



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

Correspondence Received

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

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

			The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:	
Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments
13.		Favor	Ann Dorsey	
			Anna Ferrarie	Please continue to stop people from profiting off others loss!
			Charley Linares	United We Must Stand against for those who were illegally arrested from ICE agents. Have reform and strength back for housing stabilization and working environment heal the farming crisis. funds must also be healed and assistance of victims of the California wild fires as well.
			Dorothy Truong	
			Maddie Keyes-Levine	
			Sandra Morales	
			Sergio Santos	
			Vilma Santos	



**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
13.		Oppose	Boris Mack	<p>Public Testimony: Boris Mack</p> <p>Good afternoon. My name is Boris Mack. I grew up in Compton to a single mother who struggled to keep a roof over our head and food on the table. I share that because I am sympathetic toward those who find themselves in difficult circumstances. I'm a rental property owner in Los Angeles County and I'm here today to oppose the continued extension of emergency housing price controls under Penal Code § 396.</p> <p>I want to speak directly to the data. According to DCBA's own reporting, housing-related complaints have collapsed from 865 in January to just 3 in August. That's a 99.7% reduction. Yet the Board continues to assert the existence of an "acute and ongoing housing crisis." Where is the evidentiary basis for that claim? I have made several Brown Act data requests to County Counsel but have those have been ignored.</p> <p>Due to the 90-day notification delay, I've begun to experience an 8% loss in monthly rental income. I am deferring essential repairs and halted capital improvements—not because I'm unwilling, but because the controls have made it economically unfeasible. This isn't sustainable, and it isn't just.</p> <p>Today's motion to extend emergency powers without presenting updated metrics, without public disclosure of internal complaint volumes, and without a transparent evidentiary record violates the procedural safeguards of Government Code §§ 8558(b), 8630(d), and the Brown Act.</p> <p>I'm here to demand procedural integrity. If the ongoing emergency is real, show us the data. If it's not, rescind the controls. I intend to challenge this extension in court, and I urge this body to restore transparency before judicial intervention becomes necessary.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>



**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

Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments
13.		Oppose	Boris Mack	<p>Members of the Board,</p> <p>I submit this comment to formally object to the September 16, 2025 board motion to extend the emergency housing price controls under Penal Code § 396 set to expire on September 30, 2025 to October 29, 2025. The extension lacks factual justification, violates statutory limits on emergency powers, and imposes ongoing economic harm on property owners like myself.</p> <p>The emergency conditions cited by this Board - "complaints of price gouging are continuing and have been increasing" - no longer exist in any measurable form. Internal data from the Department of Consumer & Business Affairs, which your office has declined to disclose publicly, shows a 99.7% drop in housing-related complaints—from 865 in January to just 3 in August. This collapse in complaint volume directly contradicts the Board's public rationale for continued emergency measures.</p> <p>The Emergency Services Act (Gov't Code §§ 8558(b), 8630(d)) requires demonstrable conditions of disaster or extreme peril. No such conditions exist. The Board's reliance on composite third-party figures, while suppressing internal complaint logs, violates transparency obligations under Gov't Code § 54957.5 and procedural safeguards of the Brown Act.</p> <p>As a property owner, I have suffered direct, measurable and ongoing harm. My rental income has been artificially suppressed, and I've been unable to adjust rental terms or recover costs. American Community Survey based modeling estimates countywide losses exceeding \$15 million per month.</p> <p>I respectfully urge the Board to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• To reject the motion "Extending Price Gouging Protections for Housing";• Disclose all internal data and communications used to justify the extension;• Restore lawful governance and fiscal integrity in housing policy. <p>This comment is submitted for inclusion in the public record and may be cited in future litigation. I have previously submitted two formal requests to County Counsel seeking disclosure of the data and documentation used to justify the Board's policy decisions. This marks my third request for the evidentiary basis underlying the emergency extensions. To date, County Counsel has failed to provide any response or produce the requested records, in apparent violation of Government Code § 54957.5 and the County's statutory obligations under the Brown Act. "Under Gov't Code § 54957.5(c), the public has a right to inspect and obtain copies of records used in legislative deliberations. The County's refusal to produce these records upon request—despite their use in policy justification—violates the transparency mandate of the Brown Act."</p> <p>Respectfully, Boris Mack Email: boris.village698@passmail.net Property Owner, Los Angeles County</p>

