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I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

San Francisco’s Rental Stabilization & Arbitration Ordinance was first passed in 1979 as a means to address concerns of city growth and development specific to the impacts on residential affordability among the rental housing stock. The ordinance affects all residential multi-unit buildings built before June 13th, 1979, which limit rental increases to be determined on a yearly basis by San Francisco’s Rent Arbitration Board. It is important to note that rent control varies widely between cities and states, with this particular ordinance being vacancy-decontrolled, tenants of rent controlled units in San Francisco are often less inclined to vacate as they may be unable afford current market-rate prices.

A strong economic criticism of rent control held by economists is the incentivized byproduct inducing longer tenure by discouraging vacancies, understanding this means there are likely many rent controlled units which have remained occupied for years by a single tenant due to its market freezing characteristics. The lack of a centralized database containing all known units implies that the true number of units currently protected by this ordinance is unknown. Utilizing available data from several city resources could bring assumptive, not definitive, clarity to the quantity and location of these units which can further inform local and regional housing policy to better meet housing needs.

APPROACH

After considering the signed scope of work, availability of time, resources, and skills of each individual team member, we started this project with an in-depth literature review of all cities with relevant rent control ordinances. Keeping California’s unique political climate in mind (i.e. Costa-Hawkins Act and Ellis Act), we limited our research to cities within the same state as to reduce strong policy juxtapositions. Synthesis of differing data acquisition methods were used to determine the best way to proceed considering all data made available to us for this project. Next, the team acquired all relevant “landuse” data at the parcel level from SFOpenData and other city resources to apply a long list of landuse characteristics to exclude from the final rent control map. Lastly, the final rent control map containing only parcels that match the criteria for the 1979 Rental Stabilization & Arbitration Ordinance were then compared with Rent Board Fee data provided by the SF Rent Arbitration Board. The importances of this step falls on its purpose of keeping track of all rent controlled addressed required to pay the Rent Board Fee.
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

Understanding the 1979 rent control ordinance as being one of several price-control mechanisms that impact rental units across the city, our approach was shaped by consultation with Robert Collins of the San Francisco Rent Arbitration Board who assisted us in refining our approach. After discussing our proposed methodology, we identified characteristics for the most commonly occurring rent controlled units within our San Francisco landuse data source. The landuse dataset was determined to be the most comprehensive and complete source of parcel-level data, aside from other portfolio data which was then geocoded and layered into our spatial analysis. The initial map contains all land uses so any non multi-unit residential parcels could be removed to leave only parcels and addresses that met our defined criteria.

FINDINGS

Findings indicated that the landuse data elimination method did not align with Rent Arbitration Board fee data. According to what was deduced from the landuse dataset, there were a large number of parcels and addresses indicated that should be paying the rent board fee but were not. Discrepancies were also found in the number of addresses paying the fee that should not be. The results of this method indicated that the Rent Arbitration Board’s fee is potentially less accurate than what was initially hoped.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Utilizing the most up-to-date data provided by the city it is difficult to corroborate our final rent control map with Rent Arbitration Board fee data. Due to the nuanced characteristics of rent controlled units in San Francisco, the intention of this project was modular, as to allow stakeholders to further manipulate and build on our findings. Analysis of Ellis Act data could inform these datasets further, but the discrepancies between our findings and the assumptive addresses provided by the Rent Board are concerning. Considering the difficulties that exist for improving rent control data collection methods, our recommended next steps are to further analyze our final rent control map and dataset as a means of refining relevant rent control data between departments of the City and County of San Francisco.
II. INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND

The present condition of San Francisco’s housing climate has rattled many households to the core. As massive affordable and market-rate development initiatives have stepped up to meet the resulting market demand of increased global flows of people and capital, housing is in turn evolving to meet the needs of those coming and those who wish to stay. Increased housing development is one side of the affordability coin, with the creation of market rate housing comes the difficult effort of protecting presently affordable housing from permanent loss.

The need to protect affordable housing in the Bay Area, especially in San Francisco, has led municipalities to address existing data ambiguity concerns to establish a more accurate and quantifiable estimation for the actual number of units that are protected by various forms of rental unit price-controls. The Rental Arbitration Act of 1979 acts as a quasi-permanent means to establish affordability for some of the oldest units and tenants in San Francisco. Knowing the current number of units that meet the criteria of this ordinance holds extensive potential for informing housing policy throughout the city on a neighborhood by neighborhood basis.

The purpose of this project is to establish an assumptive, not definitive, estimation for the number of units in San Francisco that are currently protected by this specific price-control regulation. Long term findings from this project show great potential to inform policy when combined with available Ellis Act eviction data, as well as support for potential revisions of Costa-Hawkins and Ellis Acts which have been strongly criticized by pro-rent control groups.

The first table (Table 1) briefly outlines which units are affected by the Rental Arbitration & Stabilization Ordinance. At first glance it is clear that based on the type of units which are affected (multi-residential units before 1979), planners can accurately assume where higher concentrations may already exist and where they may be absent based purely on current zoning maps. As a form of data synthesis we utilized Rent Arbitration Board fee data provided by the Tax Collector hoping to corroborate our findings.

Units which pay a yearly Rent Board fee should theoretically be all units that are rent controlled, however, Rent Board Executive Director Robert Collins clarified that this system is nowhere near perfect as many properties which pay the rent board fee do so unnecessarily, and many properties that should be are not, leading to massive inaccuracies in estimating rent control stock based purely on Rent Arbitration Board fee data.
WHAT IS RENT CONTROL?

Rent control is a type of housing regulation in which increases in rent over a given time are limited by a predefined threshold at a municipal level. Rent control characteristics vary between different political and housing climates as policies are tailored by the needs of the city enacting them but limited by the regional and statewide umbrella of housing policy they fall under.

Rent control in Californian cities is unique to the other four states that still allow rental control regulations primarily due to the Costa-Hawkins Rental Act of 1995. Vacancy-decontrol, a strong component of Costa-Hawkins, is a price-control mechanism that allows a rental unit to adjust to market rate in the instance of a vacancy. Upon filling that vacancy all subsequent raises in rent must comply with the municipally determined yearly threshold.

