

**Meeting Date: November 4, 2025**  
**Agenda Item No. 15**  
**Distribution Date: November 3, 2025**  
**Batch No. 02**

**From:** [Desmond, Jim](#)  
**To:** [Deborah Brant](#)  
**Cc:** [Ewart, Megan T](#); [FGG, Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** RE: [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance  
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 9:19:33 AM  
**Attachments:** [image003.png](#)

---

Thank you for your email. I appreciate you sharing your thoughts on this matter. When this item comes before the Board of Supervisors, I will consider your input and all other input before making a decision.

Again, I appreciate you contacting my office.

Sincerely,  
**JIM DESMOND**  
Supervisor, Fifth District  
County of San Diego  
p: 619-531-5555

Connect with us:



---

**From:** Deborah Brant [REDACTED] m>  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2025 12:59 PM  
**To:** Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>  
**Subject:** [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance

Supervisor Jim Desmond,

As a Rental Housing Provider, I am writing to respectfully request that you vote against advancing the Protecting Residential Rental Applicants and Tenants from Price Gouging and Fee Exploitation ordinance. This proposal ignores existing law, industry best practices, and the mounting costs impacting rental housing providers. Housing providers do not oppose transparency, but what's proposed goes far beyond that.

Disclosure in advertising sounds simple, however, this could prove to be impractical for those who do not have websites or independent housing providers who do not utilize online technology for advertising. More concerning is the increased likelihood for fraud in the application process if housing providers must accept reusable screening reports. These reports may not always come from a reputable third party and in many cases won't meet the needs of housing providers and their rental criteria.

Capping late fees (2% of rent) and holding deposit amounts (5% of rent) ignores what housing providers deal with on a regular basis and the needs of applicants and tenants. Many housing providers will choose not to allow for either if regulated to the point of being useless. And limiting other fees to 5% of the rent will likely lead to fewer amenities and ancillary services.

Increasingly tenants are requesting options to pay rent other than traditional check or money

order. Many online services and other electronic payments services are only available to a housing provider at a cost. Landlords are already prohibited from charging a fee associated with a check payment, they should not be punished for giving tenants the rent payment options they are requesting. Further limiting costs associated with helpful services like pest control and valet trash make properties less desirable and increase property costs via refuse contamination charges and piecemeal pest control visits.

California has already seen fit to lower the amount a housing provider can charge for a security deposit to no more than the equivalent of one month's rent. Most housing providers want to allow renters to have pets but without the ability to pay for damages, many will change pet policies. Pet fees help mitigate risk and damage when allowing pets. This is exacerbated by the idea that a housing provider may not charge a tenant any fee that is not specified in the rental agreement unless all parties agree.

Again, please vote no on this ordinance. Housing providers are reasonable and care about their tenants. However, this ordinance, as proposed, is more about hamstringing rental owners than it is about transparency. And it will do nothing to create the housing that experts agree is needed to address housing costs. I encourage you to thoroughly engage rental housing stakeholders for common sense solutions to help renters understand their rental agreements and obligations without making it harder and more costly to provide much-needed rental housing.

NOOOOOO! you are killing us!!!! erosion of property property rights is unacceptable!

Sincerely,

Deborah Brant



**From:** [Desmond, Jim](#)  
**To:** [Marta Haro](#)  
**Cc:** [FGG, Public Comment](#); [O'Farrell, Chase G](#)  
**Subject:** RE: [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance  
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 10:00:22 AM  
**Attachments:** [image003.png](#)

---

Thank you for your email. I appreciate you sharing your thoughts on this matter. When this item comes before the Board of Supervisors, I will consider your input and all other input before making a decision.

Again, I appreciate you contacting my office.

Sincerely,  
**JIM DESMOND**  
Supervisor, Fifth District  
County of San Diego  
p: 619-531-5555

Connect with us:



---

**From:** Marta Haro [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 1, 2025 2:47 PM  
**To:** Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>  
**Subject:** [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance

Supervisor Jim Desmond,

As a Rental Housing Provider, I am writing to respectfully request that you vote against advancing the Protecting Residential Rental Applicants and Tenants from Price Gouging and Fee Exploitation ordinance. This proposal ignores existing law, industry best practices, and the mounting costs impacting rental housing providers. Housing providers do not oppose transparency, but what's proposed goes far beyond that.

Disclosure in advertising sounds simple, however, this could prove to be impractical for those who do not have websites or independent housing providers who do not utilize online technology for advertising. More concerning is the increased likelihood for fraud in the application process if housing providers must accept reusable screening reports. These reports may not always come from a reputable third party and in many cases won't meet the needs of housing providers and their rental criteria.

Capping late fees (2% of rent) and holding deposit amounts (5% of rent) ignores what housing providers deal with on a regular basis and the needs of applicants and tenants. Many housing providers will choose not to allow for either if regulated to the point of being useless. And limiting other fees to 5% of the rent will likely lead to fewer amenities and ancillary services.

Increasingly tenants are requesting options to pay rent other than traditional check or money

order. Many online services and other electronic payments services are only available to a housing provider at a cost. Landlords are already prohibited from charging a fee associated with a check payment, they should not be punished for giving tenants the rent payment options they are requesting. Further limiting costs associated with helpful services like pest control and valet trash make properties less desirable and increase property costs via refuse contamination charges and piecemeal pest control visits.

California has already seen fit to lower the amount a housing provider can charge for a security deposit to no more than the equivalent of one month's rent. Most housing providers want to allow renters to have pets but without the ability to pay for damages, many will change pet policies. Pet fees help mitigate risk and damage when allowing pets. This is exacerbated by the idea that a housing provider may not charge a tenant any fee that is not specified in the rental agreement unless all parties agree.

Again, please vote no on this ordinance. Housing providers are reasonable and care about their tenants. However, this ordinance, as proposed, is more about hamstringing rental owners than it is about transparency. And it will do nothing to create the housing that experts agree is needed to address housing costs. I encourage you to thoroughly engage rental housing stakeholders for common sense solutions to help renters understand their rental agreements and obligations without making it harder and more costly to provide much-needed rental housing.

Sincerely,

Marta Haro

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

**From:** [Desmond, Jim](#)  
**To:** [Sharon Whitley Larsen](#)  
**Cc:** [FGG, Public Comment](#); [O'Farrell, Chase G](#)  
**Subject:** RE: [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance  
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 10:00:01 AM  
**Attachments:** [image003.png](#)

---

Thank you for your email. I appreciate you sharing your thoughts on this matter. When this item comes before the Board of Supervisors, I will consider your input and all other input before making a decision.

Again, I appreciate you contacting my office.

Sincerely,  
**JIM DESMOND**  
Supervisor, Fifth District  
County of San Diego  
p: 619-531-5555

Connect with us:



---

**From:** Sharon Whitley Larsen [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 1, 2025 3:19 PM  
**To:** Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>  
**Subject:** [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance

Supervisor Jim Desmond,

As a Rental Housing Provider, I am writing to respectfully request that you vote against advancing the Protecting Residential Rental Applicants and Tenants from Price Gouging and Fee Exploitation ordinance. This proposal ignores existing law, industry best practices, and the mounting costs impacting rental housing providers. Housing providers do not oppose transparency, but what's proposed goes far beyond that.

Disclosure in advertising sounds simple, however, this could prove to be impractical for those who do not have websites or independent housing providers who do not utilize online technology for advertising. More concerning is the increased likelihood for fraud in the application process if housing providers must accept reusable screening reports. These reports may not always come from a reputable third party and in many cases won't meet the needs of housing providers and their rental criteria.

Capping late fees (2% of rent) and holding deposit amounts (5% of rent) ignores what housing providers deal with on a regular basis and the needs of applicants and tenants. Many housing providers will choose not to allow for either if regulated to the point of being useless. And limiting other fees to 5% of the rent will likely lead to fewer amenities and ancillary services.

Increasingly tenants are requesting options to pay rent other than traditional check or money

order. Many online services and other electronic payments services are only available to a housing provider at a cost. Landlords are already prohibited from charging a fee associated with a check payment, they should not be punished for giving tenants the rent payment options they are requesting. Further limiting costs associated with helpful services like pest control and valet trash make properties less desirable and increase property costs via refuse contamination charges and piecemeal pest control visits.

California has already seen fit to lower the amount a housing provider can charge for a security deposit to no more than the equivalent of one month's rent. Most housing providers want to allow renters to have pets but without the ability to pay for damages, many will change pet policies. Pet fees help mitigate risk and damage when allowing pets. This is exacerbated by the idea that a housing provider may not charge a tenant any fee that is not specified in the rental agreement unless all parties agree.

Again, please vote no on this ordinance. Housing providers are reasonable and care about their tenants. However, this ordinance, as proposed, is more about hamstringing rental owners than it is about transparency. And it will do nothing to create the housing that experts agree is needed to address housing costs. I encourage you to thoroughly engage rental housing stakeholders for common sense solutions to help renters understand their rental agreements and obligations without making it harder and more costly to provide much-needed rental housing.

This is just another reason why I am getting out of the landlord business.