As of: 9/17/2025 7:00:10 AM



**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

13.		Oppose	Boris Mack	<p>Submitted by Boris Mack – September 2025 Members of the Board,</p> <p>I submit this comment to formally object to the September 16, 2025 board motion to extend the emergency housing price controls under Penal Code § 396 set to expire on September 30, 2025 to October 29, 2025. The extension lacks factual justification, violates statutory limits on emergency powers, and imposes ongoing economic harm on property owners like myself.</p> <p>The emergency conditions cited by this Board - "complaints of price gouging are continuing and have been increasing" - no longer exist in any measurable form. Internal data from the Department of Consumer & Business Affairs, which your office has declined to disclose publicly, shows a 99.7% drop in housing-related complaints—from 865 in January to just 3 in August. This collapse in complaint volume directly contradicts the Board's public rationale for continued emergency measures.</p> <p>The Emergency Services Act (Gov't Code §§ 8558(b), 8630(d)) requires demonstrable conditions of disaster or extreme peril. No such conditions exist. The Board's reliance on composite third-party figures, while suppressing internal complaint logs, violates transparency obligations under Gov't Code § 54957.5 and procedural safeguards of the Brown Act.</p> <p>As a property owner, I have suffered direct, measurable and ongoing harm. My rental income has been artificially suppressed, and I've been unable to adjust rental terms or recover costs. American Community Survey based modeling estimates countywide losses exceeding \$15 million per month.</p> <p>I respectfully urge the Board to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• To reject the motion "Extending Price Gouging Protections for Housing";• Disclose all internal data and communications used to justify the extension;• Restore lawful governance and fiscal integrity in housing policy. <p>This comment is submitted for inclusion in the public record and may be cited in future litigation. I have previously submitted two formal requests to County Counsel seeking disclosure of the data and documentation used to justify the Board's policy decisions. This marks my third request for the evidentiary basis underlying the emergency extensions. To date, County Counsel has failed to provide any response or produce the requested records, in apparent violation of Government Code § 54957.5 and the County's statutory obligations under the Brown Act. "Under Gov't Code § 54957.5(c), the public has a right to inspect and obtain copies of records used in legislative deliberations. The County's refusal to produce these records upon request—despite their use in policy justification—violates the transparency mandate of the Brown Act."</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Boris Mack Email: boris.village698@passmail.net Property Owner, Los Angeles County</p>
-----	--	---------------	-------------------	--

			Eric Zunkley	
		Other	Stephen Sapunor	Request that the Board more narrowly define the boundaries subject to the rent protection emergency. The article referenced from the LA Times reports that the increasing rents are mainly within 3 miles of Palisades and Altadena. The applicable HUD rent estimates in outlying areas are often not sufficient to cover mortgages and thus prevent more homes or condos from entering the market.
		Item Total	13	
		Grand Total	13	

Submitted by Boris Mack – September 2025

Members of the Board,

I submit this comment to formally object to the September 16, 2025 board motion to extend the emergency housing price controls under Penal Code § 396 set to expire on September 30, 2025 to October 29, 2025. The extension lacks factual justification, violates statutory limits on emergency powers, and imposes ongoing economic harm on property owners like myself.

The emergency conditions cited by this Board - “complaints of price gouging are continuing and have been increasing” - no longer exist in any measurable form. Internal data from the Department of Consumer & Business Affairs, which your office has declined to disclose publicly, shows a 99.7% drop in housing-related complaints—from 865 in January to just 3 in August. This collapse in complaint volume directly contradicts the Board’s public rationale for continued emergency measures.

The Emergency Services Act (Gov’t Code §§ 8558(b), 8630(d)) requires demonstrable conditions of disaster or extreme peril. No such conditions exist. The Board’s reliance on composite third-party figures, while suppressing internal complaint logs, violates transparency obligations under Gov’t Code § 54957.5 and procedural safeguards of the Brown Act.

As a property owner, I have suffered direct, measurable and ongoing harm. My rental income has been artificially suppressed, and I’ve been unable to adjust rental terms or recover costs. American Community Survey based modeling estimates countywide losses exceeding \$15 million per month.

I respectfully urge the Board to:

- To reject the motion “Extending Price Gouging Protections for Housing”;
- Disclose all internal data and communications used to justify the extension;
- Restore lawful governance and fiscal integrity in housing policy.