Similarly, the Ellis Act (1985) allowed rent controlled evictions for condo-conversions of protected units. The presence of “Ellis Act evictions” may lead to potential discrepancies for estimating the number of rent controlled units as they may have been removed from the market for a given period of time before returning.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT

The economic climate that led to the passage of the 1979 Rental Stabilization & Arbitration Act is a familiar cycle of increasing rents, commercial development interests, and displacement of San Francisco’s vulnerable populations. Throughout the 1960s and 1970s, San Francisco and other major cities experienced significant gentrification due to urban renewal and increased citywide commercial development. This created a lack of residential production and a reduction in existing rental housing stock, resulting in extremely high demand. This high demand for rental stock and absence of any residential protections enabled landlords to take advantage of their tenants.

One prominent example of this was the eviction of elderly Filipino tenants from the International Hotel in 1977. The high profile case of the International Hotel along with passage of the anti-tax Prop 13 initiative rallied the tenant movement together to fight for housing rights. Proposition 13 reduced the annual real estate property tax to 1% of its assessed valued and limited annual increases. This proposition provided a generous amount of savings on taxes per year to homeowners. In reaction, tenant activists proposed an initiative (Prop U), “that would require landlords to rebate 100% of their proposition 13 savings (Shaw, 289).” The Prop U campaign was endorsed by the rising tenant movement, a coalition called “San Franciscans for Affordable Housing”,

and supporters like the Catholic Archdiocese. Yet the bill (Prop U) was seen as too radical by its opposition, like Mayor George Moscone, who refused to support it and the bill was narrowly defeated by 53% to 47% (Shaw, 289).

Immediately after the loss of Prop U, the tenants movement worked towards a larger goal of a progressive housing reform ordinance. The initiative was placed on the ballot as Proposition R for the November 1979 election. Proposition R proposed a strong rent control ordinance in, “limiting rental increases to a percentage equal to the Rental Housing Component of the Consumer Price Index (CPI)... and required landlords to appeal to an elected rent control board in order to justify a greater increase (Hartman, 342).” Proposition R also contained protection on vacancy control, which would extend rental control beyond change of tenancy.

However, while the housing reform initiative was still gathering signatures, in April of 1979, San Francisco supervisors passed a 60 day prohibition of rent increases on residential rental properties. The moratorium was a reaction to one particular landlord’s actions, Angelo Sangiacomo, who “announced across the board 25% to 65% rent increases in his seventeen hundred apartments, inhabited mostly by middle-income tenants (Hartman, 341).” After the 60 day period expired, the supervisors promptly passed their own rent control ordinance, ahead of the election for Prop R.

The law passed by the supervisors is the foundation to today’s Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Act. Compared to Prop R, the most notable difference was that it placed the responsibility to challenge an illegal rent increase on the tenant within thirty days (Hartman, 342). The ordinance also did not have the extensive coverage of tenant protections. For instance, it excluded rights to tenants residing in owner-occupied buildings with four units or fewer, and the annual limit on rent increases was set at 7% (this rate has been updated since). Yet according to urban planner and academic Chester Hartman, “vacancy decontrol was the principal flaw in the supervisors’ rent control law, (p345).” Vacancy decontrol allows landlords to raise the rent to market-rate once the unit is vacant. Speculatively, this could result in increased evictions due to the higher profits in tenant turnover (utilizing the Ellis Act). Today vacancy decontrol is still a present issue in the rent ordinance.

However there has since been extensive amendments made of the original rent ordinance. Prop H and I are a few examples of amendments made to provide wider protections to tenants. Proposition H passed in 1992, which limited the “rent increases to 60% of the Consumer Price Index for the Bay Area, which over recent years has limited increases generally to the 1 to 2 percent range (Hartman, 356).” Then in 1994 Proposition I expanded rent control protection to cover owner-occupied 2 to 4 unit buildings. There have been other notable amendments in addition to Prop H and I.
EFFECTS OF RENT CONTROL

When discussing the topic of rent control, it is also important to discuss the effects of rent control. The intent behind rent control is to maintain the affordability of rental housing in the jurisdictions where rent control is implemented. Affordability being defined as low to middle income households paying no more than 30% of their gross income on housing costs. If a household spends more than 30% of their income on housing costs, that household is considered rent burdened. Thus, when assessing rent controls efficacy, the question to be answered is; does rent control preserve the jurisdictions affordable rental housing stock?

The first piece of literature reviewed concerning this topic was a chapter specifically on the topic of rent control in the economics text book *Issues in Economics* by Robert Guell. The author approaches the topic in a dry and straight forward manner one would expect from a textbook. Guell presents the consequences of rent control in two different scenarios; the short-term effects of rent control and the long-term effects of rent control.

The first short term effect, according to Guell, is that because of rent control, renters pay less rent then they would have without rent control and subsequently landlords earn less revenue. The second consequence of rent control is that the quantity of apartments demanded, exceeds the quantity supplied. Apartments that would have been put up for rent due to residents vacating, remain occupied due to high demand of rent stabilization.

Over the long term however, the gap created when the quantity of apartments demanded exceeds the supply, begins to widen substantially and perpetually. This happens because rent control gradually takes more and more apartments off the market, as more and more residents opt to stay put rather than move. This in turn pushes up the cost of rent on non-rent controlled housing due to demand perpetually exceeding supply. Ultimately, this scenario becomes a self-reinforcing loop. Guell illustrates his points with hypothetical supply and demand graphs.

In his final point, Guell argues that landlords respond to lost revenue due to the price ceilings imposed by rent control by practicing “deferred maintenance”. Deferred maintenance is when the landlord allows the quality of the property to decline due to the cost of maintenance and repairs exceeding the properties gross revenue.

The next article reviewed was an actual study of the effects of rent control throughout the state of California by Beacon Economics. Beacon Economics is an independent economics research institute located in Los Angeles, California. The name of the article is *An Analysis of Rent Controlled Units in California*. The study was prepared for the California Apartment Association and was released in January 2016.
The study was created to answer the question; “does rent control specifically help low-income families and residents?”