Sincerely,

Sharon Whitley Larsen



**From:** [Desmond, Jim](#)  
**To:** [laura lopez](#)  
**Cc:** [FGG, Public Comment](#); [O'Farrell, Chase G](#)  
**Subject:** RE: [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance  
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 9:58:26 AM  
**Attachments:** [image003.png](#)

---

Thank you for your email. I appreciate you sharing your thoughts on this matter. When this item comes before the Board of Supervisors, I will consider your input and all other input before making a decision.

Again, I appreciate you contacting my office.

Sincerely,  
**JIM DESMOND**  
Supervisor, Fifth District  
County of San Diego  
p: 619-531-5555

Connect with us:



---

**From:** laura lopez [REDACTED] m>  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 1, 2025 5:21 PM  
**To:** Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>  
**Subject:** [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance

Supervisor Jim Desmond,

As a Rental Housing Provider, I am writing to respectfully request that you vote against advancing the Protecting Residential Rental Applicants and Tenants from Price Gouging and Fee Exploitation ordinance. This proposal ignores existing law, industry best practices, and the mounting costs impacting rental housing providers. Housing providers do not oppose transparency, but what's proposed goes far beyond that.

Disclosure in advertising sounds simple, however, this could prove to be impractical for those who do not have websites or independent housing providers who do not utilize online technology for advertising. More concerning is the increased likelihood for fraud in the application process if housing providers must accept reusable screening reports. These reports may not always come from a reputable third party and in many cases won't meet the needs of housing providers and their rental criteria.

Capping late fees (2% of rent) and holding deposit amounts (5% of rent) ignores what housing providers deal with on a regular basis and the needs of applicants and tenants. Many housing providers will choose not to allow for either if regulated to the point of being useless. And limiting other fees to 5% of the rent will likely lead to fewer amenities and ancillary services.

Increasingly tenants are requesting options to pay rent other than traditional check or money



order. Many online services and other electronic payments services are only available to a housing provider at a cost. Landlords are already prohibited from charging a fee associated with a check payment, they should not be punished for giving tenants the rent payment options they are requesting. Further limiting costs associated with helpful services like pest control and valet trash make properties less desirable and increase property costs via refuse contamination charges and piecemeal pest control visits.

California has already seen fit to lower the amount a housing provider can charge for a security deposit to no more than the equivalent of one month's rent. Most housing providers want to allow renters to have pets but without the ability to pay for damages, many will change pet policies. Pet fees help mitigate risk and damage when allowing pets. This is exacerbated by the idea that a housing provider may not charge a tenant any fee that is not specified in the rental agreement unless all parties agree.

Again, please vote no on this ordinance. Housing providers are reasonable and care about their tenants. However, this ordinance, as proposed, is more about hamstringing rental owners than it is about transparency. And it will do nothing to create the housing that experts agree is needed to address housing costs. I encourage you to thoroughly engage rental housing stakeholders for common sense solutions to help renters understand their rental agreements and obligations without making it harder and more costly to provide much-needed rental housing.

Sincerely,

laura lopez

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.



**From:** [Desmond, Jim](#)  
**To:** [maryn310@gmail.com](mailto:maryn310@gmail.com)  
**Cc:** [FGG, Public Comment](#); [O'Farrell, Chase G](#)  
**Subject:** RE: [External] Oppose the proposed fee ordinance affecting San Diego rental housing  
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 9:58:07 AM  
**Attachments:** [image003.png](#)

---

Thank you for your email. I appreciate you sharing your thoughts on this matter. When this item comes before the Board of Supervisors, I will consider your input and all other input before making a decision.

Again, I appreciate you contacting my office.

Sincerely,  
**JIM DESMOND**  
Supervisor, Fifth District  
County of San Diego  
p: 619-531-5555

Connect with us:



-----Original Message-----

From: Mary Nguyen [REDACTED]  
Sent: Saturday, November 1, 2025 5:31 PM  
To: Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>  
Subject: [External] Oppose the proposed fee ordinance affecting San Diego rental housing

Dear Supervisor Desmond,

As a San Diego County rental housing provider, I am writing to oppose any further regulations on the rental housing industry.

While I support transparency and fairness in housing practices, this county proposal to regulate the tenant screening process and limit how housing providers share costs with their residents would add punitive administrative burdens and undermine my ability to recover legitimate operational costs.

Mandating that all fees be folded into rent will not reduce the overall cost of housing. Instead, it will reduce transparency and limit tenants' ability to understand or control specific costs. These fees often help illustrate the costs associated with operating rental housing and can give tenants the ability to manage and reduce certain expenses. Overregulating fees will not reduce the overall cost of housing.

As a result, tenants may ultimately lose access to convenient services that enhance their rental experience.

As a housing provider, I take pride in maintaining safe, well-managed homes for San Diegans.

However, continued layering of new county regulations without stakeholder input threatens the long-term viability of our rental housing market. Instead of introducing more restrictions, I urge county leaders to focus on policies that support housing production, reduce regulatory barriers, and encourage continued private investment in rental housing.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Mary Nguyen

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**From:** [Desmond, Jim](#)  
**To:** [Susan Botts](#)  
**Cc:** [FGG, Public Comment](#); [O'Farrell, Chase G](#)  
**Subject:** RE: [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance  
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 9:57:49 AM  
**Attachments:** [image003.png](#)

---

Thank you for your email. I appreciate you sharing your thoughts on this matter. When this item comes before the Board of Supervisors, I will consider your input and all other input before making a decision.

Again, I appreciate you contacting my office.

Sincerely,  
**JIM DESMOND**  
Supervisor, Fifth District  
County of San Diego  
p: 619-531-5555

Connect with us:



---

**From:** Susan Botts [REDACTED] m>  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 1, 2025 6:00 PM  
**To:** Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>  
**Subject:** [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance

Supervisor Jim Desmond,

As a Rental Housing Provider, I am writing to respectfully request that you vote against advancing the Protecting Residential Rental Applicants and Tenants from Price Gouging and Fee Exploitation ordinance. This proposal ignores existing law, industry best practices, and the mounting costs impacting rental housing providers. Housing providers do not oppose transparency, but what's proposed goes far beyond that.

Disclosure in advertising sounds simple, however, this could prove to be impractical for those who do not have websites or independent housing providers who do not utilize online technology for advertising. More concerning is the increased likelihood for fraud in the application process if housing providers must accept reusable screening reports. These reports may not always come from a reputable third party and in many cases won't meet the needs of housing providers and their rental criteria.

Capping late fees (2% of rent) and holding deposit amounts (5% of rent) ignores what housing providers deal with on a regular basis and the needs of applicants and tenants. Many housing providers will choose not to allow for either if regulated to the point of being useless. And limiting other fees to 5% of the rent will likely lead to fewer amenities and ancillary services.

Increasingly tenants are requesting options to pay rent other than traditional check or money

order. Many online services and other electronic payments services are only available to a housing provider at a cost. Landlords are already prohibited from charging a fee associated with a check payment, they should not be punished for giving tenants the rent payment options they are requesting. Further limiting costs associated with helpful services like pest control and valet trash make properties less desirable and increase property costs via refuse contamination charges and piecemeal pest control visits.

California has already seen fit to lower the amount a housing provider can charge for a security deposit to no more than the equivalent of one month's rent. Most housing providers want to allow renters to have pets but without the ability to pay for damages, many will change pet policies. Pet fees help mitigate risk and damage when allowing pets. This is exacerbated by the idea that a housing provider may not charge a tenant any fee that is not specified in the rental agreement unless all parties agree.

Again, please vote no on this ordinance. Housing providers are reasonable and care about their tenants. However, this ordinance, as proposed, is more about hamstringing rental owners than it is about transparency. And it will do nothing to create the housing that experts agree is needed to address housing costs. I encourage you to thoroughly engage rental housing stakeholders for common sense solutions to help renters understand their rental agreements and obligations without making it harder and more costly to provide much-needed rental housing.

Sincerely,

Susan Botts

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

**From:** [Desmond, Jim](#)  
**To:** [Roy Neese](#)  
**Cc:** [FGG, Public Comment](#); [O'Farrell, Chase G](#)  
**Subject:** RE: [External] Please Vote No on Item 15- Rental Fee Ordinance  
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 9:57:30 AM  
**Attachments:** [image003.png](#)

---

Thank you for your email. I appreciate you sharing your thoughts on this matter. When this item comes before the Board of Supervisors, I will consider your input and all other input before making a decision.

Again, I appreciate you contacting my office.

Sincerely,  
**JIM DESMOND**  
Supervisor, Fifth District  
County of San Diego  
p: 619-531-5555

Connect with us:



---

**From:** Roy Neese [REDACTED] m>  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 1, 2025 7:11 PM  
**To:** Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>  
**Subject:** [External] Please Vote No on Item 15- Rental Fee Ordinance

Supervisor Jim Desmond,

I sit on a city government council and own two single family homes that I rent; one is in San Diego County. These types of generalized laws that cover the entire rental industry by trying to reduce fees will only increase the rent charges to cover the loss of fees that can't be covered. Housing cost will not change, they will increase.

While Item 15 Overview states “the average monthly rent in San Diego County rose 52% between 2018 and April 2025”, that was over 7 years making this an average of 7.4% or only \$155.00 per year. Insurance and taxes go up about that much each year. Mine went up an average of \$147 over the same period. Should insurance companies be held to limited price increases?

