1	FAIR EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING COUNCIL
2	Meeting Notice and Agenda
3	
4	
5	VII. Public Hearing: Proposed Fair Housing Regulations
6	
7	Attachment B: Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
8	Attachment C: Initial Statement of Reasons
9	Attachment D: Proposed Fair Housing Regulations
10	
11	CORRECTED TRANSCRIPT 6-6-18
12	Junipero Serra Building
13	Carmel Room Auditorium (First Floor)
14	328 W. 4th Street
15	Los Angeles, California
16	
17	Wednesday, April 4, 2018
18	
19	
20	ATKINSON-BAKER, INC. COURT REPORTERS
21	500 North Brand Boulevard, Third Floor Glendale, California 91203
22	(800) 288-3376
23	Reported by:
24	Marceline F. Noble, CSR No. 3024
25	FILE NO. AC02DD0 PAGES 1 - 54

	Page 3		Page 5
25	supplements the existing state regulations interpreting	25	round of public comments during the rulemaking process.
24	The rulemaking clarifies, makes specific and	24	there are any further changes made in response to this
23	first time.	23	15-day period within which to make written comments if
22	regulations to add Fair Housing regulations for the	22	Also, anyone who testifies will have a
21	of amendments to the Fair Employment and Housing Act	21	as will anyone who makes such a request.
20	hearing is to receive comments related to the issuance	20	amendments the Council makes to the proposed regulations
19	The purpose of today's public comment	19	written comments will receive a copy of any changes or
18	member and director of the department, Kevin Kish.	18	Anyone who testifies here today or submits
17	Members Iglesias, Schur and Ortiz, along with ex-officio	17	our proceedings conclude.
16	today are colleagues of mine on the council, Council	16	please make sure you get them to Brian Sperber before
15	the Fair Employment and Housing Council. And joining me	15	comments and you don't plan to separately submit them,
14	I'm Chaya Mandelbaum. I'm chairperson of	14	If you brought a written copy of your
13	and subsequent rulemaking transcript.	13	California, 90013.
12	myself and my colleagues for purposes of today's hearing	12	right now, 320 West 4th Street, 10th floor, Los Angeles,
11	for purposes of the meeting, but allow me to reintroduce	11	DFEH's Los Angeles office located exactly where we are
10	It is April 4th and we've made introductions	10	instead, you can do so in care of Brian Sperber at the
9	public hearing here in Los Angeles.	9	at DFEHCouncil@DFEH.ca.gov or if you prefer to mail them
8	So thank you for attending our Fair Housing	8	You may e-mail written comments to Council
7	Housing ones.	7	April 4th.
6	hearing. We're going to start with the proposed Fair	6	comments to the proposed regulations until 5 p.m. today,
5	CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: We are now ready to start our doubleheader of public hearing, 45-day	5	Pursuant to that notice, we are taking testimony here today and we will also accept written
4	CHATEMAN MANDEL PALIME Ma are now ready to	4	placed on the Council's web page.
2 3	10:13 a.m 11:26 a.m.	3	stakeholders on the Council's e-mail list. It was also
1 2	Los Angeles, California, Wednesday, April 4, 2018	1 2	also via e-mail to the thousands of individuals and
1		1	
	Page 2		Page 4
25		25	Notice Register published on February 16th, 2018, and
23 24		24	more than 45 days ago in the California Regulatory
22		23	the formal rulemaking process. We noticed the hearing
21		22	We're holding this public hearing as part of
19 20		21	Council's web page.
18		20	records regulations are also available on the
17		19	The text of the Council's proposed
15 16		18	C respectively.
14	ADRIENNA WONG	17	Statement of Reasons are reflected in Attachments B and
	DENISE McGRANAHAN DIANA PRADO	16	Attachment D to the materials and the notice and Initial
13	SCOTT CHANG	15	available in the back of the room and are reflected in
12	SRI PANCHALAM	14	Copies of the proposed amendments are
11	JANET POWERS DIANE DUMAS	13	271.
	SANJAY WAGLE	12	130, 155, 161, 162, 176 through 180, 185 and 265 through
9 10	SPEAKERS WHITNEY PROUT	11	Sections 12005, 12010, 12060 through -63, 12100, 12120,
8		10	here in the California Code of Regulations at Title 2,
7		9	The proposed regulations are slated to be
6	HOLLY A. THOMAS BRIAN SPERBER	8	disability or genetic information.
	DIRECTOR KEVIN KISH	7	origin, ancestry, familial status, source of income,
5	COUNCIL MEMBER TIM IGLESIAS	6	expression, sexual orientation, marital status, national
4	COUNCIL MEMBER DALE BRODSKY	5	religion, sex, gender, gender identity, gender
	COUNCIL MEMBER JOSEPH ORTIZ	4	harassment and discrimination because of race, color,
	COUNCIL MEMBER DARA SCHUR COUNCIL MEMBER LISA CISNEROS	3	As relates to housing of FEHA prohibits
3		2	12900, et seg.

2 (Pages 2 to 5)

1	We'll consider each comment here today as	1	standards that the Council's relying on is this causal
2	well as all written comments received and we'll respond	2	link that's stated in Walker and the other cases.
3	to the comments in the Final Statement of Reason which	3	As I review those, because that standard
4	will become part of the Council's rulemaking record.	4	says that once that prima facie showing has been made,
5	The hearing is being transcribed by a	5	the burden shifts back to the respondent to show a
6	certified court reporter and the transcript of the	6	legitimate nonretaliatory, nondiscriminatory reason.
7	hearing will be available as well as part of the	7	That indicates that there's more flexibility
8	Council's official ruling record.	8	in that standard which essentially there is a legitimate
9	Because the hearing is being transcribed,	9	reason for taking the adverse action that it's not
10	it's critical that anyone speak, do so clearly,	10	retaliation.
11	relatively slowly and that only one person speaks at a	11	I provided extensive comments on this, but
12 13	time.	12 13	I'd encourage the Council to consider a but-for
	You'll not be sworn in when you testify, but	14	causation standard for that retaliation standard in this
14 15	we do ask that you come to the front of the room and	14	section and that that will be consistent with both the
16	speak into the microphone so that the court reporter can	16	F.H.A. and more in line with the dominant purpose
17	take down your comments.	17	standard required by FEHA.
18	Please begin by stating and spelling your	18	My second comment relates to section I believe it's 12185. This has to do with assistance
19	name and stating any affiliation you're speaking on behalf of.	19	animals. And this is subsection B, the section which
20	We will hear written hear testimony,	20	relates to questions, the inquiry that can be made when
21	rather, until all those wishing to do so have had an	21	the animal in question is a service animal.
22	opportunity.	22	My understanding is that the Council is
23	And without further ado, we're ready to	23	proposing this regulation to comply with the Unruh Act
24	begin.	24	and the American With Disabilities Act to the extent
25	So would someone like to kick off our public	25	that it applies.
	Page 6		Page 8
1			
± 1	hearing?	1	I have reviewed those sections. I think
1 2	hearing? MS_PROLIT: Good morning Whitney Prout	1 2	I have reviewed those sections. I think this section expands the ADA limits on inquiries that
	MS. PROUT: Good morning. Whitney Prout		this section expands the ADA limits on inquiries that
2	MS. PROUT: Good morning. Whitney Prout with the California Apartment Association. P-r-o-u-t.	2	this section expands the ADA limits on inquiries that can be made regarding service animals beyond what's
2 3	MS. PROUT: Good morning. Whitney Prout with the California Apartment Association. P-r-o-u-t. All right. So, first of all, I'd like to	2 3	this section expands the ADA limits on inquiries that can be made regarding service animals beyond what's required by the Unruh Act.
2 3 4	MS. PROUT: Good morning. Whitney Prout with the California Apartment Association. P-r-o-u-t. All right. So, first of all, I'd like to thank the Council for their continued work on this. I	2 3 4	this section expands the ADA limits on inquiries that can be made regarding service animals beyond what's required by the Unruh Act. Again, I'm providing extensive written
2 3 4 5	MS. PROUT: Good morning. Whitney Prout with the California Apartment Association. P-r-o-u-t. All right. So, first of all, I'd like to	2 3 4 5	this section expands the ADA limits on inquiries that can be made regarding service animals beyond what's required by the Unruh Act. Again, I'm providing extensive written comments on this, but I would encourage the Council to
2 3 4 5 6	MS. PROUT: Good morning. Whitney Prout with the California Apartment Association. P-r-o-u-t. All right. So, first of all, I'd like to thank the Council for their continued work on this. I think we're getting close to hopefully being able to	2 3 4 5 6	this section expands the ADA limits on inquiries that can be made regarding service animals beyond what's required by the Unruh Act. Again, I'm providing extensive written
2 3 4 5 6 7	MS. PROUT: Good morning. Whitney Prout with the California Apartment Association. P-r-o-u-t. All right. So, first of all, I'd like to thank the Council for their continued work on this. I think we're getting close to hopefully being able to finalize these. I do have written comments which I will	2 3 4 5 6 7	this section expands the ADA limits on inquiries that can be made regarding service animals beyond what's required by the Unruh Act. Again, I'm providing extensive written comments on this, but I would encourage the Council to consider amending this so that to the extent the service
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. PROUT: Good morning. Whitney Prout with the California Apartment Association. P-r-o-u-t. All right. So, first of all, I'd like to thank the Council for their continued work on this. I think we're getting close to hopefully being able to finalize these. I do have written comments which I will submit by 5 p.m. today. I just have an e-mail to make	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	this section expands the ADA limits on inquiries that can be made regarding service animals beyond what's required by the Unruh Act. Again, I'm providing extensive written comments on this, but I would encourage the Council to consider amending this so that to the extent the service animal in question will not be in an area of public
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. PROUT: Good morning. Whitney Prout with the California Apartment Association. P-r-o-u-t. All right. So, first of all, I'd like to thank the Council for their continued work on this. I think we're getting close to hopefully being able to finalize these. I do have written comments which I will submit by 5 p.m. today. I just have an e-mail to make yet. I'm going to limit my comments to three different sections today. The first one relates to the retaliation	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	this section expands the ADA limits on inquiries that can be made regarding service animals beyond what's required by the Unruh Act. Again, I'm providing extensive written comments on this, but I would encourage the Council to consider amending this so that to the extent the service animal in question will not be in an area of public accommodation, not a public entity or outside of the ADA. That it is permitted for the housing provider to request verification just of basically the two questions
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. PROUT: Good morning. Whitney Prout with the California Apartment Association. P-r-o-u-t. All right. So, first of all, I'd like to thank the Council for their continued work on this. I think we're getting close to hopefully being able to finalize these. I do have written comments which I will submit by 5 p.m. today. I just have an e-mail to make yet. I'm going to limit my comments to three different sections today.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	this section expands the ADA limits on inquiries that can be made regarding service animals beyond what's required by the Unruh Act. Again, I'm providing extensive written comments on this, but I would encourage the Council to consider amending this so that to the extent the service animal in question will not be in an area of public accommodation, not a public entity or outside of the ADA. That it is permitted for the housing provider to request verification just of basically the two questions that are stated here, which is that there is a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. PROUT: Good morning. Whitney Prout with the California Apartment Association. P-r-o-u-t. All right. So, first of all, I'd like to thank the Council for their continued work on this. I think we're getting close to hopefully being able to finalize these. I do have written comments which I will submit by 5 p.m. today. I just have an e-mail to make yet. I'm going to limit my comments to three different sections today. The first one relates to the retaliation section, this is 12130, specifically subsections A and E. These are the subsections which deal with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	this section expands the ADA limits on inquiries that can be made regarding service animals beyond what's required by the Unruh Act. Again, I'm providing extensive written comments on this, but I would encourage the Council to consider amending this so that to the extent the service animal in question will not be in an area of public accommodation, not a public entity or outside of the ADA. That it is permitted for the housing provider to request verification just of basically the two questions that are stated here, which is that there is a disability and that the animal's been trained to perform
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. PROUT: Good morning. Whitney Prout with the California Apartment Association. P-r-o-u-t. All right. So, first of all, I'd like to thank the Council for their continued work on this. I think we're getting close to hopefully being able to finalize these. I do have written comments which I will submit by 5 p.m. today. I just have an e-mail to make yet. I'm going to limit my comments to three different sections today. The first one relates to the retaliation section, this is 12130, specifically subsections A and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	this section expands the ADA limits on inquiries that can be made regarding service animals beyond what's required by the Unruh Act. Again, I'm providing extensive written comments on this, but I would encourage the Council to consider amending this so that to the extent the service animal in question will not be in an area of public accommodation, not a public entity or outside of the ADA. That it is permitted for the housing provider to request verification just of basically the two questions that are stated here, which is that there is a disability and that the animal's been trained to perform a task related to that disability.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. PROUT: Good morning. Whitney Prout with the California Apartment Association. P-r-o-u-t. All right. So, first of all, I'd like to thank the Council for their continued work on this. I think we're getting close to hopefully being able to finalize these. I do have written comments which I will submit by 5 p.m. today. I just have an e-mail to make yet. I'm going to limit my comments to three different sections today. The first one relates to the retaliation section, this is 12130, specifically subsections A and E. These are the subsections which deal with the standards that's applied to what's required to prove retaliation.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	this section expands the ADA limits on inquiries that can be made regarding service animals beyond what's required by the Unruh Act. Again, I'm providing extensive written comments on this, but I would encourage the Council to consider amending this so that to the extent the service animal in question will not be in an area of public accommodation, not a public entity or outside of the ADA. That it is permitted for the housing provider to request verification just of basically the two questions that are stated here, which is that there is a disability and that the animal's been trained to perform a task related to that disability. So I'd ask the Council to consider that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. PROUT: Good morning. Whitney Prout with the California Apartment Association. P-r-o-u-t. All right. So, first of all, I'd like to thank the Council for their continued work on this. I think we're getting close to hopefully being able to finalize these. I do have written comments which I will submit by 5 p.m. today. I just have an e-mail to make yet. I'm going to limit my comments to three different sections today. The first one relates to the retaliation section, this is 12130, specifically subsections A and E. These are the subsections which deal with the standards that's applied to what's required to prove retaliation. The Council has stated that essentially if a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	this section expands the ADA limits on inquiries that can be made regarding service animals beyond what's required by the Unruh Act. Again, I'm providing extensive written comments on this, but I would encourage the Council to consider amending this so that to the extent the service animal in question will not be in an area of public accommodation, not a public entity or outside of the ADA. That it is permitted for the housing provider to request verification just of basically the two questions that are stated here, which is that there is a disability and that the animal's been trained to perform a task related to that disability. So I'd ask the Council to consider that. My final my final comment relates to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. PROUT: Good morning. Whitney Prout with the California Apartment Association. P-r-o-u-t. All right. So, first of all, I'd like to thank the Council for their continued work on this. I think we're getting close to hopefully being able to finalize these. I do have written comments which I will submit by 5 p.m. today. I just have an e-mail to make yet. I'm going to limit my comments to three different sections today. The first one relates to the retaliation section, this is 12130, specifically subsections A and E. These are the subsections which deal with the standards that's applied to what's required to prove retaliation. The Council has stated that essentially if a purpose for the adverse action is retaliation, then	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	this section expands the ADA limits on inquiries that can be made regarding service animals beyond what's required by the Unruh Act. Again, I'm providing extensive written comments on this, but I would encourage the Council to consider amending this so that to the extent the service animal in question will not be in an area of public accommodation, not a public entity or outside of the ADA. That it is permitted for the housing provider to request verification just of basically the two questions that are stated here, which is that there is a disability and that the animal's been trained to perform a task related to that disability. So I'd ask the Council to consider that. My final my final comment relates to Article 24, consideration of criminal history
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. PROUT: Good morning. Whitney Prout with the California Apartment Association. P-r-o-u-t. All right. So, first of all, I'd like to thank the Council for their continued work on this. I think we're getting close to hopefully being able to finalize these. I do have written comments which I will submit by 5 p.m. today. I just have an e-mail to make yet. I'm going to limit my comments to three different sections today. The first one relates to the retaliation section, this is 12130, specifically subsections A and E. These are the subsections which deal with the standards that's applied to what's required to prove retaliation. The Council has stated that essentially if a purpose for the adverse action is retaliation, then that's a sufficient showing.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	this section expands the ADA limits on inquiries that can be made regarding service animals beyond what's required by the Unruh Act. Again, I'm providing extensive written comments on this, but I would encourage the Council to consider amending this so that to the extent the service animal in question will not be in an area of public accommodation, not a public entity or outside of the ADA. That it is permitted for the housing provider to request verification just of basically the two questions that are stated here, which is that there is a disability and that the animal's been trained to perform a task related to that disability. So I'd ask the Council to consider that. My final my final comment relates to Article 24, consideration of criminal history information and housing. And generally I continue to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. PROUT: Good morning. Whitney Prout with the California Apartment Association. P-r-o-u-t. All right. So, first of all, I'd like to thank the Council for their continued work on this. I think we're getting close to hopefully being able to finalize these. I do have written comments which I will submit by 5 p.m. today. I just have an e-mail to make yet. I'm going to limit my comments to three different sections today. The first one relates to the retaliation section, this is 12130, specifically subsections A and E. These are the subsections which deal with the standards that's applied to what's required to prove retaliation. The Council has stated that essentially if a purpose for the adverse action is retaliation, then that's a sufficient showing. As I've stated before, I'm I'm concerned	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	this section expands the ADA limits on inquiries that can be made regarding service animals beyond what's required by the Unruh Act. Again, I'm providing extensive written comments on this, but I would encourage the Council to consider amending this so that to the extent the service animal in question will not be in an area of public accommodation, not a public entity or outside of the ADA. That it is permitted for the housing provider to request verification just of basically the two questions that are stated here, which is that there is a disability and that the animal's been trained to perform a task related to that disability. So I'd ask the Council to consider that. My final my final comment relates to Article 24, consideration of criminal history information and housing. And generally I continue to be and the DA continues to be concerned that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. PROUT: Good morning. Whitney Prout with the California Apartment Association. P-r-o-u-t. All right. So, first of all, I'd like to thank the Council for their continued work on this. I think we're getting close to hopefully being able to finalize these. I do have written comments which I will submit by 5 p.m. today. I just have an e-mail to make yet. I'm going to limit my comments to three different sections today. The first one relates to the retaliation section, this is 12130, specifically subsections A and E. These are the subsections which deal with the standards that's applied to what's required to prove retaliation. The Council has stated that essentially if a purpose for the adverse action is retaliation, then that's a sufficient showing. As I've stated before, I'm I'm concerned with that. As we all know, FEHA requires a dominant	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	this section expands the ADA limits on inquiries that can be made regarding service animals beyond what's required by the Unruh Act. Again, I'm providing extensive written comments on this, but I would encourage the Council to consider amending this so that to the extent the service animal in question will not be in an area of public accommodation, not a public entity or outside of the ADA. That it is permitted for the housing provider to request verification just of basically the two questions that are stated here, which is that there is a disability and that the animal's been trained to perform a task related to that disability. So I'd ask the Council to consider that. My final my final comment relates to Article 24, consideration of criminal history information and housing. And generally I continue to be and the DA continues to be concerned that the regulations as written do not provide sufficient
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. PROUT: Good morning. Whitney Prout with the California Apartment Association. P-r-o-u-t. All right. So, first of all, I'd like to thank the Council for their continued work on this. I think we're getting close to hopefully being able to finalize these. I do have written comments which I will submit by 5 p.m. today. I just have an e-mail to make yet. I'm going to limit my comments to three different sections today. The first one relates to the retaliation section, this is 12130, specifically subsections A and E. These are the subsections which deal with the standards that's applied to what's required to prove retaliation. The Council has stated that essentially if a purpose for the adverse action is retaliation, then that's a sufficient showing. As I've stated before, I'm I'm concerned with that. As we all know, FEHA requires a dominant purpose. I understand the Council's position that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	this section expands the ADA limits on inquiries that can be made regarding service animals beyond what's required by the Unruh Act. Again, I'm providing extensive written comments on this, but I would encourage the Council to consider amending this so that to the extent the service animal in question will not be in an area of public accommodation, not a public entity or outside of the ADA. That it is permitted for the housing provider to request verification just of basically the two questions that are stated here, which is that there is a disability and that the animal's been trained to perform a task related to that disability. So I'd ask the Council to consider that. My final my final comment relates to Article 24, consideration of criminal history information and housing. And generally I continue to be and the DA continues to be concerned that the regulations as written do not provide sufficient guidance for a housing provider to create a coherent
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. PROUT: Good morning. Whitney Prout with the California Apartment Association. P-r-o-u-t. All right. So, first of all, I'd like to thank the Council for their continued work on this. I think we're getting close to hopefully being able to finalize these. I do have written comments which I will submit by 5 p.m. today. I just have an e-mail to make yet. I'm going to limit my comments to three different sections today. The first one relates to the retaliation section, this is 12130, specifically subsections A and E. These are the subsections which deal with the standards that's applied to what's required to prove retaliation. The Council has stated that essentially if a purpose for the adverse action is retaliation, then that's a sufficient showing. As I've stated before, I'm I'm concerned with that. As we all know, FEHA requires a dominant purpose. I understand the Council's position that that's inconsistent with the F.H.A. and that we need to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	this section expands the ADA limits on inquiries that can be made regarding service animals beyond what's required by the Unruh Act. Again, I'm providing extensive written comments on this, but I would encourage the Council to consider amending this so that to the extent the service animal in question will not be in an area of public accommodation, not a public entity or outside of the ADA. That it is permitted for the housing provider to request verification just of basically the two questions that are stated here, which is that there is a disability and that the animal's been trained to perform a task related to that disability. So I'd ask the Council to consider that. My final my final comment relates to Article 24, consideration of criminal history information and housing. And generally I continue to be and the DA continues to be concerned that the regulations as written do not provide sufficient guidance for a housing provider to create a coherent criminal history information practice policy that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. PROUT: Good morning. Whitney Prout with the California Apartment Association. P-r-o-u-t. All right. So, first of all, I'd like to thank the Council for their continued work on this. I think we're getting close to hopefully being able to finalize these. I do have written comments which I will submit by 5 p.m. today. I just have an e-mail to make yet. I'm going to limit my comments to three different sections today. The first one relates to the retaliation section, this is 12130, specifically subsections A and E. These are the subsections which deal with the standards that's applied to what's required to prove retaliation. The Council has stated that essentially if a purpose for the adverse action is retaliation, then that's a sufficient showing. As I've stated before, I'm I'm concerned with that. As we all know, FEHA requires a dominant purpose. I understand the Council's position that that's inconsistent with the F.H.A. and that we need to be consistent with that for the purposes of equivalents;	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	this section expands the ADA limits on inquiries that can be made regarding service animals beyond what's required by the Unruh Act. Again, I'm providing extensive written comments on this, but I would encourage the Council to consider amending this so that to the extent the service animal in question will not be in an area of public accommodation, not a public entity or outside of the ADA. That it is permitted for the housing provider to request verification just of basically the two questions that are stated here, which is that there is a disability and that the animal's been trained to perform a task related to that disability. So I'd ask the Council to consider that. My final my final comment relates to Article 24, consideration of criminal history information and housing. And generally I continue to be and the DA continues to be concerned that the regulations as written do not provide sufficient guidance for a housing provider to create a coherent criminal history information practice policy that's compliant with these regulations.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MS. PROUT: Good morning. Whitney Prout with the California Apartment Association. P-r-o-u-t. All right. So, first of all, I'd like to thank the Council for their continued work on this. I think we're getting close to hopefully being able to finalize these. I do have written comments which I will submit by 5 p.m. today. I just have an e-mail to make yet. I'm going to limit my comments to three different sections today. The first one relates to the retaliation section, this is 12130, specifically subsections A and E. These are the subsections which deal with the standards that's applied to what's required to prove retaliation. The Council has stated that essentially if a purpose for the adverse action is retaliation, then that's a sufficient showing. As I've stated before, I'm I'm concerned with that. As we all know, FEHA requires a dominant purpose. I understand the Council's position that that's inconsistent with the F.H.A. and that we need to be consistent with that for the purposes of equivalents; however, I did review the cases that were cited in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	this section expands the ADA limits on inquiries that can be made regarding service animals beyond what's required by the Unruh Act. Again, I'm providing extensive written comments on this, but I would encourage the Council to consider amending this so that to the extent the service animal in question will not be in an area of public accommodation, not a public entity or outside of the ADA. That it is permitted for the housing provider to request verification just of basically the two questions that are stated here, which is that there is a disability and that the animal's been trained to perform a task related to that disability. So I'd ask the Council to consider that. My final my final comment relates to Article 24, consideration of criminal history information and housing. And generally I continue to be and the DA continues to be concerned that the regulations as written do not provide sufficient guidance for a housing provider to create a coherent criminal history information practice policy that's compliant with these regulations. The regulations allow for use of a bright
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. PROUT: Good morning. Whitney Prout with the California Apartment Association. P-r-o-u-t. All right. So, first of all, I'd like to thank the Council for their continued work on this. I think we're getting close to hopefully being able to finalize these. I do have written comments which I will submit by 5 p.m. today. I just have an e-mail to make yet. I'm going to limit my comments to three different sections today. The first one relates to the retaliation section, this is 12130, specifically subsections A and E. These are the subsections which deal with the standards that's applied to what's required to prove retaliation. The Council has stated that essentially if a purpose for the adverse action is retaliation, then that's a sufficient showing. As I've stated before, I'm I'm concerned with that. As we all know, FEHA requires a dominant purpose. I understand the Council's position that that's inconsistent with the F.H.A. and that we need to be consistent with that for the purposes of equivalents;	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	this section expands the ADA limits on inquiries that can be made regarding service animals beyond what's required by the Unruh Act. Again, I'm providing extensive written comments on this, but I would encourage the Council to consider amending this so that to the extent the service animal in question will not be in an area of public accommodation, not a public entity or outside of the ADA. That it is permitted for the housing provider to request verification just of basically the two questions that are stated here, which is that there is a disability and that the animal's been trained to perform a task related to that disability. So I'd ask the Council to consider that. My final my final comment relates to Article 24, consideration of criminal history information and housing. And generally I continue to be and the DA continues to be concerned that the regulations as written do not provide sufficient guidance for a housing provider to create a coherent criminal history information practice policy that's compliant with these regulations.

