



THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

CASA Compact, vacancy tax, rent increases as "tenant harassment"... it never ends

By Noni Richen, SPOSF/SPOSFI President

Each month I approach the writing of the President's Message with determination to present a fresh perspective on being a rental housing provider in San Francisco. But each month, I realize that what affects our small businesses is the "same old, same old." Legislators and, now, appointees are proposing more regulations to solve the "crisis" for which they are partially responsible.

A certain Assemblymember from San Francisco will soon almost certainly introduce legislation similar to the recently-defeated Prop. 10, and Michael Weinstein, the promotor of that failed effort, has vowed to return with another ballot measure. Recent legislation, discussed in this newsletter (see page 2), creates a situation where local authorities

Local legislators propose a vacancy tax, claiming to know the intent of owners, particularly owners of vacant storefronts."

become mind readers supposedly capable of determining whether or not a rent increase is done with pure motive or with the intent to "harass" the renter to leave. Local legislators are also proposing a **vacancy tax**, again claiming to know the intent of owners, particularly owners of vacant storefronts.

The CASA compact (see adjacent article), which essentially imposes statewide rent control, is grinding its way toward implementation in some form. Many of us testified at yet another hearing about it recently, this time before the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). Thanks to all of you who participate in these exercises in democracy. I also made a ▶▶ Cont'd next page

Small rental property owners left out of CASA Compact decision-making

By Ilona Clark

What is the CASA Compact? Can Bay Area leaders representing diverse interests develop a compact of actionable policy solutions to address the region's housing shortage? That was the goal of a collaboration of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). The 10-point plan is guided by the 3 P's (production, preservation, and protection), calling for a regional rent cap, eviction controls, new property taxes, and a loosening of zoning regulations near transit centers.

The plan is guided by the 3P's: production, preservation, and protection ..."

The CASA task force wants the region to produce 35,000 housing units per year through 2040. Fourteen thousand of the new units would be affordable for lower-income and 7,000 for moderate-income households. It wants to preserve 30,000 affordable units in the next five years. Finally, it seeks to protect 300,000 lower-income units for "extremely rent-burdened" residents, those spending more than 50% of their income on housing.

Passed by the MTC and most recently by ABAG, the Compact requires all nine counties and their 101 cities to implement its ten components.

Small property owners denied a voice

Big-name real estate developers, politicians, and tenant advocates hashed out this far-reaching plan for the last 18 months, but small housing providers—once again—were conspicuously excluded. The unique perspective of small landlords—providers of the majority of the state's rental housing—is crucial to informing policy that works for everyone. Yet the CASA Compact fails to even acknowledge their existence.

The protection component: just cause

The first three, and most controversial, elements of the CASA Compact have to do with tenant protections. The first element, a region-wide **just cause policy** would prohibit landlords from evicting tenants without a stated reason. This policy is modeled after laws already in place in San Francisco and Oakland. Arbitrary, unjust evictions can have devastating effects on renters, and give housing

▶▶ Cont'd on page 6

IN OUR FEBRUARY 2019 ISSUE

- ▶ The President's Message1
- ▶ Small prop owners left out of CASA Compact discussions.... 1
- ▶ Oakland passes vacancy tax; SF may follow 2
- ▶ New law calls certain rent increases "harassment"..... 3
- ▶ As-is sales offer not always "free ride" for seller 4
- ▶ How to tell if tenant using unit as his "place in the City".... 5
- ▶ New law allows for third-party rent payments 5
- ▶ SPOSFI membership dues to increase 5
- ▶ SPOSFI Resource (Business Members) Guide..... 7

Cont'd from pg. 1: *The President's Message*

few comments at a Listening Tour about affordable housing conducted by State Treasurer Fiona Ma. I said that the most affordable housing is that which is already built, and encouraged the loosening of regulations that effectively force housing providers to go out of the rental business. Also,

I'm attending a hearing to be held by a coalition of city planners on stopping displacement of lower-income people. Apparently, the panel has already determined that displacement is caused by vacation rentals! I'll definitely have a few things to say to them about that.

