

**From:** [K.cloudsrest](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Yan, Calvin \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Wong, Linda \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [cloudsrest789@gmail.com](mailto:cloudsrest789@gmail.com); [Kenton Wong](#); [Dion wong](#)  
**Subject:** NO on #201262  
**Date:** Monday, November 16, 2020 10:36:33 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors:

I am a district 3 constituent and owner of a small apartment building in the Chinatown/Nob Hill area. I am writing to express my opposition to your proposed legislation requiring a Housing Inventory of rental units in the City. My brothers (co-owners) and I are already suffering huge financial setbacks due to 75% of our tenants having moved out during the pandemic. Legislation such as yours would further increase our economic burden and create added stress at an extremely difficult time. We are native San Franciscans, seniors with multiple disabilities and feel that your proposal unfairly targets those in our category. Allow me to repeat -- we are all having a hard time so why do you want to impose further unnecessary requirements when we are unable to meet our operating expenses and barely able to pay our property taxes????

-----  
**COSTLY**

- Ordinance will exponentially increase the fees that tenants and landlords pay each year to the Rent Board, but we don't even know what the cost will be. It's irresponsible to rush through an ordinance which will increase tenants costs, without understanding or studying the actual costs.
- The Ordinance states that the Controller shall calculate the fee and publish it 30 days after the effective date of the ordinance. We ask that the fee be studied and calculated BEFORE the ordinance passes so that both the landlord and tenant community can understand its impact before agreeing to support or oppose the ordinance.
- At a substantially increased cost per unit, the ordinance doesn't bring any tangible, additional benefits for either landlords or tenants. It's important to understand what landlords and tenants are paying for, and what services we will get in return.
- In a year where many tenants and landlords have lost a substantial percentage of their income, now is not the right time to dramatically increase fees.

**DRAMATICALLY REASSIGNS A MAJOR CITY DEPARTMENT**

- SF Rent Board is a major city department which provides vital services for both landlords and tenants, including counseling and answering questions, processing petitions, handling arbitration and mediation cases, and more. This ordinance is so burdensome to implement and oversee that Rent Board Staff will not be able to handle other rent board services which are necessary to the tenant and landlord community, and which have real benefits in the everyday lives of

San Franciscans.

- If the City would like to dramatically restructure a City Department that tenants and landlords rely on, it should exercise caution, convene stakeholders, and take all the time it needs to get it right. It should do so in consultation with the Departments involved, and with consideration of the workload required to implement the restructuring.

## **INVASION of PRIVACY**

- Tenants don't want their rental rates to be publicly available or searchable.
- Having "who pays what" as publicly available information sows "Rent Animosity" amongst renters who pay different amounts for similar apartments due to Rent Control, and contributes to an adversarial landlord/tenant relationship.

## **BURDENSOME**

- LA and a few other cities have a registration system which achieves the stated goal of the SF ordinance, but is much more simplified for owners and tenants to comply with.
- Small Property Owners, and in particular property owners who don't speak English as a first language (or at all) will have particular trouble complying with all the requirements of the ordinance. This is much more complicated than the "Rent Registry" systems in other cities.

## **UNNECESSARY**

- Various City Departments already have much of the data included in the registry. The City already has information on the 172,000 apartments which pay a Rent Board Fee, and already requires landlords with 4+ units to register as a Business. The Department of Building Inspection collects Inspection Fees, DPH collects Vector Control Fees, and the Assessor and Tax Collector have data on the number of units, the Rent Board Fee, and other details like the assessed value of the properties.
- Existing Rent Board processes work well to prevent illegal rent increases, to process petitions, and to arbitrate and mediate disputes between landlords and tenants.
- The Ordinance was introduced on Election Day and appears to have been written with the presumption that Prop 21 would pass. Since Prop 21 failed, much of the information required here, particularly with regards to vacancies, is no longer relevant or useful.

## **PROCEDURE/TIMING**

- The ordinance is hugely impactful to both landlords and tenants and totally reshapes a vital City Department, but is being rushed through the process without substantial input from either group. This is harmful and unnecessary—particularly because the ordinance does not become effective until almost 2 years from now. It's more important to get this huge piece of legislation RIGHT

than to give a parting gift to a one-term Supervisor.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Please dO NOT allow this proposal to become law. It is burdensome and unfair and a waste of time and money.