3 (Pages 6 to 9)

1	specific requirements of this section, it appears that	1	fact that burdens were sometimes put on the defendants
2	that's actually not permitted, that you have to consider	2	as a basis for the Council going ahead and putting the
3	mitigating information, conducted individualized content	3	burden putting this prong as on the business. We
4	because that's considered a less discriminatory	4	don't believe that that we actually think that shows
5	alternative.	5	the opposite, which is that means the legislature did
6	I provided written comments on the areas	6	look at that, was aware that they could have considered
7	that I specifically are unclear and can use	7	that and could have changed the prong, they could have
8	clarification, but DA would continue to urge the Council	8	gone ahead and said that yes, the business must also
9	to keep in mind the ability to create a compliant	9	prove that there is a more feasible alternative that has
10	practice based on these regulations, which at this point	10	a less discriminatory impact. But it did not.
11	are still unclear.	11	So we think that the Council should not
12	So unless the Council has questions for me,	12	change what the legislature, I guess, did not decide to
13	I will end there.	13	change either and to continue following Government Code
14	CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Thank you. Appreciate	14	12955.8, subdivision B-1, and use that standard for that
15	it. Look forward to your written comments.	15	particular prong. It should not be placed on business.
16	MS. PROUT: Thank you.	16	
17	•	17	If the Council wants to leave it open for
18	MR. WAGLE: Good morning. Sanjay,	18	the Government Code and not follow HUD, that's one
19	S-a-n-j-a-y, Wagle, W-a-g-l-e. I'm with the California	19	thing, but it should not be shifting that burden to
	Association of Realtors.	20	business.
20	Good morning. We'd like to, first of all,		The second comment I'm going to be making is
21	thank the Council for their work on these regulations,	21	regarding the service animal issue, and that's also
22	and as well as throughout the process. We stated this	22	12185(b). We join with the California Apartment
23	at one of our previous hearings. We appreciate that we	23	Association in disagreeing with the Council 's
24	believe our comments have been considered, carefully	24	limitation to an inquiry for service animals to simply
25	considered throughout this process and that we have been	25	the two question limitation.
	Page 10		Page 12
	6		6
- 1			
1	heard.	1	The ADA of which the Unruh Act is
2		1 2	
	I'm going to just we are going to submit		co-extensive applies only to public accommodations.
2	I'm going to just we are going to submit written comments prior to 5 o'clock today.	2	co-extensive applies only to public accommodations. Most courts have held that aside from the commercial
2 3	I'm going to just we are going to submit written comments prior to 5 o'clock today. I am going to raise just two two matters	2 3	co-extensive applies only to public accommodations. Most courts have held that aside from the commercial leasing office or perhaps in the properties are being
2 3 4	I'm going to just we are going to submit written comments prior to 5 o'clock today. I am going to raise just two two matters in my public comments today.	2 3 4	co-extensive applies only to public accommodations. Most courts have held that aside from the commercial leasing office or perhaps in the properties are being shown, it does not apply to the actual residents
2 3 4 5	I'm going to just we are going to submit written comments prior to 5 o'clock today. I am going to raise just two two matters in my public comments today. The first concerns burden shifting in	2 3 4 5	co-extensive applies only to public accommodations. Most courts have held that aside from the commercial leasing office or perhaps in the properties are being shown, it does not apply to the actual residents themselves. Residential apartment complexes do not fall
2 3 4 5 6	I'm going to just we are going to submit written comments prior to 5 o'clock today. I am going to raise just two two matters in my public comments today. The first concerns burden shifting in discriminatory effect cases, that's Section 12062, A and	2 3 4 5 6	co-extensive applies only to public accommodations. Most courts have held that aside from the commercial leasing office or perhaps in the properties are being shown, it does not apply to the actual residents themselves. Residential apartment complexes do not fall within the ADA definition of public accommodation.
2 3 4 5 6 7	I'm going to just we are going to submit written comments prior to 5 o'clock today. I am going to raise just two two matters in my public comments today. The first concerns burden shifting in discriminatory effect cases, that's Section 12062, A and B of the regs. Under both under federal law, the	2 3 4 5 6 7	co-extensive applies only to public accommodations. Most courts have held that aside from the commercial leasing office or perhaps in the properties are being shown, it does not apply to the actual residents themselves. Residential apartment complexes do not fall within the ADA definition of public accommodation. Civil Code Sections 54.1 and 54.2, the authorities cited
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I'm going to just we are going to submit written comments prior to 5 o'clock today. I am going to raise just two two matters in my public comments today. The first concerns burden shifting in discriminatory effect cases, that's Section 12062, A and B of the regs. Under both under federal law, the allocation of the burden of proof for proving a less	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	co-extensive applies only to public accommodations. Most courts have held that aside from the commercial leasing office or perhaps in the properties are being shown, it does not apply to the actual residents themselves. Residential apartment complexes do not fall within the ADA definition of public accommodation. Civil Code Sections 54.1 and 54.2, the authorities cited for the proposed section is quiet on the issue of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I'm going to just we are going to submit written comments prior to 5 o'clock today. I am going to raise just two two matters in my public comments today. The first concerns burden shifting in discriminatory effect cases, that's Section 12062, A and B of the regs. Under both under federal law, the allocation of the burden of proof for proving a less restrictive alternative under federal law rests on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	co-extensive applies only to public accommodations. Most courts have held that aside from the commercial leasing office or perhaps in the properties are being shown, it does not apply to the actual residents themselves. Residential apartment complexes do not fall within the ADA definition of public accommodation. Civil Code Sections 54.1 and 54.2, the authorities cited for the proposed section is quiet on the issue of verification.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I'm going to just we are going to submit written comments prior to 5 o'clock today. I am going to raise just two two matters in my public comments today. The first concerns burden shifting in discriminatory effect cases, that's Section 12062, A and B of the regs. Under both under federal law, the allocation of the burden of proof for proving a less restrictive alternative under federal law rests on the plaintiff in discriminatory effect cases.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	co-extensive applies only to public accommodations. Most courts have held that aside from the commercial leasing office or perhaps in the properties are being shown, it does not apply to the actual residents themselves. Residential apartment complexes do not fall within the ADA definition of public accommodation. Civil Code Sections 54.1 and 54.2, the authorities cited for the proposed section is quiet on the issue of verification. However, in Auburn Woods, the case which
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	I'm going to just we are going to submit written comments prior to 5 o'clock today. I am going to raise just two two matters in my public comments today. The first concerns burden shifting in discriminatory effect cases, that's Section 12062, A and B of the regs. Under both under federal law, the allocation of the burden of proof for proving a less restrictive alternative under federal law rests on the plaintiff in discriminatory effect cases. The Council has gone ahead and placed this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	co-extensive applies only to public accommodations. Most courts have held that aside from the commercial leasing office or perhaps in the properties are being shown, it does not apply to the actual residents themselves. Residential apartment complexes do not fall within the ADA definition of public accommodation. Civil Code Sections 54.1 and 54.2, the authorities cited for the proposed section is quiet on the issue of verification. However, in Auburn Woods, the case which actually established in California the a lot of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I'm going to just we are going to submit written comments prior to 5 o'clock today. I am going to raise just two two matters in my public comments today. The first concerns burden shifting in discriminatory effect cases, that's Section 12062, A and B of the regs. Under both under federal law, the allocation of the burden of proof for proving a less restrictive alternative under federal law rests on the plaintiff in discriminatory effect cases. The Council has gone ahead and placed this burden on the defendant, on the business or the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	co-extensive applies only to public accommodations. Most courts have held that aside from the commercial leasing office or perhaps in the properties are being shown, it does not apply to the actual residents themselves. Residential apartment complexes do not fall within the ADA definition of public accommodation. Civil Code Sections 54.1 and 54.2, the authorities cited for the proposed section is quiet on the issue of verification. However, in Auburn Woods, the case which actually established in California the a lot of the reasonable accommodation analysis for support animals,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I'm going to just we are going to submit written comments prior to 5 o'clock today. I am going to raise just two two matters in my public comments today. The first concerns burden shifting in discriminatory effect cases, that's Section 12062, A and B of the regs. Under both under federal law, the allocation of the burden of proof for proving a less restrictive alternative under federal law rests on the plaintiff in discriminatory effect cases. The Council has gone ahead and placed this burden on the defendant, on the business or the nonbusiness entity.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	co-extensive applies only to public accommodations. Most courts have held that aside from the commercial leasing office or perhaps in the properties are being shown, it does not apply to the actual residents themselves. Residential apartment complexes do not fall within the ADA definition of public accommodation. Civil Code Sections 54.1 and 54.2, the authorities cited for the proposed section is quiet on the issue of verification. However, in Auburn Woods, the case which actually established in California the a lot of the reasonable accommodation analysis for support animals, does reference service animals and suggest that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	I'm going to just we are going to submit written comments prior to 5 o'clock today. I am going to raise just two two matters in my public comments today. The first concerns burden shifting in discriminatory effect cases, that's Section 12062, A and B of the regs. Under both under federal law, the allocation of the burden of proof for proving a less restrictive alternative under federal law rests on the plaintiff in discriminatory effect cases. The Council has gone ahead and placed this burden on the defendant, on the business or the nonbusiness entity. Government Code under California law leaves	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	co-extensive applies only to public accommodations. Most courts have held that aside from the commercial leasing office or perhaps in the properties are being shown, it does not apply to the actual residents themselves. Residential apartment complexes do not fall within the ADA definition of public accommodation. Civil Code Sections 54.1 and 54.2, the authorities cited for the proposed section is quiet on the issue of verification. However, in Auburn Woods, the case which actually established in California the a lot of the reasonable accommodation analysis for support animals, does reference service animals and suggest that verification is appropriate.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I'm going to just we are going to submit written comments prior to 5 o'clock today. I am going to raise just two two matters in my public comments today. The first concerns burden shifting in discriminatory effect cases, that's Section 12062, A and B of the regs. Under both under federal law, the allocation of the burden of proof for proving a less restrictive alternative under federal law rests on the plaintiff in discriminatory effect cases. The Council has gone ahead and placed this burden on the defendant, on the business or the nonbusiness entity. Government Code under California law leaves this provision open. It simply says that any violation	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	co-extensive applies only to public accommodations. Most courts have held that aside from the commercial leasing office or perhaps in the properties are being shown, it does not apply to the actual residents themselves. Residential apartment complexes do not fall within the ADA definition of public accommodation. Civil Code Sections 54.1 and 54.2, the authorities cited for the proposed section is quiet on the issue of verification. However, in Auburn Woods, the case which actually established in California the a lot of the reasonable accommodation analysis for support animals, does reference service animals and suggest that verification is appropriate. In that case, it stated and this is a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I'm going to just we are going to submit written comments prior to 5 o'clock today. I am going to raise just two two matters in my public comments today. The first concerns burden shifting in discriminatory effect cases, that's Section 12062, A and B of the regs. Under both under federal law, the allocation of the burden of proof for proving a less restrictive alternative under federal law rests on the plaintiff in discriminatory effect cases. The Council has gone ahead and placed this burden on the defendant, on the business or the nonbusiness entity. Government Code under California law leaves this provision open. It simply says that any violation pursuant to that subdivision, which is Government Code	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	co-extensive applies only to public accommodations. Most courts have held that aside from the commercial leasing office or perhaps in the properties are being shown, it does not apply to the actual residents themselves. Residential apartment complexes do not fall within the ADA definition of public accommodation. Civil Code Sections 54.1 and 54.2, the authorities cited for the proposed section is quiet on the issue of verification. However, in Auburn Woods, the case which actually established in California the a lot of the reasonable accommodation analysis for support animals, does reference service animals and suggest that verification is appropriate. In that case, it stated and this is a quote from the case "that it is not disputed that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I'm going to just we are going to submit written comments prior to 5 o'clock today. I am going to raise just two two matters in my public comments today. The first concerns burden shifting in discriminatory effect cases, that's Section 12062, A and B of the regs. Under both under federal law, the allocation of the burden of proof for proving a less restrictive alternative under federal law rests on the plaintiff in discriminatory effect cases. The Council has gone ahead and placed this burden on the defendant, on the business or the nonbusiness entity. Government Code under California law leaves this provision open. It simply says that any violation pursuant to that subdivision, which is Government Code 12955.8, shall consider the feasible alternatives, but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	co-extensive applies only to public accommodations. Most courts have held that aside from the commercial leasing office or perhaps in the properties are being shown, it does not apply to the actual residents themselves. Residential apartment complexes do not fall within the ADA definition of public accommodation. Civil Code Sections 54.1 and 54.2, the authorities cited for the proposed section is quiet on the issue of verification. However, in Auburn Woods, the case which actually established in California the a lot of the reasonable accommodation analysis for support animals, does reference service animals and suggest that verification is appropriate. In that case, it stated and this is a quote from the case "that it is not disputed that Auburn Woods may have been entitled to further factual
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	I'm going to just we are going to submit written comments prior to 5 o'clock today. I am going to raise just two two matters in my public comments today. The first concerns burden shifting in discriminatory effect cases, that's Section 12062, A and B of the regs. Under both under federal law, the allocation of the burden of proof for proving a less restrictive alternative under federal law rests on the plaintiff in discriminatory effect cases. The Council has gone ahead and placed this burden on the defendant, on the business or the nonbusiness entity. Government Code under California law leaves this provision open. It simply says that any violation pursuant to that subdivision, which is Government Code 12955.8, shall consider the feasible alternatives, but it doesn't actually place where the burden of proof	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	co-extensive applies only to public accommodations. Most courts have held that aside from the commercial leasing office or perhaps in the properties are being shown, it does not apply to the actual residents themselves. Residential apartment complexes do not fall within the ADA definition of public accommodation. Civil Code Sections 54.1 and 54.2, the authorities cited for the proposed section is quiet on the issue of verification. However, in Auburn Woods, the case which actually established in California the a lot of the reasonable accommodation analysis for support animals, does reference service animals and suggest that verification is appropriate. In that case, it stated and this is a quote from the case "that it is not disputed that Auburn Woods may have been entitled to further factual information, including medical documentation supporting
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I'm going to just we are going to submit written comments prior to 5 o'clock today. I am going to raise just two two matters in my public comments today. The first concerns burden shifting in discriminatory effect cases, that's Section 12062, A and B of the regs. Under both under federal law, the allocation of the burden of proof for proving a less restrictive alternative under federal law rests on the plaintiff in discriminatory effect cases. The Council has gone ahead and placed this burden on the defendant, on the business or the nonbusiness entity. Government Code under California law leaves this provision open. It simply says that any violation pursuant to that subdivision, which is Government Code 12955.8, shall consider the feasible alternatives, but it doesn't actually place where the burden of proof would lie.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	co-extensive applies only to public accommodations. Most courts have held that aside from the commercial leasing office or perhaps in the properties are being shown, it does not apply to the actual residents themselves. Residential apartment complexes do not fall within the ADA definition of public accommodation. Civil Code Sections 54.1 and 54.2, the authorities cited for the proposed section is quiet on the issue of verification. However, in Auburn Woods, the case which actually established in California the a lot of the reasonable accommodation analysis for support animals, does reference service animals and suggest that verification is appropriate. In that case, it stated and this is a quote from the case "that it is not disputed that Auburn Woods may have been entitled to further factual information, including medical documentation supporting information."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I'm going to just we are going to submit written comments prior to 5 o'clock today. I am going to raise just two two matters in my public comments today. The first concerns burden shifting in discriminatory effect cases, that's Section 12062, A and B of the regs. Under both under federal law, the allocation of the burden of proof for proving a less restrictive alternative under federal law rests on the plaintiff in discriminatory effect cases. The Council has gone ahead and placed this burden on the defendant, on the business or the nonbusiness entity. Government Code under California law leaves this provision open. It simply says that any violation pursuant to that subdivision, which is Government Code 12955.8, shall consider the feasible alternatives, but it doesn't actually place where the burden of proof would lie. The Council in its initial in its	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	co-extensive applies only to public accommodations. Most courts have held that aside from the commercial leasing office or perhaps in the properties are being shown, it does not apply to the actual residents themselves. Residential apartment complexes do not fall within the ADA definition of public accommodation. Civil Code Sections 54.1 and 54.2, the authorities cited for the proposed section is quiet on the issue of verification. However, in Auburn Woods, the case which actually established in California the a lot of the reasonable accommodation analysis for support animals, does reference service animals and suggest that verification is appropriate. In that case, it stated and this is a quote from the case "that it is not disputed that Auburn Woods may have been entitled to further factual information, including medical documentation supporting information." And then the Court also stated, however,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I'm going to just we are going to submit written comments prior to 5 o'clock today. I am going to raise just two two matters in my public comments today. The first concerns burden shifting in discriminatory effect cases, that's Section 12062, A and B of the regs. Under both under federal law, the allocation of the burden of proof for proving a less restrictive alternative under federal law rests on the plaintiff in discriminatory effect cases. The Council has gone ahead and placed this burden on the defendant, on the business or the nonbusiness entity. Government Code under California law leaves this provision open. It simply says that any violation pursuant to that subdivision, which is Government Code 12955.8, shall consider the feasible alternatives, but it doesn't actually place where the burden of proof would lie. The Council in its initial in its Statement of Reasons states that based on a precedential	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	co-extensive applies only to public accommodations. Most courts have held that aside from the commercial leasing office or perhaps in the properties are being shown, it does not apply to the actual residents themselves. Residential apartment complexes do not fall within the ADA definition of public accommodation. Civil Code Sections 54.1 and 54.2, the authorities cited for the proposed section is quiet on the issue of verification. However, in Auburn Woods, the case which actually established in California the a lot of the reasonable accommodation analysis for support animals, does reference service animals and suggest that verification is appropriate. In that case, it stated and this is a quote from the case "that it is not disputed that Auburn Woods may have been entitled to further factual information, including medical documentation supporting information." And then the Court also stated, however, "and because a service animal was not at issue here,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I'm going to just we are going to submit written comments prior to 5 o'clock today. I am going to raise just two two matters in my public comments today. The first concerns burden shifting in discriminatory effect cases, that's Section 12062, A and B of the regs. Under both under federal law, the allocation of the burden of proof for proving a less restrictive alternative under federal law rests on the plaintiff in discriminatory effect cases. The Council has gone ahead and placed this burden on the defendant, on the business or the nonbusiness entity. Government Code under California law leaves this provision open. It simply says that any violation pursuant to that subdivision, which is Government Code 12955.8, shall consider the feasible alternatives, but it doesn't actually place where the burden of proof would lie. The Council in its initial in its Statement of Reasons states that based on a precedential decision by the DFEH, as well as the fact that the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	co-extensive applies only to public accommodations. Most courts have held that aside from the commercial leasing office or perhaps in the properties are being shown, it does not apply to the actual residents themselves. Residential apartment complexes do not fall within the ADA definition of public accommodation. Civil Code Sections 54.1 and 54.2, the authorities cited for the proposed section is quiet on the issue of verification. However, in Auburn Woods, the case which actually established in California the a lot of the reasonable accommodation analysis for support animals, does reference service animals and suggest that verification is appropriate. In that case, it stated and this is a quote from the case "that it is not disputed that Auburn Woods may have been entitled to further factual information, including medical documentation supporting information." And then the Court also stated, however, "and because a service animal was not at issue here, there was no requirement that the" "that the"
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I'm going to just we are going to submit written comments prior to 5 o'clock today. I am going to raise just two two matters in my public comments today. The first concerns burden shifting in discriminatory effect cases, that's Section 12062, A and B of the regs. Under both under federal law, the allocation of the burden of proof for proving a less restrictive alternative under federal law rests on the plaintiff in discriminatory effect cases. The Council has gone ahead and placed this burden on the defendant, on the business or the nonbusiness entity. Government Code under California law leaves this provision open. It simply says that any violation pursuant to that subdivision, which is Government Code 12955.8, shall consider the feasible alternatives, but it doesn't actually place where the burden of proof would lie. The Council in its initial in its Statement of Reasons states that based on a precedential decision by the DFEH, as well as the fact that the legislative analysts and the legislative history to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	co-extensive applies only to public accommodations. Most courts have held that aside from the commercial leasing office or perhaps in the properties are being shown, it does not apply to the actual residents themselves. Residential apartment complexes do not fall within the ADA definition of public accommodation. Civil Code Sections 54.1 and 54.2, the authorities cited for the proposed section is quiet on the issue of verification. However, in Auburn Woods, the case which actually established in California the a lot of the reasonable accommodation analysis for support animals, does reference service animals and suggest that verification is appropriate. In that case, it stated and this is a quote from the case "that it is not disputed that Auburn Woods may have been entitled to further factual information, including medical documentation supporting information." And then the Court also stated, however, "and because a service animal was not at issue here, there was no requirement that the" "that the" let's say "plaintiffs present evidence that their dog
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I'm going to just we are going to submit written comments prior to 5 o'clock today. I am going to raise just two two matters in my public comments today. The first concerns burden shifting in discriminatory effect cases, that's Section 12062, A and B of the regs. Under both under federal law, the allocation of the burden of proof for proving a less restrictive alternative under federal law rests on the plaintiff in discriminatory effect cases. The Council has gone ahead and placed this burden on the defendant, on the business or the nonbusiness entity. Government Code under California law leaves this provision open. It simply says that any violation pursuant to that subdivision, which is Government Code 12955.8, shall consider the feasible alternatives, but it doesn't actually place where the burden of proof would lie. The Council in its initial in its Statement of Reasons states that based on a precedential decision by the DFEH, as well as the fact that the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	co-extensive applies only to public accommodations. Most courts have held that aside from the commercial leasing office or perhaps in the properties are being shown, it does not apply to the actual residents themselves. Residential apartment complexes do not fall within the ADA definition of public accommodation. Civil Code Sections 54.1 and 54.2, the authorities cited for the proposed section is quiet on the issue of verification. However, in Auburn Woods, the case which actually established in California the a lot of the reasonable accommodation analysis for support animals, does reference service animals and suggest that verification is appropriate. In that case, it stated and this is a quote from the case "that it is not disputed that Auburn Woods may have been entitled to further factual information, including medical documentation supporting information." And then the Court also stated, however, "and because a service animal was not at issue here, there was no requirement that the" "that the"
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I'm going to just we are going to submit written comments prior to 5 o'clock today. I am going to raise just two two matters in my public comments today. The first concerns burden shifting in discriminatory effect cases, that's Section 12062, A and B of the regs. Under both under federal law, the allocation of the burden of proof for proving a less restrictive alternative under federal law rests on the plaintiff in discriminatory effect cases. The Council has gone ahead and placed this burden on the defendant, on the business or the nonbusiness entity. Government Code under California law leaves this provision open. It simply says that any violation pursuant to that subdivision, which is Government Code 12955.8, shall consider the feasible alternatives, but it doesn't actually place where the burden of proof would lie. The Council in its initial in its Statement of Reasons states that based on a precedential decision by the DFEH, as well as the fact that the legislative analysts and the legislative history to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	co-extensive applies only to public accommodations. Most courts have held that aside from the commercial leasing office or perhaps in the properties are being shown, it does not apply to the actual residents themselves. Residential apartment complexes do not fall within the ADA definition of public accommodation. Civil Code Sections 54.1 and 54.2, the authorities cited for the proposed section is quiet on the issue of verification. However, in Auburn Woods, the case which actually established in California the a lot of the reasonable accommodation analysis for support animals, does reference service animals and suggest that verification is appropriate. In that case, it stated and this is a quote from the case "that it is not disputed that Auburn Woods may have been entitled to further factual information, including medical documentation supporting information." And then the Court also stated, however, "and because a service animal was not at issue here, there was no requirement that the" "that the" let's say "plaintiffs present evidence that their dog

4 (Pages 10 to 13)

1	So in that case, the Court alluded to that you could	1	make that determination.
2	require a showing of some verification for a service	2	COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Thank you.
3	animal.	3	MR. WAGLE: Okay? All right. Thank you
4	As far as the standard, we don't believe it	4	very much. And again, thank you for the opportunity to
5	would necessarily have to be the full reasonable	5	speak to council.
6	accommodation analysis, but it would be basically to be	6	CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Thank you. We
7	allowed to verify those two questions. So to verify for	7	appreciate your comments, as always.
8	a nonobvious disability that is, in fact, a disability	8	Any other people wishing to provide I
9	and to verify for a nonobvious nexus between the service	9	have a feeling we're going to hear the word "community."
10	animal and a disability, a verification that that animal	10	MS. POWERS: Janet Powers, P-o-w-e-r-s. I'm
11	is, in fact, a service animal.	11	with Fiore, Racobs & Powers and I'm also here today on
12	So we believe verification should be	12	behalf of the California Legislature Action Committee of
13	permitted for those two sections.	13	Community Associations Institute. There's a mouthful.
14	And bottom line, our we believe that this	14	Again, I want to echo some of the sentiments
15	is persuasive under the law that there should be allowed	15	that have already been expressed about how much hard
16	to ask for verification in the context of service	16	work the Council has committed to these. I feel you're
17	animals. And just a just as a general matter, we	17	close to the end of a very long road here, but this is
18	also believe that as a matter of policy this would be a	18	such a historic event that I think it's really been
19	disaster. I think we can just look around us, even in	19	worth all the time and effort that you've all put into
20	where it is allowed for it in public accommodations,	20	it and, congratulations, close to the top of
21	that people are clearly taking advantage. We live in an	21	Mount Everest here. And thanks also for the opportunity
22	era where right now there are people who abuse the law	22	that you've given me to come and harass you and torture
23	when it comes to support support animals.	23	you and speak to you over the past year and a half on
24	But their verification actually has to	24	these various regulations.
25	happen. A service animal standard without any	25	I did submit some written comments, but
	Page 14		Page 16
1	verification would just open the door to basically all	1	while I was taking the train up today from Orange County
2	sorts of problems going forward.	2	and had a moment of peace, I actually went through them
3	I think we all know what would follow from	3	again, and I have some further thoughts that I'll go
4	that because everybody would just know this is the way I	4	back and put in writing and send them to Mr. Sperber.
5	get my animal in.	5	I think first anecdotally with regard to
6	But regardless of the consequences, we	6	Section 12005, I'm here to just let you know that since
7	believe the law does support verification for the for	7	the infamous peacock incident occurred on the plane,
8	the service animals to come and we also will be	8	requests for reasonable accommodations in community
9	submitting written comments.	9	associations that we represent have been up about ten
10	COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: I have a question,	10	percent. But no requests for peacocks.
11	Mr. Wagle.	11	Other types of poultry are are definitely
12	My mic on? Yes.	12	on the rise, but, apparently, since you can't bring one
13	Given that the government I'm going back	13	on the plane, peacocks are now in disfavor.
14		14	Under person in section we're still on
15	to your first point about shifting the burden	15	12005(v), as in Victor. The definition of persons
16	shifting.	16	
17	Given that the Government Code does not	17	references community associations, condominiums, planned
18	allocate the burden, in the absence of direction from	18	developments and other common interest developments, but
19	the Council, how would you propose that the courts would	19	earlier under the general prefatory language you do
20	determine the appropriate burden?	20	colloquially define these as HOAs. So I'm not sure if
20	MR. WAGLE: Well, I think the legislature,	20	you're just defining them early on so everybody knows
21	for whatever reason, went ahead and left that open.	21	what the heck we're talking about as an HOA or if you
22	Presumably that leaves it open to the courts based on	23	want to keep that consistent, you could also add in HOA
23 24	the facts and circumstances of the given case to maybe	23	language under (v), as in Victor, 5.
24 25	make that determination, but I just don't think that	24	I remain concerned about the direct
40	that provides sufficient direction for the Council to	20	liability and vicarious liability of language in 12010,
	Page 15		Page 17

-	· · · · · · · · · · · ·		
1	and I think the reason for that is, as you know, I come	1	They have a relationship likened to
2	and I talk about community associations. Most of the	2	Hatfields and McCoys and they engage in a variety of
3	people who serve on the board of directors of these	3	really despicable, horrible behavior toward each other.
4 5	associations are volunteer homeowners who are foolish	4	The association's ability to control that is
5	enough to run for the board of directors and spend their		extremely limited. We try to corral it generally as a
ь 7	spare time working on behalf of the community. They	6 7	nuisance if we're aware of it. But certainly that can,
8	don't get a salary.	8	and we do occasionally see it, rise to the level of
9	Most of them have little to no training in	9	something that would be discrimination based upon a
10	any kind of anything having to do with the governance of the association real property or Fair Housing matters.	10	protected class.
11	Just by numerous bills that have been	11	But the association doesn't really have
12	introduced over the years in Sacramento, there is no	12	specific authority in its governing documents to take on this kind of challenge. And so I'm here to again
13	mandatory education for directors of community	13	encourage you to give us that authority, give us that
14	associations, and perhaps some day there will be and we	14	power. Give us some tools to fight this. We have none
15	can include a lot more information that we think	15	currently.
16	directors should have.	16	Most associations are not able to evict
17	But I am a little bit concerned about	17	people who act badly. We can't evict owners. We can't
18	holding volunteer directors to the same standard of care	18	even evict the tenants of owners for conduct that would
19	as, perhaps, others that you're considering here in the	19	rise to the level of discriminatory behavior.
20	definition of person. It's very hard for me to	20	So our our arsenal here is very, very
21	understand how I'm going to explain to a board of	21	limited. We can hold a hearing. We can fine the owner
22	directors as their legal counsel that they're going to	22	of the property. We can request that the owner take
23	have liability regardless of whether they knew or should	23	action. But our relationship, particularly with the
24	have known about the conduct that resulted in the	24	tenant, is very limited.
25	discriminatory housing practice.	25	So while you're putting a burden on the
	Page 18		Daga 20
	rage 18		Page 20
1	They do their best to watch out for managers	1	association to try to deal with the problem, we just
2	or other vendors of services, independent contractors,	2	really don't have a lot of tools and authority in place
3	but I think this one is really going to take some doing	3	to take appropriate action against these wrongdoers,
4	for me to explain how a volunteer who meets once a month	4	even if the association's board of directors come to the
5	is going to have the ability to oversee or somehow	5	conclusion after a hearing that, yes, such
6	control the activities to the degree that I think the	6	discriminatory practices have occurred, our ability is
7	Council is is anticipating here.	7	extremely limited.
8	So I would love to see a carveout of some	8	We just need some help here. Put some
9	sort, or at least a reference to the fact that there may	9	authority in the ring. Give us a little teeth that
10	be differences in the standard of care here.	10	would indicate that upon discovery or determination that
11	We've kind of talked about this previously,	11	such discriminatory actions occurred that we have the
12	but I think this would be an opportunity for the Council	12	ability to take appropriate action, such as evicting a
13	to acknowledge that not all businesses are created	13 14	tenant or some other type of tool that we could use.
14 15	equal.	14	On retaliation, I want to echo some of
15	The next section that I wanted to just talk	16	the I'm sorry, 12130, I want to echo some of the
17	quickly is something that I did make a comment on at	17	comments made previously. I do think the standard really a but-for standard would be much clearer and
18	Section 12120, harassment. I certainly understand and I	18	easier for a lot of us who have to advise these entities
19	appreciate and applaud the Council's concerns with regard to trying to eliminate or at least reduce hostile	19	to implement. And I'm particularly concerned and I did
20	environment harassment.	20	put in my my my comments that I think associations
21	But I think one difficulty that we continue	21	are going to be a little bit hard-pressed in terms of
22	to have with the associations is that often the type of	22	some of the limitations that you put in the section with
23	harassment that we see is resident-on-resident	23	regard to disclosure.
24	harassment. One resident lives next door to another	24	We have a variety of financial disclosure
25	resident that they can't stand.	25	duties to our membership that are imposed by the then
	Page 19		Page 21