One bright spot on the legislative horizon comes from State Senator Scott Wiener, whose SB 50, perhaps with some tweaking, offers a positive avenue to creating more housing units, the only way to solve our shortage of housing. I live in the Western Addition, and am surrounded by various iterations of "affordable" housing. These neighbors are similar in every way to the market-rate owners and renters next to them. The buildings are also indistinguishable. Even the "projects," the public housing nearby, have improved vastly since private managers are actually managing them. Please don't fear, but rather support, density where it belongs—in transit-rich areas of the City.

Mayor Breed is the featured speaker at our February members' meeting. Please bring your positive attitudes and some good questions for her. Thank you! 🏠

SPOSFInews

Volume 21/Issue 2

FEBRUARY 2019

www.smallprop.org

Editor: Gideon Kramer **Copy editor:** David Brownell
Design & production: Gideon Kramer/Kramer Graphics
Deadline for newsletter submissions: The 20th of each month.
 Send comments and/or articles to SPOSFI, PO Box 170669, SF, CA 94117-0669, or via email to info@smallprop.org.

Contacting SPOSFI: email info@smallprop.org, (415) 647-2419

SPOSF & SPOSFI President: Noni Richen (noni@smallprop.org)

SPOSFI Executive Director: Peter Reitz (peter@smallprop.org)

SPOSF Board of Directors: Howard Epstein (Vice President), Raimondo Forlin, Terrence Jones, Sherman King, Bob Noelke, Noni Richen (President), Paul Utrecht (Treasurer), Danny Wang, and Kathy Wu

SPOSFI Board of Directors: Howard Epstein (Vice President), Raimondo Forlin, Terrence Jones, Sherman King, Bob Noelke, Noni Richen (President), Paul Utrecht (Treasurer), Danny Wang, and Kathy Wu

© 2019. SPOSFI. All rights reserved.
 This newsletter may not be reproduced in part or in whole without the express written permission of the editor.

NAA
 NATIONAL APARTMENT ASSOCIATION
 We Lead the Way Home

CalRHA
 CALIFORNIA RENTAL HOUSING ASSOCIATION

Oakland passes tax penalty for vacant properties; San Francisco ponders similar legislation

By Gideon Kramer, Editor/SPOSFI News

Vacant properties and blight are serious quality of life issues in Oakland. In 2012, the City Council voted to create a registry for vacant and foreclosed residential properties, but the funds weren't available. To address the issue, Measure W was passed last November by a 70% majority. A two-thirds majority vote was required for passage. The measure imposes a:

- tax for properties used less than 50 days per year;
- \$6,000 per parcel property tax on vacant homes;
- \$3,000 tax per vacant condominium or duplex unit;
- \$6,000 per parcel tax on non-residential and undeveloped properties;
- \$6,000 per parcel tax on vacant lots for commercial use;
- \$3,000 per parcel tax on vacant properties with ground floor commercial.

There are a number of problems with Measure W. The definition of *vacancy* as "a parcel that is in use less than 50 days during a calendar year" begs the question of what "in use" means. It may be difficult for the city to

“Because it’s a flat tax for every parcel regardless of size or value, the measure will impact small property owners more than owners of larger properties.”

monitor whether parcels are actually "in use" when owners claim they are. Also, because it's a flat tax for every parcel regardless of size or value, the measure will impact small property owners more than owners of larger properties. Small property

owners may lack the expertise required to navigate the development process, creating the unintended consequence of forcing them to sell their properties.

Measure W is expected to go into effect in mid-2020. Because it contradicts Prop. 13's prohibition on property tax increases above 2%, however, Measure W could be subject to a future legal challenge.

San Francisco may introduce its own tax proposal for vacant properties

Following Oakland's lead, San Francisco is now considering its own vacancy tax measure for both residential and commercial properties.

According to the *SF Examiner*, Supervisor Aaron Peskin (D-3) has asked the City Attorney's Office to "explore legislation that would allow the City to impose a vacancy tax on property owners to help mitigate the impacts of the widespread practice of warehousing valuable

►► Concluded on next page

residential and commercial units." Mr. Peskin says, "I continue to receive emails and requests from constituents to address the overwhelming number of vacancies both commercial and residential that continue to contribute to our housing crisis as well as the displacement and struggles of our small businesses."

Details are still being worked out, but the intent is to apply the tax to residential properties with three or more vacant units as well as vacant storefronts.

The measure would require six votes from the Board of Supervisors to get on the November 2019 ballot and two-thirds voter approval. Stay tuned for more details on this legislation as they become available. 🏠

Supes pass new law calling certain rent increases "tenant harassment"

By Sean Makarin, Esq.