To create its study, Beacon Economics conducted quantitative analysis using demographic and housing data from the 2000 Census, the 2013 American Community Survey, the US Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA), the California Department of Finance (DOF), and Data Quick. The study uses 3 models to assess the effects of rent control laws in the California jurisdictions that have them. The first model estimates how rent control has affected households at different income levels, and specifically how rent control has affected the share of households spending more than 30% of their income on rent. The dependent variable in the first model is the change in the share of households spending 30% or more of their income on rent from 2000 to 2013 for each income group. The second model addresses the supply-side effects of rent control policies and considers overall rental housing units as well as rental households in the low-, middle-, and high-income groups. The dependent variable in the equations for each of the income brackets is the growth in the number of renter households from 2000 to 2013 by income group. The third model examines the impact of rent control policies on median rent growth in a city from 2000 to 2013.

Results from the first model found that rent control was associated with a decrease in the number of middle income households (households making between $35,000-$75,000 per year) that are rent burdened. However, there was no change in the number of rent burdened low-income households (households making less than $35,000 per year). Results from the second model found that rent control was associated with a decrease in the growth of rental housing from 2000-2012, indicating that rent control restricts the supply of rental housing. When growth is restricted, and the supply of rental housing is constrained, demand causes cost of rent to rise, meaning that in this case rent control was counterproductive. The results of the third model found that rent control was associated with an increase in the growth of median rent in the city from 2000 to 2013. The results of the third model, in fact, reinforce the findings of the second model.

The Guell chapter can be thought of as a virtual hypothesis of the effects of rent control, and the Beacon study then tests the validity of the Guell chapter. The Beacon study ultimately confirms Guell’s hypothesis. While rent control does maintain the affordability of some rental housing, it only maintains that affordability for those who are fortunate enough to obtain rent controlled apartments. However, those who are not fortunate enough to land a rent controlled apartment will experience higher rents and fewer housing options. Rent control addresses symptoms of a community’s lack of affordable housing but not the root cause; the root cause simply being not enough housing.
Rent control endures because creating housing, (affordable or otherwise) is a long, expensive process. Putting a rent control ordinance on the books is always faster, cheaper, and more popular with voters. In light of these findings rent control should best be thought of as a temporary solution until a community can effectively add new housing to its affordable housing stock.
III. APPROACH TO THE PROBLEM

HOW OTHER CITIES RECORD RENT CONTROL STOCK

Of the cities within states that still allow rental regulations like rent control, broad methods are used to keep track of units that qualify for rent control and stabilization. However, exclusionary techniques are used to estimate the number of units that may qualify as rent controlled in the circumstances where a database has not been kept to account for individual units. Commonly, city census and planning data are used to develop rough estimates. Of the cities contacted between Oakland, Santa Monica, West Hollywood, and Los Angeles, there was limited information available for how units protected by rent control are accounted for.

Methodology used to quantify the number of units covered under a municipal rent control ordinance in an article for Los Angeles, published on LA Curbed, showed data collected by the rental and real estate website Trulia which combined census data with rental data to provide assumptive, but not completely precise, data for the potential number of units that may be rent controlled. According to another article published by Los Angeles Curbed, 1,370 units were removed from the rent-controlled market due to Ellis Act evictions, meaning potential financial impacts of the rental control ordinance have influenced owners to withdraw units from the rental market, with questionable certainty of their return (Barragan, 2017).

Santa Monica provides the most readily available information regarding accounting for units protected by their rent control ordinance. Approved on April 10, 1979, the Santa Monica Rent Control Law applies to all units in existence at the time the law was enacted. The full effect of this law was later experienced in 1995 with the passage of Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act which limited municipal rental control and banned vacancy-control, enabling negotiation of rent between tenants to what the market can bare. According to the Consolidated Annual Report for 2015 by the Santa Monica Rent Control Board, 27,542 units were verified as being price-controlled rental units (Condon, 2016). The study also notes all units that are potentially, but not currently at the time of the study, subject to rent control. This considers units that were withdrawn from the rental market due to the Ellis Act evictions, units that lost permits, owner-occupied by owners exempt from regulation, and other “use” exemptions.

Prior to 1979, owners of rent controlled units were required to register with the city database regarding their rent control status, along with a record of amenities per unit. Compared to rent controlled and rent regulated units in New York City, there is not comprehensive database noting the specific units that are currently controlled, but
rather, a set of criteria for tenants to determine what their unit qualifies for. When the tenant moved in, how long they have lived there, and when the unit was built are all used to determine what laws apply restricting how rent can be controlled (Condon, 2016).

Put briefly, Santa Monica stands out as a unique municipality in requiring owners of rent controlled units to register their unit and update city records between each tentative new tenant. The lack of data available in other municipalities in California and New York is likely attributed to this organizational practice. The accuracy of Santa Monica’s rent controlled unit count is likely most accurate due to the length of time owners have been required to register with the city. This practice has been praised by other municipalities who have raised conversations about implementing similar practices.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Rent Controlled</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Unit Built Before June 13, 1979</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Home**</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condos</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SROs**</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>If Tenancy extends 32 consecutive days or more, rent control may apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Dwelling Units</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant-Based Subsidies (Section 8)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHCD Portfolio</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privately Owned BMR Units</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Specific to the 1979 Rental Stabilization & Arbitration Ordinance

** Housing type potentially subject to additional price-control regulation
IV. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

METHODOLOGY

Our research utilized ArcMap to perform a spatial analysis. The goal of our spatial analysis was to identify parcels subject to rent control. By locating those parcels, we were ultimately able to report the number of units subject to rent control. The term “rent control” refers to the price control aspect of the 1979 San Francisco Rent Ordinance. This yearly fixed price control restricts how much a landlord can raise the rent annually upon tenants within the duration of their occupancy. It is important to realize that our final maps are not an exact count of rent controlled parcels/units, but instead an estimation based on assumptions we have defined in this report. We cannot be 100% certain because the laws surrounding the rent control ordinance have many exceptions and caveats. Keeping this in mind, what follows is the process in which we identified the rent controlled units by parcel in the city and county of San Francisco. For a visual perspective of our methodologies, refer to the flowchart illustrated on the following page.

