To the Citizens of Los Angeles County:

The Community Development Commission of the County of Los Angeles is conducting a study concerning fair housing compliance and impediments to fair housing choice throughout the county. This study will analyze mortgage application data, fair housing complaints and the fair housing service delivery system, as well as any media reports regarding fair housing. The study also depends on the opinions and experiences of people who are knowledgeable about housing and fair housing compliance issues — people like you.

Known as the “Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice,” the study is required by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. The goal of the research is to identify whether barriers and adverse policies exist in a variety of areas, including rental housing, home sales, and the banking, insurance, and real estate industries. The study also examines public and administrative policies that may inadvertently lead to discrimination against protected classes.

This survey should take less than 10 minutes and we urge your participation in this important research. Comments gathered during this survey will be combined in a single narrative for inclusion in the Analysis of Impediments. Your comments will remain anonymous. Please click on the link below or copy this to your browser to start the survey.

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/HH5MCPD

I realize that you are very busy, but I hope you’ll have the time to participate in this important study. Please feel free to forward this e-mail and the online survey link to any other people you feel would like to participate in this research.

Thank you for your time and assistance.

Sincerely,
Terry Gonzalez, Director
Community Development Block Grant Division
10 de marzo del 2011

Queridos Ciudadanos del Condado de Los Angeles:

ENCUESTA DE EQUIDAD DE VIVIENDA DEL CONDADO DE LOS ANGELES 2011

La Comisión de Desarrollo de la Comunidad del Condado de Los Angeles está llevando a cabo un estudio sobre el cumplimiento de normas de equidad de vivienda e impedimentos a la elección de equidad de vivienda en todo el condado. Este estudio analizará los datos de la aplicación de hipoteca, denuncias de equidad de vivienda y la entrega de servicios de equidad de la vivienda, así como los informes de medios de comunicación sobre equidad de vivienda. El estudio también depende de las opiniones y experiencias de personas que conocen de la vivienda y la equidad de vivienda son problemas de cumplimiento - gente como tú.

Conocido como el "análisis de impedimentos para justa elección vivienda", el estudio es requerido por el departamento de vivienda y desarrollo urbano de los Estados Unidos. El objetivo de la investigación es determinar si existen barreras y políticas adversas en una variedad de áreas, incluyendo viviendas de alquiler, la venta de viviendas, bancario, de seguros y las industrias de bienes raíces. El estudio también examina las políticas públicas y administrativas que inadvertidamente pueden conducir a la discriminación contra las clases protegidas.

Este estudio no le deberá de tomar más de diez (10) minutos, necesitamos su participación en esta importante investigación. Comentarios recibidos durante esta encuesta se combinarán en una sola narrativa para su inclusión en el análisis de los obstáculos. Sus comentarios se permanecerán en el anónimos. Por favor, haga clic en el enlace o copiar esto en el explorador para empezar la encuesta.

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/Y3XY8PO

Me doy cuenta de que está muy ocupado, pero espero que tenga tiempo para participar en este importante estudio. No dude en enviar este correo electrónico y la encuesta vincular a cualquier otra persona a quien le gustaría participar en esta investigación.

Si tiene alguna pregunta con respecto a la encuesta, póngase en contacto con Raymond Webster, Especialista en Desarrollo, de mi personal, al (323) 890-7317.

Gracias por su tiempo y asistencia.

Atentamente,

TERRY GONZALEZ, Directora
Community Development Block Grant Division
Chancela Al-Mansour, Executive Director  
Housing Rights Center  
520 S. Virgil Ave., Ste. 400  
Los Angeles, CA  90020-1405

Dear Ms. Al-Mansour:

INVITATION TO ATTEND FAIR HOUSING OUTREACH ACTIVITIES FOR THE  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES' 2011 ANALYSIS OF IMPEDIMENTS  
TO FAIR HOUSING CHOICE STUDY

The Community Development Commission of the County of Los Angeles is currently in the process of developing a study concerning fair housing compliance and impediments to fair housing choice in the Los Angeles Urban County. As part of developing the study known as the "2011 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (AI)," we will be holding three (3) focus groups and five (5) fair housing forums to receive input on fair housing impediments and the strategies to address them.

Based on your knowledge and experience of fair housing, we would like to invite you or a designee of your choosing to participate in the planned events. We feel that involving experts in the field will add valuable feedback to the important issues we will be addressing. See the attached schedule for the times and locations of the meetings.

Please let Raymond Webster, Development Specialist, know which events you or your designee will be attending. Mr. Webster may be reached at rwebster@lacdc.org or (323) 890-7317.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please feel free to contact me at (323) 890-7168.

Sincerely,

LINDA JENKINS, Manager  
Community Development Block Grant Division
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Attachment
LOS ANGELES COUNTY OUTREACH ACTIVITIES TO DEVELOP
THE 2011 ANALYSIS OF IMPEDIMENTS TO FAIR HOUSING CHOICE STUDY

Focus Group #1
Fair Housing and Zoning and Planning Codes/Policies
Monday, March 21, 2011, 9:30 - 11:30 a.m.
CDC Commission Room
(2 Coral Circle, Monterey Park, CA 91755)

Focus Group #2
Fair Housing and Homeownership
Monday, March 21, 2011, 2:00 – 4:00 p.m.
CDC Commission Room

Focus Group #3
Fair Housing and Special Needs
Tuesday, March 22, 2011, 9:30 - 11:30 a.m.
CDC Commission Room

Fair Housing Forum #1
Tuesday, April 19, 2011, 10:00 a.m.
Rowland Heights Library
Community Room
1850 Nogales St.
Rowland Heights, CA 91748

Fair Housing Forum #2
Tuesday, April 19, 2011, 6:00 p.m.
Los Angeles County Fire Station 129 North County Training Center
Room 66A and 66B
42110 6th Street West
Lancaster, CA 93534-7134

Fair Housing Forum #3
Wednesday, April 20, 2011, 10:00 a.m.
Plummer Park
7377 Santa Monica Blvd.
West Hollywood, CA 90046

Fair Housing Forum #4
Wednesday, April 20, 2011, 6:00 p.m.
East Los Angeles Service Center
Multi-Purpose Room #109
133 N. Sunol Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90063

Fair Housing Forum #5
Thursday, April 21, 2011, 10:00 a.m.
East Rancho Dominguez Park Community Room
15116 South Atlantic Avenue
Compton, CA 90221
February 28, 2011

David Acevedo Pitre, Branch Chief
Program Compliance
Attention: Civil Rights/FHEO Division
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
611 West Sixth Street, Suite 1020
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Dear Mr. Acevedo Pitre:

INVITATION TO FAIR HOUSING FOCUS GROUP RELATIVE TO THE SURVEY OF ZONING AND PLANNING CODES, POLICIES AND PRACTICES THAT MAY POSE AN IMPEDIMENT TO FAIR HOUSING CHOICE

The Community Development Commission of the County of Los Angeles is currently in the process of developing a study concerning fair housing compliance and impediments to fair housing choice in the Los Angeles Urban County. As part of developing the study known as the “2011 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (AI),” we will be sending our Participating Cities (49) the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) supplied survey on impediments to fair housing choice. As an introduction and orientation to the survey, we will be holding a focus group meeting on March 21, 2011 which will specifically discuss HUD’s “Survey of Zoning and Planning Codes, Policies and Practices that May Pose an Impediment to Fair Housing Choice.”

Based on your knowledge and involvement in the development of the survey, we would like to invite you or a designee of your choosing to attend the focus group meeting and provide a brief introduction on the survey, including its purpose and importance. Our consultant, Western Economic Services, LLC will also be in attendance and will then lead the discussion on each of the survey questions providing any clarification as needed. You or your designee will also be welcome to offer further explanation on the survey questions as they arise.

As we develop the AI, we will also be holding two (2) other focus group meetings and five (5) fair housing forums. Acknowledging HUD’s involvement in fair housing, we would like to invite you or a designee of your choosing to participate in these other planned events. We feel that involving experts in the field will add valuable feedback to the important issues we will be addressing. See the attached schedule for the times and locations of the meetings.
Please let me know if you are able to attend the focus group meeting or any of the other events by March 11, 2011. If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact me at (323) 890-7168 or Linda.Jenkins@laode.org.

Sincerely,

LINDA JENKINS, Manager
Community Development Block Grant Division
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From the LACDC Website

Under News and Events
Fair Housing Survey & Forums
----Link to this message:

2011 LOS ANGELES COUNTY FAIR HOUSING SURVEY
Click here for Spanish Survey Announcement

The Community Development Commission of the County of Los Angeles is conducting a study concerning fair housing compliance and impediments to fair housing choice throughout the County. Known as the “Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice,” the study is required by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. The goal of the research is to identify whether barriers and adverse policies exist in a variety of areas, including rental housing, home sales, banking, insurance, and real estate industries. The study also examines public and administrative policies that may inadvertently lead to discrimination against protected classes.

The study also depends on the opinions and experiences of people who are knowledgeable about housing and fair housing compliance issues - people like you. Therefore, we would appreciate if you could fill out the survey which can be accessed through this link:
https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/HH5MCPD

This survey should take less than ten (10) minutes and we urge your participation in this important research. Comments gathered during this survey will be combined in a single narrative for inclusion in the Analysis of Impediments. Your comments will remain anonymous.

FAIR HOUSING FORUMS

The Community Development Commission is also holding five (5) fair housing forums throughout the County from April 19th – 21st. These forums are intended to provide preliminary results of the study as well as to receive your input on fair housing impediments.

WE INVITE YOU TO ATTEND!

Please click on the following fliers for more information:

- English
- Spanish
- Chinese
- Russian
The following images represent sign in sheets from the fair housing focus groups held in March 2011.
The following narrative represents transcripts from focus groups sessions held in the Urban County in March 2011.

**Planning and Zoning Focus Group Discussion**

If land use policies are geared more toward ownership than rental, it is an impediment for people searching for rental housing.

Over the last ten years, the availability of financing for rental developments has been challenging. Even at the federal level, there is a large promotion of ownership rather than rental housing.

We are reviewing how many cities are in compliance for the housing element. This is mainly for disability and familial status but we will go through the process of analyzing denial. We will not dig too deep into every city’s zoning, but we will examine their housing elements and maybe go further with cities where we see a problem.

It has taken us a few years to get our approval for our housing element updates. Because of some recent legislature we have revised it many times. We tried to stay ahead of curve and be compliant but the subject is always changing and making compliance difficult.

There may be a few cities that do not care and are not trying to comply. We are looking for cities where we see fair housing issues and their housing elements have not been updated. We are looking to help each city improve. If your housing element is in the process there is nothing to worry about it, you are actively working on it.

We have concern about our group home ordinance. It is very flexible in terms of reasonable accommodations but there are conditions regarding the number of subleases each home may have.

I am not sure if this is discriminatory but our code requires a special permit for a facility that caters to disabled individuals in a residential district.

If you do not allow supportive services within the housing, it could be discriminatory.

Let’s say you have a development in a residential neighborhood and 25 percent of the first floor is supportive services but is designated office space. As you go through the process, that office space or supportive services are subject to a conditional use permit. Would that violate fair housing? The space is set up to be an office but is being used as supportive services. I do not think the intent is to decouple the services from the residents.

The idea is that the space needs to be used for its intended purpose.
I’m describing something that I find to be common in a lot of cities. I’m not sure how other people would answer that.

I think it is very common. I am not going to be penalized for saying “yes this does discriminate.”

We are debating if the code discriminates based on disability or familial status versus the intent of the use. In our jurisdiction, we have a licensed care facility and they are allowed by fair housing rights in the residential neighborhood until they exceed a certain number of persons and then they are required to obtain a conditional use permit. The rationale behind the permit is not because of the type of residents themselves but the intent of the facility’s use.

There may be many policies that look at the intent of use and they may have unintended consequences but the use is their primary focus.

Everyone is being treated the same. It’s in the structure of policy, not zoning, that are problems.

We are going to provide you these answers and aggregating these answers for HUD, if in the aggregate we all agree that we are discriminating against intensity of use instead of discrimination. How do you think this will be construed by HUD?

This is not a “gotcha” game. The intent is to understand how much outreach, education, training and other wrinkles need to be worked out.

With some of the question on this survey, if our definitions are not in compliance with fair housing, we need to work with each other to ensure all of our communities are in compliance.

If we find there is something wrong, we need to say we are working on it. For example, we just funded a study for affordable housing and are going to incorporate this information into that study.

The information obtained in the AI will be used to contact jurisdictions with problems and help them correct those problems. The actions identified here will be proactively addressed.

We are hoping that issues addressed through the survey will be useful to all the communities. We do not want to wind up like Westchester County because we did not follow up with due diligence. This process could take a long time, and we may find problems.

Does supply include the financing of housing? Most cities do not have housing but some cities finance housing.

I think you have to make reasonable accommodation in your developments, especially if you are financing them with grants.
There are best policies and then actual city requirements.

There are rules in the building code that says the new buildings need to meet ADA requirements.

We do a lot of supportive housing so these regulations are always required.

Yes, it would apply to buildings you finance.

When I was working with the city, if they did not want to have group homes, they would create a variance for them to go through for development.

We require a public hearing if it is a group home.

Is the public hearing for other residents or the city council?

It is for the conditional use permit.

It is not necessarily related to disability, but anytime you want a variance from zoning laws they need to have a public hearing.

How does California compare to other states, in terms of meeting HUD’s requirements? State law should comply with what HUD requires, right?

HUD’s requirements are not uniform across the county so the standards you’re held to may be different than other sections of the country.

How do I answer a question regarding zoning codes that is addressed through building codes?

I would answer no because it’s addressed elsewhere.

You could answer yes, because of HUD’s phrasing.

I would still say no and just say it is the building code.

The City of Los Angeles has an inclusionary housing ordinance. There are housing requirements for redevelopment projects, in terms of numbers they need to incorporate.

Regarding to the latest housing element cycle, one of the things they were looking at was special needs housing in emergency shelters and single room occupancy. It might not be in the code now but the codes should incorporate those.
In my case, the housing element would require that. How would I answer that question? Should I say yes, it will be addressed in the element or no, and then explain where it is addressed. Because it is not in the code?

Give them some indication you are working on this problem.

This city prefers local applicants who are seeking affordable housing. While the City cannot make the housing available exclusively to people living in their jurisdiction, the City can market aggressively in their jurisdiction.

If a city has a Rent Stabilization Ordinance and a property owner uses the Ellis Act to evict all tenants, the evicted tenants have the first choice in apartments if that building becomes apartments again. That situation also applies to market rate apartments that change into affordable apartments, income qualified former tenants have priority.
Homeownership Focus Group Discussion

We do not steer people to a certain area; they move to areas with cheaper housing. This is also true for participants in the homeownership program. For example, where I live there were no African-Americans but now you see them more frequently because they can afford my neighborhood now. It is an economic decision.

In 2007, the biggest issue was the actual property value. The appraisal would come in too low.

There are many good applicants with good credit but they need a little help to purchase a home. Current homeowners may have good credit but they don't have the property value to refinance. Property values were too low to refinance.

In past years, some of the applicants put money down to close the gap in transactions. Agents paid more money to close the transactions. Minorities, blacks and Hispanics do not have the cash on hand while whites and Asians can come up with money from other sources like gifts from family and organizations.

Whites and Asians use traditional loans, while black and especially Hispanics use FHA loans. Asian and whites use conventional loans or pay cash because they are able to.

Family business provides cash for whites and Asians while blacks and Hispanics have under-the-mattress money, for which they worked very hard.

What they are trying to say is the gap between income demographics and has grown significantly in recent years.

The percentage of ethnic applicants is important. If you have three Hispanic applicants and one was denied, that is a 30 percent denial rate. Hispanics don't buy so the denial rates may be affected.

In Hispanic culture we follow our family. The concentrations of minorities may be a cultural decision and then an economic decision.

Downpayment assistance programs may only be available for certain cities. They may not be able to get the assistance in other cities.

When you go to the City of San Fernando, with a buyer, they frequently cannot qualify for housing because it is too expensive. Then you take them to another city, that does not have down payment assistance and they can qualify for the housing. I have one client with three children who is a perfect candidate for my program but I was limited to trying to find her housing in one city where the housing is too expensive. It's difficult because instead of helping her directly, I had to locate another down payment assistance programs in a city where she could afford housing.
Many Realtors stop working with clients using assistance programs because they need a paycheck. $395,000 is the maximum amount given our by HUD, but many do not qualify for maximum loan and there is little housing at that price.

Here is an example of something I've noticed: if a Latino wants to live in San Marino and they are able to afford a home there, sometimes the seller will not sell a house to them. Those neighborhoods may not be receptive of a Latino homebuyer. We need to do research and ensure that people are not being denied housing based on race. It is usually not the owner who denies the opportunity to the buyer, it’s the banks. If I submit a HERO or FHA offer against a cash offer, they take the cash offer even if it is lower. They don’t give the opportunity to the programs.

That is a type of income discrimination to some extent. We should document how successful different programs are in bidding compared to cash offers.

It may also be a lack of knowledge on part of the listing agents. If you put in an offer using a program, many agents do not know about the programs and think it is going to complicate things. They do not think there is money. A lot of agents and loan officers, who started in the business in 2003, didn’t know who to calculate income from a W-2. They never had to.

They are discriminating against source of income.

If I do not explain a program they will not accept my offer. They think if the buyer qualifies for a program, they do not have money. They would rather sell to someone with ten percent down.

There is an FHA loan called a 203k and it is very common. Most listing agents are afraid of it.

When you write up the offer, do you have to identify the type of financing?

Yes. You have to disclose that information. Listing agents do not want to accept offers with a second mortgage because it is more likely to fall out.

Listing agents also want to look good in front of their asset manager. The sooner they close, the better they look.

When making offers on Fanny Mae and Freddie Mac properties it is a lot easier because they have incentives toward accepting different programs. Often, there is a fifteen-day window, where they are encouraged to accept alternative financing.

Is there any recommendation we can make to solve the problem of income discrimination? Maybe a guarantee?

To be honest with you, HOP is easier than NSP, overall. I helped start HOP but there was lots of red tape. With HOP you can finance regular sale, short-sale and foreclosed properties, making it more in demand. We need more funding for that program. Real estate agents and loan officers have taken the time to educate themselves about it and it works well.
The program is excellent. The issue is lack of funds. The program is the right amount of assistance for many people. I also work with the City of Compton and frankly, I really do not like their program. They offer too much money to one individual person and then all the money is gone. This program is 20 percent; would you be open to breaking it down to 10 percent to help more people? Would it be better to help more people but give each individual less funding?

In some ways it would help the buyer be more committed, because they are putting their own money in.

There were many areas, Compton for example, where people were buying houses quickly and prices went up. I think people got in over their heads.

The loans that reflect that information, subprime loans, were 80/20 loans.

The underwriting has changed and gotten stricter. They are stricter on debt to income ratios.

Are there federal programs to help modify the loans?

Yes, but our clients’ income does not qualify.

Unlike large mortgage corporations, private investors do not give the opportunity to refinance.

Minorities seeking loans frequently get denied and then go to a lender where they qualify, which is often predatory.

They are not as educated about the loans. When they qualify for a loan, they are loyal to the loan officer because that person got them into a home. However, the loan officer is not explaining the details as they should. Hispanics are particularly loyal.

