

#29 190379

Christopher Mika
2791 16th St. #5
San Francisco, Ca, 94103
510.692.7374
mika.christopher@gmail.com

April 16th, 2019

TO: The San Francisco Board of Supervisors

Dear Supervisors,

My name is Christopher Mika. I am a disabled, recently homeless applicant for Tenant seat 1 on San Francisco's SRO Task force. I stood before the Rules Committee last week, in front of Supervisors Ronen, Mar, and Walton, seeking their recommendation as part of an LGBT Housing Justice slate that included myself, Courtney Brown, and Jordan Davis. Jordan, as an incumbent on the SRO Task Force, was recommended to continue, as is apparently customary. To our disappointment, however, neither myself nor Courtney Brown were advanced by the committee. Today the Rules Committee recommendations for the SRO task force are to be ratified by the full San Francisco Board of Supervisors. I would like to bring to your attention issues surrounding the seat 1 Tenant position, and continue to advocate for myself to be appointed.

When Jordan, Courtney, and I decided to run for the SRO Task Force, we did so believing the process to be open and conducted in good faith. We have since heard that the seats that we were applying for customarily go to certain organizations who make nominations, and then their nominees are appointed. In my case that organization seems to be Central City SRO Collaborative (CCSRO). We do not know for certain that this is the case, but the facts do support this likely conclusion. Consider the following:

- Seat 1 on the SRO Task Force was previously held by a CCSRO employee for at least the previous 6 years.
- Most, if not all, of the people who advocated during public comment for the person currently recommended for Tenant Seat 1 were employees of CCSRO.
- The current recommendation of the Rules Committee for Tenant Seat 1 is also a CCSRO employee.

It is this last detail which is especially egregious. If the SRO Task Force is to have tenant seats, and unencumbered, *legitimate* tenant representation, then those seats

should not be held by people who are employees of SRO landlords or other components of the real estate/speculation industry. This recommendation is particularly nefarious to me personally as my presentation to the Rules Committee contained a stinging critique of my own SRO landlord's version of Supportive Housing, and then the Rules Committee turned around and recommended the seat I was applying for to an employee of my landlord, because as it turns out, CCSRO is literally operated by my landlord, Tenderloin Housing Clinic.

This raises a question for me: What options actually exist for tenants to effect change for quality of life issues within SROs? The two seats on the SRO Task Force are the extent of it within city government. Giving those seats to landlord employees or having them automatically given to the persons nominated by SRO organizations presents a severe conflict of interest. In fact, one of the reasons I had applied for Seat 1 was because the person formerly holding it, who was also an employee of CCSRO, voted to expand the SRO Task Force and add another landlord seat. Tenants are underrepresented on the Task Force as it stands even without all this apparent landlord favoritism.

As applicants to the SRO taskforce, myself and the rest of the LGBT Housing Justice slate I was running with had ample and visible community support, and the support of people like Matt Haney and David Campos. I don't have much hope that The Board of Supervisors will actually appoint me to the SRO task force today, but I would, at the very least, like to start a conversation about how the SRO Task Force is structured, and how we can have unencumbered, legitimate representation for SRO tenants on the task force and agency for SRO tenants within city government in the future.

Sincerely,



Christopher Mika