LAND USE

We started with the dataset, landuse. This dataset became our foundational layer because it was the most comprehensive, containing the planning department’s land use activity for every parcel in San Francisco. This dataset is publicly available on SFOpenData and is produced by the San Francisco Planning Department. The first step was to identify parcels that are strictly residential, or multi-use with residential. Starting with a total of 155,468 parcels, by identifying only residential parcels, this removed 17,473 parcels from landuse. Out of those residential parcel, then we selected parcels that are multi-unit housing. Single family units are generally excluded from rent control. This removed 97,378 parcels. Then out of those, we selected parcels built after 1980. When the SF Rent Ordinance was enacted on June 13, 1979, it provided protection for most rental units in multi residential building prior to this date. However our dataset only provided the up to the year value. This removed 3,725 parcels from landuse. Each additional dataset is used to remove parcels, or to corroborate existing parcels from the foundational landuse dataset.

CITY LOTS- CONDOS

The next dataset uploaded to the map is City Lots. This dataset is also publicly available on SFOpenData. City Lots is a dataset of San Francisco’s subdivision parcels. This dataset is important because it allowed us to identify parcels containing condos.
We were able to identify condo building, though the expression MAPBLKLOT <> BLKLOT, which translates to MAPBLKLOT does not equal BLKLOT. The BLKLOT is the Assessor Parcel Number, APN, and the MAPBLKLOT is the subdivided parcel number. Due to the way condos are subdivided, the subdivided parcel number will not match the APN number. Condo units are generally exempted from rent control because they are not rental units. So first we identified those parcels containing condo units. Then through the Erase overlay tool, we were able to erase those parcels containing condos from those parcels remaining in the landuse dataset. This action removed 5,927 parcels from landuse.

The following added datasets, all followed a similar procedure written as follows. First, if the dataset received was not a shapefile with geographic attributes, then the datasets were geocoded to the street address. The best address locator for geocoding was the EAS, or Enterprise Address System. This address locator is best for this project because it locates the address to the parcel center, whereas the street locator locates the address on the street. This is important for accurately locating and removing the corresponding parcels in the foundation landuse dataset. Yet the EAS locator is not complete, leaving several addresses unmatched. Initially we geocoded the addresses with the EAS locator, then the unmatched addresses were referenced with a ‘street’ locator, which locates the address at the street center.

After the addresses were geographically referenced with a point, then we identified which types of properties from the dataset were exempt from rent control. Those exempt properties were then located to their corresponding landuse parcels then removed. To identify and remove those parcels, we used a couple of methods for the EAS located addresses from the Erase Overlay tool, to Select by location. Alternatively, if the addresses were located with the street locator, their corresponding parcels were located manually to avoid errors.

**INCLUSIONARY SECTION 415**

This dataset was provided by our client, Charlie MacNulty with the MOHCD as a shapefile point dataset. These projects were completed under planning code section 415, for the San Francisco’s Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program. We removed all of these properties because the inclusionary zoning program is rental housing regulated by MOHCD, making them exempt from rent control. Using this dataset removed 28 parcels from the landuse dataset.

**MOHCD PIPELINE**

The MOHCD Pipeline dataset contains all projects in the pipeline in development or anticipated for development with the San Francisco Mayor’s Office and Housing and Community Development as of January 6, 2017. This dataset was also sourced from our client, Charlie MacNulty, formatted as a point shapefile. Out of this dataset, we only
identified parcels that are at the completed phase of development. This dataset removed 4 parcels from the landuse dataset.

**MOHCD PORTFOLIO**

The MOHCD Portfolio dataset contains all of the rental properties developed in partnership with nonprofits, the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development and the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, OCII. This dataset is sourced from our client, Charlie MacNulty in the format of a point shapefile. This dataset removed 133 parcels from the landuse dataset.

**HUD ASSISTED PROJECTS IN SF**

The HUD assisted projects dataset contains all of the properties that are fully or partially under contract with the US Department of Housing and Urban Development. Some of these properties are also projects under the MOHCD portfolio. This data was provided from our client, Teresa Yanga in the format of an excel spreadsheet. So this dataset initially required to be geocoded. This dataset was removed because these rental properties are operated by the united states department of housing and urban development. This removed 30 parcels from landuse.

**DHSH MASTER LEASED BUILDINGS**

This dataset contains properties that are fully or partially under contract with the SF Department of Homelessness and Supportive Services(DHSS), and the Department of Public Health(DPH). This dataset was provided by our client, Teresa Yanga, formatted as an excel spreadsheet. Again, we initially needed to geocoded these properties to their spatial location on our map. These properties were exempt from rent control because they are properties operated by a governmental agencies, the SF DHSS and DPH. This dataset removed 8 parcels from landuse.

**LIHTC PROPERTIES IN SF**

This dataset contains properties that utilized the Low Income Housing Tax Credit in San Francisco. This dataset was provided in an excel spreadsheet format by our client Teresa Yanga. Again, we initially geocoded these properties to their spatial location on our map. These properties were exempt from rent control because they are affordable rental properties funded through state tax credits. This dataset concluded our rent control map, removing 34 parcels from landuse.

In the end, our final count of rent controlled parcels was 30,728. Further, we were able to calculate the total number of rent controlled units, by calculating the sum of the attribute value ‘resunits’ in the final landuse rent controlled dataset. All together the total number of units subject to rent control are 172,064.
In order to analyze our results, first we created a series of thematic maps (Reference Findings section) depicting the number of parcels and units per San Francisco neighborhood. This was accomplished through a spatial join counting the number of parcels and units per neighborhood. This process was also applied to count the number of parcels and units per San Francisco Supervisor Districts. We also created a series of focused, or close up in scale maps. These illustrate a neighborhood or area’s spread of rent controlled parcels in comparison to non-rent controlled and nonresidential parcels. Lastly we compared our results to the Rent Board Fee dataset.