Education is important. Real estate agents and loan officers need to educate their clients. As a real estate agent, I go to the loan signing and I am there at every step of the process. Some loan officers just want you to sign.

You can see the difference between Spanish and English home buying seminars. The number of people in the Spanish seminars is much lower because they are afraid. They don’t trust that the money is going to be real, they think the programs are too good to be true.

I want more Spanish home buying seminars, but people do not come. There needs to be more advertising for them.

Right now there is only a few a year. If a person misses the first one they may not be able to make another seminar for a year. The more people we get to come, the more people will talk about them.
We cannot rely on informal word of mouth advertising because it only reaches certain groups. There needs to be additional formal advertising especially in the Latino community.

Seniors do not want to sign anything attached to their deed, such as housing rehab. I try to get them to talk to their neighbors but they are still scared the government is going to take their house. We need the people that use the programs to tell each other.

The Hispanic community likes to compete with one another. I have had clients who wanted a house but did not qualify because of income, so they went and got a different loan anyways. A friend got a house so they wanted to buy a bigger, better home in the same neighborhood. They will find funding, be told the loans are predatory and take them anyway. There is a lot of predatory lending in that community, but sometimes people choose to put themselves in that position.

Again, it comes down to education. People need to learn about budgeting, financial literacy, and buyer education.

When I first started working in city planning, I realized the Hispanic community prides themselves on homeownership. Here in Los Angeles, it seems that the fundamental understanding of homeownership comes at a high price.
Special Needs Fair Housing Focus Group Discussion

Do you have any information by age?

The 2000 census data is broken down by 5-16, 16-64 and 64 and over. I have that information just not within the presentation.

Is that an overlay of the disabled or a separate section as a protected class by age?

It would be an overlay of disabled.

Do you look at elderly separately in the AI?

In this, we have another category of elderly that has 65-69, 70-74, 75-79, 80-84 and 85 and older. They are not necessarily disabled though.

For my population that is irrelevant because they are not developing affordable housing. If we could have that break down it would really show that it is a failure.

Well, I might have that information, I have the annual report that the County submitted to the State that shows production of housing numbers by income. It is not good.

I think the reason we have very low number of complaints is that people do not report violations because they are afraid.

With the Housing Rights Center, if there was a complaint in Linwood, where would they go? I mean is it located nearby?

They would go to the Housing Rights Center but they deal with the complaints by telephone. Like all of us, the HRC is limited by funding and does not have satellite offices. However, they will follow up on the complaints.

They do have about five satellite centers throughout the county.

I have a memo I would like to share from HUD addressed to all the fair housing field offices. The subject is assessing claims of housing discrimination against victims of domestic violence under the Federal Housing Act. There are cited examples, nationwide examples, but still pertinent to California. You have examples such as evictions due to abuse occurring within the apartment. You have discrimination against renting to women who fled an apartment because of the violence.

How do they advise people aware of the situation?

The judicial system has always cited in favor of the victim of domestic violence. They recommend education for the manager of affordable housing programs regarding fair housing and domestic violence. For example, if a husband gets arrested for domestic violence; the wife
and children get evicted because the house is trashed. There needs to be additional education to ensure property managers know it is the fault of the wife and child.

The fastest growing age cohort is seniors over the age of 85. People over 85, my generation, begin breaking down. The need for assisted living facilities is a major concern for seniors, including those younger than myself. There are not enough programs for seniors. I receive assisted living facilities offers every single day but for vacancies in expensive facilities. People who are middle-income do not have the programs and support they need. The overwhelming concern is the economic factor of people who have reached their 80s or people who are physically breaking down. We need to address economic support and lack of social policy for this group.

Would I be correct in calling that the frail elderly? Because they are not necessarily of any age but they are frail.

Exactly.

I want to bring up housing construction and accessibility. Maybe you can enlighten me why problems with accessibility in new construction are still occurring?

I know that for group homes, contractors still do not know the rules. They run into barriers with the building departments. They are not getting good information. Instead of assuming everyone is in a wheelchair, there are still these crazy accessibility issues such as narrow doorways, stairs and other things we've already tried to overcome. In the City of Los Angeles, the building department told us two different standards. There is a lot of misinformation and in this case we believe they intentionally told us different answers because they didn’t want a group home.

The contractors and the permitting agency both do not know enough.

The problem is not just with new construction, it is also with the design. The design must comply with the ADA regulations. The problem is there are a lot of old building, built before the ADA regulation applies. That is why we still have many people that do not have proper access. I would like to suggest that if contractors work with the landlords, maybe they can create a program to bring older buildings up to ADA code. Bringing older buildings up to code is expensive. It would be interesting to work with the landlords.

Smaller jurisdictions are under resourced and if you are hoping to build anything, you have to go through a costly entitlement process. Then you are not guaranteed the right to build, because depending on what you’re building, there may be many public hearing to undergo. If you’re hearing conflicting information, it causes concern. The City of San Bernardino has been trying to build an emergency shelter for two years but is stuck in red tape.

What is the emergency population they are trying to build for?

Homeless.
I think it is actually a big issue; there may not be data because people go away feeling defeated. It definitely contributes to our housing shortage. Who can afford a two-year building process?

How would you overcome that?

It would have to be comprehensive. There needs to be outreach to people trying to site homes. The cities and jurisdictions would need to simplify and clarify zoning laws, especially for some types of housing. We found in our review that certain types of housing are not even in the code so builders have no idea how they will be treated in the public entitlement process. The cities and counties need to simplify the housing permitted in certain zones and reduce the cost to get entitlements.

They do not distinguish in many jurisdictions between non-profit and for-profit developments. If you are developing for a certain population, it would be nice to have certain aspects fast-tracked. In my case, for the developmentally disabled, we have developers that go through hurdles that for-profit developers would never have to go through. We have a law that states that unrelated people can live together in a group setting without special approval, but special approval is constantly required. I have a residential provider that has had a unit in limbo for two years and has a complaint filed with HUD and nothing has come of it. The unit is for five people coming out of a development center who would live together.

You have to attack this at all levels. The community feels as if these developments are bad for their community. They need to be educated that affordable housing is not going to reduce their home’s values. Institutional barriers also need to be addressed but that is particularly challenging right now because of the budget. Staff is being cut everywhere. We need a comprehensive approach to getting more units built.

There needs to be a fast track for special needs housing. When you look at the waitlists, you can extract special needs people who critically need the housing. It is improving the understanding of why our housing needs are so much more important than regular low-income individuals.

You mentioned that some housing is not specified in the code. Can you be more specific?

Yes. We were working in the City of Linwood and we looked at many jurisdictions’ housing codes. In Linwood, they did not define traditional housing or maybe even emergency shelters. Under state law right now, they are protected. A lot of jurisdictions do not have that protection or even have them defined. They need to adopt those regulations and definitions. Developers do not know how they will be treated. But, you don’t want to stop the housing from being productive with lots of definitions that may not work for the programs.

We could send you the survey sent to 49 cities. They do not define many things they just proved zoning for certain categories. A lot of them need to update their codes.

I just remembered — the emergency shelter in San Bernardino was not defined. They did not want it approved so they tried to say it was not an emergency shelter. There is no definition, so they had to revert to the statewide definitions. At which point the City tried to call it another
form of housing with different regulations. If there is NIMBYism, the jurisdiction can use their codes to act as a complete barrier. It is a huge issue and it will compound the public sentiment.

For our clients red tape is a large problem. The do not have credit history because they have lived with their family, in a group home or institution. Landlords get really creative with their requirements. Even as a state-funded agency we cannot guarantee developmentally disabled individuals rent. Many clients have trouble with their right to have service animals, not just with dogs but companion animals for people with autism. There is an impediment with pet policies. There is also a lot of outright discrimination towards people with disabilities, and they do not file complaints because it happens so frequently.

Zoning is always an issue for development. Occupancy restrictions have been a problem. Residents who want a one-bedroom apartment but have staff on eight hours shifts are told they need a two bedroom, which they can’t afford. We have had landlords require additional deposits. Then there are our clients who live on SSI. They are very low income.

We also have credit problems because the women have fled situations where their spouse had 100 percent control of financials or financial abuse. When the woman is not working or their abuser has purposely damaged their credit, the credit requirements become a problem. The income requirements are also a problem. I still have landlords saying that tenants need to make three times the amount of rent, which they don’t at minimum wage. This group is different from regular tenants and they need exceptions but legally it should not be an exception.

I do eviction defense. Most of my clients are Chinese and Korean and the language barrier is a problem, which falls under national origin. There are weird provisions in many rent-to-lease situations that may not even be legal and higher security deposits that our clients don’t do anything about because don’t completely under the lease. California law says the lease should be in the tenant’s primary language but they are not. In terms of evictions, my clients do not understand the notices. They do not understand the significance of the complaints. I see many Section 8 vouchers but they are all in English. I have even seen Section 8 voucher tenants forced to pay extra money under the table. Those have been my black and Latino clients. This practice is still cheaper than they can get elsewhere but it is still ridiculous.

We provide rental subsidies through the Department of Justice. My Spanish-speaking client handed me a Wisconsin lease and had no idea. We need to hold people accountable for their practices.

With language barriers there needs to be more education.

The main barrier I see is in making reasonable accommodations for people with disabilities. We should create a program to help them understand their rights and include the property owners.

Zoning requirements always tack on parking recruitments and most of my cognitively challenged clients don’t drive. I think I have two clients that drive. The parking requirements are ridiculous for this group of people. I would like to reiterate that across all of the public housing in the city.
Section 8 discrimination in Lancaster, was that mentioned?

We do not cover that area in terms of Section 8 because they do their own AI and receive funds directly from HUD. From what I have seen and read, some of the rules they want to enforce seem to violate fair housing laws and HUD should look at that closely. For the Section 8 we provide, we do not violate fair housing laws housing. In our program Section 8 recipients locate housing and a landlord that is willing to rent to them anywhere they choose. Lancaster and Palmdale do not want Section 8 recipients moving into their cities. They do not really have a choice though. You cannot restrict housing and still receive federal funds. For example, trying to require landlords to register as businesses so they can track Section 8 recipients is grounds for a lawsuit. They should have a choice of where they want to live.

The source of income does not include Section 8 under current California law.

Neighborhoods are trying to create barriers for people receiving Section 8. This is unfortunate because the areas are affordable where you can even find a home instead of an apartment.

Now I see why those ads say “No Section 8,” because it is not protected as source of income. The landlord has an administrative process to go through before they can accept Section 8.

Although, with Section 8, landlords are guaranteed a certain amount of rent. It is a big issue, not so much in the unincorporated areas and the participating cities. Maybe every city could do more and make Section 8 receivers protected under fair housing laws.
The images on this and the following pages represent flyers that were distributed to advertise the upcoming fair housing forums. The flyers were produced in English, Chinese, Russian and Spanish. The flyers are followed by a list of organizations solicited for participation, proof of publication of advertising as well as sign in sheets from the events.

**2011 LOS ANGELES COUNTY FAIR HOUSING FORUMS**

Sponsored by the Los Angeles County Community Development Commission

The County of Los Angeles is currently undertaking a study to evaluate fair housing, known as the **Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice**

As part of this analysis, fair housing forums will be held throughout the county to discuss the importance of the study and preliminary findings

**You are invited to attend!**

**Food and drinks will be provided**

Listen to preliminary findings of the study. Provide your knowledge, opinions and feelings about fair housing choice. Offer your suggestions on how to eliminate impediments to fair housing choice and ways we can work together to further fair housing in our community.

*State and federal fair housing laws prohibit discrimination in housing based on race, color, religion, sex, disability, familial status, national origin, ancestry, marital status, sexual orientation, source of income, medical condition, age, or any other arbitrary factor*

You are urged to attend one of the following sessions:

**Tuesday, April 19, 11:00 am – 1:00 pm**
Rowland Heights Library
Community Room
1850 Nogales St.
Rowland Heights, CA 91748

**Tuesday, April 19, 6:00 – 8:00 pm**
Los Angeles County Fire Station 129
North County Training Center
Room 66A and 66B
42110 6th Street West
Lancaster, CA 93534-7134

**Wednesday, April 20, 10:00 am – Noon**
Plummer Park, Rooms 5 and 6
7377 Santa Monica Boulevard
West Hollywood, CA 90046

**Wednesday, April 20, 6:00 – 8:00 pm**
East Los Angeles Services Center
Room 242
133 N. Sunol Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90063

**Thursday, April 21, 10:00 am – Noon**
East Rancho Dominguez Park Community Room
15166 South Atlantic Avenue
Compton, CA 90221

*For more information or for special accommodations, please contact Mr. Raymond Webster at 323 – 890 – 7317.*
2011年洛杉矶公平住居研讨会

洛县社区发展委员会赞助

洛县政府现正著手进行一个关于公平住居的评估调查，名为

公平住居选择的障碍分析

作为分析的一部份，多个住居研讨会将会在洛县不同的地方举办，藉讨论来解释此研究的重要性与及初步的发现。

你将会被邀请参加！

来聆听初步的发现。提供你对公平住居选择的知悉、意见和感受。在怎样取缔公平住居的障碍上给与我们一起建议，好使我们能向社区提供公平住居。

基于种族、肤色、宗教、性别、伤残、家庭状况、国籍、血统、婚姻状况、性取向、收入、健康状况、年龄或其他因素，加州与联邦住屋法禁在住屋上作出歧视。

我们鼓励你参加下列任何一个讨论会：

星期二, 四月十九日, 上午十一时至下午一时
Rowland Heights Library
Community Room
1850 Nogales St.
Rowland Heights, CA 91748

星期三, 四月二十日, 下午六时至八时
East Los Angeles Services Center
Room 242
133 N. Sunol Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90063

星期二, 四月十九日, 下午六时至八时
Los Angeles County Fire Station 129
North County Training Center
Room 6A and 66B
42110 6th Street West
Lancaster, CA 93534-7134

星期四, 四月二十一日, 上午十时至中午十二时
East Rancho Dominguez Park Community
Room
15166 South Atlantic Avenue
Compton, CA 90221

有茶点供应
若需要额外资料或有特别要求，请致电323-890-7317，向Mr. Raymond Wester查询。
2011 ЛОС АНЖЕЛЕССКИЙ ОКРУЖНОЙ
ФОРУМ: РЕШЕНИЕ ЖИЛИЩНЫХ ВОПРОСОВ
Спонсируем Комиссией общественного развития округа Лос-Анджелес

Графство Лос-Анджелеса в настоящее время проводит
исследование, которое поможет оценить справедливость решения
жилищных вопросов

Анализ причин, препятствующих справедливости в решении
жилищных вопросов

Как часть этого анализа, форумы будут проведены всюду по графству, чтобы
обсудить полученные предварительные результаты и важность этого исследования.

Приглашаем принять участие!

Вам предоставляют предварительные результаты исследования. Пожалуйста,
используйте ваши знания, идеи и чувства. Дайте ваши предложения, что
конкретно устранить препятствует в решении жилищных вопросов и способы,
которыми мы можем руководствоваться в дальнейшем в решении жилищных
вопросов в нашем сообществе.

Государственные и федеральные законы запрещают дискриминацию, основанную
на расе, цвете, религии, сексе, национальном происхождении, семейном положении,
сексуальной ориентации, источнике дохода, медицинского состояния, возраста, или
любого другого произвольного фактора

Убедительно предлагаем принять участие в заседании третьего района

Среда, 20 Апреля 2011 года, 10:00 – 12:00 утра
Plummer Park, комната 5 и 6
7377 Santa Monica Blvd
West Hollywood, CA 90046

Для Вас: Закуска и прохладительные напитки

За дополнительной информацией или необходимой помощью, пожалуйста звоните:
Raymond Webster
323 – 890 – 7317
CONDADO DE LOS ANGELES
FOROS DE EQUIDAD DE VIVIENDA

Patrocinado por la Comisión de Desarrollo de la Comunidad del Condado de Los Ángeles

El Condado de Los Ángeles está llevando a cabo un estudio para evaluar la equidad de vivienda, conocido como el

Análisis de Impedimentos para la Elección de Equidad de Vivienda

Como parte de este análisis, se celebrarán foros de equidad de vivienda en todo el condado para discutir la importancia de los estudios y conclusiones preliminares.

¡Son Cordialmente Invitados a Asistir!

Escuchen las conclusiones preliminares del estudio. Proporcione sus conocimientos, opiniones y sentimientos sobre la elección de equidad de vivienda. Sugerencias acerca de cómo eliminar los impedimentos a la elección de equidad de vivienda y cómo trabajar juntos para mejorar la vivienda justa en nuestra comunidad.

Las leyes estatales y federales de equidad de vivienda prohíben la discriminación en la vivienda basada en la raza, color, religión, sexo, discapacidad, situación familiar, origen nacional, ascendencia, estado civil, orientación sexual, fuente de ingresos, condición médica, edad o cualquier otro factor arbitrario.

