



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:				
Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments
2.		Other	Monisha Parker	<p>Dear Board of Supervisors, I am writing to express my serious concerns regarding the recent change in the Portability Rule from the Los Angeles County Development Authority (LACDA). This change now requires voucher holders to provide their landlords with a 60-day notice to vacate their premises before LACDA initiates the porting out process to another housing authority. I believe this requirement creates unnecessary hardship and contradicts the spirit of HUD's portability regulations.</p> <p>As you know, the HUD Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) program, also known as Section 8, is designed to provide low-income families with the opportunity to choose where they live. Portability is a crucial component of this program, allowing families to relocate to areas with better job opportunities, schools, or support systems while maintaining their rental assistance.</p> <p>The current LACDA policy requiring a 60-day notice prior to porting out creates a significant problem. Other housing authorities have their own procedures for accepting incoming portable vouchers. These procedures often involve verifying eligibility, conducting inspections, and determining whether to absorb or bill LACDA for the housing assistance payments (HAP). It is illogical and unfair to expect a tenant to give their landlord a 60-day notice to vacate before knowing whether the receiving housing authority will even accept the voucher.</p> <p>This policy puts voucher holders in an untenable situation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk of Homelessness: If the receiving housing authority denies the port, the family is left with no voucher and facing eviction. • Unnecessary Stress and Expense: The family incurs the cost and burden of moving without assurance that their voucher will be accepted in the new location. • Discrimination: Landlords may be hesitant to rent to voucher holders who are subject to such uncertain and potentially disruptive move-out requirements. <p>HUD regulations, as outlined in 24 CFR 982.353–355, are intended to facilitate the smooth transfer of vouchers between housing authorities. This change by LACDA unnecessarily complicates the process and undermines the purpose of the portability program.</p> <p>I urge the Board of Supervisors to reconsider this detrimental policy change and revert to a system that aligns with HUD regulations and prioritizes the stability and well-being of voucher holders. Specifically, I request that you allow voucher holders to initiate the porting process before providing notice to their landlords, ensuring that they have a reasonable assurance of voucher</p>

				acceptance before committing to a move.
				Thank you for your time and consideration of this important matter.
				Sincerely, Monisha Parker
		Item Total	1	
Grand Total			1	