



Daniel Lurie  
*Mayor*

Christina A. Varner  
*Executive Director*

DAVID GRUBER  
*PRESIDENT*

DAVE CROW  
JULIET HALEY  
RICHARD HUNG  
ASHLEY KLEIN  
CATHY MOSBRUCKER  
KENT QIAN  
ARTHUR TOM  
DAVID WASSERMAN

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF  
THE SAN FRANCISCO RESIDENTIAL RENT  
STABILIZATION & ARBITRATION BOARD**

Tuesday, July 15, 2025  
at 6:00 p.m.  
25 Van Ness Avenue, Room 610  
San Francisco, CA 94102

I. Call to Order

Vice President Mosbrucker called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.

II. Reading of Ramaytush Ohlone Land Acknowledgment

Commissioner Haley read the Ramaytush Ohlone Land Acknowledgement.

III. Roll Call

Commissioners Present: Crow; Hung; Haley; Mosbrucker; Qian; Tom;  
Wasserman.

Commissioners Not Present: Gruber; Klein.

Staff Present: Harrison; Katayama; Koomas; Texidor; Van  
Spronsen; Varner.

IV. Remarks from the Public

- A. Andrew Hill, the tenant at 246 Judah Street, Unit 4 (AT250034), said that 4 days after the owners acquired the property they served him with a notice to change the terms of the tenancy on February 24, 2024. He said that the new owners are pursuing the new terms based on the Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act and not Rule 6.14. He said that

♻️ Printed on 100% post-consumer recycled paper

he has been misguided in his push for Rule 6.14 in his appeal. He said that before the change in ownership, the prior landlord knew that he resided there for over two years, communicated directly with him via email and text messages, and told him that he didn't believe the master tenant had resided there since March 2023. He said that because the prior owner never took any legal action and stated that he only relied on the tenant for non-emergency repairs and access to the unit since the master tenant was unavailable, the rent increase was allowed.

- B. Jason Everett, the tenant at 644 Ashbury Street (AT250029), said that there was a miscommunication that led to the untimely filing of the appeal. He said that he did not receive notice of the appeal, so he requests that the board consider the appeal. He said that he was unrepresented at his Rent Board hearing and there was some miscommunication about whether he was going to seek representation.
- C. John Zanghi, the attorney for the landlord at 644 Ashbury Street (AT250029), said that the tenant's appeal is silent on what the tenant did after receiving the decision. He said that the appeal does not state that the tenant did not receive the decision or did not understand it but instead claims that the tenant sent a photo of the decision to his attorney and that the attorney explained that he was not familiar with Rent Board forms to be able to ascertain that it was the decision. He said that the tenant did not appeal for 5 months, and the appeal fails to mention that he emailed the tenant's attorney 4 days after the decision was mailed indicating that the tenant had lost the case, that the rent increase was proper under Costa-Hawkins and that he was amenable to discussing potential subtenants replacing the party and original occupants. He said that the tenant's attorney responded to the email so he does not understand the basis for the appeal. He said that the landlord did not accept any rent after service of the rent increase notice, and that 6 months later the tenant asked for a ledger. He said that the landlord's accountant used standard accounting procedures and applied a rent payment received months later to debt that accrued earlier during the pendency of that notice, which does not magically undo the fact that the rent was returned while the notice was pending. He said that the appeal should be denied based on the fact that it is untimely without good cause and has no substance.
- D. Dru Parker, trustee for the landlord at 542 Presidio Avenue (AL250026), said that the property manager installed a WiFi-enabled security camera above the front porch on September 21, 2024. She said that the property manager and herself had access to the footage, and that while there were some technical glitches due to the location of the router in the basement, they obtained several videos of the tenant going into the unit during work hours and other individuals using a lockbox key to enter the unit at all hours. She said that the property manager received a text from the tenant on October 4, 2024 requesting that the camera be removed, which she did not do, and then on October 8, 2024 the camera was covered with a plastic bag. She said that the landlord then installed a doorbell camera, which recorded the tenant covering the lens with a piece of paper. She said that this happened on multiple occasions, not just the two that the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) states in the appeal response memorandum. She said that there is no realistic way of obtaining the video evidence that the ALJ was requesting. She said that the tenant is covering up the cameras because he does not reside in the unit, nor is it his usual place of return. She said that the tenant lives with his

wife in a \$2 million house on 23rd Avenue that they co-own, he owns a \$1 million dollar lakeview condo in Chicago, and he testified that he utilizes the subject unit as his place of business. She said that it is not the responsibility of the landlord to subsidize his business nor is it the intent of rent control. She said that the owner was a plumber and not a wealthy man, nor are his three children heirs with one son being homeless. She said that the tenant and his wife are well-off, taking advantage of the rent control system, and are removing a sorely needed residential unit from the housing stock.

