

**From:** [Michael Lee](#)  
**To:** [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Rules Committee Public Comment - Item #1 200509 (Public Advocate)  
**Date:** Monday, July 6, 2020 12:25:04 AM

---

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Mr. Young:

I am unavailable to attend the Rules Committee meeting on Monday, July 6, 2020. However, I would like the following Public Comment to be included for Item #1 - 200509 (Public Advocate).

Rules Committee —

I have a serious concern about the proposed Public Advocate Charter Amendment which includes this sentence:

"The Public Advocate shall be licensed to practice law in all courts of the State of California."

It seems very odd to me that the vast majority of the public would be ineligible to run for or assume office as a potential Public Advocate. The number of people licensed to practice law in San Francisco is extremely low compared to the general population -- a privileged group of individuals to say the least. We already have three citywide elected offices that require one to be licensed to practice law: the City Attorney, the District Attorney, and the Public Defender. And that, of course, makes sense based on the specific role of those offices. But excluding the majority of the public from serving as a Public Advocate? That strikes me as incredibly elitist.

San Franciscans are smart and civic-minded people. The public here can, and should, be allowed to advocate for themselves -- and the voters should be allowed to determine who is uniquely qualified to represent them in this role should it be added to the City Charter. Any attempt to reserve this position for a privileged few is demeaning.

Please consider removing this unnecessary provision from the proposed Charter Amendment.

Sincerely,

Michael Lee

District 4 Resident