

March 2, 2018

Chair Betty Packard & Committee Members
Ballot Simplification Committee
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 48
San Francisco, CA 94102
Via email to: publications@sfgov.org

Re: No Eviction Without Representation Act (June 2018)
Request for Reconsideration

Dear Chair Packard and Members of the Ballot Simplification Committee:

Thank you again for all of your diligent work to make the ballot handbook accurate and understandable for San Francisco voters. We respectfully request reconsideration of the digest as set forth below.

We request the addition of the following underlined language to the **first paragraph of the Way it Is Now Section**:

The City and County of San Francisco funds nonprofit organizations that provide free legal representation to some San Francisco residential tenants who face eviction. Most San Francisco residential tenants facing eviction are not currently provided full legal representation.

Reason for the Requested Change

The approved digest gives voters no sense of whether the City already provides most of the services proposed in the ballot measure. At the hearing, the Committee took out the statement that “The City and County of San Francisco (“City”) does not provide legal representation to San Francisco tenants who face eviction from their homes” apparently based on the MOHCD letter which noted that certain limited services (filling out court forms, for example) were part of city services available to tenants.

This proposed ballot measure calls for full scope representation of all tenants facing eviction. To understand whether to vote for that, voters should be informed, not through paid arguments, but through the objective digest, that most tenants do not have full scope representation, a fact that is not in any dispute.

The Mayor’s Office on Housing & Community Development states in its memo dated February 22, 2018 to this Committee that “an estimated one-third of all eviction cases” are eligible for full scope legal representation. Two-thirds are not eligible for full scope representation through any

Request for Reconsideration, Ballot Simplification Committee
March 2, 2018

city program, per MOHCD's letter, so a statement that *most tenants do not have full representation* is a statement of fact, not argument, and one that should be in the digest to help voters understand the way it is now, so that they can decide whether the ballot measure is worthy of a yes vote.

Under the current language, a voter would not know if the city current funds full representation for 10% or 90% of tenants facing eviction. By pointing out the indisputable fact that most do not get full representation, the digest would give voters a better understanding of the situation the ballot measure addresses.

Lastly, we note that we used "full representation" rather than simply "representation" in the proposed language to avoid any possible dispute about the accuracy of the statement we seek to add.

We respectfully request that the proposed change set forth above be included in the final digest to give a more full and accurate picture to voters of the issues raised by this measure.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Dean Preston
Proponent, No Eviction Without Representation Act

cc: Brian Cheu, MOHCD (by email: brian.cheu@sfgov.org)
Hugo Ramirez, MOHCD (by email: hugo.ramirez@sfgov.org)