Adding new regulations will continue to cause a higher risk to recoup the cost to operate a long-term rental and for me it will increase the attractiveness to convert the property to a short-term rental where the risk to operate becomes lower for higher returns. I’ve known several people that have done this and have not looked back. For now I would like to continue in the long-term rental market providing housing for those in need and affordable rent.

Generalized government regulations like this only cause harm to those needing affordable housing, it does not help them. If there are bad actors in the rental industry, then let’s look at

those and apply and enforce existing landlord laws that can stop discrimination as is a concern sighted in the Item 15 overview. Don't make new laws that harm the good landlords and add cost to the taxes that property owners will pay and pass on to tenants in the form of higher rents. I would urge you to study this problem to see if this is industry wide. Do individual landlords with 1-4 unites cause this problem or is it mega rental conglomerates? Create some targeted laws, and flexible sideboards that can help not hurt.

I propose a couple of considerations on adjustments to this regulation. 1) only apply it to property who total rental amount exceeds 90% of the average rental market. And or 2) only apply this to property owners with 4 or less rental units.

I understand your decision is not an easy one. There is a problem and sometimes regulations hurt instead of help. How the problem is address from both understanding the landlords prospected and the tenants prospective is important. What you create now will impact tenants and landlords long into the future. I hope you can consider some adjustments to regulation to accomplish what is a real problem of some (I would argue a few bad actors) while providing those that do provide quality affordable housing (which I believe is the majority) relief form over regulation.

I urge you to not make it harder for middle income tax payers that have 1-4 units to not place this regulation on them. They don't have the ability to spread the cost over hundreds or thousands of units. Please don't make owner occupied land lords or those with and ADU subject to this regulation. Those are the ones open their home or property provides needed rental units at affordable prices. Please consider how this long-term regulation will move many homes out of the needed rental market to short term-rentals.

Respectfully submitted for your consideration and action,

Sincerely,

Roy Neese

 [.com](#)

**From:** [Desmond, Jim](#)  
**To:** [fangshen38@gmail.com](mailto:fangshen38@gmail.com)  
**Cc:** [FGG, Public Comment](#); [O'Farrell, Chase G](#)  
**Subject:** RE: [External] Oppose the proposed fee ordinance affecting San Diego rental housing  
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 9:57:02 AM  
**Attachments:** [image003.png](#)

---

Thank you for your email. I appreciate you sharing your thoughts on this matter. When this item comes before the Board of Supervisors, I will consider your input and all other input before making a decision.

Again, I appreciate you contacting my office.

Sincerely,  
**JIM DESMOND**  
Supervisor, Fifth District  
County of San Diego  
p: 619-531-5555

Connect with us:



-----Original Message-----

From: Fang Shen [REDACTED].net>  
Sent: Saturday, November 1, 2025 7:14 PM  
To: Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>  
Subject: [External] Oppose the proposed fee ordinance affecting San Diego rental housing

Dear Supervisor Desmond,

As a San Diego County rental housing provider, I am writing to oppose any further regulations on the rental housing industry.

While I support transparency and fairness in housing practices, this county proposal to regulate the tenant screening process and limit how housing providers share costs with their residents would add punitive administrative burdens and undermine my ability to recover legitimate operational costs.

Mandating that all fees be folded into rent will not reduce the overall cost of housing. Instead, it will reduce transparency and limit tenants' ability to understand or control specific costs. These fees often help illustrate the costs associated with operating rental housing and can give tenants the ability to manage and reduce certain expenses. Overregulating fees will not reduce the overall cost of housing.

As a result, tenants may ultimately lose access to convenient services that enhance their rental experience.

As a housing provider, I take pride in maintaining safe, well-managed homes for San Diegans.



However, continued layering of new county regulations without stakeholder input threatens the long-term viability of our rental housing market. Instead of introducing more restrictions, I urge county leaders to focus on policies that support housing production, reduce regulatory barriers, and encourage continued private investment in rental housing.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Fang Shen

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED].com

**From:** [Desmond, Jim](#)  
**To:** [Cassandra Bedore](#)  
**Cc:** [O'Farrell, Chase G](#); [FGG, Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** RE: [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance  
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 9:56:11 AM  
**Attachments:** [image003.png](#)

---

Thank you for your email. I appreciate you sharing your thoughts on this matter. When this item comes before the Board of Supervisors, I will consider your input and all other input before making a decision.

Again, I appreciate you contacting my office.

Sincerely,  
**JIM DESMOND**  
Supervisor, Fifth District  
County of San Diego  
p: 619-531-5555

Connect with us:



---

**From:** Cassandra Bedore <[REDACTED].com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 1, 2025 7:56 PM  
**To:** Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>  
**Subject:** [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance

Supervisor Jim Desmond,

As a Rental Housing Provider, I am writing to respectfully request that you vote against advancing the Protecting Residential Rental Applicants and Tenants from Price Gouging and Fee Exploitation ordinance. This proposal ignores existing law, industry best practices, and the mounting costs impacting rental housing providers. Housing providers do not oppose transparency, but what's proposed goes far beyond that.

Disclosure in advertising sounds simple, however, this could prove to be impractical for those who do not have websites or independent housing providers who do not utilize online technology for advertising. More concerning is the increased likelihood for fraud in the application process if housing providers must accept reusable screening reports. These reports may not always come from a reputable third party and in many cases won't meet the needs of housing providers and their rental criteria.

Capping late fees (2% of rent) and holding deposit amounts (5% of rent) ignores what housing providers deal with on a regular basis and the needs of applicants and tenants. Many housing providers will choose not to allow for either if regulated to the point of being useless. And limiting other fees to 5% of the rent will likely lead to fewer amenities and ancillary services.

Increasingly tenants are requesting options to pay rent other than traditional check or money

order. Many online services and other electronic payments services are only available to a housing provider at a cost. Landlords are already prohibited from charging a fee associated with a check payment, they should not be punished for giving tenants the rent payment options they are requesting. Further limiting costs associated with helpful services like pest control and valet trash make properties less desirable and increase property costs via refuse contamination charges and piecemeal pest control visits.

California has already seen fit to lower the amount a housing provider can charge for a security deposit to no more than the equivalent of one month's rent. Most housing providers want to allow renters to have pets but without the ability to pay for damages, many will change pet policies. Pet fees help mitigate risk and damage when allowing pets. This is exacerbated by the idea that a housing provider may not charge a tenant any fee that is not specified in the rental agreement unless all parties agree.

Again, please vote no on this ordinance. Housing providers are reasonable and care about their tenants. However, this ordinance, as proposed, is more about hamstringing rental owners than it is about transparency. And it will do nothing to create the housing that experts agree is needed to address housing costs. I encourage you to thoroughly engage rental housing stakeholders for common sense solutions to help renters understand their rental agreements and obligations without making it harder and more costly to provide much-needed rental housing.

Sincerely,

Cassandra Bedore



[.com](#)

**From:** [Desmond, Jim](#)  
**To:** [Barry Bedore](#)  
**Cc:** [FGG, Public Comment](#); [O'Farrell, Chase G](#)  
**Subject:** RE: [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance  
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 9:55:52 AM  
**Attachments:** [image003.png](#)

---

Thank you for your email. I appreciate you sharing your thoughts on this matter. When this item comes before the Board of Supervisors, I will consider your input and all other input before making a decision.

Again, I appreciate you contacting my office.

Sincerely,

**JIM DESMOND**

Supervisor, Fifth District

County of San Diego

p: 619-531-5555

Connect with us:



---

**From:** Barry Bedore [REDACTED].com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 1, 2025 7:57 PM  
**To:** Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>  
**Subject:** [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance

Supervisor Jim Desmond,

As a Rental Housing Provider, I am writing to respectfully request that you vote against advancing the Protecting Residential Rental Applicants and Tenants from Price Gouging and Fee Exploitation ordinance. This proposal ignores existing law, industry best practices, and the mounting costs impacting rental housing providers. Housing providers do not oppose transparency, but what's proposed goes far beyond that.

Disclosure in advertising sounds simple, however, this could prove to be impractical for those who do not have websites or independent housing providers who do not utilize online technology for advertising. More concerning is the increased likelihood for fraud in the application process if housing providers must accept reusable screening reports. These reports may not always come from a reputable third party and in many cases won't meet the needs of housing providers and their rental criteria.

Capping late fees (2% of rent) and holding deposit amounts (5% of rent) ignores what housing providers deal with on a regular basis and the needs of applicants and tenants. Many

housing providers will choose not to allow for either if regulated to the point of being useless. And limiting other fees to 5% of the rent will likely lead to fewer amenities and ancillary services.

Increasingly tenants are requesting options to pay rent other than traditional check or money order. Many online services and other electronic payments services are only available to a housing provider at a cost. Landlords are already prohibited from charging a fee associated with a check payment, they should not be punished for giving tenants the rent payment options they are requesting. Further limiting costs associated with helpful services like pest control and valet trash make properties less desirable and increase property costs via refuse contamination charges and piecemeal pest control visits.

California has already seen fit to lower the amount a housing provider can charge for a security deposit to no more than the equivalent of one month's rent. Most housing providers want to allow renters to have pets but without the ability to pay for damages, many will change pet policies. Pet fees help mitigate risk and damage when allowing pets. This is exacerbated by the idea that a housing provider may not charge a tenant any fee that is not specified in the rental agreement unless all parties agree.