**RENT BOARD FEE**

The Rent Board fee dataset was used to compare or corroborate the results of our rent controlled landuse dataset. The Rent Board Fee dataset contained properties in San Francisco that pay an annual fee to the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board, also referred to as the Rent Board. This dataset was provided by Robert Collins, the Executive Director of the San Francisco Rent Board, formatted as an excel file. The only properties subject to paying the rent board fee are properties that are protected by Rent Control. However there is no official enforcement of this fee, so it sometimes results in properties paying the fee who should not and vice versa. For our spatial analysis, we assumed that all properties paying the Rent Board fee are subject to rent control. So the properties in this dataset were geocoded to its spatial location. Then the corresponding parcels were used to corroborate or verify our completed rent controlled landuse parcels. The results of our methodology will be discussed under the findings section of our report.
METHODOLOGY FLOW CHART

1. Select residential parcels
2. Select multi-unit parcels
3. Select parcels built prior to 1980
4. Select what is excluded from the rent ordinance
5. Identify those corresponding parcels with the landuse dataset
6. Remove those parcels from landuse

RENT CONTROLLED LANDUSE PARCELS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA SET NAME</th>
<th>DEFINE</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>COMMENTS/CONCERNS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LANDUSE</td>
<td>Land use categories for every parcels in San Francisco. The land use categories are derived from a range of City and commercial databases.</td>
<td>SF Planning <a href="https://data.sfgov.org/Housing-and-Buildings/Land-Use/us3s-fp9q">https://data.sfgov.org/Housing-and-Buildings/Land-Use/us3s-fp9q</a></td>
<td>Base shapefile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY LOTS</td>
<td>A representation of San Francisco’s subdivision parcels. Each of the polygons have a unique BLKLOT value which is the Assessor Parcel Number. Multiple level(condos) lots are represented with base lot being the MAPBLKLOT value.</td>
<td>SF Planning <a href="https://data.sfgov.org/Geographic-Locations-and-Boundaries/City-Lots/45et-h7tc">https://data.sfgov.org/Geographic-Locations-and-Boundaries/City-Lots/45et-h7tc</a></td>
<td>Shapefile; Overlap of 14 projects with the MOHCD pipeline dataset.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCLUSIONARY SECTION 415</td>
<td>These are projects completed under planning code section 415 (aka Inclusionary Housing). Section 415 Inclusionary is affordable housing produced under planning code section 415</td>
<td>MOHCD</td>
<td>Shapefile; Overlap of 14 projects with the MOHCD pipeline dataset.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| MOHCD PORTFOLIO    | Affordable multifamily rental projects in MOHCD’s housing portfolio.                            | MOHCD                                                                                      | Shapefile; 70 properties/ parcels non-matching comparing resunits value from Landuse to total_units value from this dataset.  
unitsdiff= resunits- total_units  
Min = -252  
Max = 50  
Sum = 1358  
Mean = -19.4 |
| MOHCD PIPELINE     | The MOHCD’s full pipeline, containing both completed and in various stages of development      | MOHCD                                                                                      | Shapefile; Overlap of 14 projects with the Inclusionary Section 415 dataset.      |
| LIHTC               | Properties that utilized the Low Income Housing Tax Credit in San Francisco                    | MOHCD                                                                                      | Excel spreadsheet file; geocoded using EAS and street locator                    |
| HUD ASSISTED IN SF  | Properties that are fully or partially under contract with the US Department of Housing and Urban Development | MOHCD                                                                                      | Excel spreadsheet file; Geocoded using EAS and street locator                    |
| DHSH MASTER LEASE  | Units leased by the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing                          | MOHCD                                                                                      | Excel spreadsheet file; Geocoded using EAS and street locator                    |
| RENT BOARD FEE      | Properties in San Francisco that pay an annual fee to the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board, also referred to as the Rent Board | SF Rent Board                                                                             | Excel spreadsheet file; Geocoded using EAS and street locator                    |
V. FINDINGS

THEMATIC MAPS

Our methodology lead us to produce a series of maps illustrating parcels and units subject to rent control in San Francisco. To begin, we produced a series of thematic maps to symbolize the distribution of rent controlled parcels or units per neighborhood. The first map titled Map A1 illustrates the absolute number of parcels per neighborhood. The legend labels the distribution of the number of parcels in a color scheme spectrum from a light cream color, representing the lowest value to a dark brown to represent the highest value. The Outer Richmond and Mission Neighborhoods have the highest number of parcels with 3039 parcels for Outer Richmond and 3392 parcels for the Mission. Treasure Island has the least amount with 0 parcels rent controlled. This particular map is not as significant on its own because the data has not been normalized.
By normalizing the data, we can show the conversion of the absolute number into a percentage based on the total number of residential parcels or units. Normalizing the data also provides a greater context and meaning to the spatial data. Map B1 illustrates the percentage of parcels per neighborhood out of total residential parcels within each neighborhood. The color scheme remains the same, with the cream color depicting the lowest percentage value to the darker brown depicting the highest percentage value. Notice the trend of higher percentage of rent-controlled parcels in the northern area of San Francisco. In contrast, the lower percentage of rent-controlled units in the south. Based on the type of parcels we excluded in our methodology, this shows that in the southern portion of the city, there are less than 7.06% of parcels within the neighborhood subject to rent control.

Map AA1 (on the next page) depicts the absolute number of rent-controlled residential units per neighborhood. It is important to acknowledge the number of units we reported are sourced from the planning department’s attribute value, `resunits`. The `resunits` value is associated to the individual parcel. This map shows the neighborhood
with the least number of rent-controlled units is again Treasure Island with 0 units. This makes sense, considering there are 0 parcels reported for this map.