On January 15, 2019, the Board of Supervisors unanimously passed an ordinance amending the wrongful eviction and tenant harassment sections of the Rent Ordinance. The amendment takes aim at the Costa-Hawkins rent increases allowed on condos and single-family residences (SFRs), and is meant to prohibit owners of SFRs and condos from circumventing eviction controls through excessive rent increases. Previously, the law did not explicitly state that such tenants were protected from coercive rent increases, even though they have always been afforded such protection.

The impetus for the amendment was anecdotal evidence that owners of SFRs and condos wrongfully evict tenants with drastic one-time rent increases that force them to move out because they can't afford the new rent. The Board cites two examples of this occurring in the past few years, and "tenant advocates estimate that many similar cases arise in San Francisco every year."

Costa-Hawkins and the Rent Ordinance allow owners of SFRs and condos to raise rent by any amount as long as the tenant is properly notified of the increase and the increase is not meant to force a tenant to vacate.

The Rent Ordinance now explicitly prohibits an owner of a condo or SFR from recovering possession of the property with a bad-faith rent increase imposed with the intent to defraud, intimidate, or coerce a tenant into vacating. It is now explicitly considered **tenant harassment** if an owner of a condo or SFR imposes a rent increase with such intent. The ordinance provides examples of what such an increase might look like: (1) the rent increase was substantially in excess of market rates for comparable units; (2) the rent increase was within six months after an eviction attempt; and (3) any other factors a

"The Rent Ordinance now explicitly prohibits an owner of a condo or SFR from recovering possession of the property with a bad-faith rent increase imposed with the intent to defraud, intimidate, or coerce a tenant into vacating."

NEXT MEMBERS' MEETING: TUESDAY, FEB. 12, 6:15 P.M.



St. Mary's Cathedral

1111 Gough St. at Geary Blvd.

Refreshments served.

Always plenty of free parking!

SPECIAL GUEST SPEAKER:

Mayor London Breed

Also: **Leif Dautch**, California's Deputy Attorney General and president of the San Francisco Juvenile Probation Commission, will offer his insights on the City's quality of life issues.

Get your legal questions answered by the experts!

THIS MONTH'S LEGAL PANEL

With attorney **Paul F. Utrecht**
of Utrecht & Lenvin LLP

court or the Rent Board may deem relevant.

A tenant could challenge the rent increase at the Rent Board or with a lawsuit claiming tenant harassment and wrongful eviction. The Rent Board would likely require the owner to refund any rent paid pursuant to the illegal increase, but award no emotional distress damages. If damages were awarded after a lawsuit, the tenant could be awarded overpaid rent, emotional distress damages, or the owner could be fined \$1,000. If the tenant moved out due to the rent increase, damage could be the difference between the old rent and new. The tenant would have to prove the owner acted in bad faith, as described in points (1) and (2) above. Practically, the amendment makes it easier for tenants in condos and SFRs to argue that *any* rent increase on a SFR or condo is coercive. Law-abiding small property owners, many of whom are hesitant to increase rent given the army of tenant advocates who will threaten a lawsuit, will further be discouraged from raising rent within the bounds of the law.

The Board cited just two anecdotes of coercive rent increases, and tenant advocates imply that the problem is vast. The Board is clearly ignoring that the vast majority of small property owners do not raise rent to force tenants to move. This amendment will only make life harder for small property owners, many of whom have deep ties to the community. Perhaps this will be yet another reason for owners to get out of the rental business altogether and sell their property, the net effect being fewer units on the rental market. 🏠

Sean Makarin is an attorney with the Law Offices of Walter Parsley. He may be reached at (415) 777-1800 or sean@parsleylaw.com.

The as-is sales offer isn't always a "free ride" for the seller

By Terrence Jones, SPOSFI Business Member

At SPOSFI's January members' meeting, I spoke about the top 10 items to review before selling your property for the best possible price (see SPOSFI News, March 2014). In the Q&A that followed, a member asked about the responsibilities of a seller who gets an "as-is" purchase offer.

The San Francisco Association of Realtors' (SFAR) **As-is Addendum** is a one-page form that states, among other things, that the "buyer is purchasing the property in its present 'as-is' condition..." and "the seller will not agree to any requests for credits or reductions in the purchase price..." The explicit purpose of this document is to prevent a buyer from asking a seller

to fix something or for a price reduction after the offer has been accepted.

