RESOLUTION NO.

1	[Supporting Senate Bill 364 (Leno) - Amendments to State Law to Return Local Control Over the Ellis Act]
2	Control Over the Ellis Mot
3	Resolution supporting California Senate Bill 364, introduced by Senator Leno,
4	amending State law to return local control over the Ellis Act to prevent real estate
5	speculation and abuse of no-fault evictions.
6	
7	WHEREAS, The City and County of San Francisco (the "City") has historically been
8	among the cities with the highest average rent in our country; and
9	WHEREAS, The City has seen significant job creation and employment growth in the
10	past three years, seeing unemployment rates decline from 9.7% in August 2010 to 3.8% in
11	December 2014 with 70,252 more people employed; and
12	WHEREAS, The population of the City has continued to increase during the past three
13	years of economic growth, resulting in an increased demand for housing; and
14	WHEREAS, From 1997 to the present, according to data from the Rent Board, 3,277
15	units in San Francisco have been withdrawn from the rental market as a result of the Ellis Act
16	and
17	WHEREAS, The Ellis Act, Government Code, Sections 7060, et seq., provides, with
18	limited exceptions that no public entity shall, by statute, ordinance, regulation, or by
19	administrative action compel the owner of any residential real property to offer, or to continue
20	to offer, accommodations in the property for rent or lease; and
21	WHEREAS, The Ellis Act is increasingly being used, not by long-term owners of rental
22	property as the law intended, but instead by new owners who purchase the building with the
23	intent of evoking the Ellis Act purely for speculative purposes; and
24	
25	

1	WHEREAS, The Ellis Act has adversely affected the supply of rental housing in San
2	Francisco by restricting its availability without granting municipalities the tools to directly deal
3	with its negative consequences; and
4	WHEREAS, There is a trend emerging in which the Ellis Act is used by entities who
5	buy rental residential buildings and repeatedly leave the rental business, exploiting a loophole
6	in the Ellis Act that the Legislature may not have intended to create when it passed the law;
7	and
8	WHEREAS, Speculators who use the Ellis Act to evict tenants typically target long term
9	residents who tend to be seniors and impact the City's most vulnerable residents: the
10	disabled, those living with disabling HIV or AIDS, and immigrants; and
11	WHEREAS, An unintended consequence of the Ellis Act is that it places dependence
12	for unit-by-unit replacement of lost affordable rental supply on local subsidy or market rate
13	developers; and
14	WHEREAS, In the last decade, while San Francisco's market rate developers, through
15	the City's inclusionary housing program, have produced 1,530 new affordable units without a
16	City subsidy, during the same period, the City has witnessed 1,594 eviction notices based on
17	the Ellis Act – creating a net loss in non-City-subsidized affordable rental housing; and
18	WHEREAS, In the last decade, while San Francisco has produced on average 591
19	new locally subsidized affordable housing units each year, 262 affordable rental units on
20	average have been petitioned to be withdrawn from the rental market each year due to the
21	Ellis Act, diminishing the impact that City-subsidized affordable housing production has had
22	on increasing San Francisco's affordable housing, particularly for seniors and working class
23	households; and
24	WHEREAS, Although there are 50,600 units entitled for development in the Planning
25	Department's most recent pipeline report, 6,700 of which are currently under construction,

1	with 35 percent currently qualifying as permanently affordable housing, the use of the Ellis Act
2	has in the past three years increased 165%, with 215 evictions from March 2013 to February
3	2014; and
4	WHEREAS, The City does not want to continue the trend of trying to build more
5	affordable housing while at the same time losing an increasing number of our affordable rental
6	housing to Ellis Act evictions; and
7	WHEREAS, The threat of Ellis Act eviction can force tenants to accept buyouts rather
8	than face an eviction without compensation, which causes underreporting of de facto Ellis Act
9	evictions; and
10	WHEREAS, The City recognizes that we cannot wait until Ellis Act evictions reach the
11	levels seen in the year 2000 before acting to restore more local control; and
12	WHEREAS, A 2014 report from Tenants Together, a statewide organization for renters'
13	rights, found that 51% of the City's evictions begin within the first year of new ownership and
14	78% start within the first five years of new ownership; and
15	WHEREAS, Thirty percent of all Ellis Act evictions come from investors who have
16	entered and exited the rental business more than once, evicting residents from multiple
17	buildings; and
18	WHEREAS, The City should work to stem the tide of speculative evictions; and
19	WHEREAS, The City should protect residents who live in the housing stock we have
20	while continuing to build the housing our growing workforce needs; now, therefore, be it
21	RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors and Mayor should work together with a
22	common goal to amend state law to restrict speculative Ellis Act evictions and return greater
23	local control over the Ellis Act in order to reduce the speculative Ellis Act evictions that are
24	displacing long-time residents of our City and disrupting our efforts to grow in accordance to
25	our General Plan and our neighborhood plans; and, be it

1	FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors strongly supports Senate Bill
2	364 amending state law to return more local control to San Francisco in order to stop
3	speculative Ellis Act evictions and respectfully urge our Bay Area legislators to support said
4	legislation; and, be it
5	FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors and Mayor will also pursue
6	local strategies to mitigate adverse impacts on persons displaced by the Ellis Act including but
7	not limited to legislation related to relocation assistance, buy-outs, tenant harassment and
8	affordable rental housing retention.
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	