6 (Pages 18 to 21)

1	Stirling Common Interest Development Act and certainly	1	law you already put that in 12270 based on previous
2	something where we're looking at a protected activity.	2	remarks that I made, I would really appreciate if you
3	We want people to be able to file DFEH. We want them to	3	could put it in here also that we have to follow both
4	be able to implement whatever recourse they may think is	4	the Corporations Code and and the regulation.
5	appropriate. And certainly an association has no	5	So in acknowledgment that if the area is
6	obvious intent to retaliate, but when I see the language		already addressed by a federal or state law with regard
7	in I think it's I think it's C, that if we disclose	7	to criminal background history, that would be terrific.
8	the fact that someone has filed a Fair Housing	8	Just a couple more comments and I will let
9	Complaint, we may be in violation of the retaliation	9	you move on.
10	section while we're looking at having to disclose	10	Section 12178 regarding establishing that a
11	certain information to our members.	11	reasonable accommodation is necessary. I remain
12	So, for example, many times when a person	12	troubled by self-verification. I I have to say this
13	files a Fair Housing Complaint, it's not covered by	13	is this is a little bit problematic. And I'm
14	insurance. They may tender the claim to their insurance	14	concerned with Section T, as in maybe it's
15	carrier, but sometimes the insurance carrier determines	15	unfortunately, I scanned these in so that I could
16	that the association is guilty until proven innocent of	16	provide my comments in Word and as a result I think it
17	that wrongdoing.	17	might not have anyway, the section that combines that
18	So by by tendering the Complaint to the	18	depending on the individual circumstances information
19	insurance carrier, they are already making the	19	establishing that the individual has a disability can
20	assumption that the association might have engaged in	20	usually be provided directly by the individual with the
21	intentional, willful type of discriminatory activity and	21	disability through a variety of means, such as a
22	must be excluded from policy coverage.	22	credible statement or documentation of receipt of
23	So where we're going with this is that often	23	disability benefits.
24	we have to disclose to our membership, if there is a	24	A credible statement is one that a
25	financial situation that has been created, that the	25	reasonable person would believe is true based on the
	Page 22		Page 24
		-	
1	members at some point may have a special assessment or		available information.
2	other financial implications against them.	2	I find that the language can usually be
2 3	other financial implications against them. So I just want to put in there that while	2 3	I find that the language can usually be provided is a little bit difficult to parse here because
2 3 4	other financial implications against them. So I just want to put in there that while we we have a duty under Davis-Stirling to disclose	2 3 4	I find that the language can usually be provided is a little bit difficult to parse here because I think what you're trying to say is that the individual
2 3 4 5	other financial implications against them. So I just want to put in there that while we we have a duty under Davis-Stirling to disclose when a special assessment may be levied, we don't want	2 3 4 5	I find that the language can usually be provided is a little bit difficult to parse here because I think what you're trying to say is that the individual can or may be able to provide information themselves, in
2 3 4 5 6	other financial implications against them. So I just want to put in there that while we we have a duty under Davis-Stirling to disclose when a special assessment may be levied, we don't want to be appearing retaliatory by publishing a disclosure	2 3 4 5 6	I find that the language can usually be provided is a little bit difficult to parse here because I think what you're trying to say is that the individual can or may be able to provide information themselves, in other words, self-verify, as opposed to the information
2 3 4 5 6 7	other financial implications against them. So I just want to put in there that while we we have a duty under Davis-Stirling to disclose when a special assessment may be levied, we don't want to be appearing retaliatory by publishing a disclosure statement to the members, say, hey, we've got a Fair	2 3 4 5 6 7	I find that the language can usually be provided is a little bit difficult to parse here because I think what you're trying to say is that the individual can or may be able to provide information themselves, in other words, self-verify, as opposed to the information coming from a third party.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	other financial implications against them. So I just want to put in there that while we we have a duty under Davis-Stirling to disclose when a special assessment may be levied, we don't want to be appearing retaliatory by publishing a disclosure statement to the members, say, hey, we've got a Fair Housing Complaint against us, but we will have a duty to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I find that the language can usually be provided is a little bit difficult to parse here because I think what you're trying to say is that the individual can or may be able to provide information themselves, in other words, self-verify, as opposed to the information coming from a third party. But that's a little bit vague. So I'm not
2 3 4 5 7 8 9	other financial implications against them. So I just want to put in there that while we we have a duty under Davis-Stirling to disclose when a special assessment may be levied, we don't want to be appearing retaliatory by publishing a disclosure statement to the members, say, hey, we've got a Fair Housing Complaint against us, but we will have a duty to at least notify our members that there may be a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I find that the language can usually be provided is a little bit difficult to parse here because I think what you're trying to say is that the individual can or may be able to provide information themselves, in other words, self-verify, as opposed to the information coming from a third party. But that's a little bit vague. So I'm not sure if you're indicating that feasibly they can provide
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	other financial implications against them. So I just want to put in there that while we we have a duty under Davis-Stirling to disclose when a special assessment may be levied, we don't want to be appearing retaliatory by publishing a disclosure statement to the members, say, hey, we've got a Fair Housing Complaint against us, but we will have a duty to at least notify our members that there may be a financial ramification to the filing of of that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I find that the language can usually be provided is a little bit difficult to parse here because I think what you're trying to say is that the individual can or may be able to provide information themselves, in other words, self-verify, as opposed to the information coming from a third party. But that's a little bit vague. So I'm not sure if you're indicating that feasibly they can provide it versus is it part of the reliable verification
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	other financial implications against them. So I just want to put in there that while we we have a duty under Davis-Stirling to disclose when a special assessment may be levied, we don't want to be appearing retaliatory by publishing a disclosure statement to the members, say, hey, we've got a Fair Housing Complaint against us, but we will have a duty to at least notify our members that there may be a financial ramification to the filing of of that Complaint.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I find that the language can usually be provided is a little bit difficult to parse here because I think what you're trying to say is that the individual can or may be able to provide information themselves, in other words, self-verify, as opposed to the information coming from a third party. But that's a little bit vague. So I'm not sure if you're indicating that feasibly they can provide it versus is it part of the reliable verification process?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	other financial implications against them. So I just want to put in there that while we we have a duty under Davis-Stirling to disclose when a special assessment may be levied, we don't want to be appearing retaliatory by publishing a disclosure statement to the members, say, hey, we've got a Fair Housing Complaint against us, but we will have a duty to at least notify our members that there may be a financial ramification to the filing of of that Complaint. So I'm concerned about that raising	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	I find that the language can usually be provided is a little bit difficult to parse here because I think what you're trying to say is that the individual can or may be able to provide information themselves, in other words, self-verify, as opposed to the information coming from a third party. But that's a little bit vague. So I'm not sure if you're indicating that feasibly they can provide it versus is it part of the reliable verification process? And while I understand the idea that a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	other financial implications against them. So I just want to put in there that while we we have a duty under Davis-Stirling to disclose when a special assessment may be levied, we don't want to be appearing retaliatory by publishing a disclosure statement to the members, say, hey, we've got a Fair Housing Complaint against us, but we will have a duty to at least notify our members that there may be a financial ramification to the filing of of that Complaint. So I'm concerned about that raising raising a red flag in terms of retaliation.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I find that the language can usually be provided is a little bit difficult to parse here because I think what you're trying to say is that the individual can or may be able to provide information themselves, in other words, self-verify, as opposed to the information coming from a third party. But that's a little bit vague. So I'm not sure if you're indicating that feasibly they can provide it versus is it part of the reliable verification process? And while I understand the idea that a credible statement is something that a reasonable person
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	other financial implications against them. So I just want to put in there that while we we have a duty under Davis-Stirling to disclose when a special assessment may be levied, we don't want to be appearing retaliatory by publishing a disclosure statement to the members, say, hey, we've got a Fair Housing Complaint against us, but we will have a duty to at least notify our members that there may be a financial ramification to the filing of of that Complaint. So I'm concerned about that raising raising a red flag in terms of retaliation. On 12162, the specific practices related to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I find that the language can usually be provided is a little bit difficult to parse here because I think what you're trying to say is that the individual can or may be able to provide information themselves, in other words, self-verify, as opposed to the information coming from a third party. But that's a little bit vague. So I'm not sure if you're indicating that feasibly they can provide it versus is it part of the reliable verification process? And while I understand the idea that a credible statement is something that a reasonable person would believe is true, are we talking about a written
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	other financial implications against them. So I just want to put in there that while we we have a duty under Davis-Stirling to disclose when a special assessment may be levied, we don't want to be appearing retaliatory by publishing a disclosure statement to the members, say, hey, we've got a Fair Housing Complaint against us, but we will have a duty to at least notify our members that there may be a financial ramification to the filing of of that Complaint. So I'm concerned about that raising raising a red flag in terms of retaliation. On 12162, the specific practices related to land use. In terms of that section, it also is covered	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	I find that the language can usually be provided is a little bit difficult to parse here because I think what you're trying to say is that the individual can or may be able to provide information themselves, in other words, self-verify, as opposed to the information coming from a third party. But that's a little bit vague. So I'm not sure if you're indicating that feasibly they can provide it versus is it part of the reliable verification process? And while I understand the idea that a credible statement is something that a reasonable person would believe is true, are we talking about a written statement that says the person is disabled and what the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	other financial implications against them. So I just want to put in there that while we we have a duty under Davis-Stirling to disclose when a special assessment may be levied, we don't want to be appearing retaliatory by publishing a disclosure statement to the members, say, hey, we've got a Fair Housing Complaint against us, but we will have a duty to at least notify our members that there may be a financial ramification to the filing of of that Complaint. So I'm concerned about that raising raising a red flag in terms of retaliation. On 12162, the specific practices related to land use. In terms of that section, it also is covered by the criminal history and background sections.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I find that the language can usually be provided is a little bit difficult to parse here because I think what you're trying to say is that the individual can or may be able to provide information themselves, in other words, self-verify, as opposed to the information coming from a third party. But that's a little bit vague. So I'm not sure if you're indicating that feasibly they can provide it versus is it part of the reliable verification process? And while I understand the idea that a credible statement is something that a reasonable person would believe is true, are we talking about a written statement that says the person is disabled and what the nexus is?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	other financial implications against them. So I just want to put in there that while we we have a duty under Davis-Stirling to disclose when a special assessment may be levied, we don't want to be appearing retaliatory by publishing a disclosure statement to the members, say, hey, we've got a Fair Housing Complaint against us, but we will have a duty to at least notify our members that there may be a financial ramification to the filing of of that Complaint. So I'm concerned about that raising raising a red flag in terms of retaliation. On 12162, the specific practices related to land use. In terms of that section, it also is covered by the criminal history and background sections. I previously discussed and I put it in my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I find that the language can usually be provided is a little bit difficult to parse here because I think what you're trying to say is that the individual can or may be able to provide information themselves, in other words, self-verify, as opposed to the information coming from a third party. But that's a little bit vague. So I'm not sure if you're indicating that feasibly they can provide it versus is it part of the reliable verification process? And while I understand the idea that a credible statement is something that a reasonable person would believe is true, are we talking about a written statement that says the person is disabled and what the nexus is? What is the credible statement that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	other financial implications against them. So I just want to put in there that while we we have a duty under Davis-Stirling to disclose when a special assessment may be levied, we don't want to be appearing retaliatory by publishing a disclosure statement to the members, say, hey, we've got a Fair Housing Complaint against us, but we will have a duty to at least notify our members that there may be a financial ramification to the filing of of that Complaint. So I'm concerned about that raising raising a red flag in terms of retaliation. On 12162, the specific practices related to land use. In terms of that section, it also is covered by the criminal history and background sections. I previously discussed and I put it in my written comments, too, that in California, under the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I find that the language can usually be provided is a little bit difficult to parse here because I think what you're trying to say is that the individual can or may be able to provide information themselves, in other words, self-verify, as opposed to the information coming from a third party. But that's a little bit vague. So I'm not sure if you're indicating that feasibly they can provide it versus is it part of the reliable verification process? And while I understand the idea that a credible statement is something that a reasonable person would believe is true, are we talking about a written statement that says the person is disabled and what the nexus is? What is the credible statement that you're you're talking about here?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	other financial implications against them. So I just want to put in there that while we we have a duty under Davis-Stirling to disclose when a special assessment may be levied, we don't want to be appearing retaliatory by publishing a disclosure statement to the members, say, hey, we've got a Fair Housing Complaint against us, but we will have a duty to at least notify our members that there may be a financial ramification to the filing of of that Complaint. So I'm concerned about that raising raising a red flag in terms of retaliation. On 12162, the specific practices related to land use. In terms of that section, it also is covered by the criminal history and background sections. I previously discussed and I put it in my written comments, too, that in California, under the Corporations Code, associations have the ability to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	I find that the language can usually be provided is a little bit difficult to parse here because I think what you're trying to say is that the individual can or may be able to provide information themselves, in other words, self-verify, as opposed to the information coming from a third party. But that's a little bit vague. So I'm not sure if you're indicating that feasibly they can provide it versus is it part of the reliable verification process? And while I understand the idea that a credible statement is something that a reasonable person would believe is true, are we talking about a written statement that says the person is disabled and what the nexus is? What is the credible statement that you're you're talking about here? And, again, I remained concerned about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	other financial implications against them. So I just want to put in there that while we we have a duty under Davis-Stirling to disclose when a special assessment may be levied, we don't want to be appearing retaliatory by publishing a disclosure statement to the members, say, hey, we've got a Fair Housing Complaint against us, but we will have a duty to at least notify our members that there may be a financial ramification to the filing of of that Complaint. So I'm concerned about that raising raising a red flag in terms of retaliation. On 12162, the specific practices related to land use. In terms of that section, it also is covered by the criminal history and background sections. I previously discussed and I put it in my written comments, too, that in California, under the Corporations Code, associations have the ability to remove a director who has been convicted of a felony.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I find that the language can usually be provided is a little bit difficult to parse here because I think what you're trying to say is that the individual can or may be able to provide information themselves, in other words, self-verify, as opposed to the information coming from a third party. But that's a little bit vague. So I'm not sure if you're indicating that feasibly they can provide it versus is it part of the reliable verification process? And while I understand the idea that a credible statement is something that a reasonable person would believe is true, are we talking about a written statement that says the person is disabled and what the nexus is? What is the credible statement that you're you're talking about here? And, again, I remained concerned about self-verification, because in my experience, many people
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	other financial implications against them. So I just want to put in there that while we we have a duty under Davis-Stirling to disclose when a special assessment may be levied, we don't want to be appearing retaliatory by publishing a disclosure statement to the members, say, hey, we've got a Fair Housing Complaint against us, but we will have a duty to at least notify our members that there may be a financial ramification to the filing of of that Complaint. So I'm concerned about that raising raising a red flag in terms of retaliation. On 12162, the specific practices related to land use. In terms of that section, it also is covered by the criminal history and background sections. I previously discussed and I put it in my written comments, too, that in California, under the Corporations Code, associations have the ability to remove a director who has been convicted of a felony. And the difficulty that we have here is that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I find that the language can usually be provided is a little bit difficult to parse here because I think what you're trying to say is that the individual can or may be able to provide information themselves, in other words, self-verify, as opposed to the information coming from a third party. But that's a little bit vague. So I'm not sure if you're indicating that feasibly they can provide it versus is it part of the reliable verification process? And while I understand the idea that a credible statement is something that a reasonable person would believe is true, are we talking about a written statement that says the person is disabled and what the nexus is? What is the credible statement that you're you're talking about here? And, again, I remained concerned about self-verification, because in my experience, many people are able to produce a piece of paper that says I am
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	other financial implications against them. So I just want to put in there that while we we have a duty under Davis-Stirling to disclose when a special assessment may be levied, we don't want to be appearing retaliatory by publishing a disclosure statement to the members, say, hey, we've got a Fair Housing Complaint against us, but we will have a duty to at least notify our members that there may be a financial ramification to the filing of of that Complaint. So I'm concerned about that raising raising a red flag in terms of retaliation. On 12162, the specific practices related to land use. In terms of that section, it also is covered by the criminal history and background sections. I previously discussed and I put it in my written comments, too, that in California, under the Corporations Code, associations have the ability to remove a director who has been convicted of a felony. And the difficulty that we have here is that it will be helpful if you could add the same language	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I find that the language can usually be provided is a little bit difficult to parse here because I think what you're trying to say is that the individual can or may be able to provide information themselves, in other words, self-verify, as opposed to the information coming from a third party. But that's a little bit vague. So I'm not sure if you're indicating that feasibly they can provide it versus is it part of the reliable verification process? And while I understand the idea that a credible statement is something that a reasonable person would believe is true, are we talking about a written statement that says the person is disabled and what the nexus is? What is the credible statement that you're you're talking about here? And, again, I remained concerned about self-verification, because in my experience, many people are able to produce a piece of paper that says I am disabled and I require this particular disability (sic).
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	other financial implications against them. So I just want to put in there that while we we have a duty under Davis-Stirling to disclose when a special assessment may be levied, we don't want to be appearing retaliatory by publishing a disclosure statement to the members, say, hey, we've got a Fair Housing Complaint against us, but we will have a duty to at least notify our members that there may be a financial ramification to the filing of of that Complaint. So I'm concerned about that raising raising a red flag in terms of retaliation. On 12162, the specific practices related to land use. In terms of that section, it also is covered by the criminal history and background sections. I previously discussed and I put it in my written comments, too, that in California, under the Corporations Code, associations have the ability to remove a director who has been convicted of a felony. And the difficulty that we have here is that it will be helpful if you could add the same language that you have in 12270, it would be great if you could	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I find that the language can usually be provided is a little bit difficult to parse here because I think what you're trying to say is that the individual can or may be able to provide information themselves, in other words, self-verify, as opposed to the information coming from a third party. But that's a little bit vague. So I'm not sure if you're indicating that feasibly they can provide it versus is it part of the reliable verification process? And while I understand the idea that a credible statement is something that a reasonable person would believe is true, are we talking about a written statement that says the person is disabled and what the nexus is? What is the credible statement that you're you're talking about here? And, again, I remained concerned about self-verification, because in my experience, many people are able to produce a piece of paper that says I am disabled and I require this particular disability (sic). But it's not something that I think the association
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	other financial implications against them. So I just want to put in there that while we we have a duty under Davis-Stirling to disclose when a special assessment may be levied, we don't want to be appearing retaliatory by publishing a disclosure statement to the members, say, hey, we've got a Fair Housing Complaint against us, but we will have a duty to at least notify our members that there may be a financial ramification to the filing of of that Complaint. So I'm concerned about that raising raising a red flag in terms of retaliation. On 12162, the specific practices related to land use. In terms of that section, it also is covered by the criminal history and background sections. I previously discussed and I put it in my written comments, too, that in California, under the Corporations Code, associations have the ability to remove a director who has been convicted of a felony. And the difficulty that we have here is that it will be helpful if you could add the same language that you have in 12270, it would be great if you could put it in 12162 that if the activity regarding criminal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I find that the language can usually be provided is a little bit difficult to parse here because I think what you're trying to say is that the individual can or may be able to provide information themselves, in other words, self-verify, as opposed to the information coming from a third party. But that's a little bit vague. So I'm not sure if you're indicating that feasibly they can provide it versus is it part of the reliable verification process? And while I understand the idea that a credible statement is something that a reasonable person would believe is true, are we talking about a written statement that says the person is disabled and what the nexus is? What is the credible statement that you're you're talking about here? And, again, I remained concerned about self-verification, because in my experience, many people are able to produce a piece of paper that says I am disabled and I require this particular disability (sic). But it's not something that I think the association would feel that it was reliable necessarily.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	other financial implications against them. So I just want to put in there that while we we have a duty under Davis-Stirling to disclose when a special assessment may be levied, we don't want to be appearing retaliatory by publishing a disclosure statement to the members, say, hey, we've got a Fair Housing Complaint against us, but we will have a duty to at least notify our members that there may be a financial ramification to the filing of of that Complaint. So I'm concerned about that raising raising a red flag in terms of retaliation. On 12162, the specific practices related to land use. In terms of that section, it also is covered by the criminal history and background sections. I previously discussed and I put it in my written comments, too, that in California, under the Corporations Code, associations have the ability to remove a director who has been convicted of a felony. And the difficulty that we have here is that it will be helpful if you could add the same language that you have in 12270, it would be great if you could	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I find that the language can usually be provided is a little bit difficult to parse here because I think what you're trying to say is that the individual can or may be able to provide information themselves, in other words, self-verify, as opposed to the information coming from a third party. But that's a little bit vague. So I'm not sure if you're indicating that feasibly they can provide it versus is it part of the reliable verification process? And while I understand the idea that a credible statement is something that a reasonable person would believe is true, are we talking about a written statement that says the person is disabled and what the nexus is? What is the credible statement that you're you're talking about here? And, again, I remained concerned about self-verification, because in my experience, many people are able to produce a piece of paper that says I am disabled and I require this particular disability (sic). But it's not something that I think the association
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	other financial implications against them. So I just want to put in there that while we we have a duty under Davis-Stirling to disclose when a special assessment may be levied, we don't want to be appearing retaliatory by publishing a disclosure statement to the members, say, hey, we've got a Fair Housing Complaint against us, but we will have a duty to at least notify our members that there may be a financial ramification to the filing of of that Complaint. So I'm concerned about that raising raising a red flag in terms of retaliation. On 12162, the specific practices related to land use. In terms of that section, it also is covered by the criminal history and background sections. I previously discussed and I put it in my written comments, too, that in California, under the Corporations Code, associations have the ability to remove a director who has been convicted of a felony. And the difficulty that we have here is that it will be helpful if you could add the same language that you have in 12270, it would be great if you could put it in 12162 that if the activity regarding criminal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I find that the language can usually be provided is a little bit difficult to parse here because I think what you're trying to say is that the individual can or may be able to provide information themselves, in other words, self-verify, as opposed to the information coming from a third party. But that's a little bit vague. So I'm not sure if you're indicating that feasibly they can provide it versus is it part of the reliable verification process? And while I understand the idea that a credible statement is something that a reasonable person would believe is true, are we talking about a written statement that says the person is disabled and what the nexus is? What is the credible statement that you're you're talking about here? And, again, I remained concerned about self-verification, because in my experience, many people are able to produce a piece of paper that says I am disabled and I require this particular disability (sic). But it's not something that I think the association would feel that it was reliable necessarily.

^{7 (}Pages 22 to 25)