Karen Wong  
Mom and Pop Rental Property Owner  
mobile #415-992-2489

**From:** [Dion W.](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [aaron.peskin@sfgove.org](mailto:aaron.peskin@sfgove.org); [Yan, Calvin \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [cloudsrest789@gmail.com](mailto:cloudsrest789@gmail.com); [Kenton Wong](#)  
**Subject:** NO on #201262  
**Date:** Tuesday, November 17, 2020 12:23:27 PM

---

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

Dear Board of Supervisors:

I am a district 3 constituent and co-owner of an apartment building on Nob Hill. I am writing to express my strong opposition to your proposed legislation requiring a Housing Inventory of rental units in the City. You ALREADY have much of this information in the City's tax roll. My siblings and I are already suffering huge financial setbacks because 75% of our tenants have relocated due to the pandemic and its economic effects. This proposed legislation will simply increase our economic burden and create additional stress in these difficult times. All three of us are seniors with underlying health problems and think that this legislation are singling out those in our category among others. I ask again -- why are you making things more difficult by imposing useless requirements when we are encountering problems just paying operating expenses and property taxes? (I don't know of any other city in the USA that is doing this in this way.

There are many reasons the Board should not go forward with this proposal:

#### COSTLY

It will increase fees both tenants and landlords pay to the Rent Board and we don't even know the final cost. Have you taken the time to determine this?  
What benefits will tenants and landlords obtain from this?  
With the pandemic continuing, it is irresponsible to add increases.

#### DRAMATIC CHANGE THE PURPOSE OF THE RENT BOARD

The Rent Board provides valuable services to the tenants and landlords of San Francisco. They are already burdened with many duties, why do you want to put additional burdens on them to the point where they could not function efficiently? Therefore consult with them and see what services they are already doing.

#### INVASION OF PRIVACY

Tenants do NOT want their rents to be publicly published and because Rent Control already

created inequality in rental rates and this will simply lead to more adversarial tenant/landlord relationship.

#### BURDENSOME

Small property owners, and especially non-fluent English speakers will have trouble understanding and therefore complying with these requirements.

A few other cities have registration systems but is much more simplified to comply with.

#### UNNECESSARY

Much of the information to be part of the law is ALREADY in the hands of the City. I am referring to buildings with 4 or more units registered as a Business.

Existing Rent Board procedures work well to handle tenant/landlord relationship and disputes.

Proposition 21 failed, therefore much of the required information is no longer relevant or needed. State laws override city laws.

#### PROCEDURE/TIMING

This proposal is too complicated to rush through. Why aren't there meaningful discussions with the various groups involved before the Board of Supervisors act on it? It seems it is being pushed to meet some non-existent deadline. It is more important to make this fair and correct rather than give a farewell gift to a one-term supervisor.

Thank you for taking the time to consider these thoughts. DO NOT allow this proposal to become law. It is inefficient, burdensome, unfair and a total waste of money and time.

Dion Wong

District 3 property owner

415.533.2959

**From:** [K.cloudsrest](#)  
**To:** [Major, Erica \(BOS\)](#); [Yan, Calvin \(BOS\)](#); [Fewer, Sandra \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#)  
**Cc:** [cloudsrest789@gmail.com](mailto:cloudsrest789@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** Fwd: NO on #201262  
**Date:** Tuesday, November 17, 2020 11:32:07 AM

---

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

NO on # 201262. Do NOT burden small-time property owners with unnecessary, impractical, harmful, useless legislation that will NOT help tenants or property owners. The proposal is an invasion of privacy and collects information that the City already has in their possession. Thank you.

Karen Y. Wong  
San Francisco Native and small-time property owner

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

**From:** **K cloudsrest** <[cloudsrest789@gmail.com](mailto:cloudsrest789@gmail.com)>  
**Date:** Mon, Nov 16, 2020 at 10:36 PM  
**Subject:** NO on #201262  
**To:** Major, Erica (BOS) <[erica.major@sfgov.org](mailto:erica.major@sfgov.org)>, Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <[aaron.peskin@sfgov.org](mailto:aaron.peskin@sfgov.org)>, Aaron Peskin <[calvin.yan@sfgov.org](mailto:calvin.yan@sfgov.org)>, <[sandra.fewer@sfgov.org](mailto:sandra.fewer@sfgov.org)>, <[Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org](mailto:Shamann.Walton@sfgov.org)>, <[rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org](mailto:rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org)>, <[linda.wong@sfgov.org](mailto:linda.wong@sfgov.org)>  
**Cc:** [cloudsrest789@gmail.com](mailto:cloudsrest789@gmail.com) <[cloudsrest789@gmail.com](mailto:cloudsrest789@gmail.com)>, Kenton Wong <[ahwahnee1927@gmail.com](mailto:ahwahnee1927@gmail.com)>, Dion wong <[wong\\_dion@hotmail.com](mailto:wong_dion@hotmail.com)>

