

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#); [BOS-Operations](#); [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Today! Please Support the State Justice for Renters-Act Resolution file #240684
Date: Tuesday, June 25, 2024 11:14:29 AM
Attachments: [8486f3e8.png](#)

Dear Supervisors,

Please see below regarding:

File No. 240684 - Resolution supporting The Justice for Renters Act, a California State Proposition on the November 5, 2024, ballot; and reaffirming the City and County of San Francisco's support for repeal of the Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act.

Regards,

Richard Lagunte
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
Voice (415) 554-5184 | Fax (415) 554-5163
richard.lagunte@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Pronouns: he, him, his

***Disclosures:** Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors' website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: graypanther-sf <graypanther-sf@sonic.net>
Sent: Tuesday, June 25, 2024 10:34 AM
Subject: Today! Please Support the State Justice for Renters-Act Resolution file #240684

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



2024 June 25

**To SF BOS- Please Support the State Justice for Renters-Act Resolution
[file #240684](#)**

(Continued to June 25 2024 Full BOS Meeting).

Cc: Clerk of the Board: please enter into file.

From:San Francisco Gray Panthers

We represent multiple elderly and low income renters in San Francisco. We wish to enthusiastically endorse Supervisor Walton's statement on 6/11 that the statewide Justice for Renters Act is simply about repealing Costa-Hawkins which is absolutely necessary to help San Franciscans who need rent control to stay in their beloved city.

We expect you, our San Francisco representatives to stand behind working class and middle/low income San Franciscans by voting for this resolution supporting the state "Justice for Renters Act."

It is indeed very difficult to view arguments against the repeal of "Costa Hawkins" as anything other than an anti-renter, anti working class stance. Please represent your constituents and vote for this resolution.

Thank you,

Ann Colichidas
on behalf of
San Francisco Gray Panthers

1845 Hayes St. San Francisco, California 94117

Email: graypanther-sf@sonic.net

From: [Lovett, Li \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Fw: ADC letter in support of File No. 240684
Date: Monday, June 24, 2024 7:43:08 PM
Attachments: [6-24-24 Justice for Renters Resolution- File 240684.pdf](#)

Hi--

The advocates have submitted this letter for the Resolution Supporting the Justice for Renters Act (file #[240684](#)), sponsored by Supervisor Preston along with 5 cosponsors. Wanted to make sure that BOS legislation has it as well, so it can be included in the file ahead of the 6/25/24 meeting.

Thank you!

Li

Li Lovett
Legislative Aide
Supervisor Dean Preston
Office: (415) 554-7630 | Direct: (415) 554-6783
Mobile (415) 370-5279
Office website: <https://www.deanprestonsf.com/>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Molly Goldberg** <molly@sfadc.org>
Date: Mon, Jun 24, 2024 at 9:58 AM
Subject: ADC letter in support of File No. 240684
To: <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>

Hi,

I am submitting the following letter on behalf of the San Francisco Anti-Displacement Coalition to be included in the legislative file for tomorrow's Board Meeting, item #32 File No. 240684.

Thank you,

Molly Goldberg
San Francisco Anti-Displacement Coalition
1212 Market Street, Unit 200

San Francisco, CA 94102
SFADC.org

June 24, 2024

San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244, San Francisco, CA 94102



RE: File No. 240684

Dear Supervisors,

The San Francisco Anti-Displacement Coalition (SFADC) represents over 20 organizations serving tenants citywide. We write today, along with allied organizations, in support of the Justice for Renters Act on the November 2024 ballot to repeal Costa-Hawkins statewide. We encourage you to support [File #240684](#), the resolution in support of this measure sponsored by Supervisors Preston, Peskin, Ronen, Walton, Chan, and Melgar.

As organizations who daily work with tenants facing displacement due to the impacts of Costa-Hawkins, we know the importance of removing these sweeping state preemptions to our local authority. The real estate industry's response to a nationwide wave of successful community organizing for regulation of rental housing, **Costa-Hawkins creates loopholes in tenant protections that leave tens of thousands of residents unprotected from massive rent increases and displacement.** Our attached 2018 report "[The Cost of Costa Hawkins](#)" describes these loopholes and their impacts in greater detail.