1	of a stalemate.	1	are having an unrealistic expectation of the animal
2	With regard to assistance animals in 12185,	2	themselves, and many people do, or the association will
3	I am also concerned with the two questions regarding the	3	have liability when the person drowns in the
4	service animal.	4	association's common area swimming pool because the
5	To put this in a practicable context for how	5	animal is unable to accomplish that task.
6	associations would deal with these matters, frankly,	6	COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Ms. Powers, did you
7	we're really not concerned when we see the animals that	7	propose language on this in your
8	are clearly trained by Canine Companions For	8	MS. POWERS: No. But I will get on my train
9	Independence, Guide Dogs for the Blind. I mean, that's	9	and do that. Yes. I will come up with some proposed
10	a very obvious situation.	10	language.
11	But what we're encountering is a person with	11	Lastly, I I want to just comment quickly
12	an obvious disability, a readily apparent disability is	12	that I am extremely thankful that the common interest
13	proposing to have a service animal that doesn't bear any	13	development community is now going to have some really
14	resemblance to what the person with the disability is	14	fine regulations to work with. I know how much hard
15	requesting.	15	work you've put in and we're really excited about the
16	Here's an example from my desk.	16	ability to have something that we could point to board
17	A woman who had clearly was able to	17	members and managers of associations to give them some
18	provide very reliable self-verification that she was	18	guidance and I think this is a wonderful tool, and thank
19	disabled. She advised us she had diabetes; she advised	19	you all very much for your time.
20	us that she met the definition of being disabled because	20	CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Thank you.
21	she was at least 150 to 200 pounds overweight. She was	21	Further comments on the Fair Housing
22	obese. And she required an animal to accompany her not	22	regulations?
23	only to the pool area, but to possibly jump into the	23	MS. DUMAS: Good morning. My name is Diane
24		24	Dumas and I am one of those volunteer homeowners on the
25	pool at the association and save her.	25	
20	Now, the animal that she had identified as	25	board of directors in my association. So I I did
	Page 26		Page 28
	e		e
1	her service animal to accomplish this task of a woman	1	want to comment on a couple of these regulations. And
1 2	her service animal to accomplish this task of a woman who had to weigh at least 380 to -90 pounds out of a	1 2	want to comment on a couple of these regulations. And if you look at it from the perspective of the volunteer
	who had to weigh at least 380 to -90 pounds out of a		
2	who had to weigh at least 380 to -90 pounds out of a pool was a 25-pound dog.	2	if you look at it from the perspective of the volunteer
2 3	who had to weigh at least 380 to -90 pounds out of a pool was a 25-pound dog. So if we are limited to asking these two	2 3	if you look at it from the perspective of the volunteer board member trying to enforce these rules, if it comes
2 3 4	who had to weigh at least 380 to -90 pounds out of a pool was a 25-pound dog. So if we are limited to asking these two questions regarding an animal that has been identified	2 3 4	if you look at it from the perspective of the volunteer board member trying to enforce these rules, if it comes different. We have a number of people well, our homeowner association currently allows a limitation of
2 3 4 5	who had to weigh at least 380 to -90 pounds out of a pool was a 25-pound dog. So if we are limited to asking these two questions regarding an animal that has been identified as a service animal, we have absolutely no reason to	2 3 4 5	if you look at it from the perspective of the volunteer board member trying to enforce these rules, if it comes different. We have a number of people well, our
2 3 4 5 6	who had to weigh at least 380 to -90 pounds out of a pool was a 25-pound dog. So if we are limited to asking these two questions regarding an animal that has been identified as a service animal, we have absolutely no reason to believe that the 25-pound animal can accomplish that	2 3 4 5 6	if you look at it from the perspective of the volunteer board member trying to enforce these rules, if it comes different. We have a number of people well, our homeowner association currently allows a limitation of one pet per unit. We also have people applying for reasonable accommodation based on stress or PTSD.
2 3 4 5 6 7	who had to weigh at least 380 to -90 pounds out of a pool was a 25-pound dog. So if we are limited to asking these two questions regarding an animal that has been identified as a service animal, we have absolutely no reason to believe that the 25-pound animal can accomplish that task.	2 3 4 5 6 7	if you look at it from the perspective of the volunteer board member trying to enforce these rules, if it comes different. We have a number of people well, our homeowner association currently allows a limitation of one pet per unit. We also have people applying for reasonable accommodation based on stress or PTSD. The ones that require service animals, those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	who had to weigh at least 380 to -90 pounds out of a pool was a 25-pound dog. So if we are limited to asking these two questions regarding an animal that has been identified as a service animal, we have absolutely no reason to believe that the 25-pound animal can accomplish that task. So we don't want to we are not looking to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	if you look at it from the perspective of the volunteer board member trying to enforce these rules, if it comes different. We have a number of people well, our homeowner association currently allows a limitation of one pet per unit. We also have people applying for reasonable accommodation based on stress or PTSD. The ones that require service animals, those are easy, and we can approve those right away. It's the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	who had to weigh at least 380 to -90 pounds out of a pool was a 25-pound dog. So if we are limited to asking these two questions regarding an animal that has been identified as a service animal, we have absolutely no reason to believe that the 25-pound animal can accomplish that task. So we don't want to we are not looking to ask for a demonstration. We do not want a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	if you look at it from the perspective of the volunteer board member trying to enforce these rules, if it comes different. We have a number of people well, our homeowner association currently allows a limitation of one pet per unit. We also have people applying for reasonable accommodation based on stress or PTSD. The ones that require service animals, those are easy, and we can approve those right away. It's the ones where you can't quite tell how disabled they are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	who had to weigh at least 380 to -90 pounds out of a pool was a 25-pound dog. So if we are limited to asking these two questions regarding an animal that has been identified as a service animal, we have absolutely no reason to believe that the 25-pound animal can accomplish that task. So we don't want to we are not looking to ask for a demonstration. We do not want a demonstration. We are not looking for that. But	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	if you look at it from the perspective of the volunteer board member trying to enforce these rules, if it comes different. We have a number of people well, our homeowner association currently allows a limitation of one pet per unit. We also have people applying for reasonable accommodation based on stress or PTSD. The ones that require service animals, those are easy, and we can approve those right away. It's the ones where you can't quite tell how disabled they are and what exactly they need these animals to do.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	who had to weigh at least 380 to -90 pounds out of a pool was a 25-pound dog. So if we are limited to asking these two questions regarding an animal that has been identified as a service animal, we have absolutely no reason to believe that the 25-pound animal can accomplish that task. So we don't want to we are not looking to ask for a demonstration. We do not want a demonstration. We are not looking for that. But without the ability to ask a few more questions	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	if you look at it from the perspective of the volunteer board member trying to enforce these rules, if it comes different. We have a number of people well, our homeowner association currently allows a limitation of one pet per unit. We also have people applying for reasonable accommodation based on stress or PTSD. The ones that require service animals, those are easy, and we can approve those right away. It's the ones where you can't quite tell how disabled they are and what exactly they need these animals to do. And I would like a little bit more latitude
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 12	who had to weigh at least 380 to -90 pounds out of a pool was a 25-pound dog. So if we are limited to asking these two questions regarding an animal that has been identified as a service animal, we have absolutely no reason to believe that the 25-pound animal can accomplish that task. So we don't want to we are not looking to ask for a demonstration. We do not want a demonstration. We are not looking for that. But without the ability to ask a few more questions concerning the animal's ability to perform the task that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	if you look at it from the perspective of the volunteer board member trying to enforce these rules, if it comes different. We have a number of people well, our homeowner association currently allows a limitation of one pet per unit. We also have people applying for reasonable accommodation based on stress or PTSD. The ones that require service animals, those are easy, and we can approve those right away. It's the ones where you can't quite tell how disabled they are and what exactly they need these animals to do. And I would like a little bit more latitude to be able to ask questions without running afoul of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	who had to weigh at least 380 to -90 pounds out of a pool was a 25-pound dog. So if we are limited to asking these two questions regarding an animal that has been identified as a service animal, we have absolutely no reason to believe that the 25-pound animal can accomplish that task. So we don't want to we are not looking to ask for a demonstration. We do not want a demonstration. We are not looking for that. But without the ability to ask a few more questions concerning the animal's ability to perform the task that has been identified as the reason it is a service	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	if you look at it from the perspective of the volunteer board member trying to enforce these rules, if it comes different. We have a number of people well, our homeowner association currently allows a limitation of one pet per unit. We also have people applying for reasonable accommodation based on stress or PTSD. The ones that require service animals, those are easy, and we can approve those right away. It's the ones where you can't quite tell how disabled they are and what exactly they need these animals to do. And I would like a little bit more latitude to be able to ask questions without running afoul of the regulations that limit us to for example, if a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	who had to weigh at least 380 to -90 pounds out of a pool was a 25-pound dog. So if we are limited to asking these two questions regarding an animal that has been identified as a service animal, we have absolutely no reason to believe that the 25-pound animal can accomplish that task. So we don't want to we are not looking to ask for a demonstration. We do not want a demonstration. We do not want a demonstration. We are not looking for that. But without the ability to ask a few more questions concerning the animal's ability to perform the task that has been identified as the reason it is a service animal, we fear that there will be bad consequences to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	if you look at it from the perspective of the volunteer board member trying to enforce these rules, if it comes different. We have a number of people well, our homeowner association currently allows a limitation of one pet per unit. We also have people applying for reasonable accommodation based on stress or PTSD. The ones that require service animals, those are easy, and we can approve those right away. It's the ones where you can't quite tell how disabled they are and what exactly they need these animals to do. And I would like a little bit more latitude to be able to ask questions without running afoul of the regulations that limit us to for example, if a podiatrist certifies this person with a psychiatric or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	who had to weigh at least 380 to -90 pounds out of a pool was a 25-pound dog. So if we are limited to asking these two questions regarding an animal that has been identified as a service animal, we have absolutely no reason to believe that the 25-pound animal can accomplish that task. So we don't want to we are not looking to ask for a demonstration. We do not want a demonstration. We do not want a demonstration. We are not looking for that. But without the ability to ask a few more questions concerning the animal's ability to perform the task that has been identified as the reason it is a service animal, we fear that there will be bad consequences to that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	if you look at it from the perspective of the volunteer board member trying to enforce these rules, if it comes different. We have a number of people well, our homeowner association currently allows a limitation of one pet per unit. We also have people applying for reasonable accommodation based on stress or PTSD. The ones that require service animals, those are easy, and we can approve those right away. It's the ones where you can't quite tell how disabled they are and what exactly they need these animals to do. And I would like a little bit more latitude to be able to ask questions without running afoul of the regulations that limit us to for example, if a podiatrist certifies this person with a psychiatric or psychological disability. I'd like to be able to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	who had to weigh at least 380 to -90 pounds out of a pool was a 25-pound dog. So if we are limited to asking these two questions regarding an animal that has been identified as a service animal, we have absolutely no reason to believe that the 25-pound animal can accomplish that task. So we don't want to we are not looking to ask for a demonstration. We do not want a demonstration. We do not want a demonstration. We are not looking for that. But without the ability to ask a few more questions concerning the animal's ability to perform the task that has been identified as the reason it is a service animal, we fear that there will be bad consequences to that. And I don't think that we're looking for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	if you look at it from the perspective of the volunteer board member trying to enforce these rules, if it comes different. We have a number of people well, our homeowner association currently allows a limitation of one pet per unit. We also have people applying for reasonable accommodation based on stress or PTSD. The ones that require service animals, those are easy, and we can approve those right away. It's the ones where you can't quite tell how disabled they are and what exactly they need these animals to do. And I would like a little bit more latitude to be able to ask questions without running afoul of the regulations that limit us to for example, if a podiatrist certifies this person with a psychiatric or psychological disability. I'd like to be able to question them a little bit while understanding that,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 who had to weigh at least 380 to -90 pounds out of a pool was a 25-pound dog. So if we are limited to asking these two questions regarding an animal that has been identified as a service animal, we have absolutely no reason to believe that the 25-pound animal can accomplish that task. So we don't want to we are not looking to ask for a demonstration. We do not want a demonstration. We do not want a demonstration. We are not looking for that. But without the ability to ask a few more questions concerning the animal's ability to perform the task that has been identified as the reason it is a service animal, we fear that there will be bad consequences to that. And I don't think that we're looking for obvious situations. I think we just need a few more 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	if you look at it from the perspective of the volunteer board member trying to enforce these rules, if it comes different. We have a number of people well, our homeowner association currently allows a limitation of one pet per unit. We also have people applying for reasonable accommodation based on stress or PTSD. The ones that require service animals, those are easy, and we can approve those right away. It's the ones where you can't quite tell how disabled they are and what exactly they need these animals to do. And I would like a little bit more latitude to be able to ask questions without running afoul of the regulations that limit us to for example, if a podiatrist certifies this person with a psychiatric or psychological disability. I'd like to be able to question them a little bit while understanding that, yeah, they have a right to privacy.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	who had to weigh at least 380 to -90 pounds out of a pool was a 25-pound dog. So if we are limited to asking these two questions regarding an animal that has been identified as a service animal, we have absolutely no reason to believe that the 25-pound animal can accomplish that task. So we don't want to we are not looking to ask for a demonstration. We do not want a demonstration. We do not want a demonstration. We are not looking for that. But without the ability to ask a few more questions concerning the animal's ability to perform the task that has been identified as the reason it is a service animal, we fear that there will be bad consequences to that. And I don't think that we're looking for obvious situations. I think we just need a few more questions that would put this under a reasonableness	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	if you look at it from the perspective of the volunteer board member trying to enforce these rules, if it comes different. We have a number of people well, our homeowner association currently allows a limitation of one pet per unit. We also have people applying for reasonable accommodation based on stress or PTSD. The ones that require service animals, those are easy, and we can approve those right away. It's the ones where you can't quite tell how disabled they are and what exactly they need these animals to do. And I would like a little bit more latitude to be able to ask questions without running afoul of the regulations that limit us to for example, if a podiatrist certifies this person with a psychiatric or psychological disability. I'd like to be able to question them a little bit while understanding that, yeah, they have a right to privacy. But I'm particularly concerned on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	who had to weigh at least 380 to -90 pounds out of a pool was a 25-pound dog. So if we are limited to asking these two questions regarding an animal that has been identified as a service animal, we have absolutely no reason to believe that the 25-pound animal can accomplish that task. So we don't want to we are not looking to ask for a demonstration. We do not want a demonstration. We do not want a demonstration. We are not looking for that. But without the ability to ask a few more questions concerning the animal's ability to perform the task that has been identified as the reason it is a service animal, we fear that there will be bad consequences to that. And I don't think that we're looking for obvious situations. I think we just need a few more questions that would put this under a reasonableness category of if it is readily apparent that the animal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	if you look at it from the perspective of the volunteer board member trying to enforce these rules, if it comes different. We have a number of people well, our homeowner association currently allows a limitation of one pet per unit. We also have people applying for reasonable accommodation based on stress or PTSD. The ones that require service animals, those are easy, and we can approve those right away. It's the ones where you can't quite tell how disabled they are and what exactly they need these animals to do. And I would like a little bit more latitude to be able to ask questions without running afoul of the regulations that limit us to for example, if a podiatrist certifies this person with a psychiatric or psychological disability. I'd like to be able to question them a little bit while understanding that, yeah, they have a right to privacy. But I'm particularly concerned on Section 12185, the No. 4 on page 33 that says an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	who had to weigh at least 380 to -90 pounds out of a pool was a 25-pound dog. So if we are limited to asking these two questions regarding an animal that has been identified as a service animal, we have absolutely no reason to believe that the 25-pound animal can accomplish that task. So we don't want to we are not looking to ask for a demonstration. We do not want a demonstration. We do not want a demonstration. We are not looking for that. But without the ability to ask a few more questions concerning the animal's ability to perform the task that has been identified as the reason it is a service animal, we fear that there will be bad consequences to that. And I don't think that we're looking for obvious situations. I think we just need a few more questions that would put this under a reasonableness category of if it is readily apparent that the animal that's been identified with a task is not going to be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	if you look at it from the perspective of the volunteer board member trying to enforce these rules, if it comes different. We have a number of people well, our homeowner association currently allows a limitation of one pet per unit. We also have people applying for reasonable accommodation based on stress or PTSD. The ones that require service animals, those are easy, and we can approve those right away. It's the ones where you can't quite tell how disabled they are and what exactly they need these animals to do. And I would like a little bit more latitude to be able to ask questions without running afoul of the regulations that limit us to for example, if a podiatrist certifies this person with a psychiatric or psychological disability. I'd like to be able to question them a little bit while understanding that, yeah, they have a right to privacy. But I'm particularly concerned on Section 12185, the No. 4 on page 33 that says an individual may have more than one assistance animal.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	who had to weigh at least 380 to -90 pounds out of a pool was a 25-pound dog. So if we are limited to asking these two questions regarding an animal that has been identified as a service animal, we have absolutely no reason to believe that the 25-pound animal can accomplish that task. So we don't want to we are not looking to ask for a demonstration. We do not want a demonstration. We do not want a demonstration. We are not looking for that. But without the ability to ask a few more questions concerning the animal's ability to perform the task that has been identified as the reason it is a service animal, we fear that there will be bad consequences to that. And I don't think that we're looking for obvious situations. I think we just need a few more questions that would put this under a reasonableness category of if it is readily apparent that the animal that's been identified with a task is not going to be able to accomplish it, I I think there has to be a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	if you look at it from the perspective of the volunteer board member trying to enforce these rules, if it comes different. We have a number of people well, our homeowner association currently allows a limitation of one pet per unit. We also have people applying for reasonable accommodation based on stress or PTSD. The ones that require service animals, those are easy, and we can approve those right away. It's the ones where you can't quite tell how disabled they are and what exactly they need these animals to do. And I would like a little bit more latitude to be able to ask questions without running afoul of the regulations that limit us to for example, if a podiatrist certifies this person with a psychiatric or psychological disability. I'd like to be able to question them a little bit while understanding that, yeah, they have a right to privacy. But I'm particularly concerned on Section 12185, the No. 4 on page 33 that says an individual may have more than one assistance animal. And I'm looking at it from the standpoint of a number of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	who had to weigh at least 380 to -90 pounds out of a pool was a 25-pound dog. So if we are limited to asking these two questions regarding an animal that has been identified as a service animal, we have absolutely no reason to believe that the 25-pound animal can accomplish that task. So we don't want to we are not looking to ask for a demonstration. We do not want a demonstration. We do not want a demonstration. We are not looking for that. But without the ability to ask a few more questions concerning the animal's ability to perform the task that has been identified as the reason it is a service animal, we fear that there will be bad consequences to that. And I don't think that we're looking for obvious situations. I think we just need a few more questions that would put this under a reasonableness category of if it is readily apparent that the animal that's been identified with a task is not going to be able to accomplish it, I I think there has to be a an amount of common sense and an approach to this that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	if you look at it from the perspective of the volunteer board member trying to enforce these rules, if it comes different. We have a number of people well, our homeowner association currently allows a limitation of one pet per unit. We also have people applying for reasonable accommodation based on stress or PTSD. The ones that require service animals, those are easy, and we can approve those right away. It's the ones where you can't quite tell how disabled they are and what exactly they need these animals to do. And I would like a little bit more latitude to be able to ask questions without running afoul of the regulations that limit us to for example, if a podiatrist certifies this person with a psychiatric or psychological disability. I'd like to be able to question them a little bit while understanding that, yeah, they have a right to privacy. But I'm particularly concerned on Section 12185, the No. 4 on page 33 that says an individual may have more than one assistance animal. And I'm looking at it from the standpoint of a number of our homeowners. And in a one-bedroom apartment with two
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	who had to weigh at least 380 to -90 pounds out of a pool was a 25-pound dog. So if we are limited to asking these two questions regarding an animal that has been identified as a service animal, we have absolutely no reason to believe that the 25-pound animal can accomplish that task. So we don't want to we are not looking to ask for a demonstration. We do not want a demonstration. We do not want a demonstration. We are not looking for that. But without the ability to ask a few more questions concerning the animal's ability to perform the task that has been identified as the reason it is a service animal, we fear that there will be bad consequences to that. And I don't think that we're looking for obvious situations. I think we just need a few more questions that would put this under a reasonableness category of if it is readily apparent that the animal that's been identified with a task is not going to be able to accomplish it, I I think there has to be a an amount of common sense and an approach to this that is not going to put either the disabled person in a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	if you look at it from the perspective of the volunteer board member trying to enforce these rules, if it comes different. We have a number of people well, our homeowner association currently allows a limitation of one pet per unit. We also have people applying for reasonable accommodation based on stress or PTSD. The ones that require service animals, those are easy, and we can approve those right away. It's the ones where you can't quite tell how disabled they are and what exactly they need these animals to do. And I would like a little bit more latitude to be able to ask questions without running afoul of the regulations that limit us to for example, if a podiatrist certifies this person with a psychiatric or psychological disability. I'd like to be able to question them a little bit while understanding that, yeah, they have a right to privacy. But I'm particularly concerned on Section 12185, the No. 4 on page 33 that says an individual may have more than one assistance animal. And I'm looking at it from the standpoint of a number of our homeowners. And in a one-bedroom apartment with two people occupying the one bedroom, they're looking at it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	who had to weigh at least 380 to -90 pounds out of a pool was a 25-pound dog. So if we are limited to asking these two questions regarding an animal that has been identified as a service animal, we have absolutely no reason to believe that the 25-pound animal can accomplish that task. So we don't want to we are not looking to ask for a demonstration. We do not want a demonstration. We do not want a demonstration. We are not looking for that. But without the ability to ask a few more questions concerning the animal's ability to perform the task that has been identified as the reason it is a service animal, we fear that there will be bad consequences to that. And I don't think that we're looking for obvious situations. I think we just need a few more questions that would put this under a reasonableness category of if it is readily apparent that the animal that's been identified with a task is not going to be able to accomplish it, I I think there has to be a an amount of common sense and an approach to this that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	if you look at it from the perspective of the volunteer board member trying to enforce these rules, if it comes different. We have a number of people well, our homeowner association currently allows a limitation of one pet per unit. We also have people applying for reasonable accommodation based on stress or PTSD. The ones that require service animals, those are easy, and we can approve those right away. It's the ones where you can't quite tell how disabled they are and what exactly they need these animals to do. And I would like a little bit more latitude to be able to ask questions without running afoul of the regulations that limit us to for example, if a podiatrist certifies this person with a psychiatric or psychological disability. I'd like to be able to question them a little bit while understanding that, yeah, they have a right to privacy. But I'm particularly concerned on Section 12185, the No. 4 on page 33 that says an individual may have more than one assistance animal. And I'm looking at it from the standpoint of a number of our homeowners. And in a one-bedroom apartment with two

8 (Pages 26 to 29)

1	animals and plus the pet that's allowed. That means	¹ is this person actually treating? I mean, is the doctor
2	five animals could be five dogs can be in a	2 actually treating this patient who is asking for an
3	one-bedroom unit.	³ accommodation or was this a one-time thing just to go in
4	So you have to kind of look at it from the	⁴ and get my pet Dachshund.
5	standpoint, oh, boy, what can we get away with?	⁵ I have written my comments and submitted
б	And we're trying to be fair, but some of	⁶ them, but I do hope that while it's not as professional
7	these people are really pushing it. We want we want	⁷ as Ms. Powers or some of the others, that from a
8	to allow people to have their accommodations, but then	⁸ homeowner standpoint and volunteer, we take these
9	there are the people who just push the limits.	⁹ seriously and we're trying to do the right thing.
10	So that's what I'm really troubled by that	¹⁰ Thank you.
11	more more than one assistance animal.	11 COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Ms. Dumas. Thank you
12	I'm also curious. I don't understand why	¹² very much for your service both to the homeowner
13	there's the additional I guess, in Section 12005, the	¹³ association and to take the time to come talk to us.
14	additional term of assistance animal, because it's	¹⁴ I want to clarify one thing for you. The
15	already been enough to try to have people think in terms	¹⁵ reason we use the term "assistant animal" is that there
16	of a service versus a support animal. But now that	¹⁶ are some things that apply to both service animals and
17	we've got this additional term of assistance animal,	¹⁷ support animals such as the fact that the homeowner's
18	it's it's confusing.	¹⁸ association and the owner can set reasonable rules.
19	On the one hand, it seems as though it if	¹⁹ Think of it as a Lab dog, they can't create
20	you're lumping everything for the sake of complying with	²⁰ a disturbance, they have to be well trained, they can't
21	the rules, I can understand you'd rather not say	²¹ create problems in the complex.
22	"support" and "service" and it's easier to say	²² But there are other provisions where we
23	"assistance," that's the reason. I don't know.	²³ still do retain the differences in terms of the amount
24	But on the other hand, it kind of seems like	²⁴ of verification.
25	it bundles the people with the greatest need with the	²⁵ So for emotional support animals, you can
	Page 30	Page 32
1		
1	people with the least need all in the one lump-sum	¹ get additional information. So I just want to make sure
2	column, assistance animal. And really would like to go	² you understood that there are some things that apply to
2 3	column, assistance animal. And really would like to go back to having the two terms so that we can pass these	 you understood that there are some things that apply to both kinds of dogs and other things that are separate
2 3 4	column, assistance animal. And really would like to go back to having the two terms so that we can pass these terms down because they will they will try to push	 you understood that there are some things that apply to both kinds of dogs and other things that are separate for animals. And that's why we use three different
2 3 4 5	column, assistance animal. And really would like to go back to having the two terms so that we can pass these terms down because they will they will try to push it.	 you understood that there are some things that apply to both kinds of dogs and other things that are separate for animals. And that's why we use three different terms. Assistance animals for the rules that homeowners
2 3 4 5 6	column, assistance animal. And really would like to go back to having the two terms so that we can pass these terms down because they will they will try to push it. Let's see. What else?	 2 you understood that there are some things that apply to 3 both kinds of dogs and other things that are separate 4 for animals. And that's why we use three different 5 terms. Assistance animals for the rules that homeowners 6 can set for all the animals and then different rules
2 3 4 5 6 7	column, assistance animal. And really would like to go back to having the two terms so that we can pass these terms down because they will they will try to push it. Let's see. What else? Again, in Section 12179, it provides the	 2 you understood that there are some things that apply to 3 both kinds of dogs and other things that are separate 4 for animals. And that's why we use three different 5 terms. Assistance animals for the rules that homeowners 6 can set for all the animals and then different rules 7 that apply to service animals because of the various
2 3 5 6 7 8	column, assistance animal. And really would like to go back to having the two terms so that we can pass these terms down because they will they will try to push it. Let's see. What else? Again, in Section 12179, it provides the reason for denial of reasonable accommodation. There's	 2 you understood that there are some things that apply to 3 both kinds of dogs and other things that are separate 4 for animals. And that's why we use three different 5 terms. Assistance animals for the rules that homeowners 6 can set for all the animals and then different rules 7 that apply to service animals because of the various 8 laws and support animals. I just thought that would be
2 3 5 6 7 8 9	column, assistance animal. And really would like to go back to having the two terms so that we can pass these terms down because they will they will try to push it. Let's see. What else? Again, in Section 12179, it provides the reason for denial of reasonable accommodation. There's no disability-related need for the requested	 you understood that there are some things that apply to both kinds of dogs and other things that are separate for animals. And that's why we use three different terms. Assistance animals for the rules that homeowners can set for all the animals and then different rules that apply to service animals because of the various laws and support animals. I just thought that would be helpful for you to know that.
2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10	column, assistance animal. And really would like to go back to having the two terms so that we can pass these terms down because they will they will try to push it. Let's see. What else? Again, in Section 12179, it provides the reason for denial of reasonable accommodation. There's no disability-related need for the requested accommodation.	 you understood that there are some things that apply to both kinds of dogs and other things that are separate for animals. And that's why we use three different terms. Assistance animals for the rules that homeowners can set for all the animals and then different rules that apply to service animals because of the various laws and support animals. I just thought that would be helpful for you to know that. THE WITNESS: So you're keeping three,
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	column, assistance animal. And really would like to go back to having the two terms so that we can pass these terms down because they will they will try to push it. Let's see. What else? Again, in Section 12179, it provides the reason for denial of reasonable accommodation. There's no disability-related need for the requested accommodation. Is one visit to a health practitioner	 you understood that there are some things that apply to both kinds of dogs and other things that are separate for animals. And that's why we use three different terms. Assistance animals for the rules that homeowners can set for all the animals and then different rules that apply to service animals because of the various laws and support animals. I just thought that would be helpful for you to know that. THE WITNESS: So you're keeping three, you're not having that one replace the other two?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	column, assistance animal. And really would like to go back to having the two terms so that we can pass these terms down because they will they will try to push it. Let's see. What else? Again, in Section 12179, it provides the reason for denial of reasonable accommodation. There's no disability-related need for the requested accommodation. Is one visit to a health practitioner sufficient to warrant a professional diagnosis of	 you understood that there are some things that apply to both kinds of dogs and other things that are separate for animals. And that's why we use three different terms. Assistance animals for the rules that homeowners can set for all the animals and then different rules that apply to service animals because of the various laws and support animals. I just thought that would be helpful for you to know that. THE WITNESS: So you're keeping three, you're not having that one replace the other two? COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Correct. The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	column, assistance animal. And really would like to go back to having the two terms so that we can pass these terms down because they will they will try to push it. Let's see. What else? Again, in Section 12179, it provides the reason for denial of reasonable accommodation. There's no disability-related need for the requested accommodation. Is one visit to a health practitioner sufficient to warrant a professional diagnosis of disability for the purposes of getting a reasonable	 you understood that there are some things that apply to both kinds of dogs and other things that are separate for animals. And that's why we use three different terms. Assistance animals for the rules that homeowners can set for all the animals and then different rules that apply to service animals because of the various laws and support animals. I just thought that would be helpful for you to know that. THE WITNESS: So you're keeping three, you're not having that one replace the other two? COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Correct. The regulations distinguish the different points.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	column, assistance animal. And really would like to go back to having the two terms so that we can pass these terms down because they will they will try to push it. Let's see. What else? Again, in Section 12179, it provides the reason for denial of reasonable accommodation. There's no disability-related need for the requested accommodation. Is one visit to a health practitioner sufficient to warrant a professional diagnosis of disability for the purposes of getting a reasonable accommodation for a stress condition? And the reason	 you understood that there are some things that apply to both kinds of dogs and other things that are separate for animals. And that's why we use three different terms. Assistance animals for the rules that homeowners can set for all the animals and then different rules that apply to service animals because of the various laws and support animals. I just thought that would be helpful for you to know that. THE WITNESS: So you're keeping three, you're not having that one replace the other two? COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Correct. The regulations distinguish the different points. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. Thanks for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	column, assistance animal. And really would like to go back to having the two terms so that we can pass these terms down because they will they will try to push it. Let's see. What else? Again, in Section 12179, it provides the reason for denial of reasonable accommodation. There's no disability-related need for the requested accommodation. Is one visit to a health practitioner sufficient to warrant a professional diagnosis of disability for the purposes of getting a reasonable accommodation for a stress condition? And the reason why I ask that is because they are going online and	 you understood that there are some things that apply to both kinds of dogs and other things that are separate for animals. And that's why we use three different terms. Assistance animals for the rules that homeowners can set for all the animals and then different rules that apply to service animals because of the various laws and support animals. I just thought that would be helpful for you to know that. THE WITNESS: So you're keeping three, you're not having that one replace the other two? COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Correct. The regulations distinguish the different points. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. Thanks for your work, too.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	column, assistance animal. And really would like to go back to having the two terms so that we can pass these terms down because they will they will try to push it. Let's see. What else? Again, in Section 12179, it provides the reason for denial of reasonable accommodation. There's no disability-related need for the requested accommodation. Is one visit to a health practitioner sufficient to warrant a professional diagnosis of disability for the purposes of getting a reasonable accommodation for a stress condition? And the reason why I ask that is because they are going online and getting these things online. There is an additional	2you understood that there are some things that apply to3both kinds of dogs and other things that are separate4for animals. And that's why we use three different5terms. Assistance animals for the rules that homeowners6can set for all the animals and then different rules7that apply to service animals because of the various8laws and support animals. I just thought that would be9helpful for you to know that.10THE WITNESS: So you're keeping three,11you're not having that one replace the other two?12COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Correct. The13regulations distinguish the different points.14THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. Thanks for15your work, too.16CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Other Fair Housing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	column, assistance animal. And really would like to go back to having the two terms so that we can pass these terms down because they will they will try to push it. Let's see. What else? Again, in Section 12179, it provides the reason for denial of reasonable accommodation. There's no disability-related need for the requested accommodation. Is one visit to a health practitioner sufficient to warrant a professional diagnosis of disability for the purposes of getting a reasonable accommodation for a stress condition? And the reason why I ask that is because they are going online and getting these things online. There is an additional fee, I guess you pay to have an actual letter from a	 you understood that there are some things that apply to both kinds of dogs and other things that are separate for animals. And that's why we use three different terms. Assistance animals for the rules that homeowners can set for all the animals and then different rules that apply to service animals because of the various laws and support animals. I just thought that would be helpful for you to know that. THE WITNESS: So you're keeping three, you're not having that one replace the other two? COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Correct. The regulations distinguish the different points. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. Thanks for your work, too. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Other Fair Housing regulation comments?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	column, assistance animal. And really would like to go back to having the two terms so that we can pass these terms down because they will they will try to push it. Let's see. What else? Again, in Section 12179, it provides the reason for denial of reasonable accommodation. There's no disability-related need for the requested accommodation. Is one visit to a health practitioner sufficient to warrant a professional diagnosis of disability for the purposes of getting a reasonable accommodation for a stress condition? And the reason why I ask that is because they are going online and getting these things online. There is an additional fee, I guess you pay to have an actual letter from a psychologist or somebody on this online program that	2you understood that there are some things that apply to3both kinds of dogs and other things that are separate4for animals. And that's why we use three different5terms. Assistance animals for the rules that homeowners6can set for all the animals and then different rules7that apply to service animals because of the various8laws and support animals. I just thought that would be9helpful for you to know that.10THE WITNESS: So you're keeping three,11you're not having that one replace the other two?12COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Correct. The13regulations distinguish the different points.14THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. Thanks for15your work, too.16CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Other Fair Housing17regulation comments?18MS. PANCHALAM: Good morning, how are you?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	column, assistance animal. And really would like to go back to having the two terms so that we can pass these terms down because they will they will try to push it. Let's see. What else? Again, in Section 12179, it provides the reason for denial of reasonable accommodation. There's no disability-related need for the requested accommodation. Is one visit to a health practitioner sufficient to warrant a professional diagnosis of disability for the purposes of getting a reasonable accommodation for a stress condition? And the reason why I ask that is because they are going online and getting these things online. There is an additional fee, I guess you pay to have an actual letter from a psychologist or somebody on this online program that they may I don't know if they do or not talk to	2you understood that there are some things that apply to3both kinds of dogs and other things that are separate4for animals. And that's why we use three different5terms. Assistance animals for the rules that homeowners6can set for all the animals and then different rules7that apply to service animals because of the various8laws and support animals. I just thought that would be9helpful for you to know that.10THE WITNESS: So you're keeping three,11you're not having that one replace the other two?12COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Correct. The13regulations distinguish the different points.14THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. Thanks for15your work, too.16CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Other Fair Housing17regulation comments?18MS. PANCHALAM: Good morning, how are you?19My name is Sri and I will totally spell that for you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	column, assistance animal. And really would like to go back to having the two terms so that we can pass these terms down because they will they will try to push it. Let's see. What else? Again, in Section 12179, it provides the reason for denial of reasonable accommodation. There's no disability-related need for the requested accommodation. Is one visit to a health practitioner sufficient to warrant a professional diagnosis of disability for the purposes of getting a reasonable accommodation for a stress condition? And the reason why I ask that is because they are going online and getting these things online. There is an additional fee, I guess you pay to have an actual letter from a psychologist or somebody on this online program that they may I don't know if they do or not talk to that person one time just to get a certification so they	2you understood that there are some things that apply to3both kinds of dogs and other things that are separate4for animals. And that's why we use three different5terms. Assistance animals for the rules that homeowners6can set for all the animals and then different rules7that apply to service animals because of the various8laws and support animals. I just thought that would be9helpful for you to know that.10THE WITNESS: So you're keeping three,11you're not having that one replace the other two?12COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Correct. The13regulations distinguish the different points.14THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. Thanks for15your work, too.16CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Other Fair Housing17regulation comments?18MS. PANCHALAM: Good morning, how are you?19My name is Sri and I will totally spell that for you.20First name Sri, S-r-i. Last name Panchalam, P-a-n as in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	column, assistance animal. And really would like to go back to having the two terms so that we can pass these terms down because they will they will try to push it. Let's see. What else? Again, in Section 12179, it provides the reason for denial of reasonable accommodation. There's no disability-related need for the requested accommodation. Is one visit to a health practitioner sufficient to warrant a professional diagnosis of disability for the purposes of getting a reasonable accommodation for a stress condition? And the reason why I ask that is because they are going online and getting these things online. There is an additional fee, I guess you pay to have an actual letter from a psychologist or somebody on this online program that they may I don't know if they do or not talk to that person one time just to get a certification so they can have their two large Poodles or St. Bernards and	 you understood that there are some things that apply to both kinds of dogs and other things that are separate for animals. And that's why we use three different terms. Assistance animals for the rules that homeowners can set for all the animals and then different rules that apply to service animals because of the various laws and support animals. I just thought that would be helpful for you to know that. THE WITNESS: So you're keeping three, you're not having that one replace the other two? COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Correct. The regulations distinguish the different points. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. Thanks for your work, too. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Other Fair Housing regulation comments? MS. PANCHALAM: Good morning, how are you? My name is Sri and I will totally spell that for you. First name Sri, S-r-i. Last name Panchalam, P-a-n as in pan, c-h-a as in cha-cha, and I-a-m, as in lamb without
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	column, assistance animal. And really would like to go back to having the two terms so that we can pass these terms down because they will they will try to push it. Let's see. What else? Again, in Section 12179, it provides the reason for denial of reasonable accommodation. There's no disability-related need for the requested accommodation. Is one visit to a health practitioner sufficient to warrant a professional diagnosis of disability for the purposes of getting a reasonable accommodation for a stress condition? And the reason why I ask that is because they are going online and getting these things online. There is an additional fee, I guess you pay to have an actual letter from a psychologist or somebody on this online program that they may I don't know if they do or not talk to that person one time just to get a certification so they can have their two large Poodles or St. Bernards and whatever it is that exceeds our 30-pound limit on	 you understood that there are some things that apply to both kinds of dogs and other things that are separate for animals. And that's why we use three different terms. Assistance animals for the rules that homeowners can set for all the animals and then different rules that apply to service animals because of the various laws and support animals. I just thought that would be helpful for you to know that. THE WITNESS: So you're keeping three, you're not having that one replace the other two? COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Correct. The regulations distinguish the different points. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. Thanks for your work, too. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Other Fair Housing regulation comments? MS. PANCHALAM: Good morning, how are you? My name is Sri and I will totally spell that for you. First name Sri, S-r-i. Last name Panchalam, P-a-n as in pan, c-h-a as in cha-cha, and I-a-m, as in lamb without a B.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	column, assistance animal. And really would like to go back to having the two terms so that we can pass these terms down because they will they will try to push it. Let's see. What else? Again, in Section 12179, it provides the reason for denial of reasonable accommodation. There's no disability-related need for the requested accommodation. Is one visit to a health practitioner sufficient to warrant a professional diagnosis of disability for the purposes of getting a reasonable accommodation for a stress condition? And the reason why I ask that is because they are going online and getting these things online. There is an additional fee, I guess you pay to have an actual letter from a psychologist or somebody on this online program that they may I don't know if they do or not talk to that person one time just to get a certification so they can have their two large Poodles or St. Bernards and whatever it is that exceeds our 30-pound limit on animals.	 you understood that there are some things that apply to both kinds of dogs and other things that are separate for animals. And that's why we use three different terms. Assistance animals for the rules that homeowners can set for all the animals and then different rules that apply to service animals because of the various laws and support animals. I just thought that would be helpful for you to know that. THE WITNESS: So you're keeping three, you're not having that one replace the other two? COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Correct. The regulations distinguish the different points. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. Thanks for your work, too. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Other Fair Housing regulation comments? MS. PANCHALAM: Good morning, how are you? My name is Sri and I will totally spell that for you. First name Sri, S-r-i. Last name Panchalam, P-a-n as in pan, c-h-a as in cha-cha, and I-a-m, as in lamb without a B.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	column, assistance animal. And really would like to go back to having the two terms so that we can pass these terms down because they will they will try to push it. Let's see. What else? Again, in Section 12179, it provides the reason for denial of reasonable accommodation. There's no disability-related need for the requested accommodation. Is one visit to a health practitioner sufficient to warrant a professional diagnosis of disability for the purposes of getting a reasonable accommodation for a stress condition? And the reason why I ask that is because they are going online and getting these things online. There is an additional fee, I guess you pay to have an actual letter from a psychologist or somebody on this online program that they may I don't know if they do or not talk to that person one time just to get a certification so they can have their two large Poodles or St. Bernards and whatever it is that exceeds our 30-pound limit on animals. So I guess what I'm saying is if there could	 you understood that there are some things that apply to both kinds of dogs and other things that are separate for animals. And that's why we use three different terms. Assistance animals for the rules that homeowners can set for all the animals and then different rules that apply to service animals because of the various laws and support animals. I just thought that would be helpful for you to know that. THE WITNESS: So you're keeping three, you're not having that one replace the other two? COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Correct. The regulations distinguish the different points. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. Thanks for your work, too. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Other Fair Housing regulation comments? MS. PANCHALAM: Good morning, how are you? My name is Sri and I will totally spell that for you. First name Sri, S-r-i. Last name Panchalam, P-a-n as in pan, c-h-a as in cha-cha, and I-a-m, as in lamb without a B. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: As you can imagine, with the last name Mandelbaum I've come up with similar
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	column, assistance animal. And really would like to go back to having the two terms so that we can pass these terms down because they will they will try to push it. Let's see. What else? Again, in Section 12179, it provides the reason for denial of reasonable accommodation. There's no disability-related need for the requested accommodation. Is one visit to a health practitioner sufficient to warrant a professional diagnosis of disability for the purposes of getting a reasonable accommodation for a stress condition? And the reason why I ask that is because they are going online and getting these things online. There is an additional fee, I guess you pay to have an actual letter from a psychologist or somebody on this online program that they may I don't know if they do or not talk to that person one time just to get a certification so they can have their two large Poodles or St. Bernards and whatever it is that exceeds our 30-pound limit on animals.	 you understood that there are some things that apply to both kinds of dogs and other things that are separate for animals. And that's why we use three different terms. Assistance animals for the rules that homeowners can set for all the animals and then different rules that apply to service animals because of the various laws and support animals. I just thought that would be helpful for you to know that. THE WITNESS: So you're keeping three, you're not having that one replace the other two? COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Correct. The regulations distinguish the different points. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. Thanks for your work, too. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Other Fair Housing regulation comments? MS. PANCHALAM: Good morning, how are you? My name is Sri and I will totally spell that for you. First name Sri, S-r-i. Last name Panchalam, P-a-n as in pan, c-h-a as in cha-cha, and I-a-m, as in lamb without a B.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	column, assistance animal. And really would like to go back to having the two terms so that we can pass these terms down because they will they will try to push it. Let's see. What else? Again, in Section 12179, it provides the reason for denial of reasonable accommodation. There's no disability-related need for the requested accommodation. Is one visit to a health practitioner sufficient to warrant a professional diagnosis of disability for the purposes of getting a reasonable accommodation for a stress condition? And the reason why I ask that is because they are going online and getting these things online. There is an additional fee, I guess you pay to have an actual letter from a psychologist or somebody on this online program that they may I don't know if they do or not talk to that person one time just to get a certification so they can have their two large Poodles or St. Bernards and whatever it is that exceeds our 30-pound limit on animals. So I guess what I'm saying is if there could	 you understood that there are some things that apply to both kinds of dogs and other things that are separate for animals. And that's why we use three different terms. Assistance animals for the rules that homeowners can set for all the animals and then different rules that apply to service animals because of the various laws and support animals. I just thought that would be helpful for you to know that. THE WITNESS: So you're keeping three, you're not having that one replace the other two? COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Correct. The regulations distinguish the different points. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. Thanks for your work, too. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Other Fair Housing regulation comments? MS. PANCHALAM: Good morning, how are you? My name is Sri and I will totally spell that for you. First name Sri, S-r-i. Last name Panchalam, P-a-n as in pan, c-h-a as in cha-cha, and I-a-m, as in lamb without a B. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: As you can imagine, with the last name Mandelbaum I've come up with similar