- E. Curtis Dowling, the attorney for the landlord at 542 Presidio Avenue (AL250026), said that the tenants have been married for over 30 years and have always filed joint tax returns. He said that because they are financially united as one for tax purposes, they can only have one principal place of residence in the world but the decision allows them to simultaneously have three separate principal places of residence, namely the unit in this case and two residences they co-own in San Francisco and Chicago which are collectively worth \$3 million and for which homeowners' exemptions are being taken. He said that contrary to the ALJ's memorandum, this is simply not allowed. He said that this is not a close case, and five of the six factors in Rule 1.21 favor the landlord and the sixth is heavily contested. He said that the decision disregards the admonition in Rule 1.21 that "a compilation of these elements lends greater credibility to the finding of principal place of residence, whereas the presence of only one element may not support such a finding." He said that the ALJ's finding lacks credibility under the plain text of the rule. He said that in this case, the ALJ faults the landlord for not having a neighbor testify about the tenant's absence from the unit but the plain text of Rule 1.21 places the burden on tenants to introduce "credible testimony from individuals with personal knowledge that the tenant actually occupies the residential unit as his or her principal place of residence." He said that the tenant's wife and adult son did not appear at the hearing to corroborate his testimony, and rebuttal testimony becomes impossible when the tenant purposefully covers up the landlord's cameras. He said that the tenant does not reside in the unit with his 8 – 30 employees that he has at any given time and instead resides with his wife and son 10 minutes away from his work. He said this is why at least five of the six factors indisputably favor the landlord because the unit is solely a place used to conduct business and therefore the decision should be reversed in its entirety.
- F. Linda Hat, the tenant at 22 Vandewater Street, Unit 305 (AT250033), said that she had participated in a Rent Board hearing in April 2025 after which she understood that her rent was going to be increased by \$500.00 and that she had received a separate rent increase approximately 4 months prior. She said that she didn't think that the landlord could raise her rent twice in one year and submitted a declaration to the ALJ stating that. She said that she also received emails, texts, and phone calls from the landlord indicating that she owed \$1,900.00 in rent even though she had prepaid the rent through January 2025 and she received the cancelled checks. She said that a couple of days ago she received a note stating that she did not owe anything and then recently she received another note indicating that she owed \$300.00 or \$400.00. She said that when she asked about the extra costs she was being charged at the hearing, the ALJ directed the landlord to provide further information and the property manager promised that he would go over the ledger with the tenant but he never did. She said that she wants an explanation for how the landlord has arrived at her owing \$400.00.

- G. Anne Lieu, the landlord at 6 Pope Street, Unit 1 (AL250032), said that she had not previously come to the Rent Board because she was angry with the tenant and could not sleep nor eat and fell down and ended up in the hospital. She said that she did not agree with the decision in the case awarding the tenant a \$5,000.00 reduction in the rent. She said that the tenant cancelled multiple appointments to inspect the unit to perform repairs. She said that the tenant has also caused problems with other tenants, specifically the downstairs commercial tenant for which there is a police report when they fought. She said that she fairly increased the rent based on the allowable rent increase percentage dictated by the Rent Board and that the tenant has not paid rent for 3 months. She said that she spent approximately \$40,000.00 in repairs for the unit and that the tenant disconnects the wall heater and then requests that the landlord send a handyman to reconnect it. She said that the kitchen stove has been replaced 3 times throughout the years, the toilet has been replaced multiple times because of the tenant's misuse, and that the tenant's unauthorized pet damaged the bathtub. She said that the tenant never properly notified her of the repairs needed.
- H. Bonnie Low, the tenant at 4240 Irving Street (AT250036), said that she has lived in the unit for over 20 years and that she has had to constantly defend her tenancy simply for asserting her legal rights. She said that the landlords have made it clear that they want her out by not making repairs and allowing a rodent infestation to persist. She said that her housing conditions led to multiple notices of violation from the Department of Building Inspection, Department of Public Health, and PG&E but the landlord has repeatedly delayed or failed to complete necessary repairs. She asked the Board to grant the appeal because the ALJ did not fully consider substantial key evidence including one recent City violation confirming an ongoing rodent infestation with 3 deceased rodents found in the first week of July. She said that the landlord admitted under oath that they had no pest control and that the monthly janitorial services had ceased, that the laundry machine was never properly repaired, and that there is substantial photographic evidence documenting unsafe and unsanitary conditions. She said that although the ALJ granted a partial rent reduction through September 2024, the rodent issue has continued beyond that date. She asked the Board to extend the rent reduction to the present until the problem is resolved. She said that the ALJ stated that the failure to repair and maintain petition, which addresses the rent increase, was orally withdrawn, which is not true. She said that she did not withdraw the petition orally or in writing or in any other form, nor did she have any reason or benefit to do so. She said that the failure to repair and maintain petition was properly filed and that the Rent Board allows both that and a decreased housing services petition to be submitted simultaneously where there are violations and failure to make necessary repairs. She said that the ALJ's response memorandum acknowledged that this may have been an error and deferred to the Board on whether to remand the decision. The tenant asked the Board to 1) remand the decision and accept the failure to repair and maintain petition to address the rent increase; 2) extend the rent reduction period based on the continued infestation and pending violations; and 3) grant the appeal in full based on the evidence, the landlord's admissions, and the severity and duration of the habitability issues, including the loss of laundry and janitorial services. She said that the ALJ erred in applying the legal standard for decreased housing services regarding the loss of laundry and janitorial services and that she is asking for fair compensation for the decrease in housing services.