Again, please vote no on this ordinance. Housing providers are reasonable and care about their tenants. However, this ordinance, as proposed, is more about hamstringing rental owners than it is about transparency. And it will do nothing to create the housing that experts agree is needed to address housing costs. I encourage you to thoroughly engage rental housing stakeholders for common sense solutions to help renters understand their rental agreements and obligations without making it harder and more costly to provide much-needed rental housing.

Sincerely,

Barry Bedore



[.com](#)

**From:** [Desmond, Jim](#)  
**To:** [Vicky Campbell](#)  
**Cc:** [FGG, Public Comment](#); [O'Farrell, Chase G](#)  
**Subject:** RE: [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance  
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 9:54:42 AM  
**Attachments:** [image003.png](#)

---

Thank you for your email. I appreciate you sharing your thoughts on this matter. When this item comes before the Board of Supervisors, I will consider your input and all other input before making a decision.

Again, I appreciate you contacting my office.

Sincerely,  
**JIM DESMOND**  
Supervisor, Fifth District  
County of San Diego  
p: 619-531-5555

Connect with us:



---

**From:** Vicky Campbell [REDACTED] m>  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 1, 2025 11:20 PM  
**To:** Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>  
**Subject:** [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance

Supervisor Jim Desmond,

As a Rental Housing Provider, I am writing to respectfully request that you vote against advancing the Protecting Residential Rental Applicants and Tenants from Price Gouging and Fee Exploitation ordinance. This proposal ignores existing law, industry best practices, and the mounting costs impacting rental housing providers. Housing providers do not oppose transparency, but what's proposed goes far beyond that.

Disclosure in advertising sounds simple, however, this could prove to be impractical for those who do not have websites or independent housing providers who do not utilize online technology for advertising. More concerning is the increased likelihood for fraud in the application process if housing providers must accept reusable screening reports. These reports may not always come from a reputable third party and in many cases won't meet the needs of housing providers and their rental criteria.

Capping late fees (2% of rent) and holding deposit amounts (5% of rent) ignores what housing providers deal with on a regular basis and the needs of applicants and tenants. Many housing providers will choose not to allow for either if regulated to the point of being useless. And limiting other fees to 5% of the rent will likely lead to fewer amenities and ancillary services.

Increasingly tenants are requesting options to pay rent other than traditional check or money

order. Many online services and other electronic payments services are only available to a housing provider at a cost. Landlords are already prohibited from charging a fee associated with a check payment, they should not be punished for giving tenants the rent payment options they are requesting. Further limiting costs associated with helpful services like pest control and valet trash make properties less desirable and increase property costs via refuse contamination charges and piecemeal pest control visits.

California has already seen fit to lower the amount a housing provider can charge for a security deposit to no more than the equivalent of one month's rent. Most housing providers want to allow renters to have pets but without the ability to pay for damages, many will change pet policies. Pet fees help mitigate risk and damage when allowing pets. This is exacerbated by the idea that a housing provider may not charge a tenant any fee that is not specified in the rental agreement unless all parties agree.

Again, please vote no on this ordinance. Housing providers are reasonable and care about their tenants. However, this ordinance, as proposed, is more about hamstringing rental owners than it is about transparency. And it will do nothing to create the housing that experts agree is needed to address housing costs. I encourage you to thoroughly engage rental housing stakeholders for common sense solutions to help renters understand their rental agreements and obligations without making it harder and more costly to provide much-needed rental housing.

Sincerely,

Vicky Campbell





**From:** [Desmond, Jim](#)  
**To:** [SHARON MICHELSON](#)  
**Cc:** [FGG, Public Comment](#); [Ewart, Megan T](#)  
**Subject:** RE: [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance  
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 9:46:05 AM  
**Attachments:** [image003.png](#)

---

Thank you for your email. I appreciate you sharing your thoughts on this matter. When this item comes before the Board of Supervisors, I will consider your input and all other input before making a decision.

Again, I appreciate you contacting my office.

Sincerely,  
**JIM DESMOND**  
Supervisor, Fifth District  
County of San Diego  
p: 619-531-5555

Connect with us:



---

**From:** SHARON MICHELSON <[s\[REDACTED\].com](#)>  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2025 2:22 PM  
**To:** Desmond, Jim <[Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov](mailto:Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov)>  
**Subject:** [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance

Supervisor Jim Desmond,

As a Rental Housing Provider, I am writing to respectfully request that you vote against advancing the Protecting Residential Rental Applicants and Tenants from Price Gouging and Fee Exploitation ordinance. This proposal ignores existing law, industry best practices, and the mounting costs impacting rental housing providers. Housing providers do not oppose transparency, but what's proposed goes far beyond that.

Disclosure in advertising sounds simple, however, this could prove to be impractical for those who do not have websites or independent housing providers who do not utilize online technology for advertising. More concerning is the increased likelihood for fraud in the application process if housing providers must accept reusable screening reports. These reports may not always come from a reputable third party and in many cases won't meet the needs of housing providers and their rental criteria.

Capping late fees (2% of rent) and holding deposit amounts (5% of rent) ignores what housing providers deal with on a regular basis and the needs of applicants and tenants. Many housing providers will choose not to allow for either if regulated to the point of being useless. And limiting other fees to 5% of the rent will likely lead to fewer amenities and ancillary services.

Increasingly tenants are requesting options to pay rent other than traditional check or money

order. Many online services and other electronic payments services are only available to a housing provider at a cost. Landlords are already prohibited from charging a fee associated with a check payment, they should not be punished for giving tenants the rent payment options they are requesting. Further limiting costs associated with helpful services like pest control and valet trash make properties less desirable and increase property costs via refuse contamination charges and piecemeal pest control visits.

California has already seen fit to lower the amount a housing provider can charge for a security deposit to no more than the equivalent of one month's rent. Most housing providers want to allow renters to have pets but without the ability to pay for damages, many will change pet policies. Pet fees help mitigate risk and damage when allowing pets. This is exacerbated by the idea that a housing provider may not charge a tenant any fee that is not specified in the rental agreement unless all parties agree.

Again, please vote no on this ordinance. Housing providers are reasonable and care about their tenants. However, this ordinance, as proposed, is more about hamstringing rental owners than it is about transparency. And it will do nothing to create the housing that experts agree is needed to address housing costs. I encourage you to thoroughly engage rental housing stakeholders for common sense solutions to help renters understand their rental agreements and obligations without making it harder and more costly to provide much-needed rental housing.

Sincerely,

SHARON MICHELSON

 [com](#)

**From:** [Desmond, Jim](#)  
**To:** [Anthony Weaver](#)  
**Cc:** [FGG, Public Comment](#); [Ewart, Megan T](#)  
**Subject:** RE: [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance  
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 9:45:32 AM  
**Attachments:** [image003.png](#)

---

Thank you for your email. I appreciate you sharing your thoughts on this matter. When this item comes before the Board of Supervisors, I will consider your input and all other input before making a decision.

Again, I appreciate you contacting my office.

Sincerely,  
**JIM DESMOND**  
Supervisor, Fifth District  
County of San Diego  
p: 619-531-5555

Connect with us:



---

**From:** Anthony Weaver <a[REDACTED]l.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2025 2:21 PM  
**To:** Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>  
**Subject:** [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance

Supervisor Jim Desmond,

As a Rental Housing Provider, I am writing to respectfully request that you vote against advancing the Protecting Residential Rental Applicants and Tenants from Price Gouging and Fee Exploitation ordinance. This proposal ignores existing law, industry best practices, and the mounting costs impacting rental housing providers. Housing providers do not oppose transparency, but what's proposed goes far beyond that.

Disclosure in advertising sounds simple, however, this could prove to be impractical for those who do not have websites or independent housing providers who do not utilize online technology for advertising. More concerning is the increased likelihood for fraud in the application process if housing providers must accept reusable screening reports. These reports may not always come from a reputable third party and in many cases won't meet the needs of housing providers and their rental criteria.

Capping late fees (2% of rent) and holding deposit amounts (5% of rent) ignores what housing providers deal with on a regular basis and the needs of applicants and tenants. Many housing providers will choose not to allow for either if regulated to the point of being useless. And limiting other fees to 5% of the rent will likely lead to fewer amenities and ancillary services.

Increasingly tenants are requesting options to pay rent other than traditional check or money

California has already seen fit to lower the amount a housing provider can charge for a security deposit to no more than the equivalent of one month's rent. Most housing providers want to allow renters to have pets but without the ability to pay for damages, many will change pet policies. Pet fees help mitigate risk and damage when allowing pets. This is exacerbated by the idea that a housing provider may not charge a tenant any fee that is not specified in the rental agreement unless all parties agree.

Sincerely,

[www.elsevier.com](http://www.elsevier.com)

**From:** [Desmond, Jim](#)  
**To:** [Richard Dreisbach](#)  
**Cc:** [FGG, Public Comment](#); [Ewart, Megan T](#)  
**Subject:** RE: [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance  
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 9:42:53 AM  
**Attachments:** [image003.png](#)

---

Thank you for your email. I appreciate you sharing your thoughts on this matter. When this item comes before the Board of Supervisors, I will consider your input and all other input before making a decision.