Se les sugiere su asistencia a las siguientes sesiones:

martes, 19 de abril, a las 11:00 am – 1:00 pm
Biblioteca de Rowland Heights
Sala de la Comunidad
1850 Nogales St.
Rowland Heights, CA 91748

martes, 19 de abril, 6:00 a 8:00 pm
Estación de bomberos de condado de los Ángeles
129 Centro de Capacitación de Condado de Norté
66B y Sala 66A
42110 6th Street West
Lancaster, CA 93534-7134

miércoles, 20 de abril, 10:00 am – mediodía
Plummer Park, salas 5 y 6
7377 Santa Monica Boulevard
West Hollywood, CA 90046

miércoles, 20 de abril, 6:00 a 8:00 pm
Centro de Servicios del Este de Los Ángeles
Sala 242
Unidad de 133 N. Suiñol Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90063

jueves, 21 de abril, 10:00 am – mediodía
Esta Rancho Dominguez
En la Sala del Parque de la Comunidad
15166 South Atlantic Avenue
Compton, CA 90221

Se proporcionará alimentos y bebidas.
Para obtener más información o para alojamiento especial, póngase en contacto con Gloria Ramirez al 323.890.7317.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table G.1</th>
<th>Organizations Solicited for Fair Housing Forums</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Change of Faces</td>
<td>Economic Resources Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Community of Friends</td>
<td>Elks Lodge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability First</td>
<td>Emergency Food and Shelter Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid for AIDS</td>
<td>Episcopal Churches: ST. THOMAS THE APOSTLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDS Project Los Angeles</td>
<td>Esperanza Community Housing Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aikenhead, Cipes &amp; Supanich</td>
<td>Esteban E Torres High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Living For The Aging</td>
<td>Eun Sung Presbyterian Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Sentencing Program</td>
<td>Frank D. Lanterman Regional Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMCAL Business Center</td>
<td>Garfield Community Adult School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antelope Valley Board of Trade</td>
<td>Girls &amp; Boys Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antelope Valley Boys &amp; Girls</td>
<td>Good Shepherd Presbyterian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antelope Valley Chambers of Commerce</td>
<td>Greater Antelope Valley Economic Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antelope Valley Childrens</td>
<td>Habitat For Humanity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antelope Valley Domestic Violence Center</td>
<td>Here’s Life Inner City LAAddress:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antelope Valley Foundation</td>
<td>Hollywood Mental Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antelope Valley Teachers Association</td>
<td>Homeboy Industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antelope Valley Youth Services</td>
<td>Homeless Solutions Access Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arms Reach</td>
<td>Inner City Law Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Youth Center</td>
<td>Inquilinos Unidos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance League</td>
<td>Jeff Griffith Gay &amp; Lesbian Youth Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of MultiEthnic Americans, Inc.</td>
<td>Jennessa Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Alive</td>
<td>John A Rowland High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belvedere Elementary School</td>
<td>Joint Efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bet Tzedek Legal Services</td>
<td>L.A. Family Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond Shelter</td>
<td>LAANE A New Economy For All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black AIDS Institute</td>
<td>Lancaster Community Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACK FOUNDATION</td>
<td>Lancaster Public Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Council of the Blind</td>
<td>LINC Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Youth Connection</td>
<td>Los Angeles Community Action Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvary Church of Eastwood</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Economic Development Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care Housing</td>
<td>Los Angeles Gay &amp; Lesbian Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARECEN</td>
<td>Los Angeles Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casa Maravilla, Inc.</td>
<td>Los Angeles Youth Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCFS Corporate</td>
<td>MarVista Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Mental Health Advocacy Services, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champions of Caring Connection</td>
<td>Monterey Senior High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Advocate’s Office</td>
<td>NAACP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children Youth &amp; FamilyAddress:</td>
<td>NAMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Center of Antelope Valley</td>
<td>New Economics for Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIRLA</td>
<td>Nutrition Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of Jesus Christ of LDS</td>
<td>Our Lady of Lourdes Catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Of West Hollywood</td>
<td>Our Lady of Lourdes School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition for Economic Survival</td>
<td>Palmdale Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Outreach Resources</td>
<td>Palmdale City Library Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Rehabilitation Services</td>
<td>Project New Hope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compton Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Public Social Services Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compton Library</td>
<td>Regional Hispanic Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Community and Senior Services</td>
<td>Rio Hondo AIDS project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Rights Legal Center</td>
<td>Rowland Adult and Community Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominguez Youth Leadership</td>
<td>Rowland Heights Community Christian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Women’s Center</td>
<td>Rowland Heights Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East LA Community Corporation</td>
<td>Russian Community Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Los Angeles College</td>
<td>Salesian Boys and Girls Clubs of Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Los Angeles Library</td>
<td>Salesian Family Youth Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Los Angeles Women’s Center</td>
<td>Salvation Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Rancho Dominguez Library</td>
<td>Shelter Partnership Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shields For Families</td>
<td>Urban Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Asian Community Alliance</td>
<td>Veterans of Foreign Wars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California Senior Resources, Inc.</td>
<td>Volunteers of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Network</td>
<td>WeHoChurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen CenterAddress: Tenants’ Rights Clinic, Coalition for Economic Survival</td>
<td>West Hollywood Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Levine Group</td>
<td>West Hollywood Presbyterian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Lighthouse Group</td>
<td>West Hollywood Senior Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Spot</td>
<td>Women Alive Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Hostels Organization</td>
<td>YMCA/YWCA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
County of Los Angeles

I am a citizen of the United States, and a resident of the county
above; I am over the age of eighteen years; and I am not a
party to, or interested in, the notice published. I am the chief
legal advertising clerk of the publisher of the LOS ANGELES
TIMES a newspaper of general circulation, printed and
published daily in the City of Los Angeles, County of Los
Angeles. The LOS ANGELES TIMES has been adjudged a
newspaper of general circulation by the Superior Court of the
County of Los Angeles, State of California, under the date of
May 21, 1952, Case No. 398, 589. The notice, of which the
annexed is a printed copy, has been published in each regular
and entire issue of said newspaper and not in any supplement
thereof on the following dates, to-wit:

April 4

all in the year 2011

I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing
is true and correct

Dated at Los Angeles, California, this 4th day of April, 2011

[Signature]

2071571

California Newspaper Service Bureau
Public notice Advertising Since 1934
Tel 1-800-788-7840 - Fax 1-800-540-4689
Local Offices and Representatives in:
Los Angeles, Santa Ana, San Diego, Rancho Palos Verdes, Inglewood, Venice, San Francisco, Oakland, San Jose, Santa Rosa, San Pablo, and Eureka.
Special Services Available in Phoenix, Las Vegas, Denver and Seattle.
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the county aforesaid; I am over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to or interested in the above-entitled matter.

I am the principal clerk of the printer of La Opinión a newspaper of general circulation, printed and published daily in the city of Los Angeles, County of Los Angeles, and which newspaper has been adjudged a newspaper of general circulation by the Superior Court of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, under the date of July 28, 1969, Case Number: 950176; that the notice, of which the annexed is a printed copy, has been published in each regular and not in any supplement thereof on the following dates, to wit:

April 4

all in the year 20-

I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated at Los Angeles, California, this 4 day of April, 20-

Signature
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DECLARATION

I am a resident of Los Angeles County, over the age of eighteen years and not a party to any or interested in the matter noticed.

The notice, of which the annexed is a printed copy appeared in the:

PANORAMA

On the following dates:
March 30, 2011

I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated at Los Angeles, California, this 4th day of April 2011

Signature

2071664

"The only Public Notice which is justifiable from the standpoint of true economy and the public interest, is that which reaches those who are affected by it"
ПУБЛИЧНОЕ ОБЪЯВЛЕНИЕ

Комитет районного развития графства Лос-Анджелес
Анализ причин, мешающих решению жилищных проблем
на основах равенства

ДАННЫМ ПУБЛИЧНЫМ ОБЪЯВЛЕНИЕМ Комитет районного развития графства Лос-Анджелес уведомляет население о проведеом в (5) заседаний с представителями общественности, чтобы усилить их мнение о состоянии дел на рынке жилья, справедливости подхода к решению имеющихся проблем и о том, как эти проблемы влияют на их образ жизни. Речь в данном случае идет о проживающих в пределах юрисдикции городской части графства Лос-Анджелес, куда входят некоторые районы и 49 городов-участников.

ДАННЫМ ПУБЛИЧНЫМ ОБЪЯВЛЕНИЕМ ДАЛЕЕ СООБЩАЕТСЯ, что графство Лос-Анджелес проводит аналитическое исследование потенциальных препятствий, с которыми, возможно, сталкиваются его жители в нарушение существующего закона о равенстве при решении жилищного вопроса, что связано с возрастом проживания, ценностями, запретом или семейным статусом, возрастом, источников доходов, семейной ориентацией или каким-либо другим
прочувствованием фактором.

В ходе данного аналитического исследования рассчитываются и анализируются следующие вопросы/проблемы и информации:

1. Анализ демографических данных, распределение дохода, характеристики фонда жилья и доступность общественного транспорта с целью определить тенденции на жилищных структурах в зависимости от расовой и этнической принадлежности, уровня доходов и других факторов.

2. Оценка влияния на доходы населения законов о равенстве в вопросах жилья для выявления наиболее часто встречающихся тенденций.

3. Анализ общественной и частной деятельности, которая может стать помехой равенству в вопросах жилья в графстве Лос-Анджелес, включая следующие примеры:

а. Блокирование жилищных слухов и финансовая помощь;

б. проведение общественной политики и предпринимательских действий, влияющих на строительство доступного жилья;

в. проведение административной политики, нарушающей обустройство городских районов и жилищное строительство.

1. Оценка имеющихся общественных и частных жилищных программ с соблюдением закона о равенстве и деятельности в рамках этих программ.

2. Ознакомление с выводами и рекомендациями для дальнейшего следования равенствам в вопросах жилья в графстве Лос-Анджелес.

Сборная с общественностью будет продолжаться по указанному ниже адресу в следующие дни:

Дата/Время: Вторник, 19 апреля, 2011, с 11:00 утра до 1:00 дня
Место: Rowland Heights Library – Community Room
1850 Nogales St., Rowland Heights, CA 91748

Дата/Время: Вторник, 19 апреля, 2011, с 6:00 до 8:00 вечера
Место: Los Angeles County Fire Station – 129 North County Fire Station – Room 66A and 66B
42111 6th Street West, Lancaster, CA 93534-7134

Дата/Время: Среда, 20 апреля, 2011, с 10:00 утра до 12:00 дня
Место: Plummer Park – Rooms 5 and 6
7277 Santa Monica Boulevard, West Hollywood, CA 90046

Дата/Время: Среда, 20 апреля, 2011, с 6:00 до 8:00 вечера
Место: East Los Angeles Services Center – Room #242
133 N. Sundial Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90063

Дата/Время: Четверг, 21 апреля, 2011, с 10:00 утра до 12:00 дня
Место: East Rancho Dominguez Park – Community Room
15116 South Atlantic Avenue, Compton, CA 90221

Список городов-участников Los Angeles County Program:

Agoura Hills Arcadia Artesia
Avalon Azusa Bell
Bell Gardens Beverly Hills Cerritos Commerce
Covina Cudahy Duarte Culver City
Diamond Bar El Segundo Hermosa Beach Irwindale
на строительство доступного жилья; и
проведенная административная политика, касающаяся обустройства городских районов и
жилищного строительства.

1. Оценка имеющихся общественных и частных жилищных программ с соблюдением закона
о равноправии и деятельности в рамках этих программ.
2. Ознакомление с выводами и рекомендациями для дальнейшего привлечения равноправного
подхода в жилищных вопросах в графстве Лос-Анджелес.

Собранны с общественностью будут проводиться по указанным ниже адресам и в следующее время:

**Дата/Время:** Вторник, 19 апреля, 2011, с 11:00 утра до 1:00 дня
**Место:** Rowland Heights Library — Community Room
1850 Nogales St., Rowland Heights, CA 91748

**Дата/Время:** Вторник, 19 апреля, 2011, с 6:00 до 8:00 вечера
**Место:** Los Angeles County Fire Station
129 North County Training Center — Room 6A and 6B
42110 6th Street West, Lancaster, CA 93535

**Дата/Время:** Среда, 20 апреля, 2011, с 10:00 утра до 12:00 дня
**Место:** Plummer Park — Rooms 5 and 6
7377 Santa Monica Boulevard, West Hollywood, CA 90046

**Дата/Время:** Среда, 20 апреля, 2011, с 6:00 до 8:00 вечера
**Место:** East Los Angeles Services Center - Room 204
133 N. Sunset Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90063

**Дата/Время:** Четверг, 21 апреля, 2011, с 10:00 утра до 12:00 дня
**Место:** East Rancho Dominguez Park — Community Room
1519 South Atlantic Avenue, Compton, CA 90221

**Список городов-участников Los Angeles Urban County Program:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agoura Hills</th>
<th>Arcadia</th>
<th>Artesia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avalon</td>
<td>Azusa</td>
<td>Bell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell Gardens</td>
<td>Beverly Hills</td>
<td>Calabasas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerritos</td>
<td>Cudahy</td>
<td>Culver City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>Duarte</td>
<td>El Segundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bar</td>
<td>Hawaiian Gardens</td>
<td>Hermosa Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Canada-Flintridge</td>
<td>La Habra Heights</td>
<td>La Mirada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>Lawndale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Pinos</td>
<td>Malibu</td>
<td>Manhattan Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maywood</td>
<td>Monrovia</td>
<td>Rancho Palos Verdes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling Hills</td>
<td>Rolling Hills Estates</td>
<td>San Dimas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>San Marino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe Springs</td>
<td>Sierra Madre</td>
<td>Signal Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South El Monte</td>
<td>South Pasadena</td>
<td>Temple City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut</td>
<td>West Hollywood</td>
<td>Torrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westlake Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Все, кого интересуют эта тема или кто имеет к ней непосредственное отношение, могут посетить
наши заседания, подготовиться к своему сообщению и выразить пожелания, создавшие
с данной проблемой. Если у вас имеются какие-либо наилучшие обстоятельства, пожалуйста,
позвоните Рейнольду Уэбстеру (Development Specialist) по телефону: (323) 890-1317.

Кроме того, гражданам, не имеющим возможности посетить наши заседания, предлагается
представить свои комментарии в письменном виде не позднее пятницы 6 мая 2011 года по
следующему адресу:

**Ludmila George, Housing Management Consultant**
**Community Development Commission**
**Community Development Block Grant Division**
**2 Coral Circle**
**Monterey Park, CA 91755**
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
County of Los Angeles

I am a citizen of the United States, and a resident of the county aforesaid; I am over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to or interested in the above-entitled matter. I am the principal clerk of the printer of SAN GABRIEL VALLEY TRIBUNE, a newspaper of general circulation which has been adjudicated as a newspaper of general circulation by the Superior Court of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, on the date of September 10, 1957, Case Number 684891. The notice, of which the annexed is a true copy, has been published in each regular and entire issue of said newspaper and not in any supplement thereof on the following dates, to wit:

4/14/11

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed at West Covina, LA Co., California this 14th day of APRIL, 2011

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]
DECLARATION

I am a resident of Los Angeles County, over the age of eighteen years and not a party to any or interested in the matter noticed.

The notice, of which the annexed is a printed copy appeared in the:

WORLD JOURNAL (CHINESE DAILY NEWS)

On the following dates:

April 13, 2011

I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated at Los Angeles, California, this 22nd day of April 2011

Signature

2080485

"The only Public Notice which is justifiable from the standpoint of true economy and the public interest, is that which reaches those who are affected by it."

Rev: 16 09 Daily Journal Corporation, 915 East First Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012
2011 年洛杉磯公平住居研討會
洛縣社區發展委員會贊助
洛縣政府現正著手進行一個關於公平住居的評估調查，名為
公平住居選擇的障礙分析
作為分析的一部份，多個住居研討會將會在洛縣不同的地方舉辦，藉討論來
解釋此研究的重要性與初步的發現。

你將會被邀請參加！
來聆聽初步的發現，提供你對公平住居選擇的知識、意見和感受。在怎樣克服公平住居
的障礙上給我們一些建議。好使我們能共同向社區提供公平住屋。

基於種族、膚色、宗教、性別、傷殘、家庭狀況、國籍、血統、婚姻狀況、性取向、收入、健
康狀況、年齡或其他因素，加州與聯邦住屋法案禁止在住屋上作出歧視。

我們鼓勵你參加以下任何一個討論會：

星期二，四月十九日，上午十一時至下午五時
Rowland Heights Library
Community Room
1850 Nogales St.
Rowland Heights, CA 91748

有茶點供應
若需額外資料或有特別要求，
請電323-890-7317，
向Mr. Raymond Wester查詢。
PUBLIC NOTICE

Community Development Commission of the County of Los Angeles
Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice

PUBLIC NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Community Development Commission of the County of Los Angeles will hold five (5) community meetings to receive public input regarding fair housing issues affecting residents living within the jurisdiction of the Los Angeles Urban County which includes the unincorporated areas and the 49 participating cities.

PUBLIC NOTICE IS HEREBY FURTHER GIVEN THAT the County is undertaking an analysis of potential impediments that may affect fair housing choice in Los Angeles County based on race, color, ancestry, national origin, religion, sex, disability, familial status, marital status, age, source of income, sexual orientation or any arbitrary factor.

The analysis of impediments reviews and analyzes the following information and issues/concerns:

1. Analysis of demographic profile, income distribution, housing stock characteristics, and access to public transportation to determine the development of housing patterns in relation to race, ethnicity, income, and other characteristics.

2. Evaluation of fair housing complaints and violations to identify trends and patterns.

3. Analysis of public and private activities that may impede fair housing choice in Los Angeles County, including, but not limited to:
   a. Housing brokerage services and financing assistance;
   b. Public policies and actions affecting the construction of affordable housing; and
   c. Administrative policies concerning community development and housing activities.

4. Assessment of current public and private fair housing programs and activities.

5. Provision of conclusions and recommendations to further fair housing choice in Los Angeles County.

PUBLIC NOTICE IS HEREBY FURTHER GIVEN THAT the community meetings will be conducted at the following times and locations:
The following cities participate in the Los Angeles Urban County Program:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agoura Hills</th>
<th>Arcadia</th>
<th>Artesia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avalon</td>
<td>Azusa</td>
<td>Bell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell Gardens</td>
<td>Beverly Hills</td>
<td>Calabasas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerritos</td>
<td>Claremont</td>
<td>Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>Cudahy</td>
<td>Culver City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bar</td>
<td>Duarte</td>
<td>El Segundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian Gardens</td>
<td>Hermosa Beach</td>
<td>Inwindale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Canada-Flintridge</td>
<td>La Habra Heights</td>
<td>La Mirada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>Lawndale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lomita</td>
<td>Malibu</td>
<td>Manhattan Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maywood</td>
<td>Monrovia</td>
<td>Rancho Palos Verdes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling Hills</td>
<td>Rolling Hills Estates</td>
<td>San Dimas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>San Marino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe Springs</td>
<td>Sierra Madre</td>
<td>Signal Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South El Monte</td>
<td>South Pasadena</td>
<td>Temple City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut</td>
<td>West Hollywood</td>
<td>Torrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Westlake Village</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All persons interested in this matter or subjects related thereto may attend the community meeting and may present any comments or requests deemed relevant to the fair housing analysis. If you require special arrangements, please contact Raymond Webster, Development Specialist, at (323) 890-7317.

Additionally, citizens unable to attend a community meeting are invited to submit written comments up to Friday, May 6, 2011 to the following address:

Attn: Raymond Webster/CDBG Division
Community Development Commission of the County of Los Angeles
2 Coral Circle
Monterey Park, CA 91755

Publish: Monday, April 4, 2011
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First, Last)</th>
<th>Affiliation (Optional)</th>
<th>Address (Optional)</th>
<th>Phone and/or Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOV 05/1940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of West Hollywood Rent Stabilization Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOV 05/1940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident/RHCC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident/RHCC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident/RHCC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name (First, Last)</td>
<td>Affiliation (Optional)</td>
<td>Address (Optional)</td>
<td>Phone and/or Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowland Heights</td>
<td></td>
<td>1830 S. Atlantic Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowland Heights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowland Heights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident/Walnut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident/RH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name (First, Last)</td>
<td>Affiliation (Optional)</td>
<td>Address (Optional)</td>
<td>Phone and/or Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Rights Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levine Management Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calrem Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residente</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FAIR HOUSING FORUM - COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
April 21, 2011 - 10:00 - 12:00 p.m.
East Rancho Dominguez Park
Community Room
15116 South Atlantic Avenue, Compton, CA 90221

*Signing or completing this document is voluntary. No legal action is taken for non-completion.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First, Last)</th>
<th>Affiliation (Optional)</th>
<th>Address (Optional)</th>
<th>Phone and/or Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Champion &amp; Company Connections Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA FLA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name (First, Last)</td>
<td>Affiliation (Optional)</td>
<td>Address (Optional)</td>
<td>Phone and/or Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FAIR HOUSING FORUM - COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
April 20, 2011 - 6:00 - 8:00 p.m.
East Los Angeles Service Center
Room 242
133 N. Sunol Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90063

*Signing or completing this document is voluntary. No se te exige completar esta firma.*
### FAIR HOUSING FORUM - COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
April 10, 2011 - 6:00 - 8:00 p.m.
Los Angeles County Fire Station 129 North County Training Center
Rooms 66A & 66B
42110 6th Street West, Lancaster, CA 93534

*Signing or completing this document is voluntary/no se le exige completar esta forma*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First, Last)</th>
<th>Affiliation (Optional)</th>
<th>Address (Optional)</th>
<th>Phone and/or Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing Rights Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name (First, Last)</td>
<td>Affiliation (Optional)</td>
<td>Address (Optional)</td>
<td>Phone and/or Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levine, Nancy</td>
<td>Housing Rights Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FAIR HOUSING FORUM - COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
April 20, 2011 - 10:00 - 12:00 p.m.
Plummer Park
Rooms 5 and 6
7277 Santa Monica Boulevard, West Hollywood, CA 90046
The following narrative represents questions and comments received at the fair housing forums held in April in locations throughout Los Angeles County.