- I. Juralyn Thompson, the tenant at 988 Corbett Avenue (AT250035), said that she moved to the unit with 4 roommates on June 22, 2024 because she saw in the video that she had access to the backyard. She said that the landlord only allowed her access to the unit two days before she moved in and she discovered that she did not have individual access to the backyard and that the back door is not strong enough to keep her secure and that both the front door and back door do not have proper lighting. She also said that she was not provided a key to her room. She said that when she notified the landlord, they requested additional pictures without resolving the issues and even requested that she obtain a key to the room herself. She said that the garage also has items left over from a prior tenant.

V. Approval of the Minutes

MSF: To approve the minutes of June 10, 2025.  
(Qian/Haley: 3-0; Crow, Hung, Tom and Wasserman abstaining).

This item was continued to the August 12, 2025 board meeting after a failed vote.

VI. Consideration of Appeals

A. 988 Corbett Avenue

AT250035

The tenant appeals the dismissal of her claim for decreased housing services. Both the landlord and tenant failed to appear at the remote mediation session. The Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) dismissed the tenant's claim with prejudice due to the tenant's nonappearance. In the appeal, the tenant declared under penalty of perjury that she had not checked her email where the remote mediation instructions had been sent nor had she received the Notice of Mediation that the Rent Board mailed to her.

MSC: To accept the appeal and remand the case for a new hearing. Should the tenant again fail to appear, absent extraordinary circumstances, no further hearings will be scheduled.  
(Wasserman/Qian: 5-0)

B. 4240 Irving Street

AT250036

The tenant appeals the decision denying in part her claims for decreased housing services. In the decision, the ALJ found the landlord liable to the tenant for rent reductions totaling \$1,575.00 for a rodent infestation from November 1, 2023 to September 19, 2024 but denied the tenant's other claims. In her appeal, the tenant argues in part that the ALJ disregarded key evidence, that the rodent infestation is ongoing, that she did not withdraw her failure to repair and maintain claim, that the ALJ incorrectly described the property, and that she was not provided due process at the hearing.

Commissioner Crow recused himself from consideration of the appeal because he previously counseled the tenant regarding the matter.

MSC: To deny the appeal.  
(Wasserman/Tom: 5-0)

C. 416 Bryant Street, Unit 9

AL250038

The landlord appeals the decision granting the tenant's claims for decreased housing services and unlawful rent increase. In the decision, the ALJ found the landlord liable to the tenant for \$164.42 for rent overpayments and for \$330.00 for the landlord's failure to provide weekly common area cleaning. In the appeal, the landlord argues that the ALJ miscalculated the tenant's lawful rent, that the tenant's lease did not include weekly cleaning, and that cleaning was done on a weekly or monthly basis by tenants, staff, or a cleaning service.

MSC: To deny the appeal.  
(Qian/ Wasserman: 5-0)

D. 6 Pope Street, Unit 1

AL250032

The landlord filed the appeal 68 days late because she needed more time to speak to her family and ask for help to respond to the decision.