In this city's hot seller's market, many buyers present offers with the As-is Addendum and all contingencies removed—the best possible situation for the seller. The seller then has only to compare price offers and select the highest one. But while "as is" largely means what it says, an as-is sale does not absolve the seller of certain statutory obligations; he must still complete the Transfer Disclosure Statement and meet certain Energy and Water Conservation and other possible requirements. These could include something as minor as strapping down a water heater or as costly as removing an underground storage tank.

One of our office's most experienced agents commented: "In representing a seller, I always include the As-Is Addendum when delivering a counteroffer to a buyer or as terms of acceptance. This doesn't guarantee that the buyer won't come back to renegotiate the purchase price later in the transaction, but it does make it harder for him to ask for a discount on the agreed-upon purchase price" and easier for the seller to say "you knew full well when you signed the addendum that the property was being sold as is." However, if while in escrow there truly is a new legitimate discovery that was unknown to both buyer and seller, and is reasonable, the parties will often negotiate a price adjustment.

As San Francisco brokers, our primary goal is to get the highest price for a client while minimizing his and the broker's post-sale liability. To do this, we seek

NEW NUMBERS FROM THE RENT BOARD

Effective March 1, 2019 → February 29, 2020

- Maximum allowable rent increase **2.6%**
- Interest due on tenant security deposit **2.7%**
- Rent Board fee billable to tenant each year **\$22.50**

Note: Rent increases and Rent Board fees may be banked. There is no limit to the amount of rent increases that can be banked since April 1, 1982, and no time limit on their imposition. New owners may impose banked increases to existing tenants that were accumulated by prior owners. Rent Board fees, however, are bankable only back to November 1, 1999.

multiple offers and help guide clients to the offer best suited to their situation by preparing a carefully documented disclosure package before we go to market.

Disclosure is key

The moral of the story: the more we disclose before we begin marketing a property, the less there is to renegotiate after escrow opens. Location, location, location may be the three most important factors when buying a property, but when selling one, they're **disclose, disclose, disclose!** 🏠

Terrence Jones is Sr. Broker Associate with Alain Pinel Investment Group. He may be contacted at (415) 786-2216 or tjones@apr.com.

How to determine if a tenant is just using unit as his "place in the City," and what to do about it

By Justin Goodman, Esq.

San Francisco places price ceilings on all multi-unit apartments built on or before June 13, 1979. As rents go up over time, rent-controlled tenants have a greater incentive to keep their place, even if it no longer suits their lifestyle. Some tenants even purchase homes elsewhere, but keep their pied-à-terres in the City for weekend or seasonal visits. **Rent Board Rule 1.21 describes tenants in occupancy**, and the Rent

Ordinance isn't interested in providing rent control protections to those who aren't.

Prop. 10 occupied headlines last year, but Costa-Hawkins is actually a different form of decontrol. State law commands San Francisco to let go of rent control once

the last original occupant vacates (even if their sub-tenants remain). When the rental unit isn't a tenant's "usual place of return," even the City allows market rate increases.

▶▶ Concluded on next page

"The explicit purpose of the 'As Is' Addendum is to avoid a buyer asking a seller to fix something or for a price reduction after his offer is accepted."

"Rent Board Rule 1.21 describes tenants in occupancy, and the Rent Ordinance isn't interested in providing rent control protections to those who aren't."

How can you tell when your apartment is just your tenant's "place in the City?" It's not always easy. Rule 1.21 has half a dozen factors that tend to support your theory (none of which are conclusive). The most obvious indicator: who is coming and going in your building? It helps if you live there or have an on-site manager, but many owners are now using sophisticated (and increasingly inexpensive) wifi-enabled, motion-detecting cameras. These will log access and upload footage to the cloud for later use. If you rarely see your tenant, or your hallway traffic includes rotating Airbnb guests, proceed to step two.

Rent Board Rule 1.21

Rule 1.21 requires a Rent Board petition supported by evidence, and you should be thinking about how to present your case from the beginning. Private investigators can be indispensable here. They have access to high-level public record databases, with

information about cell phone contracts, utility records, vehicle and voting registration, real property purchases (and potential homeowners exemptions or owner-occupancy requirements in deeds of trust), all of which might locate your tenant at a new address. Once you've located your tenant, you can catch him in the act. Ask your PI to do a "stakeout" (like in the movies) to snap some pictures of your tenant walking to work in the morning from somewhere other than your building.