It is no surprise that the Real Estate industry has come out again in full force to oppose the repeal of this measure. **The passage of the Costa-Hawkins Act in 1995 marked over a decade of continuous effort by the real estate lobby to overturn tenant protections they could not stop at the local level.** The 1970s saw a period of massive inflation paired with stagnating wages and rising unemployment. Cost of living, including housing costs, skyrocketed. By the late 1970s, rent control laws had been passed in 170 municipalities across the country. Unable to stop tenant momentum in cities with organized renters, the real estate industry looked for ways to override local initiatives via state preemptions. Despite success in many states nationwide, they were not able to fully ban rent control in Sacramento, so the industry attempted to weaken it via the Costa-Hawkins Act. Initially introduced in 1983, the bill failed every year until 1995, when the industry's persistent lobbying finally paid off. *It has been a priority of tenant advocates to repeal the anti-tenant legislation ever since.*

Costa-Hawkins drives up the price of housing for everyone in the city. Mandated vacancy decontrol means that sales prices for rent control buildings reflect an assumption that a large percentage of long-term rent control units can be flipped to market rate. Counselors and lawyers regularly see tenants facing persistent harassment because their landlords want to empty their unit and raise the rent, including long-term tenants who are not deemed as "original tenants" by the law's definition. The city's largest landlords build this presumption into their business plans, often relying on illegal methods to circumvent tenant protections and rent control, and pricing smaller "mom and pop" landlords out of the market.

Tenants regularly visit our clinics seeking help because a massive rent increase will force them to move from their home of many decades, but they are not covered by rent control because Costa-Hawkins labels their 40-year-old unit "new construction." The ban on extending common-sense rent regulations to "new construction" means that rent controlled housing has declined from over 90% of the rental stock when rent control passed to less than 70% of the stock at last count several years ago. **Rent control housing is the single largest source of affordable units in the city, but over 86,000 units are unregulated simply**

because those buildings were constructed after 1979. Today, one-third of tenants are rent burdened. For very low-income renters, that number jumps to over 60%.

A June 17th letter of opposition submitted by an unsurprising alliance of the San Francisco Apartment Association, San Francisco Association of Realtors, market rate housing developers, and CA Yimby, makes familiar arguments against rent control. For decades, opponents of rent control have claimed that we won't build the new housing we desperately need if rent control is expanded, but **a survey of the academic literature points to rent control having no effect on housing production.** For example, a 2006 study on new construction in the Bay Area found rent-controlled cities built nearly twice as many units per resident as their non-rent-controlled neighbors.¹ A 2023 letter to the Federal Housing Finance Agency, signed by 32 economists in support of national rent control, cites “substantial empirical evidence that rent regulation policies do not limit new construction, nor the overall supply of housing.”²

The Justice for Renter’s Act is simple: it returns authority to cities and counties to enact and enforce regulations on rental housing that local jurisdictions deem necessary. The measure is backed by tenant and community groups, organized labor, veterans, seniors, LGBTQ advocates, and many others statewide. We hope you will join this broad coalition in support of this commonsense measure that will allow us to pass the rent controls we need to ensure that San Francisco is a place where all our communities can imagine and secure a future.

Signed,



¹ SOURCE: "Rent Controlled Cities Lead in New Apartment Construction in Bay Area" Berkeley Rent Stabilization Board (2006). Urban Habitat's 2018 report "[Strengthening Communities through Rent Control and Just-Cause Evictions](#)" makes similar arguments, stating “A comprehensive 1998 report by Berkeley’s Planning and Development Department looks at rent control’s effects on new construction in Berkeley and concludes that “the best available evidence shows that rent control had little or no effect on the construction of new housing.” Analyzing new construction across the decades, the report shows that building permits hit their highest levels since 1971 in 1989—nine years after the passage of rent control. It asserts that “private-sector interest in building in Berkeley changes with economic conditions,” and has more to do with the availability of financing than rent control.

² “[Re: Tenant Protections for Enterprise-Backed Multifamily Properties Request for Input](#),” submitted to the Federal Housing Finance Agency July 28, 2023.