Again, I appreciate you contacting my office.

Sincerely,  
**JIM DESMOND**  
Supervisor, Fifth District  
County of San Diego  
p: 619-531-5555

Connect with us:



---

**From:** Richard Dreisbach [REDACTED]@l.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2025 1:54 PM  
**To:** Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>  
**Subject:** [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance

Supervisor Jim Desmond,

As a Rental Housing Provider, I am writing to respectfully request that you vote against advancing the Protecting Residential Rental Applicants and Tenants from Price Gouging and Fee Exploitation ordinance. This proposal ignores existing law, industry best practices, and the mounting costs impacting rental housing providers. Housing providers do not oppose transparency, but what's proposed goes far beyond that.

Disclosure in advertising sounds simple, however, this could prove to be impractical for those who do not have websites or independent housing providers who do not utilize online technology for advertising. More concerning is the increased likelihood for fraud in the application process if housing providers must accept reusable screening reports. These reports may not always come from a reputable third party and in many cases won't meet the needs of housing providers and their rental criteria.

Capping late fees (2% of rent) and holding deposit amounts (5% of rent) ignores what housing providers deal with on a regular basis and the needs of applicants and tenants. Many housing providers will choose not to allow for either if regulated to the point of being useless. And limiting other fees to 5% of the rent will likely lead to fewer amenities and ancillary services.

Increasingly tenants are requesting options to pay rent other than traditional check or money order. Many online services and other electronic payments services are only available to a housing provider at a cost. Landlords are already prohibited from charging a fee associated with a check payment, they should not be punished for giving tenants the rent payment options they are requesting. Further limiting costs associated with helpful services like pest control and valet trash make properties less desirable and increase property costs via refuse contamination charges and piecemeal pest control visits.

California has already seen fit to lower the amount a housing provider can charge for a security deposit to no more than the equivalent of one month's rent. Most housing providers want to allow renters to have pets but without the ability to pay for damages, many will change pet policies. Pet fees help mitigate risk and damage when allowing pets. This is exacerbated by the idea that a housing provider may not charge a tenant any fee that is not specified in the rental agreement unless all parties agree.

Again, please vote no on this ordinance. Housing providers are reasonable and care about their tenants. However, this ordinance, as proposed, is more about hamstringing rental owners than it is about transparency. And it will do nothing to create the housing that experts agree is needed to address housing costs. I encourage you to thoroughly engage rental housing stakeholders for common sense solutions to help renters understand their rental agreements and obligations without making it harder and more costly to provide much-needed rental housing.

All the information that a tenant provides, especially the credit report, must be verifiable. A housing provider must be able to verify a credit score. This is so important that it would be acceptable to eliminate the screening fee so that the verification may be done at no cost to the tenant.

If costs need to be down for housing, please stop increasing costs like water, trash, and taxes.

Sincerely,

Richard Dreisbach

[REDACTED]ve  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**From:** [Desmond, Jim](#)  
**To:** [Todd McClean](#)  
**Cc:** [FGG, Public Comment](#); [Ewart, Megan T](#)  
**Subject:** RE: [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance  
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 9:42:16 AM  
**Attachments:** [image003.png](#)

---

Thank you for your email. I appreciate you sharing your thoughts on this matter. When this item comes before the Board of Supervisors, I will consider your input and all other input before making a decision.

Again, I appreciate you contacting my office.

Sincerely,  
**JIM DESMOND**  
Supervisor, Fifth District  
County of San Diego  
p: 619-531-5555

Connect with us:



---

**From:** Todd McClean [REDACTED]@mail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2025 1:49 PM  
**To:** Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>  
**Subject:** [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance

Supervisor Jim Desmond,

As a Rental Housing Provider, I am writing to respectfully request that you vote against advancing the Protecting Residential Rental Applicants and Tenants from Price Gouging and Fee Exploitation ordinance. This proposal ignores existing law, industry best practices, and the mounting costs impacting rental housing providers. Housing providers do not oppose transparency, but what's proposed goes far beyond that.

Disclosure in advertising sounds simple, however, this could prove to be impractical for those who do not have websites or independent housing providers who do not utilize online technology for advertising. More concerning is the increased likelihood for fraud in the application process if housing providers must accept reusable screening reports. These reports may not always come from a reputable third party and in many cases won't meet the needs of housing providers and their rental criteria.

Capping late fees (2% of rent) and holding deposit amounts (5% of rent) ignores what housing providers deal with on a regular basis and the needs of applicants and tenants. Many housing providers will choose not to allow for either if regulated to the point of being useless. And limiting other fees to 5% of the rent will likely lead to fewer amenities and ancillary services.



Increasingly tenants are requesting options to pay rent other than traditional check or money order. Many online services and other electronic payments services are only available to a housing provider at a cost. Landlords are already prohibited from charging a fee associated with a check payment, they should not be punished for giving tenants the rent payment options they are requesting. Further limiting costs associated with helpful services like pest control and valet trash make properties less desirable and increase property costs via refuse contamination charges and piecemeal pest control visits.

California has already seen fit to lower the amount a housing provider can charge for a security deposit to no more than the equivalent of one month's rent. Most housing providers want to allow renters to have pets but without the ability to pay for damages, many will change pet policies. Pet fees help mitigate risk and damage when allowing pets. This is exacerbated by the idea that a housing provider may not charge a tenant any fee that is not specified in the rental agreement unless all parties agree.

Again, please vote no on this ordinance. Housing providers are reasonable and care about their tenants. However, this ordinance, as proposed, is more about hamstringing rental owners than it is about transparency. And it will do nothing to create the housing that experts agree is needed to address housing costs. I encourage you to thoroughly engage rental housing stakeholders for common sense solutions to help renters understand their rental agreements and obligations without making it harder and more costly to provide much-needed rental housing.

Sincerely,

Todd McClean

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

**From:** [Desmond, Jim](#)  
**To:** [Dorina Grossman](#)  
**Cc:** [Ewart, Megan T](#); [FGG, Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** RE: [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance  
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 9:40:41 AM  
**Attachments:** [image003.png](#)

---

Thank you for your email. I appreciate you sharing your thoughts on this matter. When this item comes before the Board of Supervisors, I will consider your input and all other input before making a decision.

Again, I appreciate you contacting my office.

Sincerely,  
**JIM DESMOND**  
Supervisor, Fifth District  
County of San Diego  
p: 619-531-5555

Connect with us:



---

**From:** Dorina Grossman [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2025 1:35 PM  
**To:** Desmond, Jim <[Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov](mailto:Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov)>  
**Subject:** [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance

Supervisor Jim Desmond,

As a Rental Housing Provider, I am writing to respectfully request that you vote against advancing the Protecting Residential Rental Applicants and Tenants from Price Gouging and Fee Exploitation ordinance. This proposal ignores existing law, industry best practices, and the mounting costs impacting rental housing providers. Housing providers do not oppose transparency, but what's proposed goes far beyond that.

Disclosure in advertising sounds simple, however, this could prove to be impractical for those who do not have websites or independent housing providers who do not utilize online technology for advertising. More concerning is the increased likelihood for fraud in the application process if housing providers must accept reusable screening reports. These reports may not always come from a reputable third party and in many cases won't meet the needs of housing providers and their rental criteria.

Capping late fees (2% of rent) and holding deposit amounts (5% of rent) ignores what housing providers deal with on a regular basis and the needs of applicants and tenants. Many housing providers will choose not to allow for either if regulated to the point of being useless. And limiting other fees to 5% of the rent will likely lead to fewer amenities and ancillary services.

Increasingly tenants are requesting options to pay rent other than traditional check or money order. Many online services and other electronic payments services are only available to a housing provider at a cost. Landlords are already prohibited from charging a fee associated with a check payment, they should not be punished for giving tenants the rent payment options they are requesting. Further limiting costs associated with helpful services like pest control and valet trash make properties less desirable and increase property costs via refuse contamination charges and piecemeal pest control visits.

California has already seen fit to lower the amount a housing provider can charge for a security deposit to no more than the equivalent of one month's rent. Most housing providers want to allow renters to have pets but without the ability to pay for damages, many will change pet policies. Pet fees help mitigate risk and damage when allowing pets. This is exacerbated by the idea that a housing provider may not charge a tenant any fee that is not specified in the rental agreement unless all parties agree.

Again, please vote no on this ordinance. Housing providers are reasonable and care about their tenants. However, this ordinance, as proposed, is more about hamstringing rental owners than it is about transparency. And it will do nothing to create the housing that experts agree is needed to address housing costs. I encourage you to thoroughly engage rental housing stakeholders for common sense solutions to help renters understand their rental agreements and obligations without making it harder and more costly to provide much-needed rental housing.

House providers should have rights too!!

Sincerely,

Dorina Grossman



**From:** [Desmond, Jim](#)  
**To:** [Greg Finch](#)  
**Cc:** [FGG, Public Comment](#); [O'Farrell, Chase G](#)  
**Subject:** RE: [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance  
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 10:12:56 AM  
**Attachments:** [image003.png](#)

---

Thank you for your email. I appreciate you sharing your thoughts on this matter. When this item comes before the Board of Supervisors, I will consider your input and all other input before making a decision.