9 (Pages 30 to 33)

1	MS. PANCHALAM: And I always introduce	1	entirely is entirely consistent with that.
2	myself as Sri. So good morning.	2	And with some of the concerns that housing
3	So my comments focus, as many have today, on	3	providers have presented today, I just wanted to point
4	the assistance animal provisions of the Council proposed	4	out that there are already distinct provisions in the
5	regulation. And I just wanted to start out by saying	5	law that requires for a number of limitations, you know,
6	thank you. I know that this has been such a long	6	on animals that already protect some of the concerns
7	process and you have processed so many comments thus far	7	that have been presented, such as that you have to have
8	from the entire community on many sides of the aisle and	8	control over the animal, that you have to be able to
9	via legal services providers and as individual residents	9	take care of the animal and related items like that.
10	of California, we really appreciate the work and thought	10	And then there was also a comment about
11	that has gone into it to create the regulation in the	11	service animals being a greater need than an emotional
12	forms that they are today.	12	support animal. And I wanted to highlight for that
13	Regarding assistance animals, we appreciate	13	that, you know, in our experience, an emotional support
14	very much the Council's recognition of a person's unique	14	animal can be just as valuable as how people or service
15	right in housing to use the service animal. This is	15	animals would be. And for us, there are many clients,
16	greatly needed especially because of a lot of the	16	for example, they cannot even leave their homes or
17	confusion with housing providers and tenants alike that	17	access the community without the support that an
18	we've experienced in the course of some of which we	18	emotional support animal provides, which can be
19	actually heard today.	19	incredibly meaningful.
20	And we feel that the Council's regulations	20	And I also want to address some issues
21	are reasonable and entirely consistent with federal and	21	related we understand, for example, the Council's
22	state law in allowing service animals by right and	22	been asked to address in these regulations issues
23	emotional support animals as a reasonable accommodation.	23	related to fraud and, you know, online verification
24	And I believe there was a comment earlier	24	processes and things like that.
25	about it being an incorrect extension of the law to	25	And that we adjust as we have in our
	-		·
	Page 34		Page 36
1	include the two inquiry analysis, and this is something	1	comments the requirement for the person verifying the
2	that we addressed in our comment and I just wanted to	2	need for a support animal, track the options already
2 3	that we addressed in our comment and I just wanted to highlight this here.	2 3	need for a support animal, track the options already outlined in 12178. And and we appreciate the
2 3 4	that we addressed in our comment and I just wanted to highlight this here. As the Council's aware, the service animals	2 3 4	need for a support animal, track the options already outlined in 12178. And and we appreciate the provision require that whoever is conducting an
2 3 4 5	that we addressed in our comment and I just wanted to highlight this here. As the Council's aware, the service animals are permitted as a right in all businesses, including	2 3 4 5	need for a support animal, track the options already outlined in 12178. And and we appreciate the provision require that whoever is conducting an assessment of the person have a personal knowledge of
2 3 4 5 6	that we addressed in our comment and I just wanted to highlight this here. As the Council's aware, the service animals are permitted as a right in all businesses, including housing, such as rental properties, and do not require	2 3 4 5 6	need for a support animal, track the options already outlined in 12178. And and we appreciate the provision require that whoever is conducting an assessment of the person have a personal knowledge of the person's disability and for questions and if
2 3 4 5 6 7	that we addressed in our comment and I just wanted to highlight this here. As the Council's aware, the service animals are permitted as a right in all businesses, including housing, such as rental properties, and do not require going through the reasonable accommodations process.	2 3 4 5 6 7	need for a support animal, track the options already outlined in 12178. And and we appreciate the provision require that whoever is conducting an assessment of the person have a personal knowledge of the person's disability and for questions and if there is additional information that is required, it is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	that we addressed in our comment and I just wanted to highlight this here. As the Council's aware, the service animals are permitted as a right in all businesses, including housing, such as rental properties, and do not require going through the reasonable accommodations process. And to highlight the Unruh Act, also prohibits the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	need for a support animal, track the options already outlined in 12178. And and we appreciate the provision require that whoever is conducting an assessment of the person have a personal knowledge of the person's disability and for questions and if there is additional information that is required, it is in the circumstance that the person doesn't have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that we addressed in our comment and I just wanted to highlight this here. As the Council's aware, the service animals are permitted as a right in all businesses, including housing, such as rental properties, and do not require going through the reasonable accommodations process. And to highlight the Unruh Act, also prohibits the restriction or denial of a tenant and their guest access	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	need for a support animal, track the options already outlined in 12178. And and we appreciate the provision require that whoever is conducting an assessment of the person have a personal knowledge of the person's disability and for questions and if there is additional information that is required, it is in the circumstance that the person doesn't have personal knowledge of the disability and that the person
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	that we addressed in our comment and I just wanted to highlight this here. As the Council's aware, the service animals are permitted as a right in all businesses, including housing, such as rental properties, and do not require going through the reasonable accommodations process. And to highlight the Unruh Act, also prohibits the restriction or denial of a tenant and their guest access to facilities and services in an apartment complex.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	need for a support animal, track the options already outlined in 12178. And and we appreciate the provision require that whoever is conducting an assessment of the person have a personal knowledge of the person's disability and for questions and if there is additional information that is required, it is in the circumstance that the person doesn't have personal knowledge of the disability and that the person with the disability is allowed the opportunity to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	that we addressed in our comment and I just wanted to highlight this here. As the Council's aware, the service animals are permitted as a right in all businesses, including housing, such as rental properties, and do not require going through the reasonable accommodations process. And to highlight the Unruh Act, also prohibits the restriction or denial of a tenant and their guest access to facilities and services in an apartment complex. And so for the purposes of the analysis, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	need for a support animal, track the options already outlined in 12178. And and we appreciate the provision require that whoever is conducting an assessment of the person have a personal knowledge of the person's disability and for questions and if there is additional information that is required, it is in the circumstance that the person doesn't have personal knowledge of the disability and that the person with the disability is allowed the opportunity to provide additional information in that circumstance.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	that we addressed in our comment and I just wanted to highlight this here. As the Council's aware, the service animals are permitted as a right in all businesses, including housing, such as rental properties, and do not require going through the reasonable accommodations process. And to highlight the Unruh Act, also prohibits the restriction or denial of a tenant and their guest access to facilities and services in an apartment complex. And so for the purposes of the analysis, the two-question analysis is entirely appropriate here for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	need for a support animal, track the options already outlined in 12178. And and we appreciate the provision require that whoever is conducting an assessment of the person have a personal knowledge of the person's disability and for questions and if there is additional information that is required, it is in the circumstance that the person doesn't have personal knowledge of the disability and that the person with the disability is allowed the opportunity to provide additional information in that circumstance. Those kinds of things I think do protect and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that we addressed in our comment and I just wanted to highlight this here. As the Council's aware, the service animals are permitted as a right in all businesses, including housing, such as rental properties, and do not require going through the reasonable accommodations process. And to highlight the Unruh Act, also prohibits the restriction or denial of a tenant and their guest access to facilities and services in an apartment complex. And so for the purposes of the analysis, the two-question analysis is entirely appropriate here for the service animals and the reasonable accommodation	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	need for a support animal, track the options already outlined in 12178. And and we appreciate the provision require that whoever is conducting an assessment of the person have a personal knowledge of the person's disability and for questions and if there is additional information that is required, it is in the circumstance that the person doesn't have personal knowledge of the disability and that the person with the disability is allowed the opportunity to provide additional information in that circumstance. Those kinds of things I think do protect and are consistent with federal and state law in how the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	that we addressed in our comment and I just wanted to highlight this here. As the Council's aware, the service animals are permitted as a right in all businesses, including housing, such as rental properties, and do not require going through the reasonable accommodations process. And to highlight the Unruh Act, also prohibits the restriction or denial of a tenant and their guest access to facilities and services in an apartment complex. And so for the purposes of the analysis, the two-question analysis is entirely appropriate here for the service animals and the reasonable accommodation analysis for what we think of as emotional support	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	need for a support animal, track the options already outlined in 12178. And and we appreciate the provision require that whoever is conducting an assessment of the person have a personal knowledge of the person's disability and for questions and if there is additional information that is required, it is in the circumstance that the person doesn't have personal knowledge of the disability and that the person with the disability is allowed the opportunity to provide additional information in that circumstance. Those kinds of things I think do protect and are consistent with federal and state law in how the Council can shape these regulations in making sure that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	that we addressed in our comment and I just wanted to highlight this here. As the Council's aware, the service animals are permitted as a right in all businesses, including housing, such as rental properties, and do not require going through the reasonable accommodations process. And to highlight the Unruh Act, also prohibits the restriction or denial of a tenant and their guest access to facilities and services in an apartment complex. And so for the purposes of the analysis, the two-question analysis is entirely appropriate here for the service animals and the reasonable accommodation analysis for what we think of as emotional support animals.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	need for a support animal, track the options already outlined in 12178. And and we appreciate the provision require that whoever is conducting an assessment of the person have a personal knowledge of the person's disability and for questions and if there is additional information that is required, it is in the circumstance that the person doesn't have personal knowledge of the disability and that the person with the disability is allowed the opportunity to provide additional information in that circumstance. Those kinds of things I think do protect and are consistent with federal and state law in how the Council can shape these regulations in making sure that people with disabilities have access but are not faced
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that we addressed in our comment and I just wanted to highlight this here. As the Council's aware, the service animals are permitted as a right in all businesses, including housing, such as rental properties, and do not require going through the reasonable accommodations process. And to highlight the Unruh Act, also prohibits the restriction or denial of a tenant and their guest access to facilities and services in an apartment complex. And so for the purposes of the analysis, the two-question analysis is entirely appropriate here for the service animals and the reasonable accommodation analysis for what we think of as emotional support animals. And also to point out that the two	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	need for a support animal, track the options already outlined in 12178. And and we appreciate the provision require that whoever is conducting an assessment of the person have a personal knowledge of the person's disability and for questions and if there is additional information that is required, it is in the circumstance that the person doesn't have personal knowledge of the disability and that the person with the disability is allowed the opportunity to provide additional information in that circumstance. Those kinds of things I think do protect and are consistent with federal and state law in how the Council can shape these regulations in making sure that people with disabilities have access but are not faced with unreasonable barriers in trying to be able to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	that we addressed in our comment and I just wanted to highlight this here. As the Council's aware, the service animals are permitted as a right in all businesses, including housing, such as rental properties, and do not require going through the reasonable accommodations process. And to highlight the Unruh Act, also prohibits the restriction or denial of a tenant and their guest access to facilities and services in an apartment complex. And so for the purposes of the analysis, the two-question analysis is entirely appropriate here for the service animals and the reasonable accommodation analysis for what we think of as emotional support animals. And also to point out that the two inquiry the two-question analysis for service animals	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	need for a support animal, track the options already outlined in 12178. And and we appreciate the provision require that whoever is conducting an assessment of the person have a personal knowledge of the person's disability and for questions and if there is additional information that is required, it is in the circumstance that the person doesn't have personal knowledge of the disability and that the person with the disability is allowed the opportunity to provide additional information in that circumstance. Those kinds of things I think do protect and are consistent with federal and state law in how the Council can shape these regulations in making sure that people with disabilities have access but are not faced with unreasonable barriers in trying to be able to be supported in the community and in their housing.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that we addressed in our comment and I just wanted to highlight this here. As the Council's aware, the service animals are permitted as a right in all businesses, including housing, such as rental properties, and do not require going through the reasonable accommodations process. And to highlight the Unruh Act, also prohibits the restriction or denial of a tenant and their guest access to facilities and services in an apartment complex. And so for the purposes of the analysis, the two-question analysis is entirely appropriate here for the service animals and the reasonable accommodation analysis for what we think of as emotional support animals. And also to point out that the two inquiry the two-question analysis for service animals is consistent with Unruh issue, the FEH issue and the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	need for a support animal, track the options already outlined in 12178. And and we appreciate the provision require that whoever is conducting an assessment of the person have a personal knowledge of the person's disability and for questions and if there is additional information that is required, it is in the circumstance that the person doesn't have personal knowledge of the disability and that the person with the disability is allowed the opportunity to provide additional information in that circumstance. Those kinds of things I think do protect and are consistent with federal and state law in how the Council can shape these regulations in making sure that people with disabilities have access but are not faced with unreasonable barriers in trying to be able to be supported in the community and in their housing. That's all I have.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	that we addressed in our comment and I just wanted to highlight this here. As the Council's aware, the service animals are permitted as a right in all businesses, including housing, such as rental properties, and do not require going through the reasonable accommodations process. And to highlight the Unruh Act, also prohibits the restriction or denial of a tenant and their guest access to facilities and services in an apartment complex. And so for the purposes of the analysis, the two-question analysis is entirely appropriate here for the service animals and the reasonable accommodation analysis for what we think of as emotional support animals. And also to point out that the two inquiry the two-question analysis for service animals is consistent with Unruh issue, the FEH issue and the service.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	need for a support animal, track the options already outlined in 12178. And and we appreciate the provision require that whoever is conducting an assessment of the person have a personal knowledge of the person's disability and for questions and if there is additional information that is required, it is in the circumstance that the person doesn't have personal knowledge of the disability and that the person with the disability is allowed the opportunity to provide additional information in that circumstance. Those kinds of things I think do protect and are consistent with federal and state law in how the Council can shape these regulations in making sure that people with disabilities have access but are not faced with unreasonable barriers in trying to be able to be supported in the community and in their housing. That's all I have. Thanks.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that we addressed in our comment and I just wanted to highlight this here. As the Council's aware, the service animals are permitted as a right in all businesses, including housing, such as rental properties, and do not require going through the reasonable accommodations process. And to highlight the Unruh Act, also prohibits the restriction or denial of a tenant and their guest access to facilities and services in an apartment complex. And so for the purposes of the analysis, the two-question analysis is entirely appropriate here for the service animals and the reasonable accommodation analysis for what we think of as emotional support animals. And also to point out that the two inquiry the two-question analysis for service animals is consistent with Unruh issue, the FEH issue and the service. With the two inquiry analysis, I was saying	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	need for a support animal, track the options already outlined in 12178. And and we appreciate the provision require that whoever is conducting an assessment of the person have a personal knowledge of the person's disability and for questions and if there is additional information that is required, it is in the circumstance that the person doesn't have personal knowledge of the disability and that the person with the disability is allowed the opportunity to provide additional information in that circumstance. Those kinds of things I think do protect and are consistent with federal and state law in how the Council can shape these regulations in making sure that people with disabilities have access but are not faced with unreasonable barriers in trying to be able to be supported in the community and in their housing. That's all I have. Thanks. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that we addressed in our comment and I just wanted to highlight this here. As the Council's aware, the service animals are permitted as a right in all businesses, including housing, such as rental properties, and do not require going through the reasonable accommodations process. And to highlight the Unruh Act, also prohibits the restriction or denial of a tenant and their guest access to facilities and services in an apartment complex. And so for the purposes of the analysis, the two-question analysis is entirely appropriate here for the service animals and the reasonable accommodation analysis for what we think of as emotional support animals. And also to point out that the two inquiry the two-question analysis for service animals is consistent with Unruh issue, the FEH issue and the service. With the two inquiry analysis, I was saying it's consistent with the guidance in that it asks the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	need for a support animal, track the options already outlined in 12178. And and we appreciate the provision require that whoever is conducting an assessment of the person have a personal knowledge of the person's disability and for questions and if there is additional information that is required, it is in the circumstance that the person doesn't have personal knowledge of the disability and that the person with the disability is allowed the opportunity to provide additional information in that circumstance. Those kinds of things I think do protect and are consistent with federal and state law in how the Council can shape these regulations in making sure that people with disabilities have access but are not faced with unreasonable barriers in trying to be able to be supported in the community and in their housing. That's all I have. Thanks. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Thank you. MR. CHANG: Good morning. I'm Scott Chang,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that we addressed in our comment and I just wanted to highlight this here. As the Council's aware, the service animals are permitted as a right in all businesses, including housing, such as rental properties, and do not require going through the reasonable accommodations process. And to highlight the Unruh Act, also prohibits the restriction or denial of a tenant and their guest access to facilities and services in an apartment complex. And so for the purposes of the analysis, the two-question analysis is entirely appropriate here for the service animals and the reasonable accommodation analysis for what we think of as emotional support animals. And also to point out that the two inquiry the two-question analysis for service animals is consistent with Unruh issue, the FEH issue and the service. With the two inquiry analysis, I was saying it's consistent with the guidance in that it asks the two questions, is the dog a service animal required	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	need for a support animal, track the options already outlined in 12178. And and we appreciate the provision require that whoever is conducting an assessment of the person have a personal knowledge of the person's disability and for questions and if there is additional information that is required, it is in the circumstance that the person doesn't have personal knowledge of the disability and that the person with the disability is allowed the opportunity to provide additional information in that circumstance. Those kinds of things I think do protect and are consistent with federal and state law in how the Council can shape these regulations in making sure that people with disabilities have access but are not faced with unreasonable barriers in trying to be able to be supported in the community and in their housing. That's all I have. Thanks. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Thank you. MR. CHANG: Good morning. I'm Scott Chang, director of litigation for the Housing Rights Center in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that we addressed in our comment and I just wanted to highlight this here. As the Council's aware, the service animals are permitted as a right in all businesses, including housing, such as rental properties, and do not require going through the reasonable accommodations process. And to highlight the Unruh Act, also prohibits the restriction or denial of a tenant and their guest access to facilities and services in an apartment complex. And so for the purposes of the analysis, the two-question analysis is entirely appropriate here for the service animals and the reasonable accommodation analysis for what we think of as emotional support animals. And also to point out that the two inquiry the two-question analysis for service animals is consistent with Unruh issue, the FEH issue and the service. With the two inquiry analysis, I was saying it's consistent with the guidance in that it asks the two questions, is the dog a service animal required because of a disability, and what work or task has the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	need for a support animal, track the options already outlined in 12178. And and we appreciate the provision require that whoever is conducting an assessment of the person have a personal knowledge of the person's disability and for questions and if there is additional information that is required, it is in the circumstance that the person doesn't have personal knowledge of the disability and that the person with the disability is allowed the opportunity to provide additional information in that circumstance. Those kinds of things I think do protect and are consistent with federal and state law in how the Council can shape these regulations in making sure that people with disabilities have access but are not faced with unreasonable barriers in trying to be able to be supported in the community and in their housing. That's all I have. Thanks. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Thank you. MR. CHANG: Good morning. I'm Scott Chang, director of litigation for the Housing Rights Center in Los Angeles where Fair Housing organization here in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	that we addressed in our comment and I just wanted to highlight this here. As the Council's aware, the service animals are permitted as a right in all businesses, including housing, such as rental properties, and do not require going through the reasonable accommodations process. And to highlight the Unruh Act, also prohibits the restriction or denial of a tenant and their guest access to facilities and services in an apartment complex. And so for the purposes of the analysis, the two-question analysis is entirely appropriate here for the service animals and the reasonable accommodation analysis for what we think of as emotional support animals. And also to point out that the two inquiry the two-question analysis for service animals is consistent with Unruh issue, the FEH issue and the service. With the two inquiry analysis, I was saying it's consistent with the guidance in that it asks the two questions, is the dog a service animal required because of a disability, and what work or task has the dog been trained to perform?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	need for a support animal, track the options already outlined in 12178. And and we appreciate the provision require that whoever is conducting an assessment of the person have a personal knowledge of the person's disability and for questions and if there is additional information that is required, it is in the circumstance that the person doesn't have personal knowledge of the disability and that the person with the disability is allowed the opportunity to provide additional information in that circumstance. Those kinds of things I think do protect and are consistent with federal and state law in how the Council can shape these regulations in making sure that people with disabilities have access but are not faced with unreasonable barriers in trying to be able to be supported in the community and in their housing. That's all I have. Thanks. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Thank you. MR. CHANG: Good morning. I'm Scott Chang, director of litigation for the Housing Rights Center in Los Angeles.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that we addressed in our comment and I just wanted to highlight this here. As the Council's aware, the service animals are permitted as a right in all businesses, including housing, such as rental properties, and do not require going through the reasonable accommodations process. And to highlight the Unruh Act, also prohibits the restriction or denial of a tenant and their guest access to facilities and services in an apartment complex. And so for the purposes of the analysis, the two-question analysis is entirely appropriate here for the service animals and the reasonable accommodation analysis for what we think of as emotional support animals. And also to point out that the two inquiry the two-question analysis for service animals is consistent with Unruh issue, the FEH issue and the service. With the two inquiry analysis, I was saying it's consistent with the guidance in that it asks the two questions, is the dog a service animal required because of a disability, and what work or task has the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	need for a support animal, track the options already outlined in 12178. And and we appreciate the provision require that whoever is conducting an assessment of the person have a personal knowledge of the person's disability and for questions and if there is additional information that is required, it is in the circumstance that the person doesn't have personal knowledge of the disability and that the person with the disability is allowed the opportunity to provide additional information in that circumstance. Those kinds of things I think do protect and are consistent with federal and state law in how the Council can shape these regulations in making sure that people with disabilities have access but are not faced with unreasonable barriers in trying to be able to be supported in the community and in their housing. That's all I have. Thanks. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Thank you. MR. CHANG: Good morning. I'm Scott Chang, director of litigation for the Housing Rights Center in Los Angeles where Fair Housing organization here in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	that we addressed in our comment and I just wanted to highlight this here. As the Council's aware, the service animals are permitted as a right in all businesses, including housing, such as rental properties, and do not require going through the reasonable accommodations process. And to highlight the Unruh Act, also prohibits the restriction or denial of a tenant and their guest access to facilities and services in an apartment complex. And so for the purposes of the analysis, the two-question analysis is entirely appropriate here for the service animals and the reasonable accommodation analysis for what we think of as emotional support animals. And also to point out that the two inquiry the two-question analysis for service animals is consistent with Unruh issue, the FEH issue and the service. With the two inquiry analysis, I was saying it's consistent with the guidance in that it asks the two questions, is the dog a service animal required because of a disability, and what work or task has the dog been trained to perform?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	need for a support animal, track the options already outlined in 12178. And and we appreciate the provision require that whoever is conducting an assessment of the person have a personal knowledge of the person's disability and for questions and if there is additional information that is required, it is in the circumstance that the person doesn't have personal knowledge of the disability and that the person with the disability is allowed the opportunity to provide additional information in that circumstance. Those kinds of things I think do protect and are consistent with federal and state law in how the Council can shape these regulations in making sure that people with disabilities have access but are not faced with unreasonable barriers in trying to be able to be supported in the community and in their housing. That's all I have. Thanks. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Thank you. MR. CHANG: Good morning. I'm Scott Chang, director of litigation for the Housing Rights Center in Los Angeles.