**Compton**

Is there any thing that is being done to educate communities about predatory loans?

There are things going on but I do not believe they are not going far enough.

Do you believe that it is based on the community’s lack of knowledge of outreach programs?

I do believe it is a combination of a lack of fair housing knowledge and that access to the system is not as clear as it could be. I have worked for very small communities that received more complaints in a year than Los Angeles.

Do you give suggestions to counties and cities about their zoning process?

I’m working on behalf of the county and will recommend having some uniformity in zoning codes.

Is the home insurance industry something you would look at from a fair housing perspective? What would that entail?

In this case, we are trying to find out if you have some knowledge of unscrupulous treatment in that industry. Perhaps you were seeking to buy a home, but a lender would not give you a mortgage in certain sections of town. Or that your insurance costs were unreasonably high because of your protected class status.

I am a representative of the Fair Housing Right Center. We are not the direct organization that services Compton, that is the Fair Housing Foundation, but we do service a large population in the County. Our goal is to educate the community through workshops, community meeting and presentations. We also offer counseling services regarding legal rights. You can always give us a call. Lastly, we investigate housing discrimination. If you feel you’ve been discriminated against by a landlord, based on any of the protected classes, we will investigate that for you. In a nut shell, that’s what my organization does.

I am from the Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles. I am here to find out more about the fair housing process and engage people currently in the process. We take cases concerning landlord/tenant issues such as eviction. We are available online for additional information.

I am here to learn where to send my clients when they have questions. I really appreciated this presentation.

**Los Angeles**
It is interesting to note that those numbers correlate with the races that most frequently have poor health: blacks, Hispanics and Asians.

**West Hollywood**

HRC is a private non-profit organization contracted by the city and county to provide fair housing services. If you believe you are a victim of housing discrimination such as refusal to rent because of your membership in a protected class, differential terms and treatment or unlawful eviction, we will assist you. We take complaints and use our investigations department to gather evidence and talk to witnesses. We also try to resolve complaints informally but if the parties do not come to an agreement, we will bring the issue to litigation. It seems like there is a gap between what we do and the number of people who know about what we do. If you are interested, please come talk to me, I will give you one of my cards. If any of you are part of a community organization we would like to come by and present on how we can assist you.

*Though a translator:* He is very concerned about discrimination because he has been discriminated against. He has some income but he lives on government subsidies. They are paying $1200 plus utilities. Most of their income goes to rent, utilities and food. He is currently on the waiting list for the Section 8 program. He has been waiting for Section 8 for three years. He is looking for housing in West Hollywood and recently found an apartment on Fuller Street. He received a letter from this housing and believes he was discriminatorily denied housing. He was told that the apartment was already rented but knows for sure it is still available. He was told his he was denied because he did not have a strong enough credit history. He is paying more money currently but was denied for a cheaper apartment.

Sara is the lawyer at the Housing Rights Center and she would be happy to help you with this issue. I'm sure you can talk after the meeting.

*Through a translator:* He is not on the waiting list for government housing but believes that to get on the waiting list you have to pay or bribe someone. He knows that the amount he would have to pay is $1,500. The system is corrupt.

*Through a translator:* She has had to pay money for housing. She used to live in Valencia, in subsidized housing. She paid $8,000 to get an apartment in government housing and was then evicted after paying the $8,000. She is very glad that she found this presentation to tell people about her experience. Additionally, she would like to know how far down the list she is for government housing.

If you can see me afterwards, I can give you my number. We have housing counselors to assist you and Russian speaking counselors also.
Many times there are things that happen to tenants that are unjust and wrong but not illegal. We can act on discrimination based on protected class status; because they have a disability or their national origin.

I don’t know if this is in the scope of your survey. Our organization has a hard time with two aspects of government housing. One is private landlords accepting Section 8 vouchers, the other is publically-funded HUD units failing to make reasonable accommodations for individuals with disabilities. We frequently receive calls from individuals with mental disabilities who are being evicted because of an episode related to their disability. Federal law is very clear that before you can evict someone with a mental disability, property owners have to try to make a reasonable accommodation, which allows the person to stay in the unit. HUD housing providers, especially the LA County housing authority, has a zero tolerance policy. I am defending a client whose daughter had a mental breakdown and threatened people. She has a history of schizophrenia. Not only are the mother and daughter being evicted but her 98-year-old grandmother, who is blind and deaf, is being evicted. This family only pays $200 a month in rent. They are never going to be able to find another unit. The Housing Authority says that she is a direct threat. They have no sense of responsibility or duty to provide accommodations.

**Rowland Heights**

How do you define Fair Housing? Is it subsidized housing?

I would like to begin by defining impediments. In this context, an impediment is an action, omission and decision that restricts housing choice due to protected class status. It can be in the public, private or non-profit section of the housing market.

Does that take into considerations their income? Maybe they are not receiving the loans because they cannot afford them?

This data is reported across all income categories. I can say this, when you look at the denial rates for housing hold with say, $75,000 a year in income, the denial rates are higher for blacks and Hispanics. Even after normalizing for income.

That is looking at reported income. Many of these groups do not report their full income.

I am not going to make that statement.

Could it be because these groups are a higher credit risk?

The HAL industry argued that the high rate loans they provided were a valuable service for those with poor credit.

What is familial status and what would constitute discrimination of that protected class?
It is usually families with children. Refusal to rent because the prospective tenant has children is illegal.

Is this data mostly for rental properties?

Yes, that is correct. Most of the complaint data relates to complaints in the rental market. Occasionally, there are complaints regarding mortgage lenders but these complaints are usually in the rental section.

Do these things have more to do with existing units, as opposed to building new developments?

I most certainly want to know about what is going on in the past but it is especially important to look at what has changed since then. For example, we found a problem and addressed it through these changes to the zoning and planning codes.

You have some communities that have a very high percentage of rental units. It seems, for fairness reasons, more low-income rentals should not be forced upon those communities.

According to statistics, we found two groups with more loan denials: people with disabilities and families. Has the government done anything to make homes more accessible to them? If we take this survey, what good does it do without actions?

We perform an Analysis of Impediments every five years to find out if we are addressing all fair housing issues. What we are finding is there are still areas with lingering issues. Once we conclude the process of evaluating and identifying impediments then address what we are going to do about what we uncovered.

Well, how long are you going to take?

The draft report is due soon.

We do all of this but how long will it take? Nothing happens. This is just a waste of the governments’ money. If we do not make any changes what is this about?

This is about what we can do. We can do things in the public domain.

Maybe the legislature should have more laws to help these groups of people. We need better laws to help these people have fair housing choice.

Is there any public services for people who are discriminated against? Are there free lawyers or groups to advocate for people in a more aggressive way than just taking data? Is there a way for people to have better straightforward access to assistance?
I agree with you that access is a problem. There is a barrier to accessing the system, which we need to remove. We need to go through this process and get everyone’s opinions before we set down a five-year strategy that promotes and facilitates furthering fair housing.

Are there any public services that advocates for people?

Yes, the Housing Rights Center provides services and has lawyers to assist individuals.

What is this organizations name?

The Fair Housing Rights Center.

Many of these people do not voice what is going on. We, the HRC, cannot help them if they do not talk to us about their problems.

There was a large denial rate for people with disabilities and families with children. When you rent to people with a disability, it is very difficult to get them out of your rental. Many people do not want to rent to the disabled because if there is a problem it is very hard to evict them. It is an issue that happens a lot.

Several decades ago, one of the things HUD did was speak with architects about the laws changing toward certain regulations. HUD told the architects that they need to ensure their designs will pass public access inspections. Public buildings are now designed with public access in mind. The problem is enforcement. Because a law is on the books does not mean it will be enforced. The county enforcement agencies do not have the funding to send people into the community. For example, take a new construction site, inspectors only show up when they are called. That guy is only there to make an initial inspection. They cannot spend the time to get into the nuts and bolts of the building. This why there are buildings that fail final inspection. The point you made about some structures being built without proper inspection, that happens more in market rate housing than assisted housing because there are more hoops to jump through while constructing assisted housing.

The majority of people do not know about housing rights, does the HRC have programs for public awareness?

They have about six offices in the county. I admit, when you call them, they are difficult to get through too. That may need to be addressed.

Does this organization name appear on every lease contract? Then everyone would know that if there is a problem they have the right to contract this organization.

There is a trend in senior housing units are not willing to take Section 8. My friend was looking into differently places and some senior housing changed their policy against accepting Section 8. This is a trend against senior’s ability to find housing.
Many Americans are now aging and many businesses that supply senior housing are large corporations. If they see a chance to make a profit, they will start edging away from assisted individuals. That is just business. They go into business to make a profit.

We should offer incentive for those organizations to accept seniors with Section 8.
PUBLIC NOTICE

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
ANALYSIS OF IMPEDIMENTS TO FAIR HOUSING CHOICE

PUBLIC NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the County of Los Angeles, Community Development Commission (CDC) has drafted an Analysis of Impediments (AI) to Fair Housing Choice Update in accordance with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requirements. The AI is required as a condition of receiving federal funds and focuses on impediments that may affect fair housing choice in the Los Angeles Urban County based on race, color, ancestry, national origin, religion, sex, disability, familial status, marital status, age, source of income, sexual orientation, or any arbitrary factor. The Los Angeles Urban County geographic area encompasses 49 participating cities, and the entire County’s unincorporated areas.

The public is invited to review the draft and submit written comments. Copies of the draft AI will be available, during a public review and comment period, from June 3, 2011 to July 5, 2011, at the following locations:

1st District
Anthony Quinn Library, 3965 Cesar E. Chavez Ave., Los Angeles (323) 264-7715
East Los Angeles Library, 4937 E. Third St., Los Angeles (323) 264-0155
Graham Library, 1900 East Firestone Ave., Los Angeles (323) 582-2903
La Puente Library, 15920 E. Central Ave., La Puente (626) 968-4613
Montebello Library, 1550 W. Beverly Blvd., Montebello (323) 722-6551
South El Monte Library, 1430 N. Central Ave., South El Monte (626) 443-4158

2nd District
Carson Regional Library, 151 E. Carson St., Carson (310) 830-0901
East Rancho Dominguez Library, 4205 E. Compton Blvd., East Rancho Dominguez (310) 632-6193
Lennox Library, 4359 Lennox Blvd., Lennox (310) 674-0385
View Park Library, 3854 W. 54th St., Los Angeles (323) 293-5371
Willowbrook Library, 11838 S. Wilmington Ave., Los Angeles (323) 564-5698
Woodcrest Library, 1340 W. 106th St., Los Angeles (323) 757-9373

3rd District
Agoura Hills Library, 29901 Ladyface Ct., Agoura Hills (818) 889-2278
San Fernando Library, 217 North Maclay Ave., San Fernando (818) 365-6928
West Hollywood Library, 715 N. San Vicente Blvd., West Hollywood (310) 652-5340

4th District
El Segundo Library, 111 W. Mariposa Ave., El Segundo (310) 524-2722
Hacienda Heights Library, 16010 La Monde St., Hacienda Heights (626) 968-9356
Hawaiian Gardens Library, 11940 Carson St., Hawaiian Gardens (562) 496-1212
Lomita Library, 24200 Narbonne Ave., Lomita (310) 539-4515
Rowland Heights Library, 1850 Nogales St., Rowland Heights (626) 912-5348
South Whittier Library, 14433 Leffingwell Rd., Whittier (562) 946-4415
5th District
Altadena Library, 600 E. Mariposa St., Altadena (626) 798-0833
La Verne Library, 3640 D. St., La Verne (909) 596-1934
Lake Los Angeles Library, 16921 E. Ave. O, Suite A, Palmdale (661) 264-0593
Littlerock Library, 35119 80th St. East, Littlerock (661) 944-4138
Newhall Library, 22704 W. Ninth St., Newhall (661) 259-0750
Quartz Hill Library, 42018 N. 50th St. West, Quartz Hill (661) 943-2454

Copies of the draft AI are also available for review at the Community Development Commission (CDC), 2 Coral Circle, Monterey Park, CA 91755. In addition, citizens may view the draft on the CDC Website at: http://www3.lacdc.org/CDCWebsite/CDBG/Home.aspx. Click on Plans and Reports and choose 2011 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice. Citizens wishing to submit written comments during the public review and comment period may mail them, postmarked no later than July 5, 2011, to the CDC, to the attention of Raymond Webster, CDBG Division, who can be reached at (323) 890-7317 if there are any questions.
May 6, 2011

Chanela Al-Mansour, Executive Director
Housing Rights Center
520 S. Virgil Ave., Ste. 400
Los Angeles, CA 90020-1405

Dear Ms. Al-Mansour:

INVITATION TO A PRESENTATION ON THE LOS ANGELES URBAN COUNTY’S DRAFT ANALYSIS OF IMPEDIMENTS TO FAIR HOUSING CHOICE STUDY

The Community Development Commission (CDC) of the County of Los Angeles is in the process of preparing the Draft 2011 Analysis of Impediments (AI) to Fair Housing Choice study with the assistance of our consultant, Western Economic Services, LLC. The Draft will be sent to you on May 31, 2011 for initial review.

We will be formally presenting the Draft AI to a group of interested agencies during a presentation scheduled for June 8, 2011 from 11:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. at the CDC, 2 Coral Circle, Monterey Park, CA 91755. The meeting will feature a PowerPoint presentation providing an overview of the identified impediments, as well as the proposed actions to address them. Followed the presentation, we will host a roundtable discussion designed to encourage your comments, questions, and constructive feedback before the AI is finalized. Lunch will be provided.

We believe that by bringing together interested parties, we can stimulate an open and productive dialogue on the fair housing issues addressed in the study. In addition to your Agency, we are also inviting the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles, and key staff from the CDC that worked on the study or currently oversees the County’s fair housing services contract.

When you receive the Draft, we will also enclose a reminder of our June 8th meeting. By notifying you early, we hope that you will be able to schedule time to be with us. If you cannot, you may wish to have someone in your office attend on your behalf. Either way, we look forward to meeting with your Agency on this important study. Please RSVP by May 20, 2011. If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact me at (323) 890-7168 or Linda.jenkins@lacdc.org.

Sincerely,

LINDA JENKINS, Manager
Community Development Block Grant Division
May 6, 2011

Fernando Gayton, Senior Attorney
Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles
1550 W. 8th Street
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Dear Mr. Gayton:

INVITATION TO A PRESENTATION ON THE LOS ANGELES URBAN COUNTY’S DRAFT ANALYSIS OF IMPEDIMENTS TO FAIR HOUSING CHOICE STUDY

The Community Development Commission (CDC) of the County of Los Angeles is in the process of preparing the Draft 2011 Analysis of Impediments (AI) to Fair Housing Choice study with the assistance of our consultant, Western Economic Services, LLC. The Draft will be sent to you on May 31, 2011 for initial review.

We will be formally presenting the Draft AI to a group of interested agencies during a presentation scheduled for June 8, 2011 from 11:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. at the CDC, 2 Coral Circle, Monterey Park, CA 91755. The meeting will feature a PowerPoint presentation providing an overview of the identified impediments, as well as the proposed actions to address them. Followed the presentation, we will host a roundtable discussion designed to encourage your comments, questions, and constructive feedback before the AI is finalized. Lunch will be provided.

We believe that by bringing together interested parties, we can stimulate an open and productive dialogue on the fair housing issues addressed in the study. In addition to your Agency, we are also inviting the Housing Rights Center, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, and key staff from the CDC that worked on the study or currently oversees the County’s fair housing services contract.

When you receive the Draft, we will also enclose a reminder of our June 8th meeting. By notifying you early, we hope that you will be able to schedule time to be with us. If you cannot, you may wish to have someone in your office attend on your behalf. Either way, we look forward to meeting with your Agency on this important study. Please RSVP by May 20, 2011. If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact me at (323) 890-7168 or Linda.Jenkins@lacdc.org.

Sincerely,

LINDA JENKINS, Manager
Community Development Block Grant Division
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David Acevedo Pitre, Branch Chief
Program Compliance
Attention: Civil Rights/FHEO Division
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
611 West Sixth Street, Suite 1020
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Dear Mr. Acevedo Pitre:

INVITATION TO A PRESENTATION ON THE LOS ANGELES URBAN COUNTY’S DRAFT ANALYSIS OF IMPEDIMENTS TO FAIR HOUSING CHOICE STUDY

The Community Development Commission (CDC) of the County of Los Angeles is in the process of preparing the Draft 2011 Analysis of Impediments (AI) to Fair Housing Choice study with the assistance of our consultant, Western Economic Services, LLC. The Draft will be sent to you on May 31, 2011 for initial review.

We will be formally presenting the Draft AI to a group of interested agencies during a presentation scheduled for June 8, 2011 from 11:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. at the CDC, 2 Coral Circle, Monterey Park, CA 91755. The meeting will feature a PowerPoint presentation providing an overview of the identified impediments, as well as the proposed actions to address them. Followed the presentation, we will host a roundtable discussion designed to encourage your comments, questions, and constructive feedback before the AI is finalized. Lunch will be provided.

We believe that by bringing together interested parties, we can stimulate an open and productive dialogue on the fair housing issues addressed in the study. In addition to your Agency, we are also inviting the Housing Rights Center, Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles, and key staff from the CDC that worked on the study or currently oversees the County’s fair housing services contract.

When you receive the Draft, we will also enclose a reminder of our June 8th meeting. By notifying you early, we hope that you will be able to schedule time to be with us. If you cannot, you may wish to have someone in your office attend on your behalf. Either way, we look forward to meeting with your Agency on this important study. Please RSVP by May 20, 2011. If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact me at (323) 890-7168 or Linda.Jenkins@ladelo.org.