Again, I appreciate you contacting my office.

Sincerely,  
**JIM DESMOND**  
Supervisor, Fifth District  
County of San Diego  
p: 619-531-5555

Connect with us:    

---

**From:** Greg Finch [REDACTED] com>  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2025 2:41 PM  
**To:** Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>  
**Subject:** [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance

Supervisor Jim Desmond,

As a Rental Housing Provider, I am writing to respectfully request that you vote against advancing the Protecting Residential Rental Applicants and Tenants from Price Gouging and Fee Exploitation ordinance. This proposal ignores existing law, industry best practices, and the mounting costs impacting rental housing providers. Housing providers do not oppose transparency, but what's proposed goes far beyond that.

Disclosure in advertising sounds simple, however, this could prove to be impractical for those who do not have websites or independent housing providers who do not utilize online technology for advertising. More concerning is the increased likelihood for fraud in the application process if housing providers must accept reusable screening reports. These reports may not always come from a reputable third party and in many cases won't meet the needs of housing providers and their rental criteria.

Capping late fees (2% of rent) and holding deposit amounts (5% of rent) ignores what housing providers deal with on a regular basis and the needs of applicants and tenants. Many housing providers will choose not to allow for either if regulated to the point of being useless. And limiting other fees to 5% of the rent will likely lead to fewer amenities and ancillary services.

Increasingly tenants are requesting options to pay rent other than traditional check or money order. Many online services and other electronic payments services are only available to a housing provider at a cost. Landlords are already prohibited from charging a fee associated with a check payment, they should not be punished for giving tenants the rent payment options they are requesting. Further limiting costs associated with helpful services like pest control and valet trash make properties less desirable and increase property costs via refuse contamination charges and piecemeal pest control visits.

California has already seen fit to lower the amount a housing provider can charge for a security deposit to no more than the equivalent of one month's rent. Most housing providers want to allow renters to have pets but without the ability to pay for damages, many will change pet policies. Pet fees help mitigate risk and damage when allowing pets. This is exacerbated by the idea that a housing provider may not charge a tenant any fee that is not specified in the rental agreement unless all parties agree.

Again, please vote no on this ordinance. Housing providers are reasonable and care about their tenants. However, this ordinance, as proposed, is more about hamstringing rental owners than it is about transparency. And it will do nothing to create the housing that experts agree is needed to address housing costs. I encourage you to thoroughly engage rental housing stakeholders for common sense solutions to help renters understand their rental agreements and obligations without making it harder and more costly to provide much-needed rental housing.

Sincerely,

Greg Finch



**From:** [Desmond, Jim](#)  
**To:** [m\\_penick](#)  
**Cc:** [FGG, Public Comment](#); [O'Farrell, Chase G](#)  
**Subject:** RE: [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance  
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 10:14:23 AM  
**Attachments:** [image003.png](#)

---

Thank you for your email. I appreciate you sharing your thoughts on this matter. When this item comes before the Board of Supervisors, I will consider your input and all other input before making a decision.

Again, I appreciate you contacting my office.

Sincerely,  
**JIM DESMOND**  
Supervisor, Fifth District  
County of San Diego  
p: 619-531-5555

Connect with us:



---

**From:** m penick [REDACTED].com>  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2025 2:52 PM  
**To:** Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>  
**Subject:** [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance

Supervisor Jim Desmond,

As a Rental Housing Provider, I am writing to respectfully request that you vote against advancing the Protecting Residential Rental Applicants and Tenants from Price Gouging and Fee Exploitation ordinance. This proposal ignores existing law, industry best practices, and the mounting costs impacting rental housing providers. Housing providers do not oppose transparency, but what's proposed goes far beyond that.

Disclosure in advertising sounds simple, however, this could prove to be impractical for those who do not have websites or independent housing providers who do not utilize online technology for advertising. More concerning is the increased likelihood for fraud in the application process if housing providers must accept reusable screening reports. These reports may not always come from a reputable third party and in many cases won't meet the needs of housing providers and their rental criteria.

Capping late fees (2% of rent) and holding deposit amounts (5% of rent) ignores what housing providers deal with on a regular basis and the needs of applicants and tenants. Many housing providers will choose not to allow for either if regulated to the point of being useless. And limiting other fees to 5% of the rent will likely lead to fewer amenities and ancillary services.

Increasingly tenants are requesting options to pay rent other than traditional check or money

order. Many online services and other electronic payments services are only available to a housing provider at a cost. Landlords are already prohibited from charging a fee associated with a check payment, they should not be punished for giving tenants the rent payment options they are requesting. Further limiting costs associated with helpful services like pest control and valet trash make properties less desirable and increase property costs via refuse contamination charges and piecemeal pest control visits.

California has already seen fit to lower the amount a housing provider can charge for a security deposit to no more than the equivalent of one month's rent. Most housing providers want to allow renters to have pets but without the ability to pay for damages, many will change pet policies. Pet fees help mitigate risk and damage when allowing pets. This is exacerbated by the idea that a housing provider may not charge a tenant any fee that is not specified in the rental agreement unless all parties agree.

Again, please vote no on this ordinance. Housing providers are reasonable and care about their tenants. However, this ordinance, as proposed, is more about hamstringing rental owners than it is about transparency. And it will do nothing to create the housing that experts agree is needed to address housing costs. I encourage you to thoroughly engage rental housing stakeholders for common sense solutions to help renters understand their rental agreements and obligations without making it harder and more costly to provide much-needed rental housing.

Time and time again our government representatives think they are trying to make housing more affordable for renters. Yet when does the government say to the landlords -how about if we reduce your property taxes, or make changes so insurance companies can charge less or reduce burdensome regulations so that you can provide housing to tenants at a lower cost? Landlords are being run out of business and out of State when they are forced to do things like renting to folks that don't pay like under Covid or lets not charge so much for trash collection or you must take their pets but cannot charge for the \$5k of damage since your deposit didn't cover it. Please - if you want more housing providers you need to help us out and not continue to make unreasonable demands and rules that cause us to lose money or be forced to leave this State. I hope you will consider helping housing providers who truly want to provide quality housing to folks that need rentals in this City. Thank you

Sincerely,

m penick

 [m.penick@cityofsanfrancisco.com](mailto:m.penick@cityofsanfrancisco.com)



**From:** [Desmond, Jim](#)  
**To:** [Nancy Howard](#)  
**Cc:** [FGG, Public Comment](#); [O'Farrell, Chase G](#)  
**Subject:** RE: [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance  
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 10:16:41 AM  
**Attachments:** [image003.png](#)

---

Thank you for your email. I appreciate you sharing your thoughts on this matter. When this item comes before the Board of Supervisors, I will consider your input and all other input before making a decision.

Again, I appreciate you contacting my office.

Sincerely,  
**JIM DESMOND**  
Supervisor, Fifth District  
County of San Diego  
p: 619-531-5555

Connect with us:



---

**From:** Nancy Howard [REDACTED] com>  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2025 3:30 PM  
**To:** Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>  
**Subject:** [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance

Supervisor Jim Desmond,

As a Rental Housing Provider, I am writing to respectfully request that you vote against advancing the Protecting Residential Rental Applicants and Tenants from Price Gouging and Fee Exploitation ordinance. This proposal ignores existing law, industry best practices, and the mounting costs impacting rental housing providers. Housing providers do not oppose transparency, but what's proposed goes far beyond that.

Disclosure in advertising sounds simple, however, this could prove to be impractical for those who do not have websites or independent housing providers who do not utilize online technology for advertising. More concerning is the increased likelihood for fraud in the application process if housing providers must accept reusable screening reports. These reports may not always come from a reputable third party and in many cases won't meet the needs of housing providers and their rental criteria.

Capping late fees (2% of rent) and holding deposit amounts (5% of rent) ignores what housing providers deal with on a regular basis and the needs of applicants and tenants. Many housing providers will choose not to allow for either if regulated to the point of being useless. And limiting other fees to 5% of the rent will likely lead to fewer amenities and ancillary services.

Increasingly tenants are requesting options to pay rent other than traditional check or money

order. Many online services and other electronic payments services are only available to a housing provider at a cost. Landlords are already prohibited from charging a fee associated with a check payment, they should not be punished for giving tenants the rent payment options they are requesting. Further limiting costs associated with helpful services like pest control and valet trash make properties less desirable and increase property costs via refuse contamination charges and piecemeal pest control visits.


California has already seen fit to lower the amount a housing provider can charge for a security deposit to no more than the equivalent of one month's rent. Most housing providers want to allow renters to have pets but without the ability to pay for damages, many will change pet policies. Pet fees help mitigate risk and damage when allowing pets. This is exacerbated by the idea that a housing provider may not charge a tenant any fee that is not specified in the rental agreement unless all parties agree.

Again, please vote no on this ordinance. Housing providers are reasonable and care about their tenants. However, this ordinance, as proposed, is more about hamstringing rental owners than it is about transparency. And it will do nothing to create the housing that experts agree is needed to address housing costs. I encourage you to thoroughly engage rental housing stakeholders for common sense solutions to help renters understand their rental agreements and obligations without making it harder and more costly to provide much-needed rental housing.