The neighborhoods with the highest number of rent controlled units are Outer Richmond with 10,663 units, Marina with 10,997 units, Pacific Heights with 9,533 units, Nob Hill with 13,422 units, Tenderloin with 10621 units, and Mission with 15939 units. By comparing these results with Map A1, we can see that the neighborhoods the Marina, Pacific Heights, Nob Hill, and Tenderloin do not have the highest number of parcels, but they do have a higher numbers of units. This means these neighborhoods have a much greater density or more buildings with multiple units per parcels.
The final thematic map, AA2, normalizes AA1 to show the percentage of rent-controlled units per Neighborhood. From a housing policy perspective, this map is the most meaningful. Our client at the mayor’s office of housing indicated that they need to be able to report the level of analysis at the unit level. This map depicts a trend of rent controlled parcels in the Northwest of the city, notably the highest percentages are in the Inner Richmond, Haight-Ashbury, Hayes Valley, Nob Hill, Marina, Russian Hill, Chinatown, and Golden Gate Park. Another neighborhood with a high percentage of units is Lakeshore, although this is not consistent with the trend in the rest of the city.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEIGHBORHOOD</th>
<th>ABSOLUTE NUM. OF PARCELS</th>
<th>PERCENT OF PARCELS*</th>
<th>ABSOLUTE NUM. OF UNITS</th>
<th>PERCENT OF UNITS**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAYVIEW HUNTERS POINTS</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
<td>1439</td>
<td>14.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERNAL HEIGHTS</td>
<td>1033</td>
<td>15.28%</td>
<td>2927</td>
<td>33.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASTRO/UPPER MARKET</td>
<td>1749</td>
<td>37.51%</td>
<td>6879</td>
<td>60.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINATOWN</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>48.51%</td>
<td>6104</td>
<td>75.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCELSIOR</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>9.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINANCIAL DISTRICT/SOUTH BEACH</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.22%</td>
<td>2869</td>
<td>22.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLEN PARK</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>12.54%</td>
<td>1323</td>
<td>33.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOLDEN GATE PARK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haight Ashbury</td>
<td>1374</td>
<td>47.44%</td>
<td>6205</td>
<td>71.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes Valley</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td>53.34%</td>
<td>6880</td>
<td>71.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Richmond</td>
<td>1816</td>
<td>45.88%</td>
<td>6526</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Sunset</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>24.61%</td>
<td>6843</td>
<td>56.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japantown</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>23.28%</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>24.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeshore</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.79%</td>
<td>3909</td>
<td>74.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Park</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40.82%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone Mountain/USF</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>46.93%</td>
<td>4240</td>
<td>64.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>44.45%</td>
<td>10997</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLaren Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>46.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>3392</td>
<td>45.97%</td>
<td>15939</td>
<td>65.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Bay</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.36%</td>
<td>1195</td>
<td>20.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nob Hill</td>
<td>1088</td>
<td>64.49%</td>
<td>13422</td>
<td>78.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noe Valley</td>
<td>1575</td>
<td>27.12%</td>
<td>5715</td>
<td>50.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Beach</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>56.79%</td>
<td>4291</td>
<td>63.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanview/Merced/Ingleside</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>3.16%</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>9.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Mission</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>3.49%</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>Number of Residential Parcels</td>
<td>Residential Parcel Percentage</td>
<td>Total Number of Residential Parcels</td>
<td>Percentage of Total Number of Residential Parcels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTER RICHMOND</td>
<td>3039</td>
<td>31.74%</td>
<td>10663</td>
<td>58.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACIFIC HEIGHTS</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>35.87%</td>
<td>9533</td>
<td>64.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORTOLA</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>4.49%</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>17.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POTRERO HILL</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>22.45%</td>
<td>2409</td>
<td>40.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESIDIO</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.91%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESIDIO HEIGHTS</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>29.37%</td>
<td>2927</td>
<td>58.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSSIAN HILL</td>
<td>1297</td>
<td>58.69%</td>
<td>7856</td>
<td>70.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEACLIFF</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6.08%</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>18.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH OF MARKET</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>15.54%</td>
<td>2933</td>
<td>21.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNSET/PARKSIDE</td>
<td>1575</td>
<td>7.06%</td>
<td>5330</td>
<td>20.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENDERLOIN</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>37.73%</td>
<td>10621</td>
<td>56.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREASURE ISLAND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWIN PEAKS</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>11.47%</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td>44.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISITACION VALLEY</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>4.08%</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>10.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST OF TWIN PEAKS</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>6.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTERN ADDITION</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>42.76%</td>
<td>5229</td>
<td>43.21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentage out of total number of residential parcels
** Percentage out of total number units of all residential parcels
The following maps are just an example of what the data can give you. Red parcels are residential parcels subject to the 1979 rent controlled ordinance, while biege parcels are residential parcels not subject to the 1979 rent control ordinance. Grey parcels are in most cases non-residential parcels, though in some cases grey parcels are residential parcels subject to another form of price control and were extracted using the methodology. The above map is San Francisco supervisor district 3, Aaron Peskin's district.
This map shows where rent controlled parcels are in the Tenderloin District.
This map of where rent controlled parcels are located in the Sunset/Parkside Districts strikes a significant contrast with the preceding map of the Tenderloin. While the majority of the residential parcels in the Tenderloin are subject to rent control the majority in the Sunset are not. This is most likely due the Sunset being composed primarily of single family homes, while the Tenderloin is made up exclusively of older apartment buildings. Yet, interestingly the locations in the Sunset with significant numbers of rent controlled parcels are along commercial/transit corridors like Irving street, Judah street, and Taraval street. One could surmise that these are upper floor residential units above ground floor retail.
This is an up close inset map of the intersection of Columbus street and Broadway street. In addition to displaying where rent controlled parcels are located, the address are displayed on the parcels as well.
This map follows on the theme of Columbus and Broadway (map E1), however it displays the intersection of Haight and Divisadero.
This inset map of the Ingleside district goes a bit further than the last two inset maps and actually displays the number of units per rent controlled parcel. Like in the other focused maps, beige parcels are residential parcels not subject to rent control, while grey parcels are non-residential parcels. However rent controlled parcels are symbolized by color according to the number of units. Cold colors symbolize parcels with small numbers of units. However, as the colors warm, the number units per parcel increase. In addition, the number of units is displayed on the parcel along with the address of the parcel.
COMPARING RENT CONTROLLED AND RENT BOARD FEE

