Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to prohibit landlords from seeking rent increases on existing tenants due to increases in debt service and property tax that have resulted from a change in ownership; and to prohibit landlords from seeking rent increases due to increased management expenses unless the expenses are reasonable and necessary.

NOTE: Unchanged Code text and uncodified text are in plain Arial font. Additions to Codes are in single-underline italics Times New Roman font. Deletions to Codes are in strikethrough italics Times New Roman font. Board amendment additions are in double-underlined Arial font. Board amendment deletions are in strikethrough Arial font. Asterisks (* * *) indicate the omission of unchanged Code subsections or parts of tables.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Purpose and Findings.

(a) The Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance (the “Rent Ordinance”) is intended to protect tenants from excessive rent increases while also assuring that landlords receive fair and adequate rents. Thus, although rents are capped, a landlord may increase a tenant’s base rent by a certain percentage each year. This annual increase is generally sufficient to provide landlords fair and adequate rents.

(b) A landlord may also file a petition with the Rent Board to increase base rents beyond the annual increase, by up to an additional 7%, if the annual increase does not completely cover the landlord’s increased operating and maintenance (“O&M”) expenses. Examples of O&M expenses include the cost of day-to-day repairs, insurance, pest control, garbage, water, and security. The purpose of an O&M increase is to help a landlord recover
from existing tenants the reasonable cost of keeping the building habitable, and to keep pace
with cost increases over time, to the extent the annual increase is not sufficient to cover those
cost increases.

(c) In recent years, more and more landlords have sought O&M increases on the
basis that their debt service and property tax costs have suddenly increased. But these costs
do not reflect amounts that were reinvested to maintain or improve the buildings. Rather, the
landlords claiming these increases are new buyers who are seeking to offset the costs of
acquiring property. The increase in property tax is based on the change in ownership and
reflects the high amounts that these buyers are willing to pay for these buildings; the annual
increase is intended to cover annual tax increases due to inflation. The increase in debt
service is due to the high amount of debt these buyers are willing to take on, and most rent
control jurisdictions in California do not allow rent increases based on increased debt service.
In short, property tax and debt service are not true O&M expenses, and treating them as such
encourages real estate speculation, fuels tenant displacement, and circumvents the purpose
of rent control.

(d) An article in the San Francisco Chronicle on December 11, 2017, documented
that many tenants in rent-controlled housing in San Francisco have recently experienced
exorbitant rent increases after their buildings were acquired by new owners (often large real
estate investment firms), largely because the owners were able to petition for O&M increases
to cover the cost of paying off loans taken to buy the buildings and the higher property taxes
that had resulted from the purchase price. Since the article was published, the Rent Board
has seen a dramatic spike in O&M petitions seeking increases based on property tax and debt
service, and many of the tenants of these landlords are now at risk of displacement. The
Board of Supervisors intends to prevent landlords from taking advantage of this loophole that
the news article exposed.
Section 2. The Administrative Code is hereby amended by revising Section 37.8 to read as follows:

SECTION 37.8. ARBITRATION OF RENTAL INCREASE ADJUSTMENTS.

(e) Hearings.

(4) Determination of the Administrative Law Judge: Rental Units. Based upon the evidence presented at the hearing and upon such relevant factors as the Board shall determine, the Administrative Law Judge shall make findings as to whether or not the landlord’s proposed rental increase exceeding the limitations set forth in Section 37.3 is justified or whether or not the landlord has effected a rent increase through a reduction in services or has failed to perform ordinary repair and maintenance as required by State or local law; and provided further that, where a landlord has imposed a passthrough for property taxes pursuant to this Chapter 37 Section 37.3(6)(D), the same costs increase in property taxes shall not be included in the calculation of increased operating and maintenance expenses pursuant to this subsection (4). In making such findings, the Administrative Law Judge shall take into consideration the following factors:

(A) Increases or decreases in operating and maintenance expenses, including, but not limited to, real estate taxes; water and sewer service charges; janitorial service; refuse removal; elevator service; security system; insurance for the property; routine repairs and maintenance; and debt service and real estate taxes as set forth in subsections (i) and (ii); and reasonable and necessary management expenses as set forth in subsection (iii).

(i) provided, however, when a unit is purchased after the effective date of this ordinance, for petitions filed before December 11, 2017, and this purchase occurs, the Rent Board may consider increased debt service and increased real estate taxes; provided, however, that if the property...
has been purchased within two years of the date of the previous purchase, consideration shall not be given to that portion of increased debt service which has resulted from a selling price which exceeds the seller's purchase price by more than the percentage increase in the "Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers for the San Francisco-Oakland Metropolitan Area, U.S. Department of Labor" between the date of previous purchase and the date of the current sale, plus the cost of capital improvements or rehabilitation work made or performed by the seller.

(ii) For petitions filed on or after December 11, 2017, the Rent Board shall not consider any portion of increased debt service, or that portion of increased real estate taxes that has resulted from an increased assessment due to a change in ownership; provided, however, that the Rent Board may consider that portion of increased real estate taxes that has resulted from the completion of needed repairs or capital improvements with respect to any petition filed on or after December 11, 2017; and provided, further, that the Rent Board may consider increased debt service and increased real estate taxes in a petition filed on or after December 11, 2017 pursuant to Section 37.8(e)(4)(A)(i), if the landlord demonstrates that it had purchased the property on or before April 3, 2018 and that it had reasonably relied on its ability to pass through those costs at the time of the purchase.

(iii) For petitions filed on or after the effective date of the ordinance in Board of Supervisors File No. 180318, the Rent Board may consider management expenses only to the extent those expenses are reasonable and necessary, based on factors such as the need to provide day-to-day management of the building; the level of management services previously required for the building; the reasonable cost of the services in an arms-length transaction; whether any tenants have objected that the cost and quality of the services are not in keeping with the socioeconomic status of the building's existing tenants; and other extraordinary circumstances.

(B) The past history of increases in the rent for the unit and the comparison of the rent for the unit with rents for comparable units in the same general area.
(C) Any findings which have been made pursuant to Section 37.7 with respect to the unit.

(D) Failure to perform ordinary repair, replacement, and maintenance in compliance with applicable State and local law.

(E) Any other such relevant factors as the Board shall specify in rules and regulations.

Section 3. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board of Supervisors overrides the Mayor’s veto of the ordinance.

Section 4. Scope of Ordinance. In enacting this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors intends to amend only those words, phrases, paragraphs, subsections, sections, articles, numbers, punctuation marks, charts, diagrams, or any other constituent parts of the Municipal Code that are explicitly shown in this ordinance as additions, deletions, Board amendment additions, and Board amendment deletions in accordance with the “Note” that appears under the official title of the ordinance.

Section 5. Severability. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or word of this ordinance, or any application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held to be invalid or unconstitutional by a decision of a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions or applications of the ordinance. The
Board of Supervisors hereby declares that it would have passed this ordinance and each and every section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, and word not declared invalid or unconstitutional without regard to whether any other portion of this ordinance or application thereof would be subsequently declared invalid or unconstitutional.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
DENNIS J. HERRERA, City Attorney

By: MANU PRADHAN
Deputy City Attorney
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