Your PI can also testify about his report and express a persuasive opinion on its meaning. This is crucial because this petition is a game of who tells the better story to the administrative law judge. If you only have boring "what, when, where" facts, but your tenant has a tear-jerking story about taking care of an ailing mom or mending a struggling marriage, or perhaps they were studying abroad but mean to launch their career back here, you're likely to find yourself at the losing end.

The Rent Board has wide latitude

In some recent appeals, the Rent Board has been unsympathetic to explanations like "all my stuff is there, and construction work in the building drove me out." On the other hand, the Board has wide latitude in applying its own regulations. It also recently accepted an appeal in which the tenant asserted that his absence was medically related. The Board remanded to hold the case open for six months, to allow in further evidence about occupancy going forward. While petitioners may ask the Superior Court to review a final administrative decision, the courts are unlikely to disturb an agency's application of its own rules.

In putting on a Rule 1.21 case, you need to be thinking about the end result from the beginning. Marshal your evidence, collect your witnesses, and think about the "other side of the story" that you'll need to overcome. Unlike in court, parties at Rent Board hearings have no subpoena power, so prepare evidence in advance to impeach your tenant if his testimony or documents are inaccurate or misleading. 1.21 petitions are

“While petitioners may ask the Superior Court to review a final administrative decision, the courts are unlikely to disturb an agency’s application of its own rules.”

not a basis for eviction, only to increase the rent, but if you have the right facts that support the more persuasive story, the tenant will have to pay a fair price for the luxury of a pied-à-terre.🏠

Justin A. Goodman is an associate attorney with Zacks, Freedman & Patterson, PC. He may be reached at (415) 956-8100 or via e-mail at justin@zfplaw.com.

New state law allows tenants to pay rent through third party

A B 2219, introduced by Assemblyman Phil Ting (D-San Francisco) and signed by the Governor, went into effect January 1. Under the new law, landlords throughout the state must accept a rent payment tendered by a third party if it provides a signed acknowledgment stating it is not currently a tenant of the subject premises, and that acceptance of the rent payment does not create a new tenancy with the third party. The rationale for the law is that tenants struggling to make their rent sometimes turn to relatives or non-profit organizations for financial assistance in order to avoid eviction, but some landlords have refused such payments, putting families on the street.🏠

SPOSFI membership dues to increase; first time since 2008

Effective April 1, each category of membership will increase by \$25. The new rates will be \$100 for Regular Membership, \$150 for Supporter, \$250 for Sponsor, and \$400 for Business Membership.

Our expenses have risen, and SPOSFI is now also contributing to lobbyist costs. In December 2003, Regular membership was \$60, then increased in January 2008 to \$75. These membership levels are modest when compared to SFAA's dues, which begin at a base rate of \$376 plus \$6 per unit up to 50 units.

Business Membership qualifies you to be listed in our Resource Guide. Also, we urge you to consider including SPOSFI to your estate planning.🏠

Cont'd from pg. 1: **CASA Compact**

providers a bad name. Just cause not only regulates evictions; the end of a lease itself becomes a potential cause

“Someone who can afford a lawyer should not be given a free one. The premise that any housing provider can afford to pay for legal counsel while no renter can, is absurd.”

for litigation, creating negative consequences for housing providers, making them extremely careful to whom they rent. Worse, it makes dealing with difficult renters, or terminating leases for any reason, prohibitive, causing thousands of residential units to remain “vacant by

choice,” even in the pricey San Francisco rental market.

Statewide rent cap

The second component is a statewide rent cap similar to the emergency price-gouging prohibitions recently passed following the California wildfires. But just as extreme rent increases pose a particular burden for tenants, so do extreme limits on rent raises pose a particular burden for housing providers. In San Francisco and Oakland, for example, housing providers are not even allowed raises equal to the Bay Area Consumer Price Index (CPI). If a rent cap is imposed, so should a rent raise floor—allowable raises should at least equal the rate of inflation. Had small housing providers been included in the discussions, CASA committee members would understand the devastating effects local ordinances have had in areas that are already rent-controlled.

