrent, Lawrence continues to become a more and more expensive place to live and the reality is that if our commission allows that to happen it will

fundamentally eliminate all the character and appeal of living here. If we want to retain a diverse, healthy, creative, strong community we have to lift up those of us who are struggling the most, not prop up the financial interests of landlords.

I think the fact that there is even a question for the commission about who they side with makes me reconsider my vote next time the city commission seats come up for a vote. You can expect that I will not vote to retain anyone who votes against housing the houseless, and I will encourage everyone to vote with me.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Maddie Backus

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Jacob Schmill <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Thursday, January 12, 2023 2:30 PM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

As a Lawrence tenant, it is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase while wages stagnate. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan. The proposed plan does not restrict the control landlords already have over their set rents, and does not mandate any preferential treatment be given to those potential tenants possessing vouchers. This plan simply seeks to give fairer and more equitable opportunities to the homeless population of Lawrence.

City leadership eagerly campaigns on pledges to end the crisis of homelessness in this city, yet when time comes for action, all that is offered are hollow words and platitudes. On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords, and ensure that housing is fair and equitable for all.

Jacob Schmill
jacob.schmill@gmail.com

5100 W 6 St., Apt. B4
Lawrence, KS, Kansas 66049

Sandra Fangohr

From: Jacquelyn Potts <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Thursday, January 12, 2023 3:23 PM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Jacquelyn Potts

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Sarah Yoho <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Thursday, January 12, 2023 3:11 PM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

WE NEED AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND WHILE YOU'RE AT IT, ACCESSIBLE MENTAL HEALTH INPATIENT AND EMERGENCY FACILITIES.

WE DID NOT WANT A NEW POLICE STATION- WE WANT AFFORDABLE GOOD ACCESSIBLE HOUSING AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Sarah Yoho

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Hilary Andersen Carter <hilary.k.carter@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 12, 2023 3:06 PM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Source of Income Status - Ordinance No. 9960 - City of Lawrence, Kansas

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

Dear Mayor Larsen, Vice Mayor Littlejohn, and City Commissioners,

I am writing in support of Ordinance No. 9960, Source of Income Status, which would prohibit housing discrimination based on a person's source of income and/or status as a survivor of domestic violence. In particular, landlord discrimination against tenant-based voucher holders is a pervasive national and local problem that prevents many low-income households from securing adequate housing. I fully endorse the city's efforts to end this widespread discriminatory practice.

Thank you,

Hilary Carter
Lawrence, KS

From: Cassandra Barrett <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Thursday, January 12, 2023 3:04 PM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Ending Source of Income Discrimination in Lawrence

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

As a native of Lawrence and a tenant, I was shocked at the amount of reactive fear, ignorance, and anger displayed at the landlord outreach meeting. I strongly support the passing of this new ordinance change to provide some protection for Lawrence renters from source of income discrimination. If we are being honest, we know that this is a small change and discrimination will likely still happen, but it is a step in the right direction. Our community members who use subsidies are no more destructive or risky than any other tenant. The fact that this was the basis of so many landlord arguments against this ordinance, shows that we **need** this ordinance because discriminatory biases are clearly rampant.

I was particularly disheartened to see that individuals like Ken Vonderach, a notoriously litigious out-of-state property owner, were given so much space to voice their discriminatory views of individuals receiving subsidies for housing. He is not a Lawrencian and I hope he makes good on his threat to withdraw from the 162 units he has purchased that could be owned and inhabited by individuals who actually care about this community, rather than their "investments."

I hope you will all remember that you represent PEOPLE, not investments. In this town, most of those people rent and many more wish to rent but are not able to (in great part because of source-of-income discrimination) and are therefore unhoused. It is a choice to be a landlord-risk of lost investment is inherent in that choice. It is not optional to be a human being who needs housing. We need to prioritize real needs, not greed.

I am urging you to put research and compassion over landlord fears and profits on January 17th. Pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure it is enforced.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Cassandra Barrett

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Carol Collier <ccollier@independenceinc.org>
Sent: Friday, January 13, 2023 10:13 AM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Income discrimination protections

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

January 17 2023

Lawrence City Commission
6 E 6th. St.
Lawrence, KS 66044

Dear Mayor Larsen, City Commissioners, and City Staff:

Independence, Inc. desires to express our support for the proposed changes to Chapter 10 of the City Code. This policy change has been recognized as effective at improving housing outcomes and increased opportunities for housing by HUD, the American Bar Association, the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, the Poverty Race and Research Action Counsel, and dozens of additional national housing organizations. We know that these changes would support Lawrence community members.

Renters in Lawrence with vouchers currently have no protections from discrimination due to source of income. This significant barrier has caused our community's Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) utilization rate to go down and frequently prevents the housing of our elderly, disabled, and working class population.

The negative impact that strict source of income requirements have had on our clients and community is staggering. Community members who experience discrimination in the screening process too often remain inadequately housed, become homeless due to lack of protections, and can potentially lose their HCV. Housing instability puts further strain on our social safety nets including expensive shelter and temporary housing. The more we enact policy encouraging the stable housing of our clients, the more economic and humanitarian benefits we will see in our community.

We implore the Mayor, City Commissioners, and City Staff to support this vital change to Chapter 10 of the City Code. Thank you for your dedication to the health and safety of everyone in our community.

On a personal note, I'm a 70 year old widow who has come out of retirement to come back to work. I don't have much savings left and I'm trying to make it last as long as possible. Fortunately, I'm healthy and able to work for now. Without the income from my job, I would have to live on my SSA income of approx. \$1,350.00/month. With rentals that are \$700, \$800 and \$900 I don't know where I'm going to be able to live.

The landlords don't seem to have any limits on what they can raise the rent to apparently.. Last year the rent went up about \$70.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Carol Collier
Information and Referral Specialist
Independence, Inc.



Carol Collier
Information & Referral Specialist
ccollier@independenceinc.org
www.independenceinc.org

2001 Haskell Avenue • Lawrence, KS 66046
Telephone: (785) 841-0333
Fax: (785) 841-1094

The mission of Independence, Inc. is to maximize
the independence of people with disabilities through
advocacy, peer support, training, transportation and community education.

This message and accompanying documents are covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. 2510-2521, and contain information intended for the specified individual (s) only. This information is confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this documentation in error and that any review, dissemination, copying, or the taking of any action based on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by e-mail, and delete the original message. Thank you.

Sandra Fangohr

From: Allison Zielke <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Thursday, January 12, 2023 5:21 PM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

Dear City Commissioners,

I live and rent in Lawrence and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Allison Zielke

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Sandra Fangohr

From: Serena Nangia <info@sg.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Friday, January 13, 2023 2:51 PM
To: City Commission Agendas
Subject: Public Comment for January 17th City Commission Meeting - Source of Income Ordinance

External Email. Be careful with links and attachments.

- City of Lawrence IT Helpdesk

City Commission Public Comment,

City Commissioners,

I am a Lawrence tenant and I'm disappointed and angry.

It is astounding that the city spent time and money on special outreach to landlords to get their feedback on changes meant to protect tenants from predatory landlords. Read that again, it is ridiculous.

You represent a community where over half the population rents, over 300 people don't have housing, and rental costs continue to increase. Well researched solutions like the proposed source of income protections should be quick, easy passes for a commission that ran on housing issues and wrote solving housing issues into the city's strategic plan.

On January 17th you have another opportunity to take action. Represent your constituents better than you did on December 13th and pass the Source of Income Ordinance. Make sure that the ordinance is adequately enforced. Protect tenants like myself from predatory landlords.

Please redact my personal information from my comment when including it in the agenda packet.

Serena Nangia

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]