10 (Pages 34 to 37)

-			
1	services and Fair Housing organizations, including	1	Denise McGranahan, M-c-G-r-a-n-a-h-a-n.
2	Western Center on Law and Poverty, National Housing Law	2	THE REPORTER: Thank you.
3	Project that have been providing comments to the Council	3	MS. McGRANAHAN: I'm from the Legal Aid
4	on Council's proposed regulations, which the Council	4	Foundation of Los Angeles.
5	first proposed them in 2015.	5	LAFLA is one of the largest law firms that
6	We submitted written comments yesterday.	6	represent indigent persons in the country and many of
7	I would just note that the Fair Housing	7	our clients many, many of our clients are disabled
8	regulations are particularly timely this year. Today we	8	and facing homelessness, which is a ballooning problem
9	observed the 50th anniversary of the death of	9	in the state and country.
10	Martin Luther King whose assassination led to the	10	Every day our our advocates go to court
11	passage of the Fair Housing Act, federal Fair Housing	11	and they face unlawful detainer judges who do not
12	Act a few years ago.	12	understand Fair Housing law, do not understand why
13	The housing provisions of the Fair	13	reasonable accommodations can be used as defenses in
14	Employment and Housing Act is one of our state's most	14	unlawful detainer cases.
15	important and vital civil rights law. Housing, as you	15	This is why we especially commend the
16	know, is a linchpin for quality schools, safe	16	Council for adopting for considering the adoption of
17	neighborhoods, good jobs and accessible transportation.	17	12176(c)(7) and other regulations relating to unlawful
18	Like the Fair Housing Act, the Fair	18	detainer cases, specifically, the timing of making a
19	Employment and Housing Act plays a continuing and	19	unlawful detainer request and the use of it in defense
20	central role in moving our state towards a more	20	are issues that judges are just unfamiliar with.
21	integrated and fair society.	21	So I'll give you an example of a recent
22	We appreciate the Council's dedicated work	22	case.
23	over the past three years to draft these regulations	23	I assisted one of the younger advocates with
24	that accurately and faithfully implement the housing	24	an unlawful detainer where a man with he suffered
25	provisions of Fair Employment and Housing Act.	25	schizophrenia, lived with his mother for his entire
	Page 38		Page 40
	1 4 2 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5		1 450 40
1	We generally expressed our strong support	1	life. She had been providing him with medication. She
2	for the draft regulations.	2	went into the hospital and he didn't take his
3	Given the relative lack of case law	3	medication. So he acted inappropriately according to
4	interpreting FEHA, the housing regulation will provide	4	the landlord and was being evicted for nuisance.
5	critical and meaningful guidance to define the rights	5	He had been there for his entire life.
6	and obligations for the term "FEHA."	6	The advocate in my office was unable to
7	I just wanted to address one comment that	7	convince the judge that he can ask for reasonable
8	was made previously regarding the burden of proof on	8	accommodation after the service of the three-day notice
9	less discriminatory alternatives under discriminatory	9	and that the fact the fact that he allegedly
10	effects standard. We believe that the Council	10	committed a nuisance wouldn't trump the fact that he
11	appropriately assigned that burden of proof to the	11	could be entitled to an accommodation.
12	defendant.	12	He ended up proposing a motion in limine. A
13	As a practical matter, much of the	13	lot of work went into this motion to convince the judge,
14	information that determines whether or not there is a	14	No. 1, that it was a defense; No. 2, that the timing
15	less discriminatory alternative is in exclusive	15	could be to the proverbial last minute.
16	knowledge of the defendants, particularly in land use	16	Ultimately, the judge did allow the defense.
17	cases. And there is also a federal case law that	17	But there were a lot this would have been
18	supports this burden of proof to the defendants.	18	way easier way, way easier if the person our
19	We'd be happy to submit additional comments	19	advocate had been able to cite to these regulations or
20	on that particular provision.	20	regulations had said you can make the accommodation
21	COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: I think it would be	21	request at any time.
22	helpful.	22	The fact that they didn't respond to the
23	MR. CHANG: Thank you very much.	23	reasonable accommodation letter, which often occurs,
24	CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Thank you.	24	could be considered a denial. That would be
25	MS. McGRANAHAN: Good morning. My name is	25	discrimination.
	Page 39		Page 41

11 (Pages 38 to 41)

1		1	
1	So I think that having these regulations	1 2	our letter so one second. So in our letter, we say
2	just would be so wonderful for the work that we do. It	3	that okay. In the case law, Giebeler,
3 4	would help us every day to prevent disabled individuals	4	G-i-e-b-e-l-e-r, versus M & B Associates, it's
4 5	from becoming evicted becoming homeless, which is	5	referenced in our letter, the 9th Circuit held that
6	what our goal is.	6	that a reasonable accommodation reasonable
7	I also want to say that that that,	7	accommodations are not limited to the immediate
8	sure, we needed education of unlawful detainer judges,	8	manifestations of a disability but may also address
9	but I think if we have these regulations that it will	9	practical needs caused by disability which can be
10	help them understand that FEHA is the law that we cite	10	financial. In that case, it had to do with with
11	as advocates. To interpret FEHA includes federal	11	allowing a co-signer.
12	authority. Many judges do not particular judges do	12	And there have been cases that have extended
13	not want to see that. They don't want to recognize that	13	that and addressed that. And we proposed language and
14	they need to look at federal law and that would be very	14	the language is "an individual with a disability may
15	helpful as well to be able we have to go through it	15	request a reasonable accommodation in financial policies
16	with them, cite to the Government Code and say where it	16	when a modification or change of such policies is
17	says that, and it would be easy to have something	17	necessary to accommodate a disability." Such economic
18	easier to have something in there that satisfies that.	18	accommodations may include waiving guest fees, making an exception to a policy of not accepting Section 8
19	I thought we put it in our letter, because I helped write the letter that was written and provided	19	vouchers, waiving a rule requiring that rent be paid on
20	yesterday and all the other letters we worked on have	20	the 1st of the month, allowing it to then to relocate to
21	been we've been very happy that the Council is	21	a different unit without an otherwise applicable rent
22	hearing our comments. Mainly I wanted to mention that.	22	increase and allowing a prospective tenant to use a
23	One other issue is what is necessary.	23	co-signer when the limited income when their limited
24	I've I have a personal interest in financial	24	income when their income is limited because of a
25	accommodations. Worked very hard on Section 8	25	disability and it would not otherwise qualify for the
20	accommodations. Worked very hard on Section of		
	Page 42		Page 44
1	discrimination cases and the idea of, for example,	1	apartment.
2	getting a being able to use Section 8 as a reasonable	2	. We have case cites for each of those.
3	accommodation, but co-signers and having a roommate	3	They're all federal cites. We just don't have a lot of
4	because you lost your you're unable to work any	4	case authority in California for a lot of these to
5	longer. There are a lot of ways that you could a	5	convince a court that the landlord's denial of a
6	financial accommodation could help save people from	6	roommate or a co-signer or whatever, it's tough.
7	eviction, which is really what we're most concerned	7	Tough to file cases in California under FEHA
8	about in the work that we do.	8	and not be able to cite not be able to get the Court
9	So I appreciate what the Council has done	9	to agree with the fact that federal authority is
10	and I'm so looking forward to the adoption of this	10	relevant.
11	regulation and hopefully the best form possible.	11	This issue, this economic accommodation
12	Thank you very much.	12	issue is so helpful for people when you can show the
13	COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: Thank you.	13	nexus between their disability and their need for the
14	Can the recommendation that you just made	14	accommodation.
15	about the cross-referencing between the state and	15	For example as I gave a really great
16	federal law, if that's not in your letter, can you get	16	example, my client became disabled through a car
17	it to us already?	17	accident, had a two-bedroom apartment, could no longer
18	MS. McGRANAHAN: I absolutely will. I think	18	afford the rent. I requested on her behalf the
19	we were trying to consolidate and not make the Council	19	reasonable accommodation that she be able to have a
20	crazy with too much information, but I will provide	20	roommate, which was not allowed in her lease, a waive
21	that.	21	the no roommate policy. Thinking out of the box, which
22	COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: Would you provide a	22	we must all do in these cases, and they granted it and
23	little more information on the financial accommodations	23	she was able to stay in her apartment.
24	you were discussing?	24	Those types of accommodations where you
25	MS. McGRANAHAN: So let me reference it in	25	could really tie it to the disability. You have to tie
	Page 43		Page 45

12 (Pages 42 to 45)

1	it to the disability, of course, are really, really	1	fact that we may come up against a judge that doesn't
2	helpful to maintaining how they in keeping people	2	want to understand that a reasonable accommodation is a
3	with disabilities from becoming homeless.	3	defense in a unlawful detainer action.
4	I think we explained this pretty well. If	4	So again, thank you for these regulations.
5	you need additional legal authority, I'm happy to	5	We can't state it enough.
6	provide it.	6	No. 2, being in the process of an
7	COUNCIL MEMBER ORTIZ: Thank you.	7	unlawful detainer, we shouldn't even be here. There
8	COUNCIL MEMBER SCHUR: I didn't see the cite	8	shouldn't even be an unlawful detainer action. There
9	to Keebler. If you have additional citations on this,	9	should be no what a waste of judicial economy, what a
10	that will be hopeful. You mentioned other cases.	10	waste of the resources we have on the very limited
11	MS. McGRANAHAN: I will. Thank you very	11	amount of attorneys that we already have in the housing.
12	much.	12	Again, public defenders in the housing role.
13	MS. PRADO: Good morning. My name is Diana	13	There is a limited amount of access for tenants to even
14	Prado, P-r-a-d-o. I'm a housing rights attorney with	14	have attorneys, let alone then be faced with having to
15	the Eviction Defense Network.	15	miss jobs to go to court, jobs to just get their answer
16	And just picking up on my colleague's	16	done, to meet with the attorneys, all because a housing
17	comments, I want to first thank the Council for the time	17	
18		18	provider failed to grant a reasonable accommodation request that should have been granted.
19	to draft these regulations. I'm a housing rights	19	
20	attorney and particularly for the first part of my	20	And so these regulations are so important to
20	career, an eviction defense attorney, these are very	20	be made clear to the courts that we shouldn't even be
21	crucial in order to be able to help the judges and the	21	here today.
	courts understand the need for reasonable accommodation,		We shouldn't be here in an
23	particularly in an unlawful detainer context.	23 24	unlawful detainer, somebody facing homelessness because
24	I know that our comments have provided		a housing provider refused a reasonable accommodation
25	examples and I know that those are actually very key	25	that was necessary and should have been done.
	Page 46		Page 48
	<u> </u>		6 -
1	here under regulations in providing those examples in	1	And then lastly, just to bring up the point
2	unlawful detainers. Particularly going to the to	2	of more than one animal.
3	income and financial. If I can just there's a lot,	3	Again, we appreciate the Council
4	particularly with the funds that are coming in for	4	understanding that there could be a need for more than
5	homelessness prevention in L.A. County. There's a lot	5	one animal. That one animal could provide help with
6	of third-party service providers, for example, veteran's	6	guidance to the door and another animal can just very
7	groups that are providing funding for those vets or	1	
8		7	
0		7	much provide emotional support. The analysis that's
° 9	those facing homelessness to pay for their rent. And		much provide emotional support. The analysis that's required is case based and so we I will just applaud
9	those facing homelessness to pay for their rent. And we're having a lot of issues that housing providers are	8	much provide emotional support. The analysis that's required is case based and so we I will just applaud that there could be a need for more than one animal and
9 10	those facing homelessness to pay for their rent. And we're having a lot of issues that housing providers are not making or are not responding to our requests to	8 9	much provide emotional support. The analysis that's required is case based and so we I will just applaud that there could be a need for more than one animal and that the Council has recognized that and provided an
9 10 11	those facing homelessness to pay for their rent. And we're having a lot of issues that housing providers are not making or are not responding to our requests to allow for third parties to pay for that portion of the	8 9 10 11	much provide emotional support. The analysis that's required is case based and so we I will just applaud that there could be a need for more than one animal and that the Council has recognized that and provided an analysis as such that we'd be able to go through.
9 10 11 12	those facing homelessness to pay for their rent. And we're having a lot of issues that housing providers are not making or are not responding to our requests to allow for third parties to pay for that portion of the rent or the back rent.	8 9 10	much provide emotional support. The analysis that's required is case based and so we I will just applaud that there could be a need for more than one animal and that the Council has recognized that and provided an analysis as such that we'd be able to go through. Thank you.
9 10 11 12 13	those facing homelessness to pay for their rent. And we're having a lot of issues that housing providers are not making or are not responding to our requests to allow for third parties to pay for that portion of the rent or the back rent. So having these regulations in an example,	8 9 10 11 12 13	much provide emotional support. The analysis that's required is case based and so we I will just applaud that there could be a need for more than one animal and that the Council has recognized that and provided an analysis as such that we'd be able to go through. Thank you. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Thank you.
9 10 11 12 13 14	those facing homelessness to pay for their rent. And we're having a lot of issues that housing providers are not making or are not responding to our requests to allow for third parties to pay for that portion of the rent or the back rent. So having these regulations in an example, citing to that, is very crucial. And so again, we thank	8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 much provide emotional support. The analysis that's required is case based and so we I will just applaud that there could be a need for more than one animal and that the Council has recognized that and provided an analysis as such that we'd be able to go through. Thank you. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Thank you. Any other public comments on the Fair
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	those facing homelessness to pay for their rent. And we're having a lot of issues that housing providers are not making or are not responding to our requests to allow for third parties to pay for that portion of the rent or the back rent. So having these regulations in an example, citing to that, is very crucial. And so again, we thank you for being able to highlight those types of things.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 much provide emotional support. The analysis that's required is case based and so we I will just applaud that there could be a need for more than one animal and that the Council has recognized that and provided an analysis as such that we'd be able to go through. Thank you. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Thank you. Any other public comments on the Fair Housing regulations?
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	those facing homelessness to pay for their rent. And we're having a lot of issues that housing providers are not making or are not responding to our requests to allow for third parties to pay for that portion of the rent or the back rent. So having these regulations in an example, citing to that, is very crucial. And so again, we thank you for being able to highlight those types of things. Particularly also with emotional support	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 much provide emotional support. The analysis that's required is case based and so we I will just applaud that there could be a need for more than one animal and that the Council has recognized that and provided an analysis as such that we'd be able to go through. Thank you. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Thank you. Any other public comments on the Fair Housing regulations? MS. WONG: Good morning. Adrienna Wong,
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	those facing homelessness to pay for their rent. And we're having a lot of issues that housing providers are not making or are not responding to our requests to allow for third parties to pay for that portion of the rent or the back rent. So having these regulations in an example, citing to that, is very crucial. And so again, we thank you for being able to highlight those types of things. Particularly also with emotional support animals. Again, in the unlawful detainer context, just	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 much provide emotional support. The analysis that's required is case based and so we I will just applaud that there could be a need for more than one animal and that the Council has recognized that and provided an analysis as such that we'd be able to go through. Thank you. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Thank you. Any other public comments on the Fair Housing regulations? MS. WONG: Good morning. Adrienna Wong, A-d-r-i-e-n-n-a, W-o-n-g, for ACLU of
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	those facing homelessness to pay for their rent. And we're having a lot of issues that housing providers are not making or are not responding to our requests to allow for third parties to pay for that portion of the rent or the back rent. So having these regulations in an example, citing to that, is very crucial. And so again, we thank you for being able to highlight those types of things. Particularly also with emotional support animals. Again, in the unlawful detainer context, just today, we have a case where there was a reasonable	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 much provide emotional support. The analysis that's required is case based and so we I will just applaud that there could be a need for more than one animal and that the Council has recognized that and provided an analysis as such that we'd be able to go through. Thank you. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Thank you. Any other public comments on the Fair Housing regulations? MS. WONG: Good morning. Adrienna Wong, A-d-r-i-e-n-n-a, W-o-n-g, for ACLU of Southern California.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	those facing homelessness to pay for their rent. And we're having a lot of issues that housing providers are not making or are not responding to our requests to allow for third parties to pay for that portion of the rent or the back rent. So having these regulations in an example, citing to that, is very crucial. And so again, we thank you for being able to highlight those types of things. Particularly also with emotional support animals. Again, in the unlawful detainer context, just today, we have a case where there was a reasonable accommodation requested. There was a letter provided	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 much provide emotional support. The analysis that's required is case based and so we I will just applaud that there could be a need for more than one animal and that the Council has recognized that and provided an analysis as such that we'd be able to go through. Thank you. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Thank you. Any other public comments on the Fair Housing regulations? MS. WONG: Good morning. Adrienna Wong, A-d-r-i-e-n-n-a, W-o-n-g, for ACLU of Southern California. I'm here today to express my organization's
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	those facing homelessness to pay for their rent. And we're having a lot of issues that housing providers are not making or are not responding to our requests to allow for third parties to pay for that portion of the rent or the back rent. So having these regulations in an example, citing to that, is very crucial. And so again, we thank you for being able to highlight those types of things. Particularly also with emotional support animals. Again, in the unlawful detainer context, just today, we have a case where there was a reasonable accommodation requested. There was a letter provided from the doctor, from the therapist, tying stating	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 much provide emotional support. The analysis that's required is case based and so we I will just applaud that there could be a need for more than one animal and that the Council has recognized that and provided an analysis as such that we'd be able to go through. Thank you. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Thank you. Any other public comments on the Fair Housing regulations? MS. WONG: Good morning. Adrienna Wong, A-d-r-i-e-n-n-a, W-o-n-g, for ACLU of Southern California. I'm here today to express my organization's strong support for the draft regulation. The ACLU
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	those facing homelessness to pay for their rent. And we're having a lot of issues that housing providers are not making or are not responding to our requests to allow for third parties to pay for that portion of the rent or the back rent. So having these regulations in an example, citing to that, is very crucial. And so again, we thank you for being able to highlight those types of things. Particularly also with emotional support animals. Again, in the unlawful detainer context, just today, we have a case where there was a reasonable accommodation requested. There was a letter provided from the doctor, from the therapist, tying stating the disability, tying the disability and the need for	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 much provide emotional support. The analysis that's required is case based and so we I will just applaud that there could be a need for more than one animal and that the Council has recognized that and provided an analysis as such that we'd be able to go through. Thank you. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Thank you. Any other public comments on the Fair Housing regulations? MS. WONG: Good morning. Adrienna Wong, A-d-r-i-e-n-n-a, W-o-n-g, for ACLU of Southern California. I'm here today to express my organization's strong support for the draft regulation. The ACLU Southern California position is that housing is
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	those facing homelessness to pay for their rent. And we're having a lot of issues that housing providers are not making or are not responding to our requests to allow for third parties to pay for that portion of the rent or the back rent. So having these regulations in an example, citing to that, is very crucial. And so again, we thank you for being able to highlight those types of things. Particularly also with emotional support animals. Again, in the unlawful detainer context, just today, we have a case where there was a reasonable accommodation requested. There was a letter provided from the doctor, from the therapist, tying stating the disability, tying the disability and the need for having an emotional support animal. And then	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 much provide emotional support. The analysis that's required is case based and so we I will just applaud that there could be a need for more than one animal and that the Council has recognized that and provided an analysis as such that we'd be able to go through. Thank you. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Thank you. Any other public comments on the Fair Housing regulations? MS. WONG: Good morning. Adrienna Wong, A-d-r-i-e-n-n-a, W-o-n-g, for ACLU of Southern California. I'm here today to express my organization's strong support for the draft regulation. The ACLU Southern California position is that housing is foundational to the exercise of other civil rights and
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	those facing homelessness to pay for their rent. And we're having a lot of issues that housing providers are not making or are not responding to our requests to allow for third parties to pay for that portion of the rent or the back rent. So having these regulations in an example, citing to that, is very crucial. And so again, we thank you for being able to highlight those types of things. Particularly also with emotional support animals. Again, in the unlawful detainer context, just today, we have a case where there was a reasonable accommodation requested. There was a letter provided from the doctor, from the therapist, tying stating the disability, tying the disability and the need for having an emotional support animal. And then nonetheless, here we are today with an unlawful detainer	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 much provide emotional support. The analysis that's required is case based and so we I will just applaud that there could be a need for more than one animal and that the Council has recognized that and provided an analysis as such that we'd be able to go through. Thank you. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Thank you. Any other public comments on the Fair Housing regulations? MS. WONG: Good morning. Adrienna Wong, A-d-r-i-e-n-n-a, W-o-n-g, for ACLU of Southern California. I'm here today to express my organization's strong support for the draft regulation. The ACLU Southern California position is that housing is foundational to the exercise of other civil rights and civil liberties. And we think that the regulations are
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	those facing homelessness to pay for their rent. And we're having a lot of issues that housing providers are not making or are not responding to our requests to allow for third parties to pay for that portion of the rent or the back rent. So having these regulations in an example, citing to that, is very crucial. And so again, we thank you for being able to highlight those types of things. Particularly also with emotional support animals. Again, in the unlawful detainer context, just today, we have a case where there was a reasonable accommodation requested. There was a letter provided from the doctor, from the therapist, tying stating the disability, tying the disability and the need for having an emotional support animal. And then nonetheless, here we are today with an unlawful detainer action on our hands and having to go through the entire	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 much provide emotional support. The analysis that's required is case based and so we I will just applaud that there could be a need for more than one animal and that the Council has recognized that and provided an analysis as such that we'd be able to go through. Thank you. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Thank you. Any other public comments on the Fair Housing regulations? MS. WONG: Good morning. Adrienna Wong, A-d-r-i-e-n-n-a, W-o-n-g, for ACLU of Southern California. I'm here today to express my organization's strong support for the draft regulation. The ACLU Southern California position is that housing is foundational to the exercise of other civil rights and civil liberties. And we think that the regulations are a great step towards ensuring fair and equal access to
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	those facing homelessness to pay for their rent. And we're having a lot of issues that housing providers are not making or are not responding to our requests to allow for third parties to pay for that portion of the rent or the back rent. So having these regulations in an example, citing to that, is very crucial. And so again, we thank you for being able to highlight those types of things. Particularly also with emotional support animals. Again, in the unlawful detainer context, just today, we have a case where there was a reasonable accommodation requested. There was a letter provided from the doctor, from the therapist, tying stating the disability, tying the disability and the need for having an emotional support animal. And then nonetheless, here we are today with an unlawful detainer	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 much provide emotional support. The analysis that's required is case based and so we I will just applaud that there could be a need for more than one animal and that the Council has recognized that and provided an analysis as such that we'd be able to go through. Thank you. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Thank you. Any other public comments on the Fair Housing regulations? MS. WONG: Good morning. Adrienna Wong, A-d-r-i-e-n-n-a, W-o-n-g, for ACLU of Southern California. I'm here today to express my organization's strong support for the draft regulation. The ACLU Southern California position is that housing is foundational to the exercise of other civil rights and civil liberties. And we think that the regulations are
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	those facing homelessness to pay for their rent. And we're having a lot of issues that housing providers are not making or are not responding to our requests to allow for third parties to pay for that portion of the rent or the back rent. So having these regulations in an example, citing to that, is very crucial. And so again, we thank you for being able to highlight those types of things. Particularly also with emotional support animals. Again, in the unlawful detainer context, just today, we have a case where there was a reasonable accommodation requested. There was a letter provided from the doctor, from the therapist, tying stating the disability, tying the disability and the need for having an emotional support animal. And then nonetheless, here we are today with an unlawful detainer action on our hands and having to go through the entire	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 much provide emotional support. The analysis that's required is case based and so we I will just applaud that there could be a need for more than one animal and that the Council has recognized that and provided an analysis as such that we'd be able to go through. Thank you. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Thank you. Any other public comments on the Fair Housing regulations? MS. WONG: Good morning. Adrienna Wong, A-d-r-i-e-n-n-a, W-o-n-g, for ACLU of Southern California. I'm here today to express my organization's strong support for the draft regulation. The ACLU Southern California position is that housing is foundational to the exercise of other civil rights and civil liberties. And we think that the regulations are a great step towards ensuring fair and equal access to