Free legal counsel for renters (only)

The Compact states, “Access to a lawyer can be the difference between losing a home and keeping it.” But this is equally true for mom-and-pop housing providers. Renters and owners alike should have access to free legal counsel if they qualify. Beneficiaries of such a system should be means-tested and held to the same standards. Someone who can afford a lawyer should not be provided with a free one. The premise, that any housing provider can afford to pay for legal counsel while no renter can, is absurd.

Better yet, all renters and housing providers should have access to impartial mediation, as most owner/renter disputes can be resolved before they get bad enough to require the involvement of lawyers.

Lowering the voter threshold

CASA recommends lowering the voter threshold for passage of tax measures from two-thirds to just 55%. This controversial proposal would greatly favor renters over property owners, and ensure that tax measures that disproportionately impact owners will pass, but does nothing to guarantee that they are beneficial. People vote for laws they think will benefit them, but less inclined to do so if they have to share in the cost. Bonds and parcel

Who are MTC and ABAG?

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission is the transportation planning, financing and coordinating agency for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area. This little-known but powerful agency is key to our regional transportation system, with billions of dollars in state and federal funds to disburse and real power and influence to exert.

The Association of Bay Area Governments works with local governments and stakeholders to develop and implement solutions for issues critical to the entire Bay Area region.

taxes, paid for through property taxes, may not be passed through to rent-controlled renters, even though they benefit renters as much as owners. The result is that such measures often pass in renter-heavy cities like San Francisco. Unfortunately, most of CASA’s suggested funding sources take unequally from specific sectors of our community, but none directly involve renters.

The housing shortage affects all residents—property owners, housing providers, and renters. If we, as a community, feel that housing is a community-wide problem, then solutions must be funded by the entire community. “Rent control” works best when government taxes everyone and provides cash subsidies to those who really need rent assistance.

Conclusion

The proposals enumerated in the CASA Compact seem moderate compared to most current rent control laws. Many local regulations may start out moderate, but rarely remain that way. California cities that have implemented rent control have then engaged in policies that make property ownership more expensive and onerous with each passing year: tenant relocation fees rise, program fees rise, more units come under rent control, and

“If we, as a community, feel that housing is a community-wide problem, then solutions must be funded by the entire community.”

Just Cause and Fair Return petitions become more difficult to submit and less likely to be approved. The San Francisco Rent Ordinance has been amended 103 times since June 1979. This slippery slope is not

theoretical; it is real and consistent. Obtaining housing providers’ support for the CASA Compact will mean providing protections not just for renters, but for small property owners as well.

Rent control policies have benefitted a few while deepening problems for most renters and housing providers. Let’s learn from these mistakes, not repeat them. 

Ilona Clark is an ICU nurse and Richmond small property owner. She believes housing policy should support a less conflict-oriented, less litigious, less expensive system that supports both renters and housing providers and brings people together to hash out issues. She may be reached at in70@comcast.net.

THE FOLLOWING BUSINESSES SUPPORT SPOFSI and have joined at the **Business Member Level**. For a full listing, with complete contact information, please visit our website at:

www.smallprop.org/resources/guide/

When selecting service providers from this list, always exercise good judgment to ensure that they meet your specific needs. **SPOFSI makes no claims or warranties of any kind**, and provides these service listings for your convenience only.

All phone numbers are **(415)** area code unless noted otherwise.



APPLICATIONS, PAYMENTS, TENANT SCREENING

- **Patricia A. Harris, Apartment Owners Association of California (AOA)** (818) 988-9200

ATTORNEYS: LANDLORD

- **Andrew M. Zacks (中文服務)** Zacks, Freedman & Patterson, PC 956-8100
- **Paul F. Utrecht, Utrecht & Lenvin LLP** 357-0600
- **Daniel Bornstein, Bornstein Law** 409-7611
- **Nicholas Goldman, Nicholas Goldman Law** 350-8740
- **Denise A. Leadbetter** Law Offices of Denise A. Leadbetter 713-8680
- **Sean E. Makarin** Law Offices of Walter Parsley 777-1800
- **Steven Adair MacDonald (中文服務)** Steven Adair MacDonald & Partners, P.C. 956-6488
- **Leonard P. Mastromonaco** Mastromonaco Real Property Law Group 956-4030
- **Karen Y. Uchiyama** Law Offices of Karen Y. Uchiyama 563-9300
- **Jason Yee** Law Offices of Jason K. Yee (中文服務) 968-8877