MSC: To find good cause for the late filing of the appeal.  
(Qian/Mosbrucker: 5-0)

The landlord untimely appeals the decision granting the tenants' claims for decreased housing services, failure to repair and maintain, and unlawful rent increase. In the decision, the ALJ found the landlord liable to the tenants for \$1,170.00 for rent overpayments, for \$3,615.00 for damaged master bedroom windows and a rodent infestation, and for \$360.00 for rent overpayments based on the landlord's failure to perform requested repairs or maintenance. In the appeal, the landlord argues that she repaired and replaced the master bedroom window, that she adequately responded to the rodent infestation by following the advice of the pest inspector, that she promptly responded to and repaired every issue the tenants reported, and that the tenants did not allow access to the unit for inspections and repairs and caused additional wear on the unit necessitating repairs.

MSC: To deny the appeal.  
(Qian/Wasserman: 5-0)

E. 644 Ashbury Street

AT250029

The tenant filed the appeal 106 days late because there was a miscommunication between the tenant and the tenant's representative about whether the tenant had received the decision.

MSC: To find good cause for the late filing of the appeal.  
(Qian/Wasserman: 5-0)

The tenant untimely appeals the decision denying his claim for unlawful rent increase. In the decision, the ALJ determined that the landlord was entitled to raise the tenant's rent to \$3,900.00 effective February 1, 2024 pursuant to Civil Code Section 1954.53(d)(2) of the

Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act because the original occupants vacated the unit and the tenant appellant was a subtenant at the time the rent increase notice was served. In his appeal, the tenant argues that the landlord's conduct after the rent increase notice went into effect created a direct landlord-tenant relationship between the parties that is retroactive to the period preceding the notice of rent increase.

MSC: To deny the appeal.  
(Wasserman/Tom: 5-0)

F. 246 Judah Street, Unit 4

AT250034

One tenant appeals the decision denying his claim for unlawful rent increase. In the decision, the ALJ determined that the landlord was entitled to increase the tenants' rent to \$4,200.00 pursuant to Civil Code Section 1954.53(d)(2) of the Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act because the evidence established that at the time the rent increase notice was served, the original occupants had vacated the unit and the tenant appellant was a subtenant. In his appeal, the tenant argues that he became an "original occupant" by the conduct of the prior landlord and that the landlord waived their right to increased rent.

Commissioner Crow recused himself from consideration of the appeal because he previously counseled the tenants regarding the matter.

MSC: To deny the appeal.  
(Wasserman/Tom: 5-0)

G. 542 Presidio Avenue

AL250026

This appeal was continued for consideration from the June 10, 2025 board meeting. The landlord appeals the denial of its petition seeking a rent increase under Rules and Regulations Section 1.21. In the decision, the ALJ found that the unit was the tenant's usual place of return and the landlord had failed to meet their burden of proving that the tenant was not a "tenant in occupancy" at the time that the petition was filed on August 16, 2024. In the appeal, the landlord argues that the ALJ incorrectly evaluated the evidence and misapplied Rule 1.21 by including the time the tenant operates his business from the unit in the analysis of whether the tenant was a "tenant in occupancy" of the unit.

Commissioner Mosbrucker recused herself from consideration of the appeal as her law firm previously represented the tenant in this matter.

Commissioner Wasserman recused himself from consideration of the appeal because he previously counseled the landlord in another, unrelated matter.

MSF: To deny the appeal.  
(Hung/Tom: 2-2; Hung, Tom dissenting)

MSC: To continue consideration of this agenda item to the August 12, 2025 meeting.  
(Qian/Hung: 4-0)

H. 22 Vandewater Street, Unit 305

AT250033

The tenant appeals the remand decision granting the landlord's petition seeking a rent increase under Rules and Regulations Section 1.21. In the decision, the ALJ found that the landlord met their burden of proving that there was no "tenant in occupancy" of the subject unit at the time the petition was filed on July 29, 2024. In her appeal, the tenant claims that her absence from the unit was due to family medical emergencies and deaths, that she was unaware of the legal requirement that the unit had to be her primary residence as the rule was not in effect when her tenancy began, that the decision contained a factual error by stating that she had only slept in the unit once since 2004, and that the property management company has not explained a monthly recurring charge as promised during the hearing.