Sincerely,

LINDA JENKINS, Manager
Community Development Block Grant Division
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- Attendee 1
  Western Economic Services, LLC

- Attendee 2
  Community Development Commission
  Community Development Block Grant Division

- Attendee 3
  Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles

- Attendee 4
  Community Development Commission
  Community Development Block Grant Division

- Attendee 5
  Community Development Commission
  Community Development Block Grant Division

- Attendee 6
  Community Development Commission
  Community Development Block Grant Division

- Attendee 7
  Community Development Commission
  Community Development Block Grant Division

- Attendee 8
  Housing Authority of the County of Los Angeles

- Attendee 9
  Housing Rights Center

- Attendee 10
  Community Development Commission
  Community Development Block Grant Division
Attendee 1: As background for you all, HUD’s *Fair Housing Planning Guide* Volume 1 has one of our first AIs produced in 1993 and we’ve been doing AIs ever since, for over 18 years. From here to Boston, Mississippi, to Montana, and Virginia to Florida to New Mexico to Arizona and all over the country. There is an evolutionary process to this as science and technology allows the ability to analyze data, and with more sophisticated software that has come about, there’s been more requirements. But nowadays the scrutiny by which HUD takes a look at these things has been elevated significantly. I’ll explain that a little bit in just a minute. For those of you who aren’t real certain why we’re here, as a condition of the Consolidated Plan, which my firm prepared for the Commission a few years ago, this is actually our second AI as well — the Analysis of Impediments — for the Commission. Within the consolidated planning process, jurisdictions that get money from HUD have to certify to HUD that they’re affirmatively furthering fair housing. Now that’s not like signing a form and putting in the drawer and forever kissing it goodbye. It actually involves several steps. We’re really only here on step 1. Theoretically at least, when you do the Consolidated Plan, sometimes it’s a three to five year Consolidated Plan, you should also implement the AI. Not all jurisdictions elect to do that, sometimes the two can be fairly significant in the amount of effort dedicated to them. The Commission has elected to take a first one, then the other approach, but every five years this AI process comes along. Now if impediments are identified in the study then you need to do something about that — certainly we have found some — and then maintain records of your actions. Maintaining records means being able to report back to HUD about what you did, how much you spent, how affective it was, who was assisted, a variety of things you can explain.

This process is fairly complicated. I’ll try to keep it as simple as possible. Today I’m not going into a lot of the data details, but I will describe to you some of the major pieces of our methodological approach. We collected a huge amount of data about housing, about people, about where they live, the racial and ethnic concentrations, income data, poverty, employment information, giving us current data of what economic and demographic factors have influenced housing choice. We have Community Reinvestment Act data to try to tell where businesses are investing, how many loans, how large of loans. We’ve collected from the Commission: Section 8 vouchers, where they’re located, are they concentrated by race or ethnicity in certain areas? We’ve geographically mapped a lot of these concepts, they’re all in Volume 1, data tables are in a couple hundred page Volume II. We took a look at community care facilities as well, trying to see how they’re distributed across the county. Home loan application data from the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act, we try to look at who gets denied and if you get a loan, what kind of loan is that? We also took a look at other secondary studies that have been done, such as academic studies, things people are currently talking about as current state of the art, and evaluating fair housing, a fairly significant body of information. We also turn to the Housing Rights Center (thank you very much), HUD, and the California Department of Fair Employment
and Housing to get their perspective on housing complaints. A fair housing survey of
stakeholders was sent out by the Commission to approximately 1200 and some. Prospective
participants in the survey, the 2011 Fair Housing Survey, asking a variety of questions about fair
housing, understanding of fair housing, knowledge of questionable practices. We also
conducted a Planning and Zoning Survey of 49 participating jurisdiction. We had some special
focus groups talking about specific issues, one was with the planners of the communities, one
was for a group of special needs populations, and then we had five fair housing forums, one in
each of the supervisory districts. The public outreach: the surveys in fact were available in four
different languages: English, Spanish, Russian and Chinese, invitations to participating
jurisdictions to come during some of our outreach for the public input meetings. We did
telephone notifications of faith-based groups, local chambers of commerce, and others we
called near where the forum site was to be. We published in the newspapers in accordance with
the citizens and participation plan and we distributed this initial draft document to fifty libraries
all throughout the Urban County.

One of the things that guided our identification process is really the way in which HUD defines
an impediment. There are a variety of barriers that can constrain people’s choices, but we’re
looking at it as actions, omissions, or decisions which restrict or have the affect of restricting
housing choice because of protected class status. Those protected classes under the federal fair
housing law are these groups here. There are other protections in lending laws but I want to
keep that separate so I know who’s covered under fair housing law. Different groups might be
covered under employment law or lending law, but fair housing and fair housing discrimination
of these groups are the protected ones. A moment ago I mentioned the word Urban County and
also noted the 49 jurisdictions. Not all cities and counties are participating with us. Just a select
few, 49 of them. We have maybe 22 percent of the County’s population in this Urban County
area, that’s these 49 participating jurisdictions, and the unincorporated areas of the county. It’s
different if you’re thinking the City of Los Angeles or Long Beach, they’re actually not in this
study. They get their own money for their own Consolidated Plan. They need to do their own
consolidated planning process and have their own AI, because they may have issues unique to
themselves.

In my opening remarks I talked about scrutiny of these AIs. In 2007, the Anti-Discrimination
Center in New York City sued Westchester County, New York. Westchester County is roughly a
pie shaped county, where the tip of the pie abuts New York City. People who work in the city
-drive out to Westchester County to live. In a way, Westchester County is like the Commission,
they’re administering a lot of cities and unincorporated areas of the county but not the entire
county. Westchester’s County’s program and the participating jurisdictions were under a cloud
for two years while they were being sued for falsely claiming affirmatively further fair housing
certification. After two years, Judge Cote of the New York court system ruled that they had
indeed falsely made that claim. They basically didn’t take a look at racial concentrations in the
way in which they administered their programs. The complainant, the Anti-Discrimination
Center, successfully argued that their actions led to further segregation of the population,
increases in poverty, rather than the opposite, what the goals were. The consequence to that is
that they were forced to pay back thirty to fifty million to HUD, set aside some additional funds
for specific housing dedicated to particular areas as directed by the state court and are forced to
pay the legal fees. The consequence for every one else in the country is that the scrutiny by which this process is implemented is significantly higher. Things that I’ve seen that haven’t been practiced in a number of years, when the fair housing planning guide first came out in 1996, there was a little passage which said that the chief elected official needs to sign this. Well that was good for the late 1990s but it was forgotten about until recently. Now there is talk of needing this signature from the chief elected official or designee. In my opinion, you can have it in a letter of transmittal, you could go as complicated as you wish, such as getting the signatures of all 49 jurisdictions, participating plus the Commission. I think someone in the Commission should sign it. They also look at how the impediments occurred, why they’re occurring, when and the frequency, and what are you going to do about it? Sometimes, it’s a dollar commitment, we want a commitment for marshalling resources, we need a body count. Who’s going to do what? Who’s the responsible agency you’re going to contract for services? What are they going to do? How are you going to monitor that? What kind of objectives are you going to go for? I’m thinking this is where we are headed here, documenting the impediments, documenting in much greater detail than we have in the past. The successes and failures, or perhaps the partial successes and failures of our actions and how we might change those and improve those next year. The scrutiny is pretty high. Generally speaking, that flows into the evaluation of each Annual Action Plan. FHEO plays a much higher role in that. In the past, Community Planning and Development ran the ball: evaluated the Annual Action Plan, checked to see if the AI was done, and check boxes that everything goes forward and you get funded. FHEO now can come in, and has been coming in, and saying, wait, this isn’t clearly plugged in your Annual Action Plan. I’ve seen jurisdictions who got authorized by Community Development Planning, CPD, at HUD, to fund certain projects, and FHEO comes by two or three years later and say, no, that’s all denied. Too bad the money’s been spent, the project’s built, it's up and running, but FHEO, however tardy their opinions were. I want to caution you and put it all out in front of us. I'm sorry they couldn’t be here. I want to mention that FHEO was invited to one of our focus groups, which was their Planning and Zoning Survey, which they provided to us. We needed their comments, interactions, what were they thinking in these questions, and they were unable to attend that meeting also. How exactly they’re going to respond to all these things, I am not sure, but we are making a best faith effort making sure we go through each and every one of these steps. As I mentioned, I’m not going to get into all the details, all the data, and the maps. I just want to walk through these impediments with you and get your reaction. Do we need more specificity? Is this too general? This doesn’t make sense to me. As Attendee 2 said, we’re winding up the process. This is public input, we’re continuing that public input process. The public comment period goes for a few more weeks so if you think of something in the near future, we definitely want to hear about it.

This is not what I consider a formal presentation, but I would like to walk through these things. I've separated them into private sector and public sector pieces. Private sector really is lenders, property managers, people who are not in decision making capacity like in our public sector, who are not cities and communities that may have housing or housing projects or non-profits operating through some of our public sector agencies, but the private sector. The first relates to the rental market. There's a matrix in here that talks about where the data was located, where we found it, how many different places it came from. What we are seeing is that some renters are feeling harassed, if they're already there or they're trying to become a renter. We received this
kind of input and saw some of it in the fair housing survey and some of the focus groups. We are thinking in many of these cases, why don’t we go and look and see how big a problem this is. I am suggesting that we do some testing and enforcement activities. Following that, we have some idea about this, we can go ahead and do some outreach and education to landlords, property management companies, as well as educating some of our housing consumers in their fair housing rights. I want to emphasize the Commission has given your organization approximately $250,000 a year in the past and we have a lot more impediments this time than we’ve had in the past, and the amount of funding the Commission’s anticipating to receive is going down. We’re stuck a little bit between a rock and a hard spot, so answering that question, I welcome any input today, and we can consider what to do. Maybe we need to get more private sector support in this.

**Attendee 9:** One thing, in here it says 275 a year so the amount is wrong.

**Attendee 1:** Okay, it is 250 right?

**Attendee 9:** It’s been 250 and is going to go to 225 this upcoming year. You may have gotten the 275 amount because that’s approximately, we subsidize this project about $25,000 so 275 is what our actual cost is, but we get reimbursed 250.

**Attendee 7:** Maybe that should be noted?

**Attendee 1:** Was it 275 for the FHIP grant?

**Attendee 9:** You think it was referring to the FHIP grant?

**Attendee 2:** Yeah, because we put those numbers in here. I don’t think we put the number we provided. I think we pulled that off the HUD website. We aren’t sure if that’s exactly what you got eventually —

**Attendee 9:** I’ll find it.

**Attendee 1:** There’s 20 to 30 impediments here and I’m going to walk through them. It’s your opportunity to tell me what you think. What you think relates to the commitment that we’re making here. We’ve got this input about prospective renters feeling that they are subject to harassment, what should we do about that?

**Attendee 9:** One of my questions is, I’ve looked through them, and often times I see the suggested actions are to conduct testing and enforcement activities, which is fine. But there’s nothing about legislative work in order to enhance landlord tenant laws. To give tenants addition, in terms of enforcement, increase punitive damages, things like that that get at landlords, and make them take a step back. Is that something the County would do?

**Attendee 7:** It’s one of these things that it’s a fine line with advocacy. HUD doesn’t want to see that public funds are going toward advocating for the receipt of grants directly. They want to
see that it’s worthy administration. On one side we’re getting a stick and the money is going down on the federal level. The domestic spending is cut, cut, cut, but do more, do more, do more. On the public sector side, we’re being squeezed. I don’t know in terms of the private, they’re usually not the one’s coming up with any money to help with these kind of things. It is difficult. That in itself is an impediment in a way.

Attendee 1: There’s certainly a barrier to expanding our efforts in fair housing as to do it for what, nothing? Do it for half as much money? Tell me if you can do twice as much for half as much.

Attendee 6: I was with HUD many years ago, and during that period the administration had promoted voluntary affirmative marketing agreements with the mortgage bankers, the real estate industry.

Attendee 1: I’m familiar with those.

Attendee 6: Being that the funding is going down, is that something that maybe HUD might want to consider throwing in state?

Attendee 1: Well, those are still there collecting dust.

Attendee 6: They are?

Attendee 1: They’re usually signed by the local or state realtors associations or banking associations. When we first starting doing AIs those were out, that was late 1990s. Those were kind of forgotten about. I think that’s a good suggestion to dust off something that’s already there.

Attendee 6: I was with FHEO and we went out into the community and formed community housing resource boards which included members of the housing industry, consumers, legal aid foundations, HRCS, and at least in the Pacific Northwest, they were very active. They were not just collecting dust, we went out and actually formed these voluntary groups.

Attendee 1: I think that’s a good suggestion, how do you guys at the Commission feel about that?

Attendee 6: But the burden would be on the FHEO to do that.

Attendee 7: That would be the burden on them, because she was with HUD at the time doing that.

Attendee 6: So FHEO would have to do the leg work.

Attendee 1: I guess your role would be to ask them to do it. Would that be good to add to this then?
Attendee 7: I think it’s fine. Whether they do it or not, it could go on the record. Especially with the private sector that we don’t really have any influence over.

Attendee 1: I am not here to approve or disapprove, I am here to get your comments and if we want to add more to this than great.

Attendee 7: I think on the policy side, we can do what we can to remove barriers, especially if they are things that are outdated, as we go along but also to make suggestions if possible.

Attendee 6: Because the burden should be on everybody, not just the field, the recipients, but also on the government to do more. As they’re taking money away from us then they have to take the burden to do more in conjunction with the Department of Justice.

Attendee 9: I want to say, 15 years ago, HUD had Tom Monoray.

Attendee 6: Yeah. I worked for Tom Monoray

Attendee 9: And he was excellent. Everybody in LA County knew that he was the fair housing person and he was president. HUD just doesn’t have that same kind of presence anymore when it comes to fair housing.

Attendee 6: Yeah, and the other thing we did was FHEO was very involved in the review of CPD grant applications. We had the housing assistance plan so a recipient’s grant could not be approved each year until FHEO had reviewed the housing and assistance plan for the jurisdiction, and to determine where are they going to place all the new assisted housing units to make sure they were not being concentrated. I don’t know what happened? It seems that the whole grant process got very watered down.

Attendee 1: I’d like to return to your concern, Attendee 9, about how changing laws and what role do you think the Commission could play?

Attendee 9: That’s why I asked the question because I don’t know what your political concerns are? And our ability to do that?

Attendee 7: We do, but I don’t know that we would document it that way, but we do.

Attendee 9: I just know from the tenant’s advocacy side, if you really want to stop harassment, most of the things you listed here for impediments from landlords, you need something more to get them with in terms of increasing punitive damages and things that they can be charged. One of the big ones is when a landlord files unlawful detainer against a tenant, a tenant can’t cross complain. A tenant can’t say I’m going to sue you also, for this amount of money. The tenant has to file a whole separate civil action. They can’t do it in the unlawful detainer process, and that hurts tenants a great deal. I would like to see more specificity with things that really would help tenants.
Attendee 3: I’m going to submit a comment, as they come and during the comment period I’ll submit something in writing. Just to piggy back on from the tenant side, there’s so many things that can be done. It’s not asking the Housing Commission to put lawyers out on the street to enforce these, but increasing and enhancing remedies, and giving teeth to some of these enforcement mechanisms would serve part of this goal at least and allow those on the ground doing this work to go after. The other thing we deal with a lot is retaliatory eviction. This litigation privilege is currently being scrutinized. Landlords can, at will, send out as many notices as they want to tenants to harass them to leave their units. That’s one of the challenges that we face.

Attendee 1: Attendee 3, when you talk about putting teeth to this, who would actually put the teeth?

Attendee 3: I think what Attendee 9 was suggesting is that the Commission take a position such that the elected can then take that and do what they need to do.

Attendee 1: If I understand this correctly, when you say put teeth in, you’re talking about state legislators.

Attendee 9: It could be state, it could be local. San Francisco has some really strong laws and protection and there’s a whole separate system for evicting tenants. For instance, if a tenant comes to court with the money in the three-day notice, the landlord has to accept it. New York has that as well if the tenant can come up with the money on the day of court. In California, it’s still a strict three day notice thing and then you’re out. Which allows landlords to do things on the third day, say the tenant didn’t come and that type of thing. There are some local things as well.

Attendee 1: In this instance with these counties, since we have 49 cities and some unincorporated areas, these guys are over here.

Attendee 7: It’s tricky because the county has jurisdictions over, we don’t have that kind of jurisdiction over let’s say the City. If the City wants to something different, the City of LA, and we have those 49 cities and those cities have their own governments, so it get’s complicated with the County. San Francisco is a city-county.

Attendee 9: A city-county. So, West Hollywood for instance is covered under LA County, but they have some of the strongest tenant protection laws.

Attendee 7: They are very progressive.

Attendee 9: Yeah, I’m sure they probably did it on their own but anything the County can do to encourage these jurisdictions.
Attendee 7: And you know what, you can put something there and encourage them to implement certain things. It’s the other part, like making them, is something else. We can try and pursue certain things even with our own unincorporated areas. It’s difficult when you deal with these various jurisdictions and it does get tricky. West Hollywood is a great example, they’re very progressive in that anyways.

Attendee 2: Could we do something where we could encourage the cities and use that as an example that they may, not tell them that they have to do it, but that they may?

Attendee 7: To enhance, or additional actions —

Attendee 2: West Hollywood’s thing might be something they might want to consider. Do cities have housing courts? I know that when I was in Illinois we had our own housing court.

Attendee 9: Not like that, no. It’s all county basically, the Superior Court and County.

Attendee 2: There is a section in the downtown court at least, that’s basically where all unlawful detainers happen. But the outlining courts have it where any judge can be assigned to an unlawful detainer.

Attendee 9: Or a commissioner, or landlord’s attorney.

Attendee 3: And that’s that, I haven’t really immersed myself as I’d hoped, to provide proactive comments before the deadline but I don’t know if that will do it for HUD. But it’s certainly something to add to the pile.

Attendee 1: We want to do things that are measurable and things that are within the mandate, that the Commission can realistically accomplish something. We said put deep teeth in, what I just heard, put teeth in County law, 49 cities and say, forget you, is kind of what I heard.

Attendee 9: I’m just throwing this out there, judges, most of them are county judges to some degree. I’m not sure anymore about all courthouses but a lot of are.

Attendee 7: They’re elected, right?

Attendee 9: Some are elected, some are appointed, commissioners are appointed. A lot of the unlawful detainer courts, at least in the outlining areas, are commissioners not judges so they are appointed by the deciding judge.

Attendee 3: But it’s LA County courts.

Attendee 9: But it’s LA County. The bottom line is it is LA County. When I did unlawful detainers for years and years the things that always got to me is how judges did not know unlawful detainer law, they did not know tenant law. I had a judge who evicted a tenant that had a great [unintelligible] case but she didn’t have any documentation that showed she had told the
landlord about the problems, but the problems were, he should have known, like no hot/cold running water, that kind of thing. He was like sorry, the tenants out. And I presented the [unintelligible] v. Superior Court, the main Superior Court case that’s been on the books for years and he looked at it and he goes, well, I’ve never seen this case before and I’ve been on the bench for years, and had no idea. So, I’ve been to trainings where I was given someone like that, we need judges to train them about unlawful tenant law.

Attendee 7: That’s something if we want to focus on that, let’s say, within our contract, maybe that hasn’t been something we’ve done before but maybe we can emphasize that and the funding is limited but we don’t have to do the same type of outreach and training every year. We could do something like this year, we’re going to focus on the judges and the these other things and getting the word out that way.

Attendee 9: Yeah.

Attendee 7: Maybe that’s where we will make more of a difference in that area. I think that’s tangible, something we could address.

Attendee 1: And that would be for those cases that were at some point becoming litigated, right?

Attendee 9: Well, the problem is they’re almost never litigated because the tenants show up and they don’t have an attorney and the next thing they know they lose.

Attendee 7: They can’t cross, they can’t sue.

Attendee 9: Yeah, they can’t do a cross complaint. They get to the judge but they lose before they even open their mouth is the bottom line. Because the judges think they know the law. They listen to what the landlord’s attorney tells them about what the law says and they say, okay sounds good to me, and so they decide against the tenant. Unless the tenant is savvy enough to ask for a written decision and then file an appeal within 15 days and all these kind of things, which most tenants would never do. Most tenants don’t even show up to court because they think they’re going to lose anyways.