Dear Board of Supervisors:

I am a district 3 constituent and owner of a small apartment building in the Chinatown/Nob Hill area. I am writing to express my opposition to your proposed legislation requiring a Housing Inventory of rental units in the City. My brothers (co-owners) and I are already suffering huge financial setbacks due to 75% of our tenants having moved out during the pandemic. Legislation such as yours would further increase our economic burden and create added stress at an extremely difficult time. We are native San Franciscans, seniors with multiple disabilities and feel that your proposal unfairly targets those in our category. Allow me to repeat -- we are all having a hard time so why do you want to impose further unnecessary requirements when we are unable to meet our operating expenses and barely able to pay our property taxes????

-----

### **COSTLY**

- Ordinance will exponentially increase the fees that tenants and landlords pay each year to the Rent Board, but we don't even know what the cost will be. It's irresponsible to rush through an ordinance which will increase tenants costs, without understanding or studying the actual costs.
- The Ordinance states that the Controller shall calculate the fee and publish it 30

days after the effective date of the ordinance. We ask that the fee be studied and calculated BEFORE the ordinance passes so that both the landlord and tenant community can understand its impact before agreeing to support or oppose the ordinance.

- At a substantially increased cost per unit, the ordinance doesn't bring any tangible, additional benefits for either landlords or tenants. It's important to understand what landlords and tenants are paying for, and what services we will get in return.
- In a year where many tenants and landlords have lost a substantial percentage of their income, now is not the right time to dramatically increase fees.

### **DRAMATICALLY REASSIGNS A MAJOR CITY DEPARTMENT**

- SF Rent Board is a major city department which provides vital services for both landlords and tenants, including counseling and answering questions, processing petitions, handling arbitration and mediation cases, and more. This ordinance is so burdensome to implement and oversee that Rent Board Staff will not be able to handle other rent board services which are necessary to the tenant and landlord community, and which have real benefits in the everyday lives of San Franciscans.
- If the City would like to dramatically restructure a City Department that tenants and landlords rely on, it should exercise caution, convene stakeholders, and take all the time it needs to get it right. It should do so in consultation with the Departments involved, and with consideration of the workload required to implement the restructuring.

### **INVASION of PRIVACY**

- Tenants don't want their rental rates to be publicly available or searchable.
- Having "who pays what" as publicly available information sows "Rent Animosity" amongst renters who pay different amounts for similar apartments due to Rent Control, and contributes to an adversarial landlord/tenant relationship.

### **BURDENSOME**

- LA and a few other cities have a registration system which achieves the stated goal of the SF ordinance, but is much more simplified for owners and tenants to comply with.
- Small Property Owners, and in particular property owners who don't speak English as a first language (or at all) will have particular trouble complying with all the requirements of the ordinance. This is much more complicated than the "Rent Registry" systems in other cities.

### **UNNECESSARY**

- Various City Departments already have much of the data included in the registry. The City already has information on the 172,000 apartments which pay a Rent Board Fee, and already requires landlords with 4+ units to register as a

Business. The Department of Building Inspection collects Inspection Fees, DPH collects Vector Control Fees, and the Assessor and Tax Collector have data on the number of units, the Rent Board Fee, and other details like the assessed value of the properties.

- Existing Rent Board processes work well to prevent illegal rent increases, to process petitions, and to arbitrate and mediate disputes between landlords and tenants.
- The Ordinance was introduced on Election Day and appears to have been written with the presumption that Prop 21 would pass. Since Prop 21 failed, much of the information required here, particularly with regards to vacancies, is no longer relevant or useful.

### **PROCEDURE/TIMING**

- The ordinance is hugely impactful to both landlords and tenants and totally reshapes a vital City Department, but is being rushed through the process without substantial input from either group. This is harmful and unnecessary—particularly because the ordinance does not become effective until almost 2 years from now. It's more important to get this huge piece of legislation RIGHT than to give a parting gift to a one-term Supervisor.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Please dO NOT allow this proposal to become law. It is burdensome and unfair and a waste of time and money.

Karen Wong  
Mom and Pop Rental Property Owner  
mobile #415-992-2489

--

Karen  
mobile #415-992-2489