I manage a small amount of properties (32) for owners. Most of my units have lower income individuals living there. Waiting 7 days for late rent doesn't work. I have rent due on first late on 4th with an automatic late fee of \$50. I used to do five days. Tenants were constantly late. Having a shorter time period has solved that issue. Renters know it's due on the 1st. And that's their first thought. It's the first I need to pay my rent. If they have more days then we will be back to the old problem of late payers. If a renter is going to be late they tell me and with no reminder having to come from me and they pay the late fee with no problem. Let's not go backwards. I understand where you are coming from but well meaning as you are, waiting 7 days is counterproductive. The other thing is having animals in a unit. Fleas, pet food attracting rats & roaches you have to have a reserve. And 5% sec deposit will not cover it. When tenants leave the cost to replace flooring from dog stink or "mistakes" a pet has costs money to remedy for the next tenant. This also doesn't make sense especially for owners with one property. They should be exempt from these new rules. Do we really want corporate ownership. Because that's where it is headed if you pass these restrictions. Instead focus on seniors in land lease parks and gouging rent and then seniors losing their home to park when they can't afford the new rent. Park insists they fix it if they decide to sell and they can't. So Park takes their home and fixes it up or pulls out and replaces it with new one and makes a ton of money. I know of specific incidents of this happening in North County by Rutherford Investment Incorporated. Do something about that instead.

Sincerely,

Nancy Howard



**From:** [Desmond, Jim](#)  
**To:** [burklepurdue@yahoo.com](mailto:burklepurdue@yahoo.com)  
**Cc:** [FGG, Public Comment](#); [O'Farrell, Chase G](#)  
**Subject:** RE: [External] Oppose the proposed fee ordinance affecting San Diego rental housing  
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 10:18:25 AM  
**Attachments:** [image003.png](#)

---

Thank you for your email. I appreciate you sharing your thoughts on this matter. When this item comes before the Board of Supervisors, I will consider your input and all other input before making a decision.

Again, I appreciate you contacting my office.

Sincerely,  
**JIM DESMOND**  
Supervisor, Fifth District  
County of San Diego  
p: 619-531-5555

Connect with us:    

-----Original Message-----

From: david burkle [REDACTED] >  
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2025 3:43 PM  
To: Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>  
Subject: [External] Oppose the proposed fee ordinance affecting San Diego rental housing

Dear Supervisor Desmond,

As a San Diego County rental housing provider, I am writing to oppose any further regulations on the rental housing industry.

While I support transparency and fairness in housing practices, this county proposal to regulate the tenant screening process and limit how housing providers share costs with their residents would add punitive administrative burdens and undermine my ability to recover legitimate operational costs.

Mandating that all fees be folded into rent will not reduce the overall cost of housing. Instead, it will reduce transparency and limit tenants' ability to understand or control specific costs. These fees often help illustrate the costs associated with operating rental housing and can give tenants the ability to manage and reduce certain expenses. Overregulating fees will not reduce the overall cost of housing.

As a result, tenants may ultimately lose access to convenient services that enhance their rental experience.

As a housing provider, I take pride in maintaining safe, well-managed homes for San Diegans. However, continued layering of new county regulations without stakeholder input threatens the

long-term viability of our rental housing market. Instead of introducing more restrictions, I urge county leaders to focus on policies that support housing production, reduce regulatory barriers, and encourage continued private investment in rental housing.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

david burkle

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**From:** [Desmond, Jim](#)  
**To:** [James Kim](#)  
**Cc:** [FGG, Public Comment](#); [O'Farrell, Chase G](#)  
**Subject:** RE: [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance  
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 10:19:59 AM  
**Attachments:** [image003.png](#)

---

Thank you for your email. I appreciate you sharing your thoughts on this matter. When this item comes before the Board of Supervisors, I will consider your input and all other input before making a decision.

Again, I appreciate you contacting my office.

Sincerely,  
**JIM DESMOND**  
Supervisor, Fifth District  
County of San Diego  
p: 619-531-5555

Connect with us:    

---

**From:** James Kim <[REDACTED]@il.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2025 4:24 PM  
**To:** Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>  
**Subject:** [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance

Supervisor Jim Desmond,

As a Rental Housing Provider, I am writing to respectfully request that you vote against advancing the Protecting Residential Rental Applicants and Tenants from Price Gouging and Fee Exploitation ordinance. This proposal ignores existing law, industry best practices, and the mounting costs impacting rental housing providers. Housing providers do not oppose transparency, but what's proposed goes far beyond that.

Disclosure in advertising sounds simple, however, this could prove to be impractical for those who do not have websites or independent housing providers who do not utilize online technology for advertising. More concerning is the increased likelihood for fraud in the application process if housing providers must accept reusable screening reports. These reports may not always come from a reputable third party and in many cases won't meet the needs of housing providers and their rental criteria.

Capping late fees (2% of rent) and holding deposit amounts (5% of rent) ignores what housing providers deal with on a regular basis and the needs of applicants and tenants. Many housing providers will choose not to allow for either if regulated to the point of being useless. And limiting other fees to 5% of the rent will likely lead to fewer amenities and ancillary services.

Increasingly tenants are requesting options to pay rent other than traditional check or money

order. Many online services and other electronic payments services are only available to a housing provider at a cost. Landlords are already prohibited from charging a fee associated with a check payment, they should not be punished for giving tenants the rent payment options they are requesting. Further limiting costs associated with helpful services like pest control and valet trash make properties less desirable and increase property costs via refuse contamination charges and piecemeal pest control visits.

California has already seen fit to lower the amount a housing provider can charge for a security deposit to no more than the equivalent of one month's rent. Most housing providers want to allow renters to have pets but without the ability to pay for damages, many will change pet policies. Pet fees help mitigate risk and damage when allowing pets. This is exacerbated by the idea that a housing provider may not charge a tenant any fee that is not specified in the rental agreement unless all parties agree.

Again, please vote no on this ordinance. Housing providers are reasonable and care about their tenants. However, this ordinance, as proposed, is more about hamstringing rental owners than it is about transparency. And it will do nothing to create the housing that experts agree is needed to address housing costs. I encourage you to thoroughly engage rental housing stakeholders for common sense solutions to help renters understand their rental agreements and obligations without making it harder and more costly to provide much-needed rental housing.

Sincerely,

James Kim

 [.com](#)

**From:** [Desmond, Jim](#)  
**To:** [Christopher Smith](#)  
**Cc:** [FGG, Public Comment](#); [O'Farrell, Chase G](#)  
**Subject:** RE: [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance  
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 10:21:12 AM  
**Attachments:** [image003.png](#)

---

Thank you for your email. I appreciate you sharing your thoughts on this matter. When this item comes before the Board of Supervisors, I will consider your input and all other input before making a decision.

Again, I appreciate you contacting my office.

Sincerely,  
**JIM DESMOND**  
Supervisor, Fifth District  
County of San Diego  
p: 619-531-5555

Connect with us:    

---

**From:** Christopher Smith [REDACTED]om>  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2025 5:14 PM  
**To:** Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>  
**Subject:** [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance

Supervisor Jim Desmond,

As a Rental Housing Provider, I am writing to respectfully request that you vote against advancing the Protecting Residential Rental Applicants and Tenants from Price Gouging and Fee Exploitation ordinance. This proposal ignores existing law, industry best practices, and the mounting costs impacting rental housing providers. Housing providers do not oppose transparency, but what's proposed goes far beyond that.

Disclosure in advertising sounds simple, however, this could prove to be impractical for those who do not have websites or independent housing providers who do not utilize online technology for advertising. More concerning is the increased likelihood for fraud in the application process if housing providers must accept reusable screening reports. These reports may not always come from a reputable third party and in many cases won't meet the needs of housing providers and their rental criteria.

Capping late fees (2% of rent) and holding deposit amounts (5% of rent) ignores what housing providers deal with on a regular basis and the needs of applicants and tenants. Many housing providers will choose not to allow for either if regulated to the point of being useless. And limiting other fees to 5% of the rent will likely lead to fewer amenities and ancillary services.

Increasingly tenants are requesting options to pay rent other than traditional check or money

order. Many online services and other electronic payments services are only available to a housing provider at a cost. Landlords are already prohibited from charging a fee associated with a check payment, they should not be punished for giving tenants the rent payment options they are requesting. Further limiting costs associated with helpful services like pest control and valet trash make properties less desirable and increase property costs via refuse contamination charges and piecemeal pest control visits.

California has already seen fit to lower the amount a housing provider can charge for a security deposit to no more than the equivalent of one month's rent. Most housing providers want to allow renters to have pets but without the ability to pay for damages, many will change pet policies. Pet fees help mitigate risk and damage when allowing pets. This is exacerbated by the idea that a housing provider may not charge a tenant any fee that is not specified in the rental agreement unless all parties agree.

Again, please vote no on this ordinance. Housing providers are reasonable and care about their tenants. However, this ordinance, as proposed, is more about hamstringing rental owners than it is about transparency. And it will do nothing to create the housing that experts agree is needed to address housing costs. I encourage you to thoroughly engage rental housing stakeholders for common sense solutions to help renters understand their rental agreements and obligations without making it harder and more costly to provide much-needed rental housing.