This comment is submitted for inclusion in the public record and may be cited in future litigation. I have previously submitted two formal requests to County Counsel seeking disclosure of the data and documentation used to justify the Board’s policy decisions. This marks my third request for the evidentiary basis underlying the emergency extensions. To date, County Counsel has failed to provide any response or produce the requested records, in apparent violation of Government Code § 54957.5 and the County’s statutory obligations under the Brown Act. “Under Gov’t Code § 54957.5(c), the public has a right to inspect and

obtain copies of records used in legislative deliberations. The County's refusal to produce these records upon request—despite their use in policy justification—violates the transparency mandate of the Brown Act.”

Respectfully,

Boris Mack

Email: boris.village698@passmail.net

Property Owner, Los Angeles County

Submitted by Boris Mack – September 2025

Members of the Board,

I submit this comment to formally object to the September 16, 2025 board motion to extend the emergency housing price controls under Penal Code § 396 set to expire on September 30, 2025 to October 29, 2025. The extension lacks factual justification, violates statutory limits on emergency powers, and imposes ongoing economic harm on property owners like myself.

The emergency conditions cited by this Board - “complaints of price gouging are continuing and have been increasing” - no longer exist in any measurable form. Internal data from the Department of Consumer & Business Affairs, which your office has declined to disclose publicly, shows a 99.7% drop in housing-related complaints—from 865 in January to just 3 in August. This collapse in complaint volume directly contradicts the Board’s public rationale for continued emergency measures.

The Emergency Services Act (Gov’t Code §§ 8558(b), 8630(d)) requires demonstrable conditions of disaster or extreme peril. No such conditions exist. The Board’s reliance on composite third-party figures, while suppressing internal complaint logs, violates transparency obligations under Gov’t Code § 54957.5 and procedural safeguards of the Brown Act.

As a property owner, I have suffered direct, measurable and ongoing harm. My rental income has been artificially suppressed, and I’ve been unable to adjust rental terms or recover costs. American Community Survey based modeling estimates countywide losses exceeding \$15 million per month.

I respectfully urge the Board to:

- To reject the motion “Extending Price Gouging Protections for Housing”;
- Disclose all internal data and communications used to justify the extension;
- Restore lawful governance and fiscal integrity in housing policy.

This comment is submitted for inclusion in the public record and may be cited in future litigation. I have previously submitted two formal requests to County Counsel seeking disclosure of the data and documentation used to justify the Board’s policy decisions. This marks my third request for the evidentiary basis underlying the emergency extensions. To date, County Counsel has failed to provide any response or produce the requested records, in apparent violation of Government Code § 54957.5 and the County’s statutory obligations under the Brown Act. “Under Gov’t Code § 54957.5(c), the public has a right to inspect and

obtain copies of records used in legislative deliberations. The County's refusal to produce these records upon request—despite their use in policy justification—violates the transparency mandate of the Brown Act.”

Respectfully,

Boris Mack

Email: boris.village698@passmail.net

Property Owner, Los Angeles County

Public Testimony Script – Boris Mack

Date: August 8, 2025

Venue: DCBA Public Hearing / Board of Supervisors

Good afternoon. My name is Boris Mack. I grew up in Compton to a single mother who struggled to keep a roof over our head and food on the table. I share that because I am sympathetic toward those who find themselves in difficult circumstances. I'm a rental property owner in Los Angeles County and I'm here today to oppose the continued extension of emergency housing price controls under Penal Code § 396.

I want to speak directly to the data. According to DCBA's own reporting, housing-related complaints have collapsed from 865 in January to just 3 in August. That's a 99.7% reduction. Yet the Board continues to assert the existence of an "acute and ongoing housing crisis." Where is the evidentiary basis for that claim? I have made several Brown Act data requests to County Counsel but have those have been ignored.

Due to the 90-day notification delay, I've begun to experience an 8% loss in monthly rental income. I am deferring essential repairs and halted capital improvements—not because I'm unwilling, but because the controls have made it economically unfeasible. This isn't sustainable, and it isn't just.

Today's motion to extend emergency powers without presenting updated metrics, without public disclosure of internal complaint volumes, and without a transparent evidentiary record violates the procedural safeguards of Government Code §§ 8558(b), 8630(d), and the Brown Act.

I'm here to demand procedural integrity. If the ongoing emergency is real, show us the data. If it's not, rescind the controls. I intend to challenge this extension in court, and I urge this body to restore transparency before judicial intervention becomes necessary.

Thank you.