Attendee 1: Our research and this research kind of indicates a lot of people don’t even go to the complaint process. They’re not aware of it.

Attendee 9: You mean they don’t file an [answer].

Attendee 1: Yes, they forget about it.

Attendee 7: They get the eviction and move on.

Attendee 1: Move on. I mean, they got to get their kids in a house and shelter and they’ve got more battles rather than just the legal fight.
Attendee 7: Well, maybe it’s a step in the process, just as all the AI and dealing with the barriers. If we take steps here and there, collectively over time, we can have an impact on that outcome.

Attendee 6: And could that training orientation, or whatever, be City and County joint and get funding from the City too right? So that it impacts all of LA County?

Attendee 9: Yeah, definitely. I think most of the judges would think there’d be some benefit there.

Unknown: Would this be something that the Housing Rights Center would want to do on it’s own or would your particular organization?

Attendee 9: I think we would do it definitely in conjunction with the Legal Aid. there are a few other Legal Aid organizations, I think that would be a good idea. I think actually we would have to because you know the judges in your service area and the legal services and there’s judges in their service, so to really identify what, and every courthouse has its own quirks.

Attendee 7: We need to be on the same page in terms of what is being communicated to them to get education out to them, the commissioners and the judges.

Attendee 9: Yeah, because they all have different quirks, I mean different things. I had judges that would not allow a child over the age of 10 in the courtroom and a lot of my working moms, I mean not working moms, just moms, would go to court and they couldn’t sit in the courtroom with their child. The judge would be like, I’m not going to have a child in my courtroom, and I use to hear that over and over again. Or their best witness would be their child to say, the manager came and harassed my mom. I’ve had judges and commissioners say I don’t want children to testify because it’s too hard on them, so they would lose. There are just so many things that happen, but again, like I said, we would know what’s happening in our courtrooms so I think that’s why everybody should be included.

Attendee 6: Maybe part of the training orientation, so it’s more lasting, the development of an unlawful detainer for dummies, so you know, they have a reference guide there.

Attendee 9: Yeah, yeah. I don’t know if the judges would like that [unintelligible background laughs].

Attendee 6: But also for everybody, the consumer, the landlords.

Attendee 9: Yeah, exactly. I think that would be good. I mean, I have no statistical data about this but the feeling is that a lot of the time judges decide against tenants because they’re property owners themselves, so there is some kind of a bias against tenants. In anything, and not just judges, from sheriffs coming out and forcing stay away orders, which often times there’s hesitancy to do that there unless they have evidence of physical harm on the domestic violence victim. There’s so many layers. There’s pending state law right now, I’m not sure where it stands,
that will give extra protection to the victims of domestic violence so they can't be evicted for nuisance because their batterer has come back and abused and often times landlords will give them a notice and say, hey there's nuisance going on in your unit, and so forth. There's so many layers there. From the Sheriffs Department to the judges to state law, that would give these protections to tenants because for the most part, like I said, the problem with a lot of tenants is that even if they kind of know that they have rights to some degree, because of the fear of thinking, I'm going to be myself in court. The Housing Rights Center for instance, we don't represent all unlawful detainers, we're not contracted to do that. And I know funding is a big thing but a big impediment is the lack of funding. It's the number one over all of these, the lack of funding to organizations and tenants rights advocacy groups to really assist someone, not just tell them what their rights are but be able to go with them to court and that type of thing.

Attendee 1: If we could circle back around just a minute and talk about a coordinated team effort to strengthen the legal community’s understanding. Could this be something that Legal Aid and your organization and the Commission would like to pre-actively get together and do a team plan for this?

Attendee 7: Or at least have a plan for within a year or this kind of thing. Because we have an annual contract with the Housing Rights Center and it is limited funding, so maybe it's a way of targeting the funds for a particular year and saying this will be goal for the year, we're going to really target this aspect of it.

Attendee 9: And some of it may not even be a funding issue. Like when thinking of public and subsidized housing, a lot of tenants, they're in outlying areas and so forth, and really do feel isolated. Some of it may just be talking to your Section 8 programs, your public housing programs, and figuring out better ways to inform tenants. I mean, it's kind of difficult when you’re the landlord also but informing them of their rights and that type of thing.

Attendee 7: The other thing is maybe to engage our local FHEO and having them be a part of it because the reason why they’re not here, and I talked to them at length, and it’s like we cover this huge area, we’re looking at all these plans. So really, it’s kind of like code enforcement. Most cities it’s complaint based so if somebody files a complaint and they have to investigate it. That’s where they’re going as opposed to if they don’t hear any problems they’re not focused. They’re on a very reactionary base. I think they’d like to be in another position but they’re limited on funding, but I do think we might be able to get their buy in on something that’s more global if it’s going to benefit several jurisdictions and I can’t see how this wouldn’t. With the County, and the County courts it would, Inglewood, Gardenia, Long Beach, all these other jurisdictions that receive federal funds that may not even be apart of our Urban County but they receive funds and by educating and outreaching it would benefit. I think if we could get them on board. That could be a goal, something they could strive for.

Attendee 1: The Commission could take the lead on trying to form this.

Attendee 7: Sure.
Attendee 1: Okay.

Attendee 3: Can I ask a question to clarify? I see that throughout, and again I haven’t gone through this thoroughly so I know that some of the impediments are clearly defined here in some parts of this document but suggested actions throughout you see conducting testing, conducting testing and enforcement activities. Can you define that a little better? And what is meant by that in terms of enforcement activities.

Attendee 1: Well, there’s different types of testing. There’s complaint based as Attendee 7 was talking about, you don’t really pay any attention to things until somebody says, hey we have a problem here.

Attendee 7: Right, with this particular landlord, they’re always doing this.

Attendee 1: This particular circumstance even, just one event. But testing could be audit testing, you have a concept: new construction isn’t being built to ADA, you go out and test all the new construction. Then you realize, oh gee, only the market rate properties have that problem because nobody’s tied into them closely enough, so you maybe establish some kind of tracking system. There’s systemic testing if you’ve heard of a particular problem you can test all rental properties and for some things the enforcement might be, okay we found a problem with your firm, this is what the Housing Rights Center’s going to do for you to fix that. And you’re going to change or we’re going to sue you, or whatever, and that’s testing and enforcement to follow that path. Audit testing typically is education, not as much after an individual, more after trying to make a change in direction for the market place. Our phrase for conducting testing and enforcement activities for all these things, I believe we need to conduct testing and that’s an action as a measurable outcome. We unfortunately don’t have any testing results in the document because we were unable to get any testing results. If we do conduct some testing through this, maybe five years from now we would have testing results and we would know from visits to the market place exactly how large and severe the problems are. It’s one thing to hear about it at a meeting or see it in a survey response. It’s another thing quite different to go and actually do a scientific investigation. I think in nearly all these things, some form of testing, whether it is just a sample to measure the size of the problem and give you an idea of which problems we should rank first, or second, or third. That’s what I’m referring to when I say that.

Attendee 3: Right here, the statement, conduct testing and enforcement activities. With the testing part of that, you were thinking of it as there’s not concrete plan in place necessarily, but it would be on a case by case basis?

Attendee 1: The concrete plan comes as an annual action plan. These are the kind of five-year concepts. Sometimes a HUD review person, and it varies by jurisdiction. Sometimes the FHEO review person will want to see the annual action plan items in the AI, so it plugs in cleanly the first year. Other times, this is fine, then the annual action plan has to make specific comments, whether that’s that we’re going to do 200 paired tests in this section. That’s where you actually put a specific measurable action. These are guides to tell you where to go with this. You can do any one of these things. You can educate, do outreach and so on. You ought to do that forever.
Attendee 7: So that’s why you have down suggested action that could be for the impediments. Of course, we’re always limited in funding and so that becomes expensive, conducting the testing and enforcement, and I think that’s why a lot of that has been more complaint based, if you hear that a particular landlord has been doing certain things.

Attendee 1: Then you can test that at those facilities.

Attendee 7: Right, and we do have some cities that contract for landlord-tenant mediation or testing and enforcement activities maybe separately. Then again too, we’re dealing with limited funding because, at least with the Community Development Block Grant Program, there’s caps, a 15 percent cap if it’s a public service activity so when the grant goes down, that cap becomes smaller. The same thing with the administration, there’s a 20 percent cap and so if our grant goes down that gets smaller too.

Attendee 1: It impedes all of housing and community development.

Attendee 7: Yeah, that financial part is an impediment.

Attendee 9: Yeah, that’s the biggest part to me. Can I just talk about education outreach?

Attendee 1: You bet.

Attendee 9: I guess that’s the common thread throughout all our actions. I’m going to try not to be too defensive but I did think the document was a little bit one sided in some of the criticisms of HRC and not really looking at what’s happening with other LA County, little cities that participate. For instance, on page 86 it says, while our website notes and investigates housing discrimination, no information was provided on how a person files a complaint. Well, that’s not true. We go into great detail. I actually brought my [unintelligible] pad I can pass around to show that it says we list at protected classes. We go into great detail about the services we provide, we break it down into legal action, enforcement, fair housing training and outreach, and our number is clear there and says if you have any more complaints, it lists our address and our office hours. It says please call or contact us to file a complaint. So no, we do not have a mechanism where you can file a complaint online and submit it, very few agencies do, I thought that was inaccurate, number one. Number two, it says we don’t describe how our intake process is conducted. I don’t think that would be productive to do so. Very few, I know that legal aid organizations for instance, don’t go into detail about how their intake process is conducted. Number one, it leads to an expectation on behalf of the caller, the complainant. If it says for instance, five days after you file a complaint, we’ll do this and we’ll have you come in and we’ll possibly test and all of this, it leads to such an expectation for the complainant, and may not be correct in their assessment to their situation, that it would not benefit either of us. It’s true we don’t go into great detail about our intake process, but there’s a reason why, so I did not see that as an impediment, personally. My third point is on page 106 you talk about the analysis of our reporting activities showed poor attendance, well I think the County should recognize poor attendance as a problem with everything. I mean, you conducted your forums,
some of them not one person came. That’s not just an HRC problem, poor attendance is a problem for everyone. I couldn’t really get into the details about these because it’s not HRC that does these as it says here. It’s actually our sub-recipient of the Fair Housing Foundation, they’re the ones that cover a lot that we don’t, so I can’t really get into how many people came because it’s not HRC. I would correct them because it’s misleading by saying its us.

**Attendee 2:** What page was that?

**Attendee 9:** I’m sorry, page 106. I’m sorry I can’t see, I need my glasses on, my own impediment. I’m so vein I don’t want to put them on. 166. But it is the Fair Housing Foundation, it’s not the Housing Rights Center. So if you wanted, I don’t have a problem with this being here but I’m just saying that it’s seen as another organization. But also, I asked our own outreach people, I said, well how can it happen sometimes for instance, where we may have, it says one person, a complainant shows up to a workshop but 20 pieces of literature are distributed. Well, often times, and this happens most of the time, we give the tenant multiple copies so they can distribute to other tenants in the building, or the tenant will say to us, may I’ll take this to my church because my church would need to have this, or because we had our outreach for these things and City Halls usually, or City libraries, City staff come by and say, oh, can I grab some copies of these so I can put them at my desk? It’s not that we’re just like saying we distributed 20 pieces and we didn’t, we do distribute these pieces, we have to show extensive auditing to show that actually the pieces were produced and distributed. But we do this so we can further educated tenants and people who weren’t at the meetings, City staff.

**Attendee 2:** Those activities and conferences and stuff, is that funded by like the FHIP or through our grant? Is there a requirement that they have? I’m just wondering, is there an alternative, maybe there’s an alternative way of doing the outreach? I don’t know how much those things cost but it costs us a lot of money to do community meetings.

**Attendee 9:** No, no, I’m sorry, these aren’t community, well, like I said, it’s not us. I can’t really speak to these things, I’d have to contact that agency.

**Attendee 2:** I guess just in general, if we’re doing stuff with the contract, and say if we were doing that and we’re only getting so many people, then maybe the money could go toward something else.

**Attendee 9:** Oh, no, no, no, okay so I wanted to get to the basis of this, because like I said, it comes on harsh and with criticism. So what I did was, and I just had time, I just conducted these things last night, to contact 10 of the cities that participate. We went to their websites, and almost none of them said, if you have a housing discrimination complaint, or if you have a landlord-tenant complaint, contact the agency. Almost none of them had it. A couple of them, I want to say Duarte, you could navigate to us, but you had to go through the links to code enforcement. So unless you went through the links to code enforcement, it wouldn’t have told you any information about how to contact us. And then, we called City Hall on many of them, some of them, Beverly Hills had no idea, they were like I don’t know. A couple of them, I want to say Malibu, surprisingly, was really good. The person did say contact the Housing Rights Center.
Often times they had our number but didn’t have the name of our organization so the person who called, they had the number of our organization but if they wanted to go online and look us up they couldn’t. I think the easiest thing to do would be to contact all the cities that contract with you and make sure that their websites and that their City staff were appropriately trained and had the information where a person could find out about our workshops.

Attendee 7: We’ve done this before with our cities. We have a city quarterly meeting and it has been a couple years, but we did have them come out and it was before we started this. And as we got going, we wanted to keep them informed with what we were doing with the AI, but prior to that we wanted them to be aware of especially accommodations for persons with disabilities because it was coming out more and more. Especially with comfort animals and other kinds of things, you cannot have discriminatory practices within your cities with what’s going on. We weren’t there yet, it was with other people that came to our meetings but we can continue to do that, and doing the spot checks and talking to our folks and making those recommendations for better placements so that their constituencies and their residence are aware. That’s part of the issue too, is accessibility.

Attendee 9: I think it’s huge because like I said, the reason why I think this is misleading here is because it assumes that a complainant in LA County knows, okay, I need to contact the Housing Rights Center. More than likely that’s not how they’re going to come to us. Their going to come to us because they live in Beverly Hills, they got turned down for an apartment, they’re going to go the City Hall or to the website of Beverly Hills. They probably won’t even go to the County website.

Attendee 7: They won’t.

Attendee 9: Yeah, they won’t, right? They won’t even know that that’s the way to do it. They’ll go to their local jurisdiction and I’m sure with city funding cuts there’s probably a lot of staff turn over and all that over the last couple of years since that kind of meeting or training was held. That’s how they’re going to find us. We do as much as we can, we do PSAs, we’re in as many newspapers as we can afford to be in. Like I said, I think it’s misleading to just say that our attendance is low without really looking to how can people access the information to even know about us to attend. And that is that big cities have to be better educated and trained.

Attendee 1: I’m hearing actually, two different things. A referral system needs to be more pointed where to go. The second thing is, enhancing attendance at fair housing trainings and seminars, kind of two separate things. And for the last few, two or three minutes, reviewed how to enhance the referral system. On the other hand, we still haven’t addressed how do we increase attendance?

Attendee 9: Well, I think they’re not separate at all. I think they’re very related. If the Beverley Hills City, if they send out their newsletter or whatever to tenants or a member, and it doesn’t have, if you have a fair housing complaint or we have a workshop. Most of our workshops aren’t conducted like willy nilly. Most of them are scheduled with certain dates, certain times every month, because we don’t want there to confusion about, are we going to be there are we not
going to be there? So it’s something very easy for the cities to put on their websites to say, there’s going to be a fair housing person in the library, Thursdays from 3 to 5. And have that information to tell the person. Like I said, when I cold called these cities, almost none of them gave that type of information.

**Attendee 1:** You know, I think your suggestion’s a good one. Where we get out the word about your organization and what you’re offering as a way to enhance attendance. I’m thinking also that again, kind of a team approach, pairing your training with some Consolidated Plan activity. Maybe it’s the Annual Action Plan stuff that goes out, we get this much money, we’re thinking about doing this much, these different things and these communities, but we also have this, and your organization would make some statements about fair housing and teaming that some more.

**Attendee 7:** But they do, they come to our community meetings.

**Attendee 2:** Yeah, they come to our meetings. I guess the main thing is a lot of people don’t come to the fair housing stuff so if you could piggy back, that’s one example.

**Attendee 10:** The weak point there is we do community meetings once a year and there’s five meetings. And I take you guys probably have forums that go on all the time throughout the whole year, so I guess the question there is what are you guys doing to advertise your forms?

**Attendee 6:** What we could do is give her the contact person for every 49 of our participating cities.

**Attendee 9:** That would be excellent.

**Attendee 10:** That actually is probable, that could be done.

**Attendee 7:** I think the other issue, at least in terms of some of our community forums, I think this happens even with our community meetings, although those are a little bit different, I think that if there’s an issue happening, people will come out and they’ll be there for whatever reason. Randy was pretty much attacked, wherever you were last time, because they thought it was something else.

**Attendee 9:** Oh, the Lancaster one?

**Attendee 7:** Oh, yeah.

**Attendee 10:** There was major issues going on up there and we had about 60 people in a really tight room.

**Attendee 7:** He was verbally harassed, and it was like wow. And we weren’t there on Section 8, but for some reason they thought that’s what they, he became the face.
Attendee 2: Attendee 7’s right, they come out because there’s issues in the community, so they really come out. Regardless of what the meeting is about.

Attendee 7: So unless you have an issue, you’re not going to think, oh that’s me, but unless we target it such that we’re targeting specifically landlords, where the issues are happening. Or, City staff, which I think we’re eventually going to get there and as we kind of get into if there’s perhaps barriers within some of our cities and some of their zoning practices. It’s really working with them to say, these don’t look right, you might want to revisit these because this could be a lawsuit in the making in the future. Something’s might be outdated and they just forgot about them or just haven’t dealt with them yet for whatever reason.

Attendee 2: Or they say, we know, we say, oh yeah, we know this is wrong, we’re going to try to fix it. There’s like one or two cities that know their definition is not updated.

Attendee 7: Any maybe what we need to do there is just put a time frame in on some of those. As opposed to they’ll get to it when they get to it because now it’s on the backburner because they’re dealing with so many other things. Could be.

Attendee 3: What about Lancaster and Palmdale?

Attendee 7: They’re not our cities.

Attendee 3: No? They’re not part of this AI?

Attendee 7: They receive their own funds. They have to do their own AIs. And in order to get their CDBG and HOME, they should have an Analysis of Impediments and identify their own barriers and how they’re going to deal with —

Attendee 3: I’m sorry, I was confused. I thought that you read —

Attendee 9: LA County, they serve in terms of Section 8 program, but they don’t do their fair housing contract. They do their Section 8 but not their fair housing.

Attendee 7: So we were actually, I say Palmdale but where was it? Pearblossom?

Attendee 10: It was in Pearblossom.

Attendee 7: It was in an unincorporated area but people drove out.

Attendee 10: There’s a lot of unincorporated out in the high desert, so the areas that are unincorporated, that’s our responsibility.

Attendee 7: And there’s a lot of area out there.
Attendee 10: But the area in question, they were unhappy with the stuff that was going on in Palmdale and Lancaster and they heard of our meeting so they drove across the valley and came to our meeting and had a lot to say.

Attendee 7: To Randy.

[unintelligible side comments]

Attendee 10: I was very prominent, they knew who I was. That’s why they descended upon me.

Attendee 7: Well it wasn’t even so much that they, it was the one guy and then everybody else was like, we’re really sorry about the guy.