Sincerely,

Christopher Smith





**From:** [Desmond, Jim](#)  
**To:** [DIANE BROWN](#)  
**Cc:** [FGG, Public Comment](#); [O'Farrell, Chase G](#)  
**Subject:** RE: [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance  
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 10:18:47 AM  
**Attachments:** [image003.png](#)

---

Thank you for your email. I appreciate you sharing your thoughts on this matter. When this item comes before the Board of Supervisors, I will consider your input and all other input before making a decision.

Again, I appreciate you contacting my office.

Sincerely,  
**JIM DESMOND**  
Supervisor, Fifth District  
County of San Diego  
p: 619-531-5555

Connect with us:



---

**From:** DIANE BROWN [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2025 3:53 PM  
**To:** Desmond, Jim <[Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov](mailto:Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov)>  
**Subject:** [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance

Supervisor Jim Desmond,

As a Rental Housing Provider, I am writing to respectfully request that you vote against advancing the Protecting Residential Rental Applicants and Tenants from Price Gouging and Fee Exploitation ordinance. This proposal ignores existing law, industry best practices, and the mounting costs impacting rental housing providers. Housing providers do not oppose transparency, but what's proposed goes far beyond that.

Disclosure in advertising sounds simple, however, this could prove to be impractical for those who do not have websites or independent housing providers who do not utilize online technology for advertising. More concerning is the increased likelihood for fraud in the application process if housing providers must accept reusable screening reports. These reports may not always come from a reputable third party and in many cases won't meet the needs of housing providers and their rental criteria.

Capping late fees (2% of rent) and holding deposit amounts (5% of rent) ignores what housing providers deal with on a regular basis and the needs of applicants and tenants. Many housing providers will choose not to allow for either if regulated to the point of being useless. And limiting other fees to 5% of the rent will likely lead to fewer amenities and ancillary services.

Increasingly tenants are requesting options to pay rent other than traditional check or money order. Many online services and other electronic payments services are only available to a

housing provider at a cost. Landlords are already prohibited from charging a fee associated with a check payment, they should not be punished for giving tenants the rent payment options they are requesting. Further limiting costs associated with helpful services like pest control and valet trash make properties less desirable and increase property costs via refuse contamination charges and piecemeal pest control visits.

California has already seen fit to lower the amount a housing provider can charge for a security deposit to no more than the equivalent of one month's rent. Most housing providers want to allow renters to have pets but without the ability to pay for damages, many will change pet policies. Pet fees help mitigate risk and damage when allowing pets. This is exacerbated by the idea that a housing provider may not charge a tenant any fee that is not specified in the rental agreement unless all parties agree.

Again, please vote no on this ordinance. Housing providers are reasonable and care about their tenants. However, this ordinance, as proposed, is more about hamstringing rental owners than it is about transparency. And it will do nothing to create the housing that experts agree is needed to address housing costs. I encourage you to thoroughly engage rental housing stakeholders for common sense solutions to help renters understand their rental agreements and obligations without making it harder and more costly to provide much-needed rental housing.

Sincerely,

DIANE BROWN

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature and any handwritten notes or dates that might have been present.

**From:** [Desmond, Jim](#)  
**To:** [Carl Venstrom](#)  
**Cc:** [FGG, Public Comment](#); [O'Farrell, Chase G](#)  
**Subject:** RE: [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance  
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 10:27:19 AM  
**Attachments:** [image003.png](#)

---

Thank you for your email. I appreciate you sharing your thoughts on this matter. When this item comes before the Board of Supervisors, I will consider your input and all other input before making a decision.

Again, I appreciate you contacting my office.

Sincerely,  
**JIM DESMOND**  
Supervisor, Fifth District  
County of San Diego  
p: 619-531-5555

Connect with us:    

---

**From:** Carl Venstrom [REDACTED]om>  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2025 7:09 PM  
**To:** Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>  
**Subject:** [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance

Supervisor Jim Desmond,

As a Rental Housing Provider, I am writing to respectfully request that you vote against advancing the Protecting Residential Rental Applicants and Tenants from Price Gouging and Fee Exploitation ordinance. This proposal ignores existing law, industry best practices, and the mounting costs impacting rental housing providers. Housing providers do not oppose transparency, but what's proposed goes far beyond that.

Disclosure in advertising sounds simple, however, this could prove to be impractical for those who do not have websites or independent housing providers who do not utilize online technology for advertising. More concerning is the increased likelihood for fraud in the application process if housing providers must accept reusable screening reports. These reports may not always come from a reputable third party and in many cases won't meet the needs of housing providers and their rental criteria.

Capping late fees (2% of rent) and holding deposit amounts (5% of rent) ignores what housing providers deal with on a regular basis and the needs of applicants and tenants. Many housing providers will choose not to allow for either if regulated to the point of being useless. And limiting other fees to 5% of the rent will likely lead to fewer amenities and ancillary services.

Increasingly tenants are requesting options to pay rent other than traditional check or money

order. Many online services and other electronic payments services are only available to a housing provider at a cost. Landlords are already prohibited from charging a fee associated with a check payment, they should not be punished for giving tenants the rent payment options they are requesting. Further limiting costs associated with helpful services like pest control and valet trash make properties less desirable and increase property costs via refuse contamination charges and piecemeal pest control visits.

California has already seen fit to lower the amount a housing provider can charge for a security deposit to no more than the equivalent of one month's rent. Most housing providers want to allow renters to have pets but without the ability to pay for damages, many will change pet policies. Pet fees help mitigate risk and damage when allowing pets. This is exacerbated by the idea that a housing provider may not charge a tenant any fee that is not specified in the rental agreement unless all parties agree.

Again, please vote no on this ordinance. Housing providers are reasonable and care about their tenants. However, this ordinance, as proposed, is more about hamstringing rental owners than it is about transparency. And it will do nothing to create the housing that experts agree is needed to address housing costs. I encourage you to thoroughly engage rental housing stakeholders for common sense solutions to help renters understand their rental agreements and obligations without making it harder and more costly to provide much-needed rental housing.

Sincerely,

Carl Venstrom



[.com](#)

**From:** [Desmond, Jim](#)  
**To:** [john.morton](#)  
**Cc:** [FGG, Public Comment](#); [O'Farrell, Chase G](#)  
**Subject:** RE: [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance  
**Date:** Monday, November 3, 2025 10:27:06 AM  
**Attachments:** [image003.png](#)

---

Thank you for your email. I appreciate you sharing your thoughts on this matter. When this item comes before the Board of Supervisors, I will consider your input and all other input before making a decision.

Again, I appreciate you contacting my office.

Sincerely,  
**JIM DESMOND**  
Supervisor, Fifth District  
County of San Diego  
p: 619-531-5555

Connect with us:    

---

**From:** john.morton [REDACTED].com>  
**Sent:** Friday, October 31, 2025 6:30 PM  
**To:** Desmond, Jim <Jim.Desmond@sdcounty.ca.gov>  
**Subject:** [External] Please Vote No on Rental Fee Ordinance

Supervisor Jim Desmond,

As a Rental Housing Provider, I am writing to respectfully request that you vote against advancing the Protecting Residential Rental Applicants and Tenants from Price Gouging and Fee Exploitation ordinance. This proposal ignores existing law, industry best practices, and the mounting costs impacting rental housing providers. Housing providers do not oppose transparency, but what's proposed goes far beyond that.

Disclosure in advertising sounds simple, however, this could prove to be impractical for those who do not have websites or independent housing providers who do not utilize online technology for advertising. More concerning is the increased likelihood for fraud in the application process if housing providers must accept reusable screening reports. These reports may not always come from a reputable third party and in many cases won't meet the needs of housing providers and their rental criteria.

Capping late fees (2% of rent) and holding deposit amounts (5% of rent) ignores what housing providers deal with on a regular basis and the needs of applicants and tenants. Many housing providers will choose not to allow for either if regulated to the point of being useless. And limiting other fees to 5% of the rent will likely lead to fewer amenities and ancillary services.

Increasingly tenants are requesting options to pay rent other than traditional check or money

order. Many online services and other electronic payments services are only available to a housing provider at a cost. Landlords are already prohibited from charging a fee associated with a check payment, they should not be punished for giving tenants the rent payment options they are requesting. Further limiting costs associated with helpful services like pest control and valet trash make properties less desirable and increase property costs via refuse contamination charges and piecemeal pest control visits.

California has already seen fit to lower the amount a housing provider can charge for a security deposit to no more than the equivalent of one month's rent. Most housing providers want to allow renters to have pets but without the ability to pay for damages, many will change pet policies. Pet fees help mitigate risk and damage when allowing pets. This is exacerbated by the idea that a housing provider may not charge a tenant any fee that is not specified in the rental agreement unless all parties agree.

Again, please vote no on this ordinance. Housing providers are reasonable and care about their tenants. However, this ordinance, as proposed, is more about hamstringing rental owners than it is about transparency. And it will do nothing to create the housing that experts agree is needed to address housing costs. I encourage you to thoroughly engage rental housing stakeholders for common sense solutions to help renters understand their rental agreements and obligations without making it harder and more costly to provide much-needed rental housing.

Sincerely,

john morton

 [.com](#)