Our final map (Map G1) produced from our research compared the parcels we determined were rent-controlled to the parcels paying the rent board fee. The rent board fee is an annual fee property owners pay per units subject to rent-control. So in theory, the parcels we determined were rent-controlled should corroborate or match the properties paying the rent board fee. The map illustrates three types of parcels: 1 Rent controlled and Paying Rent Board Fee in pink, 2 Paying Rent Board Fee and Not Rent Controlled in blue and 3 Rent controlled and not paying rent board fee in green.
We expected our results to be rent controlled and paying the rent board fee, or all pink according to map’s color scheme. However, this was not the case. There are a large portion of parcels represented by the color green, that are rent-controlled and not paying the rent board fee. A concentration of those parcels are illustrated within the Inner Richmond, Potrero Hill, Bayview/Hunters Point, and Lakeshore neighborhoods. There are also a few visible patches of parcels paying the rent board fee and not rent-controlled throughout the city. Yet the most concerning results of this map are the large concentrations of rent controlled and not paying the rent board fee. This could be an indication of property owners that are in fact illegally not paying the rent board fee. Alternatively, it could indicate a discrepancy within our datasets or methodology. In any case, each of these scenarios requires further analysis.
VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

After refining parcel level data to all residential units from the city’s landuse dataset, we have determined that the discrepancies between the total deduced value of potentially rent controlled units does not fall within a comfortable range to what was currently assumed based on the Rent Arbitration Board fee data. Our next-step recommendations for this project is to cross-reference and verify all assumed rent controlled units with our Rent Control thematic map and dataset.

Our findings indicate the estimations for the total number of rent controlled units as suggestive not definitive. The data and the methodology were effectively used to determine landuse parcels that are probably subject to rent control but not necessarily. This is because while the 1979 ordinance specifies that any multi-unit rental property constructed before June 13th 1979 should be subject to rent control, but the nuts and bolts of rent control in San Francisco are considerably more complicated and nuanced. The purpose of this project was to create a comprehensive spatial index of where rent controlled units probably are in San Francisco for the purpose of reference.

The data used, and created in the effort to establish this reference will be included for stakeholders to analyze and manipulate to their own ends. The output and the methodology was designed from the very beginning to be modular, thus each step can be examined for improvement or discarded for irrelevance or recalibrated for better accuracy.

The core data set “landuse” was narrowed down to just all multi-unit residential landuse parcels built in 1979 or earlier (“Landuse_Multi_Res_1980”). Next, data pertaining to other types of “affordable” rental housing was queried and/or geocoded, vectored, overlain and sliced out of landuse leaving us with the final layer of analysis, “Landuse_11”. We feel that “Landuse_11”, is accurate due to how well geocoded and queried layers from other disparate data sets overlay each other during the execution of the methodology.

The only issue came with the Rent Board Fee data. Because of lax enforcement, ignorance, and in some cases wilful disregard, some landlords not are paying the rent board fee that should pay the fee, and some are paying the fee that shouldn’t be paying the fee. This made the rent board fee data an unreliable source of information regarding the location of rent controlled units.

While we feel the data concerning the location of rent controlled parcels contained in Landuse_11 is fairly accurate, the ultimate recommendation is for stakeholders is to continue to push the boundaries of the data. Additionally we advise for better data collaboration between governmental departments to avoid further discrepancies among the data. Like a scientific study, analyze it, critique it, imitate it, reference it, and improve it, until it is indisputable fact.
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A. REFERENCES


B. CONTACT INFORMATION

NICK FISH
nicholas.c.fish@icloud.com

QUINN OLIVER
qualiver6@gmail.com

CHRISTINA MIRANI
cmmirani@gmail.com
C. MOHCD - PROJECT PROPOSAL

SPRING 2017 Urban Studies and Planning Senior Seminar Projects
Proposal Description Form

Group/Agency Profile

Name of Organization/Department: Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development

Contact Name: Teresa Yanga/Charles MacNulty

Position: Director of Housing Research/Program Development and Data Specialist

Address: 1 South Van Ness, 5th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103

Phone: (415) 701-5549

Email: Charles.MacNulty@sfgov.org

Organization/Department Purpose or Mission:

The mission of the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) is to provide financing for the development, rehabilitation and purchase of affordable housing and to partner with the community to strengthen the social, physical and economic infrastructure of San Francisco's low-income neighborhoods and communities in need.

To accomplish its mission, MOHCD guides and coordinates the City's housing policy and administers a variety of programs to finance the development of affordable housing by non-profit and for-profit developers, provides financial and educational assistance to first-time homebuyers, and finances housing rehabilitation costs for low-income homeowners. MOHCD is also responsible for monitoring and ensuring the long-term affordability and physical viability of the City's stock of affordable housing. Additionally, MOHCD administers the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development’s (HUD) Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program the Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) program and the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) program, as well as General Fund and Housing Trust Fund grants focused on community development issues and services, eviction prevention, housing stability, and access to housing issues for low-to-moderate income residents.

Project Information

Project Title: San Francisco Rent Control Research and Mapping Project

Community Issue Areas: Housing Policy, Affordable Housing, Rent Control

Project/Problem Description:

Chapter 37 of the San Francisco Administrate Code authorizes the Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board to safeguard tenants from excessive rent increases and assure landlords fair and adequate rents. Commonly referred to as “Rent Control”, the ordinance regulates the amount of rent
increase that can be imposed by a landlord for rental housing units built before June 13, 1979. Estimates of the number of rent controlled units vary, with approximately 80% of all rental units (and 60% of all housing units) subject to the rent control ordinance. However, the City of San Francisco does not have an official count of rent controlled units, nor an explicit method for estimating the number, as units move in and out of rent control and landlords are not required to “register” rent controlled unit with the city’s Rent Board.

Student Consulting Team Role/Task:

Under supervision of the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development’s Director of Housing Research and the department’s Program Development and Data Specialist, the student consulting team will identify methodologies and data sources for estimating the number housing units subject to San Francisco’s rent control ordinance, estimate the number of rent controlled units, and map the location of units.

Specific project tasks would include:

- Summarize the types of properties covered under rent control;
- Identify possible methodologies to be used to estimate the number of rent controlled units, surfacing methodological strength and weakness;
- Identify possible data sources required to estimate number of housing units subject to rent control, identifying data gaps and propose solutions to address missing, incomplete, or inaccurate data;
- Using GIS software, map the location of rent controlled units in San Francisco and the parcel level, summarizing the data by neighborhood and supervisor district, and
- Present summary of findings to City stakeholders.