13 (Pages 46 to 49)

-		1	
1	I also want to express our support for the	1	nuisance that's not included in the memo, I'd appreciate
2	written comments that were submitted to the Council by	2	it.
3 4	Legal Service Providers, on housing rights organizations	4	MS. WONG: Yes. I'll take another look at
4 5	by Western Center. We have the opportunity to review	5	the memo and if there's anything to add, we will submit
6	those comments after they were submitted to the Council	6	that separately.
7	and we'd like to endorse them in full.	7	CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Any other Fair Housing
8	In particular, I want to emphasize our	8	public regulations comments people wish to provide?
	support for the portion of the draft regulations that	9	Any via e-mail?
9 10	address specifically, we think, the kind of overwrought	10	Okay. Well, I want to thank everyone for
10	nuisance enforcement actions that are typified by the	11	taking the time to provide public comments at today's
12	crime-free housing program.	12	hearing regarding issuance of the proposed Fair Housing
13	In our experience those programs are	13	regulations.
14	generally somewhat uniform and not only violate Fair	14	Again, we will accept written comments until
15	Housing law but also due process, right to privacy,	15	5 p.m. today. So if you haven't already done so, please
16	equality protection, the First Amendment. So we have	16	make sure to submit comments.
17	successfully brought legal challenges in court against	17	And with that, the first of our hearings is concluded.
18	the crime-free housing program, both here in	18	
18	Southern California and across the country.	19	But I think this would be a good time for a
20	I think it's fair to say that the guidance	20	break for our court reporter.
20	that the regulations give regarding those programs will	20	And this part is off the record.
21	help localities avoid litigation rather than generating	21	(Off record at 11:26 a.m.)
	more. So we support the inclusion of I think it's	23	
23 24	12162(b) if I'm not wrong. The section of the	23	
24 25	regulation that addresses those programs.	24	
20	And we also support the additions	25	
	Page 50		Page 52
1	recommended in the written comments by the Legal Service	1	
2	Providers and housing rights organizations to that	2	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATION
3	section, we think will clarify and further strengthen	3	
4	those.	4	I, Marceline F. Noble, a Certified Shorthand
5	I also want to emphasize our support for the	5	Reporter in and for the State of California, do hereby
6	portion of the regulations that address consideration of	6	certify:
7	criminal history information, although I also want to	7	
8	echo the request made by other provisions that the	8	That the foregoing meeting was then taken before me
9	Council consider a criminal look back period that is	9	at the time and place herein set forth; that the meeting
10	shorter than seven years. We understand that in in	10	was reported stenographically by me and later
11	the consumer context seven years has been recognized,	11	transcribed into typewriting under my direction; that
12	but based on our experiences, we have serious fairness	12	the foregoing is a true record of the meeting taken at
13	and accuracy concerns about consideration of stale	13	that time.
14	criminal records and so we have in the interest and	14	
15	well-being of our community versus alongside our	15	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have subscribed my name this
16	community partners to pressure local public housing	16	12th day of April, 2018.
17	authorities for shorter look back periods successfully.	17	
18	So we know that it's doable, it's practicable, that it's	18	
19	legally supportable, and for the reasons stated in the	19	
20	written comments and is the relevant HUD guide, and we'd	20	Marceline F. Noble, CSR No. 3024
21	encourage the Council to also consider a shorter look	21	
22	back period.	22	
23	Thank you.	23	
24	COUNCIL MEMBER IGLESIAS: If you have	24	
25	additional legal authority with regard to the overbroad	25	
	Page 51		Page 53

14 (Pages 50 to 53)

	adopting 40:16	35:15,17 36:6,11,15	Auditorium 1:13	but-for 8:12 21:17
	adoption 40:16 43:10	47:17	authorities 13:8 51:17	Sut-101 0.12 21.17
A-d-r-i-e-n-n-a 49:17	Adrienna 2:14 49:16	anniversary 38:9	authority 20:11,13 21:2	C
a.m 3:2,2 52:21	advantage 14:21	answer 48:15	21:9 42:11 45:4,9 46:5	C 1:8 4:18 22:7
ability 10:9 19:5 20:4 21:6,12 23:19 27:12	adverse 7:17 8:9	anticipating 19:7	51:25	c-h-a 33:21
27:13 28:16	advise 21:18	anyway 24:17	available 4:15,20 6:7	California 1:15,21 3:1
able 7:6 20:16 22:3,4	advised 26:19,19	apartment 7:3 12:22	25:1	4:10,24 5:13 7:3 10:18
25:5,21 26:17 27:22	advocate 41:6,19	13:6 29:23 35:10 45:1	avoid 50:21	11:15 12:22 13:12
29:13,16 36:8 37:16	advocates 40:10,23	45:17,23	aware 12:6 20:6 35:4	16:12 23:18 34:10
41:19 42:14 43:2 45:8	42:10	apparent 26:12 27:20		45:4,7 49:18,21 50:18
45:8,19,23 46:21	affiliation 6:18	apparently 17:12	В	53:5
47:15 49:11	afford 45:18	APPEARANCES 2:1	B 1:7 4:17 8:19 11:8	Canine 26:8
absence 15:17	afoul 29:13	appearing 23:6	33:22 44:3	car 45:16
absolutely 27:6 43:18	Agenda 1:2 ago 4:24 38:12	appears 10:1 applaud 19:18 49:8	B-1 12:14	care 5:10 18:18 19:10
abuse 14:22	agree 45:9	applicable 44:21	back 4:15 8:5 15:13 17:4	36:9
AC02DD0 1:24	ahead 11:12 12:2,8	applied 7:14	31:3,25 47:12 51:9,17	career 46:20
accept 5:5 52:13	15:21	applies 8:25 13:2	51:22	carefully 10:24
accepting 44:18	Aid 40:3	apply 13:5 32:16 33:2,7	background 23:16,25 24:7	Carmel 1:13
access 35:9 36:17 37:15	aisle 34:8	applying 29:6	bad 27:15	carrier 22:15,15,19 carveout 19:8
48:13 49:24 accessible 38:17	alike 34:17	appreciate 10:14,23	badly 20:17	case 13:11,16,17 14:1
accessible 38:17	allegedly 41:9	16:7 19:18 24:2 34:10	ballooning 40:8	15:23 39:3,17 40:22
accommodate 44:16	alleviate 13:25	34:13 37:3 38:22 43:9	barriers 37:16	44:2,9 45:2,4 47:18
accommodation 9:9	allocate 15:17	49:3 52:1	based 10:10 11:22 15:22	49:8
13:7,13 14:6 24:11	allocation 11:9	approach 27:23	20:8 24:1,25 29:7 49:8	cases 7:24 8:2 11:7,11
29:7 31:8,10,14 32:3	allow 3:11 9:24 30:8	appropriate 13:15 15:19	51:12	39:17 40:14,18 43:1
34:23 35:13 41:8,11	41:16 47:11	21:3,12 22:5 35:12	basically 9:11 14:6 15:1	44:11 45:7,22 46:10
41:20,23 43:3,6 44:5	allowed 14:7,15,20 30:1	appropriately 39:11	basis 12:2	category 27:20
44:14 45:11,14,19	37:10 45:20 allowing 34:22 44:10,20	approve 29:9 April 1:17 3:1,10 5:7	bear 26:13	causal 8:1
46:22 47:19 48:2,17	44:22	53:16	becoming 42:4,4 46:3	causation 8:13
48:24	allows 29:5	area 9:8 24:5 26:23 28:4	bedroom 29:24	caused 44:8
accommodations 13:2	alluded 14:1	areas 10:6	behalf 6:19 16:12 18:6 37:25 45:18	Center 37:22 38:2 50:4 central 38:20
14:20 17:8 30:8 35:7	alongside 51:15	arsenal 20:20	behavior 20:3,19	certain 22:11
40:13 42:25 43:23 44:6,17 45:24	alternative 10:5 11:10	Article 9:17	believe 8:18 10:24 12:4	certainly 19:17 20:6 22:1
accompany 26:22	12:9 39:15	aside 13:3	14:4,12,14,18 15:7	22:5
accomplish 27:1,7,22	alternatives 11:18 39:9	asked 36:22	24:25 25:14 27:7	certification 31:20 53:2
28:5	amending 9:7	asking 27:4 32:2	34:24 39:10	certified 6:6 53:4
accuracy 51:13	Amendment 50:15	asks 35:21	benefits 24:23	certifies 29:15
accurately 38:24	amendments 3:21 4:14	assassination 38:10	Bernards 31:21	certify 53:6
acknowledge 19:13	5:20	assessment 23:1,5 37:5	best 19:1 43:11	cha-cha 33:21
acknowledgment 24:5	American 8:24	assigned 39:11	beyond 9:3	CHAIRMAN 2:2 3:4
ACLU 49:17,20	amount 27:23 32:23 48:11,13	assistance 8:18 26:2 29:21,25 30:11,14,17	bills 18:11	10:14 16:6 28:20
act 3:21 8:23,24 9:4 13:1	analysis 13:13 14:6 35:1	30:23 31:2 33:5 34:4	bit 18:17 21:21 24:13	33:16,23 37:20 39:24
20:17 22:1 35:8 38:11	35:11,12,14,17,20	34:13	25:3,8,25 29:12,17	49:13 52:6
38:12,14,18,19,25	49:7,11	assistant 32:15	Blind 26:9 board 18:3,5,21 21:4	chairperson 3:14
acted 41:3	analysts 11:24	assisted 40:23	28:16,25 29:3	challenge 20:12 challenges 50:16
action 7:17 8:9 16:12 20:23 21:3,12 47:24	ancestry 4:7	Associates 44:3	bottom 14:14	Chang 2:12 37:21,21
48:3,8	anecdotally 17:5	association 7:3 10:19	Boulevard 1:21	39:23
actions 21:11 50:10	Angeles 1:15 3:1,9 5:11	12:23 18:10 20:10	box 45:21	change 12:12,13 44:15
activities 19:6	5:12 37:23,24 40:4	21:1 22:5,16,20 25:23	boy 30:5	changed 12:7
activity 22:2,21 23:24	animal 8:21,21 9:8 12:21	26:24 28:2,25 29:5	Brand 1:21	changes 5:19,24
actual 13:5 31:17	13:22 14:3,10,10,11	32:13,18	break 52:19	Chaya 2:2 3:14
ADA 9:2,10 13:1,7	14:25 15:5 26:4,13,22	association's 20:4 21:4	Brian 2:6 5:10,16	Circuit 44:4
add 3:22 17:22 23:22	26:25 27:1,5,6,7,15,20 28:1,5 29:21 30:11,14	28:4 associations 16:13 17:9	bright 9:24	circumstance 37:8,11
52:4	30:16,17 31:2 32:15	17:16 18:2,4,14 19:22	bring 17:12 49:1	circumstances 15:23
additional 30:13,14,17	34:4,15 35:22 36:8,9	20:16 21:20 23:19	BRODSKY 2:4	24:18
31:16 33:1 37:7,11	36:12,14,18 37:2	26:6 28:17	brought 5:14 50:16 Building 1:12	CISNEROS 2:3 citations 46:9
39:19 46:5,9 51:25	47:22 49:2,5,5,6,9	assumption 22:20	bundles 30:25	cite 41:19 42:9,15 45:8
additions 50:25 address 36:20,22 39:7	animal's 9:13 27:13	ATKINSON-BAKER 1:20	burden 8:5 11:6,9,13,19	46:8
44:7 50:9 51:6	animals 8:19 9:3 12:24	Attachment 1:7,8,9 4:16	12:3,18 15:14,17,19	cited 7:24 13:8
addressed 24:6 35:2	13:13,14 14:17,23	Attachments 4:17	20:25 39:8,11,18	cites 45:2,3
44:12	15:8 26:2,7 29:8,11	attending 3:8	burdens 12:1	citing 47:14
addresses 50:24	30:1,2 31:23 32:16,17	attorney 46:14,19,20	business 11:13 12:3,8	civil 13:8 38:15 49:22,23
adjust 36:25	32:25 33:4,5,6,7,8	attorneys 48:11,14,16	12:15,19	claim 22:14
ado 6:23	34:13,22,23 35:4,13	Auburn 13:11,18	businesses 19:13 35:5	clarification 10:8
		I		I

clarifies 3:24 clarify 32:14 51:3 **class** 20:9 clear 48:20 clearer 21:17 clearly 6:10 14:21 26:8 26:17 client 45:16 clients 36:15 40:7.7 close 7:6 16:17,20 co-extensive 13.2 co-signer 44:10,23 45:6 co-signers 43:3 Code 4:1,10 11:15,17,25 12:13,17 13:8 15:16 23:19 24:4 42:15 coherent 9:21 colleague's 46:16 colleagues 3:12,16 colloquially 17:19 color 4:4 column 31.2 combines 24:17 come 6:14 15:8 16:22 18:1 21:4 28:9 32:13 33:24 48:1 comes 14:23 29:3 coming 25:7 47:4 commend 40:15 comment 3:19 6:1 8:17 9:16 12:20 19:16 28:11 29:1 34:24 35:2 36:10 39:7 comments 3:20 5:6,8,15 5:19,23,25 6:2,3,16 7:7,9 8:11 9:6 10:6,15 10:24 11:3,5 15:9 16:7 16:25 21:16,20 23:18 24:8,16 28:21 32:5 33:17 34:3.7 37:1 38:3 38:6 39:19 42:22 46:17,24 49:14 50:2,5 51:1,20 52:7,10,13,15 commercial 13:3 committed 16:16 41:10 Committee 16:12 common 17:17 22:1 27:23 28:4,12 community 16:9,13 17:8 17:16 18:2,6,13 28:13 34:8 36:17 37:17 51:15,16 Companions 26:8 Complaint 22:9,13,18 23:8.11 complex 32:21 35:10 complexes 13:6 compliant 9:23 10:9 comply 8:23 complying 30:20 concerned 7:19 9:19 17:24 18:17 21:19 23:12 24:14 25:19 26:3,7 29:19 43:7 concerning 27:13 concerns 11:6 19:18 36:2,6 51:13 conclude 5:17

concluded 52.17 conclusion 21:5 condition 31:14 condominiums 17:16 conduct 18:24 20:18 conducted 10:3 conducting 37:4 confusing 30:18 confusion 34:17 congratulations 16:20 consequences 15:6 27:15 consider 6:1 8:12 9:7,15 10:2 11:18 51:9.21 consideration 9:17 51:6 51:13 considered 10:4,24,25 11:25 12:6 41:24 considering 18:19 40:16 consistent 7:23 8:14 17:22 34:21 35:18,21 36:1 37:13 consolidate 43:19 consumer 51.11 content 10:3 context 14:16 26:5 46:23 47 17 51 11 continue 9:18 10:8 12:13 19:21 25:25 continued 7:5 continues 9:19 continuing 38:19 contractors 19:2 control 19:6 20:4 36:8 convicted 23:20 convince 41:7,13 45:5 **Copies** 4:14 **copy** 5:14,19 Corporations 23:19 24:4 corral 20:5 Correct 33:12 CORRECTED 1:11 council 1:1 2:2,3,3,4,4 3:15,16,16 5:8,20 7:5 7:16 8:12,22 9:6,15 10:8,12,21 11:12,21 12:2,11,16,23 15:10 15:18,25 16:2,5,16 19:7,12 28:6 32:11 33:12 34:4 35:25 37:14 38:3,4 39:10,21 40:16 42:21 43:9,13 43:19,22 46:7,8,17 49:3,10 50:2,5 51:9,21 51:24 Council's 4:19,21 5:2,3 6:4,8 7:21 8:1 19:18 34:14.20 35:4 36:21 38:4,22 counsel 18:22 country 40:6,9 50:18 County 17:1 47:5 couple 24:8 29:1 course 34:18 46:1 court 1:20 6:6,15 13:21 14:1 40:10 45:5,8 48:15 50:16 52:19 courts 13:3 15:18,22

46:22 48:20 coverage 22:22 covered 22:13 23:15 crazy 43:20 create 9:21 10:9 32:19 32:21 34:11 created 19:13 22:25 credible 24:22,24 25:13 25.17crime-free 50:11,17 criminal 9:17,22 23:16 23:24 24:7 51:7,9,14 critical 6:10 39:5 cross-referencing 43:15 crucial 46:21 47:14 CSR 1:23 53:20 curious 30:12 currently 20:15 29:5 D **D** 1:9 4:16 DA 9:19 10:8 Dachshund 32:4 **DALE** 2:4 **DARA** 2:2 Davis-Stirling 23:4 day 18:14 40:10 42:3 53:16 davs 4:24 deal 7:13 21:1 26:6 death 38:9 decide 12:12 decision 11:23 dedicated 38:22 defendant 11:13 39:12 defendants 12:1 39:16 39:18 defenders 48:12 defense 40:19 41:14,16 46:15.20 48:3 defenses 40:13 define 17:19 39:5 defining 17:20 definitely 17:11 definition 13:7 17:15 18:20 26:20 **degree** 19:6 demonstration 27:10,11 denial 31:8 35:9 41:24 45:5 Denise 2:13 40:1 department 3:18 depending 24:18 descriptions 33:25 desk 26:16 despicable 20:3 detainer 40:11,14,18,19 40:24 42:7 46:23 47:17,23,25 48:3,7,8 48:23 detainers 47:2 determination 15:24 16:1 21:10 determine 15:19 determines 22:15 39:14 development 22:1 28:13 developments 17:17,17 **DFEH** 11:23 22:3

DFEH's 5:11 DFEHCouncil@DFEH.... 5:9 diabetes 26:19 diagnosis 31:12 Diana 2:13 46:13 Diane 2:11 28:23 differences 19:10 32:23 different 7:9 29:4 33:4,6 33:13 44:21 difficult 25:3 difficulty 19:21 23:21 direct 17:24 direction 15:17,25 53:11 directly 24:20 director 2:5 3:18 23:20 37:22 directors 18:3,5,13,16 18:18,22 21:4 28:25 disabilities 8:24 37:15 46:3 disability 4:8 9:13,14 13:25 14:8,8,10 24:19 24:21,23 25:22 26:12 26:12,14 29:16 31:13 35:23 37:6,9,10 44:7,8 44:13,16,25 45:13,25 46:1 47:21,21 disability-related 31:9 disabled 25:15,22 26:19 26:20 27:24 29:10 40:7 42:3 45:16 disagreeing 12:23 disaster 14:19 disclose 22:7,10,24 23:4 disclosure 21:23,24 23.6 discovery 21:10 discrimination 4:4 20:8 41:25 43:1 discriminatory 10:4 11:7 11:11 12:10 18:25 20:19 21:6,11 22:21 39:9,9,15 discussed 23:17 discussing 43:24 disfavor 17:13 disputed 13:17 distinct 36:4 distinguish 33:13 disturbance 32:20 doable 51:18 doctor 32:1 47:20 documentation 13:19 24:22 documents 20:11 dog 13:24 27:3 32:19 35:22,24 dogs 26:9 30:2 33:3 doing 19:3 dominant 7:20 8:15 door 15:1 19:24 49:6 doubleheader 3.5 draft 38:23 39:2 46:18 49:20 50:8 drowning 27:25 drowns 28:3 due 50:14

Dumas 2:11 28:23.24 32:11 duties 21:25 duty 23:4,8 F E 7:13 e-mail 5:1,2,8 7:8 52:8 earlier 17:18 34:24 early 17:20 easier 21:18 30:22 41:18 41:18 42:17 easy 29:9 42:16 echo 16:14 21:14,15 51:8 economic 44:16 45:11 economy 48:9 education 18:13 42:7 effect 11:7,11 effects 39:10 effort 16:19 either 12:13 27:24 eliminate 19:19 emotional 32:25 34:23 35:14 36:11,13,18 47:16,22 49:7 emphasize 50:7 51:5 Employment 1:1 3:15,21 38:14.19.25 enactment 11:25 encountering 26:11 encourage 8:12 9:6 20:13 51:21 ended 41:12 endorse 50:6 enforce 29:3 enforcement 50:10 engage 20:2 engaged 22:20 ensuring 49:24 entire 34:8 40:25 41:5 47:24 entirely 34:21 35:12 36:1 36:1 entities 21:18 entitled 13:18 41:11 entity 9:9 11:14 environment 19:20 equal 19:14 49:24 equality 50:15 equivalents 7:23 era 14:22 especially 34:16 40:15 essentially 7:16 8:8 established 13:12 establishing 24:10,19 et 4:2 event 16:18 Everest 16:21 everybody 15:4 17:20 evict 20:16,17,18 evicted 41:4 42:4 evicting 21:12 eviction 43:7 46:15,20 evidence 13:24 ex-officio 3.17 exactly 5:11 29:11 example 22:12 26:16

29:14 36:16,21 40:21	39:4,6 42:9,10 45:7	18:21,22 19:3,5 21:21	47:8 48:23	22:11 24:18 25:1,5,6
43:1 45:15,16 47:6,13	felony 23:20	22:23 27:21,24 28:13	homeowner 29:5 32:8	33:1 37:7,11 39:14
examples 46:25 47:1	fight 20:14	31:15 35:7 47:2	32:12	43:20,23 51:7
exceeds 31:22	file 1:24 22:3 45:7	good 7:2 10:17,20 28:23	homeowner's 32:17	initial 1:8 4:16 7:25
	filed 22:8			11:21
exception 44:18		33:18 34:2 37:21	homeowners 18:4 28:24	
excited 28:15	files 22:13	38:17 39:25 46:13	29:23 33:5	innocent 22:16
excluded 22:22	filing 23:10	49:16 52:18	homes 36:16	inquiries 9:2
exclusive 39:15	final 6:3 9:16,16	governance 18:9	hope 32:6	inquiry 8:20 12:24 35:1
exercise 49:22	finalize 7:7	governing 20:11	hopeful 46:10	35:17,20
existing 3:25	financial 21:24 22:25	government 4:1 11:15	hopefully 7:6 43:11	Institute 16:13
expands 9:2	23:2,10 42:24 43:6,23	11:17,25 12:13,17	horrible 20:3	insurance 22:14,14,15
expectation 28:1	44:9,14 47:3	15:13,16 42:15	hospital 41:2	22:19
experience 25:20 36:13	find 25:2	grant 48:17	hostile 19:19	integrated 38:21
50:12	fine 20:21 28:14	granted 45:22 48:18	housing 1:1,5,9 3:7,8,15	intent 22:6
experienced 34:18	Fiore 16:11	great 23:23 45:15 49:24	3:21,22 4:3 9:10,18,21	intentional 22:21
experiences 51:12	firms 40:5	greater 36:11	18:10,25 22:8,13 23:8	interest 17:17 22:1
explain 18:21 19:4	first 1:13 3:23 7:4,11	greatest 30:25	28:21 33:16 34:15,17	28:12 42:24 51:14
explained 46:4	10:20 11:6 15:14 17:5	•	-	
•		greatly 34:16	35:6 36:2 37:17,22,23	interpret 42:10
express 49:19 50:1	33:20 38:5 46:17,19	groups 47:7	38:1,2,7,11,11,13,14	interpreting 3:25 39:4
expressed 16:15 39:1	50:15 52:16	guess 12:12 30:13 31:17	38:15,18,19,24,25	introduce 34:1
expression 4:6	five 30:2,2	31:24	39:4 40:12 46:14,18	introduced 18:12
extended 44:11	flag 23:13	guest 35:9 44:17	47:9 48:11,12,16,24	introductions 3:10
extension 34:25	flexibility 8:7	guidance 9:21 28:18	49:15,21,25 50:3,11	issuance 3:20 52:11
extensive 8:11 9:5	floor 1:13,21 5:12	35:21 39:5 49:6 50:19	50:14,17 51:2,16 52:6	issue 12:21 13:9,22
extent 8:24 9:7	focus 34:3	guide 26:9 51:20	52:11	35:18,18 42:23 45:11
extremely 20:5 21:7	follow 12:17 15:3 24:3	guilty 22:16	HUD 12:17 51:20	45:12
28:12	following 12:13	• •		issues 36:20,22 40:20
	foolish 18:4	Н		47:9
F	foregoing 53:8,12		idea 25:12 43:1	items 36:9
	form 43:11	half 16:23		
F 1:23 53:4,20	formal 4:23	hand 30:19,24	identified 26:25 27:5,14	J
F.H.A 7:22 8:15	forms 34:12	hands 47:24	27:21	
face 40:11 47:25		happen 14:25	identity 4:5	Janet 2:11 16:10
faced 37:15 48:14	forth 4:1 53:9	happy 39:19 42:21 46:5	Iglesias 2:4 3:17 51:24	jobs 38:17 48:15,15
facie 8:4	forward 10:15 15:2	harass 16:22	imagine 33:23	join 12:22
facilities 35:10	43:10	harassment 4:4 19:17	immediate 44:6	joining 3:15
facing 40:8 47:8 48:23	Foundation 40:4	19:20,23,24	impact 12:10	JOSEPH 2:3
fact 11:23 12:1 14:8,11	foundational 49:22	hard 16:15 18:20 28:14	implement 21:19 22:4	judge 41:7,13,16 48:1
19:9 22:8 32:17 41:9,9	frankly 26:6 27:25	42:25	38:24	judges 40:11,20 42:7,11
41:10,22 45:9 48:1	fraud 36:23	hard-pressed 21:21	implications 23:2	42:11 46:21
facts 15:23	front 6:14	Hatfields 20:2	important 38:15 48:19	judicial 48:9
factual 13:18	full 14:5 50:6	health 31:11	imposed 21:25	jump 26:23
failed 48:17	funding 47:7		-	
	funds 47:4	hear 6:20,20 16:9	inappropriately 41:3	Junipero 1:12
fair 1:1,5,9 3:6,8,15,21	further 5:24 6:23 13:18	heard 11:1 34:19	incident 17:7	
3:22 18:10 22:8,13	17:3 28:21 51:3	hearing 1:5 3:5,6,9,12	include 18:15 35:1 44:17	К
23:7 28:21 30:6 33:16	17.5 20.21 51.5	3:20 4:22,23 6:5,7,9	included 52:1	Keebler 46:9
37:23 38:1,7,11,11,13		7:1 20:21 21:5 42:22	includes 42:10	keep 10:9 17:22
38:18,18,21,25 40:12	G	52:11	including 13:19 35:5	keeping 33:10 46:2
49:14,24 50:13,19	G-i-e-b-e-l-e-r 44:3	hearings 10:23 52:16	38:1	Kevin 2:5 3:18
52:6,11	gender 4:5,5,5	heck 17:21	inclusion 50:22	key 46:25
fairness 51:12	general 14:17 17:18	held 13:3 44:4	income 4:7 44:23,24,24	kick 6:25
faithfully 38:24	generally 9:18 20:5 39:1	help 21:8 42:3,9 43:6	47:3	kind 18:9 19:11 20:12
fall 13:6	50:13	46:21 49:5 50:21	inconsistent 7:22	30:4,24 50:9
familial 4:7	generating 50:21	helped 42:19	incorrect 34:25	kinds 33:3 37:12
far 14:4 34:7	genetic 4:8	helpful 23:22 33:9 39:22	increase 44:22	King 38:10
fear 27:15	getting 7:6 31:13,16	42:14 45:12 46:2	incredibly 36:19	Kish 2:5 3:18
feasible 11:18 12:9	43:2	hey 23:7	Independence 26:9	
feasibly 25:9	Giebeler 44:2	highlight 35:3,8 36:12	independent 19:2	knew 18:23
February 4:25	give 20:13,13,14 21:9	47:15	indicate 21:10	know 7:20 15:3,4 17:6
federal 11:8,10 23:25	28:17 40:21 50:20	historic 16:18	indicates 8:7	18:1 28:14 30:23
24:6 34:21 37:13	given 15:13,16,23 16:22	history 9:17,22 11:24	indicating 25:9	31:19 33:9 34:6 36:5
		-	0	36:13,23 38:16 46:24
38:11 39:17 42:10,13	39:3 Clandala 1:21	23:16,25 24:7 51:7	indigent 40:6	46:25 51:18
43:16 45:3,9	Glendale 1:21	HOA 17:21,22	individual 24:18,19,20	knowledge 37:5,9 39:16
fee 31:17	go 17:3 31:2,25 32:3	HOAs 17:19	25:4 29:21 34:9 44:13	known 18:24
feel 16:16 25:24 34:20	40:10 42:14 47:24	hold 20:21	individualized 10:3	knows 17:20
feeling 16:9	48:15 49:11	holding 4:22 18:18	individuals 5:1 42:3	1
fees 44:17	goal 42:5	HOLLY 2:6	infamous 17:7	L
FEH 35:18	going 3:6 7:9 11:2,2,4	homeless 42:4 46:3	information 4:8 9:18,22	
FEHA 4:1,3 7:20 8:16	12:2,20 15:2,13 16:9	homelessness 40:8 47:5	10:3 13:19,20 18:15	I-a-m 33:21
	1	1	I	I