ATTORNEYS: CONSTRUCTION

- **Philip Soderquist, Soderquist Law Offices** 374-8500
- **George W. Wolff, Wolff Law Office** 788-1881

ATTORNEYS: ESTATE PLANNING, WILLS & TRUSTS

- **Ron Chun, Attorney & CPA** 977-1300
- **John O'Grady, O'Grady Law Group** 986-8500

ELECTRICAL CONTRACTORS

- **Josh Frost, Electrical Contractor** 517-0309

FULL CREDIT REPORT

- www.myscreeningreport.com

HOME INSPECTION/EXPERT WITNESS SERVICES

- **Roger Drosd** General Contractors Inspection Service (GCIS) 822-9090

LEASING AGENTS

- **Eric Baird, ReListo Real Estate** (236) 6116 x101
- **J. Wavro, J. Wavro Associates (中文服務)** 509-3456

PRIVATE INVESTIGATORS

- **Hai Hua-wen, Wen & Associates** (650) 863-7925

PROPERTY MANAGERS

- **Eric & Christian Alexanderson** Alexanderson Properties 285-3737
- **Patrick Clifford** Gordon/Clifford Realty 613-7694

REAL ESTATE AGENTS

- **Peter Brannigan, Paragon Real Estate Group** 401-9901
- **Tim Brown, Keller Williams** 334-0100
- **Allison Chappleau** Paragon Commercial Brokerage 516-0648
- **Gavin Coombs** Pacific Union Commercial 509-4782
- **Terrence Jones, APR Investments** 786-2216
- **Nancy Mazza, Paragon Real Estate Group** 701-2615
- **Mike Miller, Coldwell Banker** 740-2564
- **Lee Ann Monfredini, Compass Real Estate** 722-4840
- **David Parry, McGuire Real Estate** 351-4611
- **Pota Perimenis, Compass Real Estate** 407-2595

- **Tina C. Wong** Realty World Advance Group (中文服務) (510) 502-6018

- **GoGo Wu, Berri Real Estate, 百利地產公司 (中文服務)** 830-7883

RECYCLING & WASTE DISPOSAL SERVICES

- **Recology** 330-1300



**Small Property Owners
of San Francisco Institute**
P.O. Box 170669
San Francisco, CA 94117-0669

Visit us online at
www.smallprop.org
 (415) 647-2419

MARK YOUR CALENDAR



**NEXT MEMBERS'
MEETING**

TUES., FEB. 12, 6:15 P.M.

SPECIAL GUEST SPEAKER:

MAYOR LONDON BREED

RENT BOARD ANNOUNCES NEW MAX. ALLOWABLE
RENT INCREASE AND SECURITY DEPOSIT INTEREST
RATE FIGURES FOR 2019-20



—STARTING WITH OUR POPULAR
LEGAL PANEL
WITH ATTORNEY PAUL F. UTRICHT

Published monthly except August

and December. SPOSF members can

also download the newsletter from

our website. The next four

members' meetings take place on:

- Tuesday, February 12
- Tuesday, March 12
- Tuesday, April 9
- Tuesday, May 14

**YES. I WANT TO JOIN
THE FIGHT TO PRESERVE
THE RIGHTS OF SMALL
PROPERTY OWNERS**

Please complete all information below, tear off
form and mail with your check payable to:
Small Property Owners of San Francisco Institute
P.O. Box 170669, San Francisco, CA 94117-0669



FEB. 2019
SPOSF:
Standing up for
the rights of small
property owners
through advocacy
and education

Name: _____ Home tel: _____ Business tel: _____ E-mail: _____

Mailing address: _____ City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Employer: _____ Occupation: _____ Self-employed Retired

How many units do you own? _____ In which Supervisorial District (1-11) do you reside? _____ OK to share your e-mail with NAA?

Sign me up as a: **\$75-Regular member** **\$125-Supporter** **\$225-Sponsor** **\$375-Business member** (includes listing in Resource Guide)

same address). Enclosed is my contribution of: \$50 other: _____

PLEASE NOTE: While SPOSF membership dues are tax-deductible as a charitable contribution to the extent allowed by law, donations to SPOSF are not tax-deductible as charitable contributions.