Fluency in the type of research skills expected (e.g., GIS mapping, interviewing, observations of the built environment, historical archival research, survey design, field data collection) of students:

GIS Mapping, Data Analysis

Specific deliverables expected:

- Narrative report outlining of methodologies and data sources for assessing the number of rent controlled units
- Map(s) of estimated rent controlled units
- Presentation to City Stakeholders

Impact/significance of the project:

The City currently has no reliable method for estimating the number of rent controlled units. This project would support official City efforts to assess more accurately the number of rent controlled housing units in San Francisco in order to inform housing policy making.
D. SCOPE OF WORK

Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development: Rent Control Map  
Draft Project Scope of Work: Spring 2017

I. BACKGROUND  
The San Francisco Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Ordinance helps protect tenants from excessive rent increases and tenants can only be evicted for “just causes.” The Rent Control aspect of the Rent Ordinance regulates the amount of rent increases landlords can raise by a set amount each year. Yet this regulation does not cover all rental units in San Francisco. Some exceptions include: rental units built after June 13, 1979, project-Based subsidies, single-family homes, and less than 32 days in a residential hotel (commonly referred to as SROs). Due to the complexity of these exceptions to the ordinance, the City of San Francisco does not have an official count of rent controlled units, nor an existing method for estimating the number.

II. PROJECT OBJECTIVES  
A. Review published works relevant to rent control as a social benefit as well as examples of methodology used for how cities have historically kept track of units protected by rent control legislation and their corresponding survey methods.  
B. Summarize the types of properties covered under rent control and corresponding data available through the MOHCD and SF Open Data as part of identifying all relevant methodological strengths and weaknesses that are present.  
C. Using these findings, narrow down specific datasets seen as relevant in leading to an accurate count of the total number of units that may be rent controlled.  
D. Using GIS software, map the location of rent controlled units in San Francisco at the parcel level, summarizing the data by supervisor district and/or neighborhood and present a summary of findings to City stakeholders.

III. PROJECT TIMELINE  
Feb 2- March 6: Phase 1 Project Development  
- Develop Scope Of Work and Gantt Chart  
- Establish Meeting Schedule  
Feb 20- March 27: Phase 2 Data Management  
- Identify Datasets and Relevant Literature  
March 27- April 17: Phase 3 Analysis of Research  
- Provide Summary of Data by Neighborhood and Supervisor District  
- Preliminary Research Findings  
April 3- May 23: Phase 4 Report Findings  
- Provide Report of Findings

IV. DELIVERABLES  
- Narrative Report outlining the methodologies and data sources for assessing the number of rent controlled units  
- Map(s) of Estimated Rent Controlled units  
- Presentation to City Stakeholders
V. CLIENT REQUIREMENTS
   A. Provision of adequate data for Land Use Map Data, MOHD Portfolio Data, SF Housing Authority Parcels, and Rent Board Fee Data.
   B. Biweekly meeting

SFSU Consultant Team

Nick Fish
nfish@mail.sfsu.edu
916-412-8318

Quinn Oliver
qoliver@mail.sfsu.edu
415-680-8373

Christina Mirani
cmirani@mail.sfsu.edu
415-539-6539

Clients

Charles MacNulty
Program Development and Data Specialist
charles.macnulty@sfgov.org

Teresa Yanga
Director of Housing Research
teresa.yanga@sfgov.org
### Phase 1: Project Development

**Tasks:**
- Initial Meeting with Client
  - 13-Feb
- Meeting w/DataSF, Jason Lally
  - 17-Feb
- Develop of Scope of Work and Gantt Chart
- Meeting: Review Scope of Work and Gantt Chart

**Deliverables:**
- Gantt Chart
  - 28-Feb
- Scope of Work
  - 28-Feb

### Phase 2: Data Management

**Tasks:**
- Table: Summarize Types of Rent Controlled Properties
- Table: Identify Strengths and Weaknesses of Data Sets
- Meet with Robert Collins from SF Rent Board: Review Evictions datasets
- Bi-Weekly Meeting
  - 13-March
- Geocode Data Sets with addresses
- Table: Identify Solutions to address data gaps, missing and incomplete data sets
- Spatial Analysis: Estimate of Rent Control units

**Deliverables:**
- Literature Review (individual)
  - 14-March

### Phase 3: Analysis of Research

**Tasks:**
- Bi-Weekly Meeting
  - 27-March
- Report Methodologies for Future Replicable Studies
  - 10-April

**Deliverables:**
- Research Design Write Up (Individual)
  - 4-April
- Preliminary Research Findings (Individual)
  - 11-April

### Phase 4: Report Findings

**Tasks:**
- Report Finding into a Powerpoint
  - 24-April
- Senior Seminar: Practice Presentations
  - 11-April
- Final Jury Presentation
  - 2-May
- Final Rent Control Map(s)
  - 23-May
- Final Narrative Report
  - 23-May

**Legend:**
- = Meeting
- = In Progress
- = Deliverables
F. LIST OF DIGITAL FILES ATTACHED ON DVD

1. DATA SOURCES GEODATABASE (ZIP FILE)
2. MAP GEODATABASE (ZIP FILE)
3. Data Dictionary for Geodatabases
4. Python script for Modelbuilder
5. SLIDE SHOW PRESENTATION
6. STEP BY STEP METHODOLOGY
7. MAP JPEGS
   a) MAP A1- Absolute number of parcels per neighborhood
   b) MAP B1- Percent of parcels per neighborhood
   c) MAP AA1- Absolute number of units per neighborhood
   d) MAP AA2- Percent of units per neighborhood
   e) MAP C1 - District 3 Map
   f) MAP D1- Tenderloin Map
   g) MAP D2- Sunset District Map
   h) MAP E1- Close up Chinatown/North Beach Map
   i) MAP E2- Close up Haight/Divisadero Map
   j) MAP F1- Close Up Ingleside- Number of Units Map
   k) MAP G1- Rent Controlled and Rent Board Fee Paying parcels