	1	I	1	I
L.A 47:5	lives 19:24	mentioned 46:10	occurs 41:23	18:3 20:17 22:3 25:20
Lab 32:19	local 51:16	met 26:20	office 5:11 13:4 41:6	28:2 29:4,6,24 30:7,8
lack 39:3	localities 50:21	mic 15:12	official 6:8	30:9,15,25 31:1 36:14
LAFLA 40:5	located 5:11	microphone 6:15	oh 30:5	37:15 43:6 45:12 46:2
lamb 33:21	long 16:17 34:6	mind 10:9	okay 16:3 33:14 44:2	52:7
			-	-
land 23:15 39:16	longer 43:5 45:17	mine 3:16	52:9	percent 17:10
landlord 41:4	look 10:15 12:6 14:19	minute 41:15	once 8:4 19:4	perform 9:13 27:13
landlord's 45:5	29:2 30:4 42:13 51:9	mitigating 10:3	one-bedroom 29:23 30:3	35:24
language 17:18,23,25	51:17,21 52:3	modification 44:15	one-time 32:3	period 5:23 51:9,22
22:6 23:22 25:2 28:7	looking 22:2,10 27:9,11	moment 17:2	ones 3:7 29:8,10	periods 51:17
				-
28:10 44:12,13	27:17 29:22,24 43:10	month 19:4 44:20	online 31:15,16,18 36:23	permitted 9:10 10:2
large 31:21	looks 7:25	morning 7:2 10:17,20	open 11:16 12:16 15:1	14:13 23:25 35:5
largest 40:5	Los 1:15 3:1,9 5:11,12	28:23 33:18 34:2	15:21,22	person 6:11 17:14 18:20
lastly 28:11 49:1	37:23,24 40:4	37:21 39:25 46:13	opportunity 6:22 16:4,21	22:12 24:25 25:13,15
latitude 29:12	lost 43:4	49:16	19:12 37:10 50:4	26:11,14 27:24 28:3
	lot 13:12 18:15 21:2,18	mother 40:25	opposed 25:6	
law 11:8,10,15 14:15,22				29:15,25 31:20 32:1
15:7 24:1,6 34:22,25	34:16 41:13,17 43:5	motion 41:12,13	opposite 12:5	37:1,5,8,9 41:18
36:5 37:13 38:2,2,15	45:3,4 47:3,5,9	Mount 16:21	options 37:2	person's 34:14 37:6
39:3,17 40:5,12 42:9	love 19:8	mouthful 16:13	Orange 17:1	personal 37:5,9 42:24
42:13 43:16 44:2	lump-sum 31:1	move 24:9	order 46:21	persons 17:15 40:6
50:14	lumping 30:20	moving 38:20	organization 37:23	• • • • •
		110vilig 30.20		perspective 29:2
laws 33:8	Luther 38:10		organization's 49:19	persuasive 14:15
lease 45:20		N	organizations 38:1 50:3	pet 29:6 30:1 32:4
leasing 13:4	M	name 6:18 28:23 33:19	51:2	picking 46:16
leave 12:16 36:16			orientation 4:6	piece 25:21
leaves 11:15 15:22	M 44:3	33:20,20,24 39:25	origin 4:7	place 11:19 21:2 53:9
	M-c-G-r-a-n-a-h-a-n 40:1	46:13 53:15		
led 38:10	mail 5:9	national 4:6 38:2	Ortiz 2:3 3:17 43:22 46:7	placed 5:3 11:12 12:15
left 15:21	maintaining 46:2	necessarily 14:5 25:24	outlined 37:3	plaintiff 11:11
legal 18:22 34:9 37:25	making 12:20 22:19	necessary 24:11 42:23	outside 9:9	plaintiffs 13:24
40:3 46:5 50:3,16 51:1			overbroad 51:25	plan 5:15
51:25	37:14 40:18 44:17	44:16 48:25	oversee 19:5	plane 17:7,13
	47:10	need 7:22 21:8 27:18		
legally 51:19	man 40:24	29:11 30:25 31:1,9	overweight 26:21	planned 17:16
legislative 11:24,24	managers 19:1 28:17	36:11 37:2 42:13	overwrought 50:9	plays 38:19
legislature 12:5,12	mandatory 18:13	45:13 46:5,22 47:21	owner 20:21,22 32:18	please 5:16 6:17 52:14
15:20 16:12	Mandelbaum 2:2 3:4,14	49:4,9	owners 20:17,18	plus 30:1
legitimate 8:6,8			,	podiatrist 29:15
•	10:14 16:6 28:20	needed 34:16 42:7		-
let's 13:24 31:6	33:16,23,24 37:20	needs 44:8	P	point 10:10 15:14 23:1
letter 31:17 41:23 42:18	39:24 49:13 52:6	neighborhoods 38:17	P-a-n 33:20	28:16 35:16 36:3 49:1
42:19 43:16 44:1,1,4	manifestations 44:7	Network 46:15	P-o-w-e-r-s 16:10	points 33:13
47:19	Marceline 1:23 53:4,20	nexus 14:9 25:16 45:13	P-r-a-d-o 46:14	policies 44:14,15
letters 42:20				policy 9:22 14:18 22:22
level 20:7,19	marital 4:6	Noble 1:23 53:4,20	P-r-o-u-t 7:3	44:18 45:21
	Martin 38:10	nonbusiness 11:14	p.m 5:6 7:8 52:14	
levied 23:5	materials 4:16	nondiscriminatory 8:6	page 4:21 5:3 29:20	Poodles 31:21
liability 17:25,25 18:23	matter 14:17,18 39:13	nonobvious 14:8,9	PAGES 1:25	pool 26:23,24 27:3 28:4
28:3	matters 11:4 18:10 26:6	nonretaliatory 8:6	paid 44:19	portion 47:11 50:8 51:6
liberties 49:23	McCoys 20:2	North 1:21	pan 33:21	position 7:21 27:25
lie 11:20				49:21
	McGRANAHAN 2:13	note 38:7	Panchalam 2:12 33:18	possible 43:11
life 41:1,5	39:25 40:1,3 43:18,25	notice 1:2,7 4:16,25 5:4	33:20 34:1	
likened 20:1	46:11	41:8	paper 25:21	possibly 26:23 29:25
limine 41:12	mean 26:9 32:1	noticed 4:23	parse 25:3	potentially 27:25
limit 7:9 29:14 31:22	meaningful 36:19 39:5	notify 23:9	part 4:22 6:4,7 25:10	poultry 17:11
limitation 12:24.25 29:5	means 12:5 24:21 30:1	nuisance 20:6 41:4,10		pounds 26:21 27:2
limitations 21:22 36:5			46:19 52:20	Poverty 38:2
	medical 13:19	50:10 52:1	particular 12:15 25:22	
limited 20:5,21,24 21:7	medication 41:1,3	number 29:4,22 36:5	39:20 42:11 50:7	power 20:14
27:4 44:6,23,23,24	meet 48:16	37:25	particularly 20:23 21:19	Powers 2:11 16:10,10,11
48:10,13	meeting 1:2 3:11 53:8,9	numerous 18:11	29:19 38:8 39:16	28:6,8 32:7
limits 9:2 30:9	53:12		46:19,23 47:2,4,16	practicable 26:5 51:18
linchpin 38:16				practical 39:13 44:8
	meets 19:4	0	parties 47:11	-
line 8:15 9:25 14:14	member 2:2,3,3,4,4 3:18	o'clock 11:3	partners 51:16	practice 9:22,25 10:10
link 8:2	15:10 16:2 28:6 29:3	obese 26:22	party 25:7	18:25
LISA 2:3	32:11 33:12 39:21		pass 31:3	practices 21:6 23:14
list 5:2	43:13,22 46:7,8 51:24	obligations 39:6	passage 38:11	practitioner 31:11
litigation 37:22 50:21		observed 38:9		Prado 2:13 46:13,14
little 18:8,17 21:9,21	members 3:17 22:11	obvious 22:6 26:10,12	patient 32:2	precedential 11:22
	23:1,7,9 28:17	27:18	pay 31:17 47:8,11	
24:13 25:3,8,25 29:12	membership 21:25	occasionally 20:7	peace 17:2	prefatory 17:18
29:17 43:23	22:24	occupying 29:24	peacock 17:7	prefer 5:9
live 14:21	memo 52:1,4		peacocks 17:10,13	present 13:24
lived 40:25	mention 42:22	occurred 17:7 21:6,11	people 14:21,22 16:8	presented 35:25 36:3,7
-	111011142.22	1	PEOPIE 14.21,22 10.0	

		l	I	l
pressure 51:16	PTSD 29:7	recognized 49:10 51:11	48:18 51:8	sake 30:20
Presumably 15:22	public 1:5 3:5,9,19 4:22	recommendation 43:14	requested 31:9 45:18	salary 18:7
pretty 46:4	5:25 6:25 9:8,9 11:5	recommended 51:1	47:19	Sanjay 2:10 10:17
prevent 42:3	13:2,7 14:20 48:12	record 6:4,8 52:20,21	requesting 26:15	satisfies 42:17
prevention 47:5	49:14 51:16 52:7,10	53:12	requests 17:8,10 47:10	save 26:24 43:6
previous 10:23 24:1	published 4:25	records 4:20 51:14	require 14:2 25:22 29:8	saying 31:24 34:5 35:20
•	•		•	
previously 19:11 21:16	publishing 23:6	recourse 22:4	35:6 37:4	says 8:4 11:16 25:15,21
23:17 39:8	purpose 3:19 7:17,21	red 23:13	required 7:14 8:16 9:4	29:20 42:16
prima 8:4	8:15	reduce 19:19	26:22 35:22 37:7 49:8	scanned 24:15
prior 11:3	purposes 3:11,12 7:23	reference 13:14 19:9	requirement 13:23 37:1	schizophrenia 40:25
privacy 29:18 50:14	31:13 35:11	43:25	requirements 10:1	schools 38:16
problem 21:1 40:8	pursuant 5:4 11:17	referenced 44:4	requires 7:20 36:5	Schur 2:2 3:17 15:10
problematic 24:13	push 30:9 31:4	references 17:16	requiring 44:19	16:2 28:6 32:11 33:12
problems 15:2 32:21	pushing 30:7	reflected 4:15,17	resemblance 26:14	39:21 43:13 46:8
proceedings 5:17	put 12:1 16:19 17:4 21:8	refused 48:24	resident 19:24,25	Scott 2:12 37:21
	•			
process 4:23 5:25 10:22	21:20,22 23:3,17,24	regard 17:5 19:19 21:23	resident-on-resident	second 8:17 12:20 44:1
10:25 25:11 34:7 35:7	24:1,3 26:5 27:19,24	24:6 26:2 51:25	19:23	section 4:1 7:12 8:14,17
47:25 48:6 50:14	28:15 42:18	regarding 9:3 12:21	Residential 13:6	8:19 9:2 10:1 11:7,25
processed 34:7	putting 12:2,3 20:25	23:24 24:10 26:3 27:5	residents 13:5 34:9	13:9 17:6,14 19:15,17
processes 36:24		34:13 39:8 50:20	resources 48:10	21:22 22:10 23:15
produce 25:21	Q	52:11	respectively 4:18	24:10,14,17 29:20
professional 31:12 32:6	qualify 44:25	regardless 15:6 18:23	respond 6:2 41:22	30:13 31:7 42:25 43:2
program 31:18 50:11,17		Register 4:25	respondent 8:5	44:18 50:23 51:3
programs 50:12,20,24	quality 38:16	regs 11:8	responding 47:10	sections 4:11 7:10 9:1
	question 8:21 9:8 12:25			
prohibits 4:3 35:8	15:10 29:17 31:25,25	regulation 8:23 24:4	response 5:24	13:8 14:13 23:16
Project 38:3	questions 8:20 9:11	33:17 34:5,11 39:4	restriction 35:9	see 19:8,23 20:7 22:6
prong 12:3,7,15	10:12 14:7 26:3 27:5	43:11 49:20 50:24	restrictive 11:10	26:7 31:6 42:12 46:8
proof 11:9,19 39:8,11,18	27:12,19 29:13 35:22	regulations 1:5,9 3:22	rests 11:10	self-verification 24:12
properties 13:4 35:6	37:6	3:22,25 4:9,10,20 5:6	result 24:16	25:20 26:18
property 18:10 20:22	quickly 19:16 28:11	5:20 9:20,23,24 10:10	resulted 18:24	self-verify 25:6
propose 15:18 28:7	quiet 13:9	10:21 16:24 28:14,22	retain 32:23	send 17:4
proposed 1:5,7,9 3:6 4:9	•	29:1,14 33:13 34:20	retaliate 22:6	sense 27:23
4:14,19 5:6,20 13:9	quite 29:10	36:22 37:14 38:4,8,23	retaliation 7:11,15,17	sentiments 16:14
28:9 34:4 38:4,5 44:12	quote 13:17	39:2 40:17 41:19,20	8:10,13 21:14 22:9	separate 33:3
52:11		42:1,8 46:18 47:1,13	23:13	separately 5:15 52:5
proposing 8:23 26:13	R		retaliatory 23:6	seq 4:2
	race 4:4	48:4,19 49:15,23 50:8		
41:12	Racobs 16:11	50:20 51:6 52:7,12	review 7:24 8:3 50:4	serious 51:12
prospective 44:22	raise 11:4	Regulatory 4:24	reviewed 9:1	seriously 32:9
protect 36:6 37:12	raising 23:12,13	reintroduce 3:11	reviewing 9:25	Serra 1:12
protected 20:9 22:2	ramification 23:10	related 3:20 9:14 23:14	right 5:12 7:4 14:22 16:3	serve 18:3
protection 50:15	readily 26:12 27:20	36:9,21,23	29:9,18 32:9 34:15,22	service 8:21 9:3,7 12:21
Prout 2:10 7:2,2 10:16	ready 3:4 6:23	relates 4:3 7:11 8:17,20	35:5 50:14	12:24 13:14,22 14:2,9
prove 7:14 12:9 25:25	real 18:10	9:16	rights 37:22 38:15 39:5	14:11,16,25 15:8 26:4
proven 22:16		relating 40:17	46:14,18 49:22 50:3	26:13 27:1,6,14 29:8
proverbial 41:15	really 16:18 19:3 20:3,10	relationship 20:1,23	51:2	30:16,22 32:12,16
provide 9:20 16:8 24:16	21:2,17 24:2 26:7	relative 39:3	ring 21:9	33:7 34:15,22 35:4,13
25:5,9 26:18 37:11	28:13,15 30:7,10 31:2	relatively 6:11	rise 17:12 20:7,19	35:17,19,22 36:11,14
39:4 43:20,22 46:6	34:10 43:7 45:15,25	relevant 45:10 51:20	road 16:17	41:8 47:6 50:3 51:1
	46:1,1	reliable 25:10,24 26:18	role 38:20 48:12	services 19:2 34:9 35:10
49:5,7 52:7,10	Realtors 10:19			
provided 8:11 10:6	reason 6:3 8:6,9 15:21	religion 4:5	room 1:13 4:15 6:14	38:1
24:20 25:3 42:19	18:1 27:6,14 30:23	relocate 44:20	roommate 43:3 45:6,20	set 4:1 32:18 33:6 53:9
46:24 47:19 49:10	31:8,14 32:15	relying 8:1	45:21	seven 51:10,11
provider 9:10,21 48:17	reasonable 13:13 14:5	remain 17:24 24:11	round 5:25	sex 4:5
48:24	17:8 24:11,25 25:13	remained 25:19	rule 44:19	sexual 4:6
providers 34:9,17 36:3	29:7 31:8,13 32:18	remarks 24:2	rulemaking 1:7 3:13,24	shape 37:14
47:6,9 50:3 51:2		remove 23:20	4:23 5:25 6:4	shifting 11:6 12:18
provides 15:25 31:7	34:21,23 35:7,13	rent 44:19,21 45:18 47:8	rules 29:3 30:21 32:18	15:14,15
36:18	40:13 41:7,23 43:2	47:12,12	33:5,6	shifts 8:5
providing 9:5 38:3 41:1	44:5,5,14 45:19 46:22	rental 35:6	ruling 6:8	shorter 51:10,17,21
47:1,7	47:18 48:2,17,24	replace 33:11	run 18:5	Shorthand 53:4
proving 11:9	reasonableness 27:19	reported 1:23 53:10	running 29:13	show 8:5 45:12
provision 11:16 37:4	reasons 1:8 4:17 7:25	reporter 6:6,15 40:2		showing 7:18 8:4 14:2
•	11:22 51:19	•	S	shown 13:5
39:20	receipt 24:22	52:19 53:5		
provisions 32:22 34:4	receive 3:20 5:19	REPORTER'S 53:2	s 12:23	shows 12:4
36:4 38:13,25 51:8	received 6:2	REPORTERS 1:20	S-a-n-j-a-y 10:18	sic 25:22
psychiatric 29:15	recognition 34:14	represent 17:9 40:6	S-r-i 33:20	sides 34:8
psychological 29:16	recognize 42:12	request 5:21 9:11 20:22	Sacramento 18:12	similar 33:24
psychologist 31:18		40:19 41:21 44:14	safe 38:16	simply 11:16 12:24

Meeting Notice and Agenda VII April 4, 2018

	l		[<u></u>	I
situation 22:25 26:10	subsections 7:12,13	33:3 36:24 37:12	typewriting 53:11	15:11,20 16:3
situations 27:18	subsequent 3:13	47:15	typified 50:10	waive 45:20
slated 4:9	successfully 50:16	think 7:6 9:1 12:4,11		waiving 44:17,19
slowly 6:11	51:17	14:19 15:3,20,24	U	Walker 8:2
society 38:21	suffered 40:24	16:18 17:5 18:1,15	Ultimately 41:16	want 16:14 17:22 21:14
somebody 31:18 48:23	sufficient 7:18 9:20	19:3,6,12,21 21:16,20		21:15 22:3,3 23:3,5
somewhat 50:13	15:25 31:12	22:4,7,7 24:16 25:4,23	unable 28:5 41:6 43:4	27:9,10 28:11 29:1
sorry 21:15	suggest 13:14	27:17,18,22 28:18	unclear 10:7,11	30:7,7 32:14 33:1
			understand 7:21 18:21	
sort 19:9	supplements 3:25	30:15 32:19 35:14	19:17 25:12 30:12,21	36:20 42:6,12,12
sorts 15:2	support 13:13 14:23,23	37:12 39:21 42:1,8	36:21 40:12,12 42:9	46:17 48:2 50:1,7 51:5
source 4:7	15:7 30:16,22 32:17	43:18 46:4 49:23 50:9	46:22 48:2 51:10	51:7 52:9
Southern 49:18,21 50:18	32:25 33:8 34:23	50:19,22 51:3 52:18	understanding 8:22	wanted 19:15 34:5 35:2
spare 18:6	35:14 36:12,13,17,18	Thinking 45:21	29:17 49:4	36:3,12 39:7 42:22
speak 6:10,15 16:5,23	37:2 39:1 47:16,22	third 1:21 25:7 47:11	understood 33:2	wants 12:16
SPEAKERS 2:9	49:7,20 50:1,8,22,25	third-party 47:6	unfamiliar 40:20	warrant 31:12
speaking 6:18	51:5	THOMAS 2:6		waste 48:9,10
speaks 6:11	supportable 51:19	thought 33:8 34:10	unfortunately 24:15	watch 19:1
special 23:1,5	supported 37:17	42:18	uniform 50:13	way 15:4 31:25 41:18,18
			unique 34:14	
specific 3:24 10:1 20:11	supporting 13:19	thoughts 17:3	unit 29:6 30:3 44:21	41:18
23:14	supports 39:18	thousands 5:1	unlawful 40:11,14,17,19	ways 43:5
specifically 7:12 10:7	sure 5:16 17:19 25:9	three 7:9 33:4,10 38:23	40:24 42:7 46:23 47:2	we'll 6:1,2
13:25 40:18 50:9	33:1 37:14 42:7 52:15	three-day 41:8	47:17,23,25 48:3,7,8	we're 3:6 4:22 6:23 7:6
spell 33:19	swimming 28:4	tie 45:25,25	48:23	16:9 17:14,21 20:6
spelling 6:17	sworn 6:13	TIM 2:4	unrealistic 28:1	22:2,10,23 26:7,11
spend 18:5		time 3:23 6:12 16:19		27:17 28:15 30:6 32:9
Sperber 2:6 5:10,16 17:4	т	18:6 28:19 31:20	unreasonable 37:16	43:7 47:9
Sri 2:12 33:19,20 34:2		32:13 41:21 46:17	Unruh 8:23 9:4 13:1 35:8	we've 3:10 19:11 23:7
	T 24:14		35:18	
St 31:21	take 6:16 19:3 20:11,22	52:10,18 53:9,13	urge 10:8	30:17 34:18 42:21
stakeholders 5:2	21:3,12 32:8,13 36:9	timely 38:8	use 9:24 10:7 12:14	web 4:21 5:3
stale 51:13	41:2 52:3	times 22:12	21:13 23:15 32:15	Wednesday 1:17 3:1
stalemate 26:1	taken 53:8,12	timing 40:18 41:14	33:4 34:15 39:16	weigh 27:2
stand 19:25	talk 18:2 19:15 31:19	Title 4:10	40:19 43:2 44:22	well-being 51:15
standard 8:3,8,13,13,16	32:13	today 3:16 5:5,6,18 6:1	usually 24:20 25:2	went 15:21 17:2 41:2,13
12:14 14:4,25 18:18	talked 19:11	7:8,10 11:3,5 16:11	uouunj 21.20 20.2	West 5:12
19:10 21:16,17 39:10	talking 17:21 25:14,18	17:1 34:3,12,19 36:3	v	Western 38:2 50:4
standards 7:14 8:1	task 9:14 27:1,8,13,21	38:8 47:18,23 48:21		WHEREOF 53:15
standpoint 29:22 30:5	28:5 35:23	49:19 52:14	v 17:23	Whitney 2:10 7:2
32:8	teeth 21:9	today's 3:12,19 52:10	vague 25:8	willful 22:21
start 3:5,6 34:5		tool 21:13 28:18	valuable 36:14	wish 52:7
state 3:25 23:25 24:6	tell 29:10	tools 20:14 21:2	variety 20:2 21:24 24:21	wishing 6:21 16:8
34:22 37:13 38:20	ten 17:9	top 16:20	various 16:24 33:7	WITNESS 33:10,14
40:9 43:15 48:5 53:5	tenant 20:24 21:13 35:9	torture 16:22	vendors 19:2	53:15
	44:22		verification 9:11 13:10	
state's 38:14	tenants 20:18 34:17	totally 33:19	13:15 14:2,10,12,16	woman 26:17 27:1
stated 7:16,19 8:2 9:12	48:13	tough 45:6,7	14:24 15:1,7 25:10	wonderful 28:18 42:2
10:22 13:16,21 51:19	tender 22:14	track 37:2	32:24 36:23	Wong 2:14 49:16,16
statement 1:8 4:17 6:3	tendering 22:18	train 17:1 28:8		52:3
7:25 11:22 23:7 24:22	term 30:14,17 32:15 39:6	trained 9:13 13:25 26:8	verify 14:7,7,9	Woods 13:11,18
24:24 25:13,15,17	terms 21:21 23:13,15	32:20 35:24	verifying 37:1	word 16:9 24:16
states 11:22	30:15 31:3,4 32:23	training 18:8	versus 25:10 30:16 44:3	words 25:6
stating 6:17,18 47:20		transcribed 6:5,9 53:11	51:15	work 7:5 10:21 16:16
status 4:6,7	33:5	transcript 1:11 3:13 6:6	veteran's 47:6	28:14,15 33:15 34:10
status 4.0,7 stay 45:23	terrific 24:7	transportation 38:17	vets 47:7	35:23 38:22 41:13
stenographically 53:10	testifies 5:18,22	treating 32:1,2	vicarious 17:25	42:2 43:4,8
step 49:24	testify 6:13		Victor 17:15,23	worked 42:20,25
	testimony 5:5 6:20	troubled 24:12 30:10	VII 1:5	,
Stirling 22:1	text 4:19	true 24:25 25:14 53:12	violate 50:13	working 18:6
Street 1:14 5:12	thank 3:8 7:5 10:14,16	trump 41:10	violation 11:16 22:9	worth 16:19
strengthen 51:3	10:21 16:2,3,4,6 28:18	try 20:5 21:1 30:15 31:4	visit 31:11	wouldn't 41:10
stress 29:7 31:14	28:20 32:10,11 33:14	trying 19:19 25:4 29:3	vital 38:15	write 42:19
strong 39:1 49:20	34:6 37:20 39:23,24	30:6 32:9 37:16 43:19		writing 17:4
subdivision 11:17 12:14	40:2 43:12,13 46:7,11	two 9:11 11:4,4 12:25	volunteer 18:4,18 19:4	written 5:5,8,14,19,23
submit 5:15 7:8 11:2	46:17 47:14 48:4	14:7,13 26:3 27:4	28:24 29:2 32:8	6:2,20 7:7 9:5,20 10:6
16:25 39:19 52:4,15		29:23,25 31:3,21	vouchers 44:19	10:15 11:3 15:9 16:25
submits 5:18	49:12,13 51:23 52:9	33:11 35:1,16,20,22		23:18 25:14 32:5 38:6
	thankful 28:12	two-bedroom 45:17	W	
submitted 32:5 38:6	thanks 16:21 33:14		W 1:14	42:19 50:2 51:1,20
50:2,5	37:19	two-question 35:12,17	W-a-g-l-e 10:18	52:13
submitting 15:9	therapist 47:20	tying 47:20,21	W-a-g-i-e 10.18 W-o-n-g 49:17	wrong 50:23
subscribed 53:15	thing 12:18 32:3,9,14	type 19:22 21:13 22:21		wrongdoers 21:3
subsection 8:19	things 31:16 32:16 33:2	types 17:11 45:24 47:15	Wagle 2:10 10:17,18	wrongdoing 22:17
	I	I	1	I
L				

Meeting Notice and Agenda VII April 4, 2018

	33 29:20		
X	33 29:20 380 27:2		
	300 27.2		
Y	4		
yeah 29:18			
year 16:23 38:8	4 1:17 3:1 29:20		
years 18:12 38:12,23	45 4:24		
51:10,11	45-day 3:5		
yesterday 38:6 42:20	4th 1:14 3:10 5:7,12		
younger 40:23	<u>_</u>		
	5		
Z	5 5:6 7:8 11:3 17:23		
	52:14		
0	500 1:21		
	50th 38:9		
1	54 1:25 54.1 13:8		
1 1:25 41:14	54.2 13:8		
10:13 3:2	34.2 15.0		
10th 5:12	6		
11:26 3:2 52:21		•	
12005 4:11 17:6 30:13	6-6-18 1:11		
12005(v) 17:15	63 4:11		
12010 4:11 17:25	7		
12060 4:11	7	·]	
12062 11:7			
12100 4:11	8		
12120 4:11 19:17	8 42:25 43:2 44:18		
12130 7:12 21:15	800 1:22		
12162 23:14,24			
12162(b) 50:23	9		
12176(c)(7) 40:17	90 27:2		
12178 24:10 37:3	90013 5:13		
12179 31:7	91203 1:21		
12185 8:18 26:2 29:20	9th 44:4		
12185(b) 12:22			
12270 23:23 24:1			
12900 4:2			
12955.8 11:18 12:14			
12th 53:16			
130 4:12			
15-day 5:23 150 26:21			
155 4:12			
161 4:12			
162 4:12			
16th 4:25			
176 4:12			
180 4:12		1	
185 4:12		1	
1st 44:20			
2			
2 4:10 41:14 48:6		1	
200 26:21			
2015 38:5			
2018 1:17 3:1 4:25 53:16			
24 9:17			
25-pound 27:3,7			
265 4:12			
271 4:13			
288-3376 1:22			
3			
30-pound 31:22			
3024 1:23 53:20			
001-11.20 00.20			
320 5:12 328 1:14			