Attendee 9: Are these landlords or Section 8 tenants?

Attendee 7: These are residents.

Attendee 9: They’re residents but not Section 8 residents?

Attendee 10: These were residents that in their opinion they were adamant that they didn’t want to see Section 8 and that’s really what they’re message was.

Attendee 9: Yeah.

Attendee 7: They were saying, we don’t want you out here.

Attendee 10: That’s right. Well they didn’t want Section 8.

Attendee 9: Yeah, they don’t want budget for it is what it really is. Only because I served that area for 16 years.

Attendee 10: This is actually Pearblossom and there’s actually a pretty large black population.

Attendee 9: [unintelligible] it is to some degree racially segregated.

Attendee 10: It’s not really Sun Village. Sun Village is —

Attendee 7: Our big unincorporated area.

Attendee 10: Yeah, and we’re up in Pearblossom but it’s all kind of Pearblossom/Sun Village so there’s quite a big population out there.

Attendee 7: The people that came to the meeting though, they were just —
Attendee 10: Yeah, I don’t know where they lived, it’s hard to say where somebody lives when they come to the meeting.

Unintelligible: Because their racists with cars [laughs]

Attendee 6: Is source of income a protected class?

Attendee 9: Source of income is a protected class but Section 8 is specifically excluded from the source of income protection. A landlord can still discriminate against Section 8.

Attendee 7: We don’t want to get side tracked.

Attendee 1: No, but getting side tracked sometimes is good.

Attendee 9: There’s not a protection for people receiving government housing subsidies.

Attendee 7: Well, and that’s the thing is that people have the freedom to, if they have a voucher and they want to live somewhere and they meet the requirements.

Attendee 9: Yeah. No, it’s a huge impediment. Years ago we did testing on Section 8 up there in Palmdale and Lancaster and it was very —

Attendee 6: Were those cities adopting preferences, ordinances?

Attendee 9: Some of them, yeah. Again, I’m not sure about some of the smaller ones.

Attendee 1: You’ve talked about impediments and there’s financial impediments across all budgetary categories, we’ve operated this in terms of HUDs definition of impediments as actions, omissions and decisions that restrict housing choice based on protected class status. There are other impediments that can be addressed that we haven’t, if laws were changed, like the Section 8 clause was removed, so that’s kind of the fine line. And financing, the budgets that we get from the government, not necessarily an impediment to fair housing choice only, sometimes they cross the operation of all of these problems.

Attendee 7: The whole nation, yeah.

Attendee 3: I have a question. The point of what you brought on the Analysis of, and this would get at actions, decisions or omission, but in terms of Section 8 voucher mobility, any analysis of what happens when there are for example, opt outs or closures or disposition and those Section 8 voucher holders have to disperse, what happens to them?

Attendee 7: I’m not sure if I understand what you mean?
Attendee 3: So for example, is the closure by the County, LA, of a scattered site, does that result in a Section 8 voucher holder being relegated to going to Antelope Valley where they’re going to face racism. Or what happens to those voucher holders?

Attendee 7: People have the choice of where they take their voucher. The Authority, Housing Authority, does not steer them to any specific location. As a matter of fact if they want to port out, they can port out, right?

Attendee 8: Out of state. And just specifically to address when they have —

Attendee 3: Can you remind me of your name please?

Attendee 8: My name is Attendee 8, and so if there is a disposition or an opt out that HUD and the owner has disagreed and they basically are not going to review their contract. What HUD does is they will contact the local Authority and ask them to reissue vouchers to those individuals. And so basically they have a voucher now, and they can relocate, like Attendee 7 said, anywhere they’d like to, out of state, or within California.

Attendee 7: But the Housing Authority doesn’t direct them.

Attendee 8: No.

Attendee 9: But, they can. There have been mobility plus programs, LA City had mobility plus program, where they work with landlords, they educated them about the Section 8 program to try to dismiss some of the stereotype and misgivings about the Section 8 program. Right now with the economy, you would think that landlords maybe will be a little more apt to take Section 8 because it’s guaranteed money.

Attendee 7: They’re going to get money.

Attendee 9: But often times landlords hear from other people, oh, dealing with Section 8’s a headache and you have to deal with all the paperwork and so forth and they make you do repairs and make sure the curtain’s hung and all this other kind of stuff. I have found often times when I really to landlords, a lot more of them are willing to take Section 8.

Attendee 7: They really are.

Attendee 9: Maybe another impediment and an action is decreasing landlord stereotype or their own inhibition to accepting Section 8 contracts by educating them about the program.

Attendee 7: Are we finding that as an impediment? That they’re not accepting Section 8?

Attendee 9: It’s huge, it should be.

Attendee 8: But Section 8’s not a protected class.
Attendee 1: Right.

Attendee 9: But it doesn’t have to be. You don’t have to have protected activities in your analysis.

Attendee 6: Because the impact could be race.

Attendee 9: Because you look at the impact. The path of this doesn’t have to be protected, like the lack of transportation.

Attendee 6: Like families with children

Attendee 7: Downsize

Attendee 9: Yeah, or lack of transportation, for instance, is not a fair housing protected category, but it’s clearly an impediment if a person can’t get from housing to their medical provider or work.

Attendee 2: Is there, Attendee 8, in some of the areas that are not so much segregated, is there any outreach that goes to them, to the landlords to try get them to accept Section 8?

Attendee 8: You know, we don’t personally do any outreach per say, we do attend the neighborhood legal services, the apartment association meetings and so forth, and try to do some outreach in that manner, but like I said with the reduced spending, we’re limited to that. We do go to a lot of conferences and we do go out and setup booths and so forth and so on but it’s, like Attendee 7 said, the resources we have, we have to use them to administer the program so that’s extra. It’s not a requirement from HUD to do but it’s workshops we do, we deal with the conferences, we deal with the apartment associations. That’s the extra steps we take to outreach to the owner to explain the program to them and let them know how the program works, and it’s really up to the owners. Most owners feel that they have, the negative press they see, as well as the outcome from a bad experience.

Attendee 9: A bad experience once.

Attendee 8: But they have to realize it’s their responsibility to screen the tenants. Just because the tenant is participating in the Section 8 program, we’re not screening them as a tenant, as a renter, that’s really what the difference is. We do tell them, we run criminal background checks, we do credit checks, we make sure their eligible for the program, but we didn’t contact their previous landlord, or the landlord their renting from right now, that’s your responsibility. I don’t know if they’re going to tear up the unit or not. I know they met the criteria for the Section 8 program. And that’s where the difference is coming and I think that’s where people just had a bad experience, or their friend had a bad experience and the rumor get out and the newspaper articles don’t help too much in the AV area.
Attendee 7: That’s a challenge right there.

Attendee 2: Because when we looked at the Section 8 voucher data because we went to training that HUD had in response to Westchester County, and sometimes there’s unintended consequences. You’re providing the vouchers, it’s just re-segregating and a lot of it’s by choice.

Attendee 7: It is by choice.

Attendee 2: And income too.

Attendee 7: They choose to move places.

Attendee 2: Yeah. LA County is so diverse income wise as well, so it’s hard to pinpoint to say that this person—Well, that’s why I asked about outreach, if there’s areas where it was affordable still, and there’s landlords to allow people to disperse if they wanted to, if they wanted to live in a certain area.

Attendee 8: The only thing that HUD does require us to do, part of our map requirements, we get grades and basically they require that we select areas in the county, that we provide education, opportunities for employment, and that’s supposed to be on concentrating Section 8. So what we do within the county, we’ve selected probably about 20 of the cities, and we have a booklet that’s available that our voucher issuant and we’ll say that you may be interested, these cities have this opportunity for employment, have this for education schooling, the bus routes, we’re required to do that.

Attendee 7: But that’s not based on race. It’s just Section 8.

Attendee 9: It’s the concentration of poverty.

Attendee 8: Yes, so it’s about what’s available in this area, and it’s stepping outside in your area. Like you said, most people already identify where they want to live, they know their churches are there.

Attendee 9: I mean, so like one example is for a long time there was the 30 percent rule, where a tenant couldn’t pay more than 30 percent of their income for housing and that was becoming a huge impediment when rents got really high. So then the Housing Authorities allowed for this 30 to 40 percent so a tenant could pay more if they wanted to so that they could access that housing.

Attendee 3: Is that available? The 20 cities that you get, in some ways encourage them into, is that available on the website?

Attendee 8: It’s not on our website, it’s actually available on our lobby. It’s a huge booklet that we had to put together and we have to update it annually for the cities and so forth, but if you like —
Attendee 7: Is it online?

Attendee 8: No, we’ve never scanned it and put because it’s actually hard documents.

Attendee 2: And this is something you give to the tenant?

Attendee 8: Yes, we’ll share with the tenant, these are the cities, this is the education information, this is the job opportunities within the city and so forth. I think we’re really going to work toward putting it online, trying to put a brochure together, it’s something that we have to on an annual basis maintain and update. It’s difficult to print all these copies and hand them out and then making changes along the way each year, so that’s what we found a little challenging.

Attendee 3: And does the 20 cities that you select, are they formed by, do they change? How do you select the 20 cities?

Attendee 8: Well, it just depends on where the employment opportunities are, where the education and where the bus lines are, because once again, some of the Section 8 participants it’s, okay, we’re supposed to say where’s good transportation, are the schools in this area. There’s a guideline that HUD uses, cities are supposed to meet these guideline, and so you should provide this information for each of these cities and so they have to meet so many criteria before we even select them. As you know, LA County is so huge so it’s kind of like, okay we can’t do all the cities that meet these criteria right now, we’re going to do the first 20 we find and then go from there.

Attendee 3: Thank you.

Attendee 8: Would you like some information like that? I can send that to you.

Attendee 3: Yeah, that’d be great if I could get that.

Attendee 1: Most of the discussion thus far has been more about the rental market. We have three concepts of how to improve the understanding of fair housing in that, kind of form something for servicing our legal system, getting their understanding. Forming a team for referrals as well as enhancing the understanding of available training. But that’s mostly from our discussion of rental markets. I’d like to steer on here to home purchase pieces. We saw a few housing complaints related to steering and so on but a lot of this came out of the fair housing survey. Really, the several of these relate to trying to purchase a home, certain activities that the private sector are doing, if you will, questionable activities, certain preferences that have been occurring. Now, this again is outreach and education but the reality is, it’s so expensive to do each one of these. The first 10 or 12 talk about testing, and I mean, testing, I’m sure you understand, the testing is not cheap. It’s complicated. We can’t afford to do everything, so at some point, we got to decide, what can we do with these? There are a few things, all of the HMDA data we evaluated talked about the denials for certain groups who are unusually high and those denial rates are concentrated in particular areas, particularly for blacks and Hispanics.
It’s hard to say, even HMDA’s formal documentation indicates that you can’t conclude that these lenders are acting discriminatorily. It might literally be the credit rating and all the other pieces that the applicant simply is not eligible. So in each of these cases we’re talking about focusing on our own buyers. How do we get these guys educated? Some of these testing, more trying to understand the scope of the problem. Is it really related to discriminatory activities? I’m just suggesting that you look into that. This particular part of discriminatory lending, in 2004, this Home Mortgage Disclosure Act began reporting, if you will, those loan originations, those loans which were made that had certain predatory like characteristics. So we’ve got six years of that data in here. Low and behold, we see that these lower quality lending, these low quality loan instruments, tend to occur in areas with higher concentrations of low income households, blacks and Hispanics. Less so with Asians. Asians and whites are more similar. It gives us an idea about if we wanted to take action, that’s really kind of the bottom line in all of these actions for you to consider, do you want to do something about these things?

Attendee 7: We do have something actually, through the Department of Consumer Affairs. I think they have some directive to deal with predatory lenders and what not. In our county, they do have an enforcement ability to deal with some of the predatory lending, but they don’t deal with from a fair housing perspective, but just in terms of general. We do have them.

Attendee 1: So we should get the word out more?

Attendee 7: They actually do a pretty good job with that it’s just I think the problem is much larger than they are, I don’t know? Most counties don’t have that.

Attendee 2: Didn’t it decrease a little bit? Did the predatory lending decrease?

Attendee 1: The predatory lending, according to HMDA, declined substantially since 2006. Mainly because those who were extremely exposed went bankrupt. So, it’s down quite a bit. But then again, all lending and the percentage of shared lending whether it’s predatory, is down. But it’s still there. Even in this market, with the underwriting the way it is, how is it still occurring? It’s still thousands.

Attendee 2: Wasn’t there a case that you found?

Attendee 1: Yes, there was a case we found. A lender, I forget where they were headquartered, I think it was Texas, but they operated here and they were preying on Hispanic households and making them pay higher fees to get the loan processed, substantially higher, and were found out about that. We have it recorded in the document and they were required to issue the purchasers a refund, but how do you tell if all the applicants got the refund? Something like that, that particular case we could make that known to our participating jurisdictions.

Attendee 2: But the testing part of it is to try to remove those lenders to test.

Attendee 7: Who would do the testing?
Attendee 9: It costs between 200 and 500 dollars because a person has to do a full credit application, most people aren't going to do that.

Attendee 6: And they expose their credit score.

Attendee 9: We need to expose everything so it’s really expensive to do that kind of testing. We historically only would do that if we had a case we were going to file, we wouldn’t just randomly do it.

Attendee 7: Right, so that you could get damages.

Attendee 9: So we could get damages. Otherwise, it’s really costly. Now there are, that is something we could always apply for HUD grants or something like that to do that.

Attendee 2: That’s good to know in terms of feasibility.

Attendee 1: As it stands right now, once we’re able to secure additional funding, testing in this market would not occur?

[Crowd]: No.

Attendee 1: Would you like me to remove this language?

Attendee 7: The conduct testing?

Attendee 1: Yeah.

Attendee 7: I just don’t think we have the money to do this in the private sector on this part of it. But we do offer education to homebuyers. We have pretend homebuyer programs that they have to, especially if they’re getting HUD funds, because we don’t provide the complete loan funding, but we do provide [unintelligible] seconds and other housing opportunities, and we offer first time homebuyer programs and we can ask them to incorporate these.

Attendee 9: Do you contract with LA neighborhood housing services or some other first time homebuyer groups?

Attendee 7: I’m not sure which one they do but they usually have first time homebuyer educational all day program. It's like an eight hour deal and they have to do that in order to get federal funding to help them with their first home. So, we could see about including that into the programs.

Attendee 1: As far as the testing, could we say research the feasibility of teaming, that gives you an opportunity to figure out a way to apply for federal funding for that. Would that work?

Attendee 7: I think so.
Attendee 9: I think that’s better.

Attendee 1: I do hear you say that there’s a need for it. Is that correct?

Attendee 9: Well, like the National Fair Housing Rights, they’ve been doing it, they got full credit testing or whatever, and yes they found out all kinds of things. Especially in the REO market, you know, foreclosures, where people of color are really being steered toward to certain homes and the foreclosing market in more established white neighborhoods, you don’t even know it’s a foreclosure. The lawn is green, there’s no sign up front that says “bank owned,” that kind of thing. But in order to test to see where people were being taken, like I said, they’re much more expensive tests.

Attendee 1: But I am hearing you say that there’s a need for that.

Attendee 9: Yeah, there definitely would be. If there was funding that would be-

Attendee 1: Figuring out a way to address that need is the problem.

Attendee 9: Yes.

Attendee 7: So in terms of providing some of the comments on some of them if they’re like, conduct testing or whatever that’s not really feasible, we should provide alternative language.

Attendee 1: I would think that would be really good for you —

Attendee 7: Because otherwise there’s a big expectation that either Housing Rights Center’s going to do this or we’re going to take on a certain approach. If that’s just not even feasible, it’s almost like okay, we need to prioritize which areas we’re going to focus on because we might not be able to do. Did you say 30 impediments?

Attendee 9: Or hope to identify sources of revenue or funding to do more investigation.

Attendee 1: That’s right. If you continue together and make an application as you suggested, I think that’s a brilliant idea. Then that teaming effort would be part of the research a way to get the funds to do this.

Attendee 9: And you could take testing out and I would just put investigation instead. Because it may not be test, it may be some other way.

Attendee 7: Or could even be a referral if we’re hearing about stuff, to refer it to say Fair Housing Alliance and you know, especially if it’s like a lender or something, it’s probably bigger than even here. If the organization’s in Texas, chances are they’re doing this in different parts of the country.
Attendee 1: Yeah, I mean there are lenders. In the hey day of the subprime, lenders in Atlanta were found to let the payments lay on the table until it was one day past due to keep the credit rating out of whack so these people could not refinance. It’s really a gamesmanship and from my staff who read this we’re referring to private sector impediment 15.

Attendee 10: Is NOFA funding, do they fund any of that? If you apply, will you receive NOFA funding?

Attendee 9: You mean through HUD?

Attendee 10: Yeah.

Attendee 9: There are a few. It’s not a lot because HUD’s budget was cut tremendously. So really, you just [handed] the guy that was the National Fair Housing Alliance at Washington D.C. that is doing this kind of work.

Attendee 1: Just to iterate your suggestion, and I welcome for modified language on these actions, and this is the perfect example. I mentioned a little bit earlier about some of the private sector building, what can you do about that? I realize that there are 49 local jurisdictions to probably do the building inspections, so some monitoring.

Attendee 6: Well, under the CDBG grant it’s not our responsibility to monitor compliance of that.

 Attendee 9: Well, probably not under CDBG but under the County, I mean there must be something.

Attendee 7: Well, there’s laws, and that’s the thing is when there’s new housing construction, it is upon that local jurisdiction planning department, their inspectors to go out and make sure that they adhere. Our Department of Regional Planning or actually Department of Public Works I would imagine, would be looking at some of this stuff, to make sure that they in fact comply within the unincorporated of the county.

Attendee 9: When we’re audited by HUD, they literally come up when they’re auditing, they take out tape measures. The doorways, the hallways, the bathroom, everything, because we have to be in compliance so when things like, again I don’t know what some local jurisdictions are doing, but I hope they would do the same kind of thing where in order to pass to get a permit you would have to do that.

Attendee 7: Right, that they have a certain amount.

Attendee 6: What I’m saying is that it shouldn’t be on the CDBG grant part to oversee monitoring of that, compliance of that.
Attendee 7: You know, it’s not necessarily CDBG, but it’s asking. It is upon the local jurisdiction to enforce the ADA requirements. It’s not just a CDBG thing, they should be following ADA compliance requirements as set forth by the law.

Attendee 6: So, what would our role be?

Attendee 7: Probably more in terms of, well, I don’t know.

Attendee 2: If they’re receiving CDBG funds, then it could be a problem.

Attendee 7: Well on the CDBG side of it, or on HOME, or if their doing some construction project.

Attendee 6: Yeah, I can see the stuff that we’re funding, but for private and every single public facility in the jurisdiction-

Attendee 2: Oh, yeah.

Attendee 6: You see what I’m saying?

Attendee 2: Yeah.

Attendee 6: That’s out of our jurisdiction.

Attendee 7: So maybe you’re saying it’s too broad.

Attendee 6: Yeah, it’s too broad.

Attendee 9: It’s out of CDBG jurisdiction but there has to be some agency department within LA County that does oversee, just like County.

Attendee 2: What about the matrix that we provided?

