



# Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning

*Planning for the Challenges Ahead*



Amy J. Bodek, AICP  
Director

Dennis Slavin  
Chief Deputy Director

20 June 2019

**TO:** Shannon Louis  
Rent Stabilization Program  
Department of Consumer and Business Affairs

**FROM:**  Gina M. Natoli, Hearing Officer

## **REQUEST FOR INFORMATION FOR CASES NO. RSQ19-02024 AND RSQ19-01475, PETITIONS FOR RELIEF FROM MORATORIUM**

Petitions for Relief from Moratorium Cases No. RSQ19-02024 and RSQ19-01475 (AASW Alliance, LLC/Wei Chang) are scheduled for public hearing on 29 June 2019. After reviewing the Hearing Officer packages for the items, I have the following questions concerning the cases. Please be prepared to answer these questions at the hearing, or inform me at the hearing if you need additional time. I ask that you forward these questions to the petitioner. It is possible that information presented at the hearing may prompt additional questions.

1. Why are a mortgage amount and a net operating income mortgage amount included in the Figures 1 and 2 Income & Expense Calculations for both cases if mortgage is not considered an expense under the Interim Rent Stabilization Ordinance (IRSO)?
2. Sections in both staff reports discuss the differences between what Petitioner reported and what Department of Consumer and Business Affairs staff substantiated. These questions relate to those sections:
  - a. In both cases, an expense of \$3,423 is listed for insurance for September 2018, but Staff states that "documentation provided for the claim does not demonstrate a relationship to what has been reported." How so?
  - b. For Case No. RSQ19-02024, the explanation for December 2018 includes a statement that an expense of \$9,885 "was unable to be substantiated as the check requests provided do not provide information related to the work Petitioner claims was performed." How so?
  - c. For Case No. RSQ19-01475, amounts for April 2019 are included in Figures 1 and 2 but there is no explanation as to why there is a difference in the amounts between the figures. Please explain.
3. Petitioner claims \$3,423 for insurance for 11506 Obert (Case No. RSQ19-01475) in September 2018, but also claims \$3,423 for insurance for 11517 Obert (Case No. RSQ19-02024) in September 2018. The properties are different sizes: 10 units in 12,233 square feet

320 West Temple Street • Los Angeles, CA 90012 • 213-974-6411 • TDD: 213-617-2292

   @LACDRP | [planning.lacounty.gov](http://planning.lacounty.gov)

Cases No. RSQ19-02024 and RSQ19-01475

24 June 2019

Page 2

for 11506 and 15 units in 6,854 square feet for 11517. Are these actually two separate policies – one per property – for the exact same amount, or is there only one policy covering the two properties?

Thank you for looking into these questions.

GMN:gmn