Attendee 7: Only on those that take place within those jurisdictions. If they have a building permit through Department of Public Works or in an unincorporated area, let’s say, where a public facility or something or housing, then they’ll go out and they’ll look at that. And let’s say if it’s in the City of Beverly Hills, with their planning department when they get a permit to build, then it’s their inspector that goes out.

Attendee 9: So it’s not a county inspector, it’s Beverly Hills?

Attendee 7: Right, if it’s that jurisdiction, because the County only looks at the unincorporated areas of the county. The cities have that kind of autonomy within their own jurisdictions unless they contract with the Department of Regional Planning, or excuse me, Department of Public
Works, which most of them don’t. Most cities like to have full control of what’s being built in their communities.

**Attendee 1:** This particular example is perfect because in a way the AI, as it says, it doesn’t matter if it’s assisted or market rate, you have the responsibility to affirmatively further fair housing. In the private sector, how much influence do you have over builders, making sure that they understand what to do and the inspectors from each of these communities, when they come they understand what to do. There’s sometimes a breakdown of community, one guy inspects the inside, somebody else inspects the outside and the accessibility is three steps up.

**Attendee 7:** In terms of this, an action would be upon the local jurisdiction’s, I think, inspectors to insure that code requirements are met.

**Attendee 9:** Yeah, I agree.

**Attendee 1:** That’s the actionable thing, but in this case, it’s the lead agency for the Consolidated Plan and the AI, has to have the action. Or, you can encourage them to take the action.

**Attendee 7:** Yeah, it’s hard for us to get involved in something we’re not even involved with at all. We may not even know what’s happening.

**Attendee 1:** Usually that is the case.

**Attendee 7:** I’m just saying because we’re not the Department of, we’re not issuing any kind of permits, we only see what we are involved with.

**Attendee 6:** Yeah, our County Council, a case came before them, a senior was complaining that the City of South Pasadena did not have an accessible exit for all four sides of a building that was rehabbed with our dollars. County Council looked at it and said, they did have access, but on one or two, she wanted it all sides. County Council said, enforcement of Section 504 or ADA, she would file a complaint and it would go to the Department of Justice for investigation, or maybe to you guys and then the Department of Justice for enforcement.

**Attendee 7:** Was this a community center or housing?

**Attendee 6:** Yeah, in South Pasadena. It was a public facility.

**Attendee 7:** Okay, then I don’t think it would be them because they deal with fair housing.

**Attendee 6:** Yeah, you’re right, this was public accommodations.

**Attendee 1:** This discussion, really kind of in a way, is addressing the classic disconnect between some of the requirements, the AI and what your mandates are.
**Attendee 7**: What we can influence.

**Attendee 1**: So how do you wish to deal with that? This is a real case, it’s market rate, it’s to CDBG or HOME or any of the assisted projects that are being built. Usually it occurs in the private market place, some contractor’s building and some architect designed it, stuff like that. And there’s some mistakes being made so if anything, we know we got this from two sources, the survey at least, and what can we do about it? If we just say well, it’s beyond our ability to do anything.

**Attendee 6**: Could it say increase monitoring of CDC funded home construction projects?

**Attendee 7**: But this was based on private sector. Failure to comply with accessibility requirements in construction of housing units. It may not have any federal, state, or local funding at all. Then it’s really pretty much asking our jurisdictions to take responsibility in their inspections.

**Attendee 9**: But you can put that as an action.

**Attendee 1**: That’s a perfectly good example.

**Attendee 9**: Yeah.

**Attendee 7**: I think that’s all we could legitimately do because we don’t know about this, we’re not part of the permitting, we’re not part of the financing.

**Attendee 1**: So you increase monitoring by having the participating jurisdiction tell you something about what’s going on.

**Attendee 6**: Or we encourage, we encourage participating jurisdictions to increase monitoring.

**Attendee 7**: Well, they would have to do it anyway.

**Attendee 10**: Just making them aware of the impediment and they need to follow up?

**Attendee 7**: To ensure that they are doing this.

**Attendee 10**: Yeah, not necessarily have to come back to us with an answer but you’re just making them aware, and that’s your mitigation.

**Attendee 6**: Or like you say, on their website, when they talk about fair housing, if you experience any of these call the City and it would be a fair housing discrimination, or lack of accessibility to housing.
Attendee 1: I mean, we do want to reduce or eliminate the liability that somebody’s building into the market place, so if we can do that, leverage our participating jurisdictions in some way, look at that more closely, that would be a great idea.

Attendee 7: Well, I think that’s all we can do.

Attendee 1: Right.

Attendee 7: And informing them that this is a barrier that they need to be aware and then they need to do their job.

Attendee 10: Better.

Attendee 7: And informing them that this is a barrier that they need to be aware and then they need to do their job.

Attendee 1: Yeah. That would also be true then for communicating with the County departments who are responsible for the unincorporated areas.

Attendee 7: That’s correct.

Attendee 1: We will make those modifications. Again, just to iterate for all of you, the recording, some minutes will be prepared for you and you can review that. This is related to the Community Reinvestment Act data that we looked that. It was remarkable just how different the level of investments were being made throughout the Urban County, concentrated more in areas having higher incomes. Maybe there is a way you can communicate with the investment community that encourages them to disperse that investment in a broader way.

Attendee 7: I think that’s all we can do, it advise them, because we don’t look at what they do in those communities before they do them.

Attendee 1: No, you can just talk to them and let them know that you have seen this, and would like it changed. So, advise.

Attendee 2: It could be a letter or something.

Attendee 7: With our findings, I guess, that’s all we can do.

Attendee 1: That’s correct.

Attendee 2: Some of these we’re going to have to prioritize. Obviously some we’ve spent 20 minutes on and some are like this, but it’s just stuff that we found and so it’s good that we’re doing this. Obviously, it’s sort of a laundry list, but we haven’t gone to the next step of really flushing them out and hopefully we can get more feedback from you on each one.

Attendee 7: Well, the financing banking committee, I’m trying to think of what committee in D.C.
Attendee 9: Okay so, the Community Reinvestment Act was an Act placed in 1979 and the problem is the language is very weak. It says that financial institutions have to serve the economic needs of its geographic community, something like that. It’s literally like that short. Then they are rated by different agencies, so the Office of Thrift Supervision does certain financial institutions with over certain millions of dollars, OCC does some others, and the Federal Reserve does some others also. One of things that’s happening is there is a new government agency, the Consumer Federal Protection Bureau.

Attendee 7: That’s correct.

Attendee 9: Under the [unintelligible] bill and so they are going to supposedly be looking at financial institutions to make sure that they are really serving the needs of all the people in their area. One of the actions may be to contact them and ask them for resources, training materials, to come speak, or something like that from the consumer financial protection. From the advocate side, big problems that we’ve seen, that you’ve heard historically in different parts of Los Angeles. Banks say, well, we’re meeting the financial needs but they’re closing brick and mortar branches and their putting up check cashers or payday lending type institutions instead. Most community activists would say that those type of businesses are not in the best interest of consumers in terms of large interest rates and fees and so forth. Again, it’s hard for me because I don’t really know what LA County can do. What some cities have done, like Oakland and San Diego, is they pass ordinances to say that for military personnel, you can’t provide payday loans that have a certain amount of fees. Or, they’ll limit what check cashers can do, with zoning ordinances to limit the number of check cashers or pawn shop places and things like that so that there’s not such the proliferation of those type of business in low income communities. Monitoring lending practices-

Attendee 7: That’s kind of hard to do. We can’t even monitor to them, we don’t have the ability to do that. We can advise them, but I don’t think we can monitor ourselves. We can look at statistics, but then what are we going to do?

Attendee 1: Okay, so you’re going to advise and ask for resources.

Attendee 9: Yeah, I’d say ask for federal resources would be good, at least from the new Bureau. I guess to some degree-

Attendee 7: This is where I think where with banking and federal reserves, or however some of these banks get their ratings or how cheap they get their money or whatever they get. It’s really beyond even HUD.

Attendee 9: Oh yeah, it’s definitely beyond HUD.

Attendee 7: And it’s totally beyond us. Some of these banks, their lending practices or how they’re dealing with the CRA is not what it should be. That’s something that the treasury should take up and make that an issue.
Attendee 1: Conversely, it could be a community visioning process initiating to help direct investment in particular geographic areas.

Attendee 9: On that line, for instance, what some cities have done is they look at where their deposits are held. I don’t know who holds most of LA County’s deposits but let’s say B of A. Since obviously then you would have some clout with the bank where you’re deposits are held, then you ask for meetings with your banking officials and make sure their meeting the Community Reinvestment Act requirements.

Attendee 7: Yeah, like we have the money to do that. I’m just saying, we’re barely getting by with our shrinking staff, it’s like, how are we going to do that?

Attendee 1: I sympathize with you 100 percent. Westchester County has to do all this additional analysis and you’re expected to take additional actions based on those with a shrinking budget. I am completely sympathetic but I’m just here to be the messenger.

Attendee 6: Does a federal agency provide a list of those financial institutions that are not in compliance with that, the CRA?

Attendee 9: There is not a list but if you contact each particular bank and ask what the rating is of that bank.

Attendee 6: So then maybe what we can say is that our executive director can confer and make sure that wherever we have our money, has a good rating. It’s more of an internal right decision and then we give the information to our participating jurisdictions.

Attendee 9: There’s a lot of city and county precedent for that.

Attendee 7: Well, something like that is something that’s a little more doable than monitoring.

Attendee 1: Well, monitoring might be like, create in two or three years, when you do this again, a set of maps like we have in the document to show where this investment went. We have this one and in five years we show what has changed that would be monitored.

Attendee 2: So Attendee 1, it’s about 1:00 already, do we want to kind of just go through them? I know we’re probably going to need feedback from everybody.

Attendee 1: Yeah, I think this is the last private sector one. Getting people to participate, public sector.

Attendee 9: What communities are out of compliance? I’m just wondering, how do you know if they’re out of compliance?

Attendee 7: It’s based upon their surveys we have them fill out.
Attendee 1: Surveys, there’s also the housing element, the state evaluated them so we have something there. In the public sector, I want to preface this by talking about a way that which you the Commission might be able to address all these and before Attendee 7 takes off, I’m going to suggest that we retain funding from some communities.

Attendee 7: We may have to, I think that’s something we need to discuss further with management but certainly if they’re way out of compliance and they’re not on the road to compliance.

Attendee 1: For example, it’s those that did not participate in the Planning and Zoning Survey or won’t talk to us or come to any of them fair housing things, maybe they shouldn’t be funded for anything.

Attendee 7: We may be able to put them on the hook. How many are there?

Attendee 1: It’s a handful. I think three or four did not participate in the survey, although some didn’t take much time responding to the survey, they kind of went through it.

Attendee 10: For agencies that are funded they have a very low rate.

Attendee 2: First we asked them to fill out the survey and then to comply. Because I know that Cerritos really wanted to and then all of the sudden they got hammered. I’m sure they’d fill it out if they had more time.

[Attendee 7 departs]

Attendee 1: The reasons for my suggestions is once we retain the funding it gives us the capacity to reallocate that with something you might want to do instead.

Attendee 9: I actually really don’t know how this works. A city like Beverly Hills receives over $50,000 so it has to participate. So they pay the County to do their fair housing?

Attendee 2: All the cities fall under, in terms of the services or the study?

Attendee 9: In terms of the fair housing services. They pay the County a certain amount?

Attendee 2: No.

Attendee 9: No?

Attendee 2: There’s only one or two, I think only one now —

Attendee 6: There’s a couple of cities that contract directly with either FHF —

Attendee 9: I mean the ones that contract with you, the participating cities.
Attendee 6: The 25K that we’re giving you covers everybody.

Attendee 9: I understand that, but how do they pay you? These 49 participating cities?

Attendee 1: The Commission is them and allocation of the budget.

Attendee 9: Why is he still covered then?

Attendee 1: There is a cover under the first district. Each district gets a pot of money, so East LA, it’s not a city so they get money through whatever she funds, she funds a lot of stuff in the district too, in that area.

Attendee 10: The money that we get is allocated, there’s a pot of money that goes to each individual city. There’s an allocation that they get and then there’s another allocation that goes to each supervisorial district, so each supervisorial district gets a pot of money.

Attendee 9: Yeah, and they get to spend it however they want.

Attendee 10: And that’s pretty much the split. And then the unincorporated areas, which is the districts, and then in incorporated areas which is the participating cities.

Attendee 9: Yeah the 49 are the incorporated areas. Because the number changed, didn’t it? Wasn’t it 47?

Attendee 10: Yes, it used to be. And we got a couple that have come, Torrance has come on board.

Attendee 6: Avalon left —

Attendee 10: Avalon came back —

Attendee 6: Artesia left —

Attendee 10: I understand Artesia is potentially coming back, they’re not included in the 49.

Attendee 1: I think that last time we did an AI there were 46 so there is some flux. There are fewer than 18 here, but the public sector ones really address many things that we have already talked about, about how the Commission and some of the related agencies can work together. The outreach and education might be ineffective for some of the others, with the referral system being poor and a variety of other things. Just lack of enforcement, capacity, capacity meaning the resources to do that, it’s not a lack of ability but resources to take that on. That’s going to be a tough nut to crack considering where we’re headed currently. Some people just have difficulty because they are obviously, as you suggested before, that I don’t know where to go or they’re returning to the wrong place and enhancing that outreach and referral system would go a long
ways toward that. Here, this is the same kind of thing, but in the public sector reasonable accommodations still is an issue. We had some special cases that have occurred here, it has examples of that. This was from West Hollywood, really it’s the main place. Some of the Russians who came to the meeting talked about extortion and bribery and these are criminal acts in addition to being national origin issues. A thing like this really needs to be taken care, these guys should go to jail, but I’m only pontificating there. Some of the local decisions by the 46 or 45 communities that have participated, we have some issues with that as well. Some comments received within the survey, it’s inconsistent across many of the communities. Some past policies have caused some, if you will, segregation choices, there’s ways in which that can be changed, just some of the actions here, working with the local jurisdictions to make sure their land use and planning are in compliance with current housing element. This was covered in the Zoning Survey as Attendee 2 suggested earlier, they’re all trying to work on it so they say, some have completed that, some have yet to initiate but the intent is there and we really should monitor movement toward there. This also is the same kind of thing we saw with the private sector is the enforcement. I’m not sure how much control, same discussion we had earlier, how much control that the Commission can have over local government. This in particular, were phrases taken directly out of the Planning Zoning Survey, which in turn was created by HUD, it’s kind of an unwieldy instrument, but we did find that some of the communities had differing definitions, some appearing that they were not in compliance with current law. We should probably encourage them to come into compliance and monitor their ability to do so. Same kinds of things related to inclusionary policy. This suggests that some communities are just not getting there, not participating in this dialogue, and this is kind of in a way, maybe if they’re not going to participate, we pull their funding. This refers to some of the stuff we talked about at first. How do we put the teeth in things, how do we make changes? I’m going away with the sense that the Commission is not in the position to advocate for changes in law. If I’m mistaken in that, please let me know, because that’s what I’m suggesting we do, encourage legislative change. What else can we do? We’ve talked a lot about other items.

Attendee 9: Just on the last one, the other group I’d probably add would be immigrants. Technically, I mean, you could make an argument that they’re protected under national origin but we have found a lot of times it’s based solely on immigration, which there are state cases that have found that but it’s not as clear as it could be. Same thing with the elderly, they are kind of covered because there is age, by law you can’t discriminate based on age with the exception of senior housing but as you’re probably saying there, there need to be some specific protections for the elderly, same thing for immigrants.

Attendee 1: Right. All of these we’d be making changes to, current laws, I think we all heard Attendee 7 saying we can’t really do that, we’d be that advocacy organization. In this kind of thing, do we want to eliminate it from it as an impediment? Although it clearly is but every impediment needs to have an action of which at some point within the five year planning cycle, HUD will ask, what did you do about this? And the next AI, five years from now, HUD will say, what have you done on each of these 18 plus 14, 32 items? That’s where we have to go with that. If it’s not within your authority, there’s no way to do it, do we feel good about deleting this? I’m not so sure. It is kind of a problem, we could put it in as other concerns, maybe there aren’t sufficient protections under current law, and information on, we welcome opportunities to
participate in that dialogue and changing those law. We can change the language with your permission.

Attendee 2: Well, that’s going to be our next step is to take all these and sitting down with maybe yourself and getting feedback at least, and prioritizing what we can realistically do to address them. Maybe they won’t follow up but they’ll still be included and we can say that further research or this needs to be addressed by somebody else or whatever it is but we can include all of those but the next step is to prioritize what we really need to tackle. It sounds like we don’t need to do this, we may do something different next time around in the next five years. There’s some ideas there, but that’s just to let you know, again, it’s just a list. Like you said, we have to come up with if we want to set out five year goals with annual actions, that’s very specific and then go into which ever fair housing contract, it been you for the last, you know, your agency. Then it could go onto a contract and then also farmed out to other folks.

Attendee 1: I’m sensing that you’re saying this is an internal process that’s going to take a little while to walk through.

Attendee 2: Oh yeah. After this, just to let you know, we develop a fair housing strategy that is more detailed with the recommendations that you found.

Attendee 1: With the modifications to language and so on that we’ve talked about and I assume that we’ll have some other recommendations about modifying some of the language or some of the text that transliterated needs to be softened or strengthened on a particular subject. That’s why we’re having this session but a month from now or so when we’re concluding this process, what happens next as we have these general things. Sometimes HUD likes to see fairly specific action items. It would be wise for all of us consider making a statement in this document about the initial annual action goals and objectives at least.

Attendee 2: Yeah, yeah. We want to do that with you. We can refine it. It’s going to evolve but we definitely want to do that before it’s finalized. Attendee 3, have we missed anything, or if there’s actions that weren’t there, any ideas that you have, let us know because if you could help us address these issues or some of the issues we have that we haven’t identified yet, let us know.

Attendee 3: Yeah.

Attendee 1: Please. Although I think we’ve got things pretty comprehensive, [unintelligible] next to impossible to accomplish everything, even in five years. With that in mind I want to thank you all for coming. I very much appreciate you coming and offering comments. If you wish to provide later comments, we continue to welcome that. Attendee 2, what’s the date of the closure of the public comment period?

Attendee 2: July 5

Attendee 3: What’s the process, is there a hearing after that or is there something sent out to the Commission?
Attendee 2: I think our executive director just needs to sign. I don’t if we’re going to bring it to the board. What we do is bring our fair housing strategy to the board when we put it into our next consolidated plan, but that’s a couple of years out. There’s not a hearing on this amongst the board of supervisors.

Attendee 9: How else are you soliciting public comments for it?

Attendee 2: We send a public notice, newspaper advertisement, it’s all at the libraries, it’s on our website. We talked about sending out notifications to folks who have participated in our focus groups or actually to some that were just invited and cities, let them know it’s available, they’ll look at their section. It’s on our website so if you know anybody, any other agencies that might want to look at it. They should be covered, but I’m not sure if they’re on our list. We had a list of 1200 people that we sent out, I think mental health advocacy was on there, and WACP, we invited them to the focus groups. Recently we got a freedom of information request about Section 8 stuff. Hopefully, they review it, we might send them an email and say, please review this. I think they’re more concerned about the Palmdale.

[Everyone departs]