MSC: To deny the appeal except to remand the case to the ALJ to issue a  
Technical Correction.  
(Wasserman/Tom: 5-0)

I. 352 Lexington Street

AT250031

One tenant appeals the decision granting the landlord's petition for capital improvement passthroughs. In the decision, the ALJ certified the cost of replacing a ceiling fan, toilet, and kitchen faucet in one unit. In her appeal, the tenant argues in part that all of the work was necessary to comply with basic habitability standards and should be considered "repairs" or "maintenance" instead of capital improvements.

MSC: To deny the appeal.  
(Wasserman/Tom: 4-1; Mosbrucker dissenting)

IV. Remarks from the Public (cont.)

- A. Linda Hat, the tenant at 22 Vandewater Street, Unit 305 (AT250033), asked the Board how often per year the landlord can raise the rent. She said that the property manager promised to provide an explanation of the fees but never did so and only made the promise to look good in front of the participants at the hearing, and that she did not understand how the system works.
- B. Bonnie Low, the tenant at 4240 Irving Street (AT250036), said that she does not understand why the Board denied her appeal. She said that she was informed that she could file a failure to repair and maintain petition to address a rent increase when there are decreases in housing services and open violations and a failure to repair simultaneously with a decrease in housing services petition. She said that the ALJ also stated that not considering the failure to repair and maintain petition could be an error.
- C. Anne Lieu, the landlord at 6 Pope Street, Unit 1 (AL250032), asked the Board why her appeal had been denied. She said that the tenants abused the property as well as the landlord. She said that the tenants are currently not paying rent so she was not sure how she would pay to complete the necessary repairs. She said that before doing



repairs she usually notifies the tenant 24 hours beforehand, but when the tenants filed their petition, they had not given her the same 24 hours notice. She said that she is now liable for \$10,000.00 and it is not fair. She said that she will pursue a lawsuit against the Rent Board regarding the appeal.

- D. Andrew Hill, the tenant at 246 Judah Street, Unit 4 (AT250034), said that the Costa-Hawkins rent increase for his unit is unlawful. He said that Rules and Regulations Section 6.14(c)(2) previously created an original occupancy for his tenancy. He said that 90 days after the original occupancy was granted to him, the previous landlord made an annual rent increase through the Rent Board, which would block Costa-Hawkins from applying. He said that the rent for his unit would have been governed by local law, not state law at that point, especially at the time the ownership changed. He said that his tenancy remains the same and his tenant rights should have carried over from the prior landlord to the new landlord. He said that he has a right to a dog and garage use. He said that Costa-Hawkins is blocked by Rule 6.14, which designates him as an original occupant. He said that whether the landlord chooses to use 6.14 or not, waiver and estoppel has occurred through the transfer of ownership. He said that opportunities to increase his rent have already been waived by the prior landlord and inherited by the new landlords in February 2024. He said that there was never a total vacancy of the unit as tenants have always resided there. He asked the Board how a tenant would not be to rely on the Rent Ordinance to protect them from future rent increases through Costa Hawkins and state law when a tenant has already been granted local law protections. He said that it cannot be as simple as a four-day owner dismissing San Francisco rental laws in favor of state law regarding an established tenancy of multiple years. He said that he has been self-represented and he is not understanding why he has not had a positive outcome in this case.
- E. A friend of the landlord at 6 Pope Street, Unit 1 (AL250032), said that the landlord is elderly and has some health issues. She said that the tenant has denied access to the unit to inspect and perform repairs, which has caused delays in completing the repairs. She said that the landlord pays a high property tax and insurance costs and is attempting to sell the building. She said that the tenant causes issues with other tenants at the property. She said that the landlord has tried to perform the repairs as fast as they could but their age and health has made it difficult for them. She asked the Board to consider how they could help the landlord instead of only helping tenants.
- F. Juralyn Thompson, the tenant at 988 Corbett Avenue (AT250035), asked the Board whether her appeal had been granted.

## VII. Communications

In addition to correspondence concerning cases on the calendar, the Commissioners received the following communications:

- A. News articles from Mission Local and the San Francisco Chronicle.
- B. Departmental workload statistics for May 2025.

### VIII. Director's Report

Executive Director Christina Varner introduced the Board to new employee Whitney Harrison, a new counselor in the Rent Board's Public Information Unit. Director Varner told the Board that Whitney was hired to replace a vacancy and came to the Rent Board from the State Bar of California Office of Chief Trial Counsel, where she managed a high volume of cases involving attorney misconduct, led investigations, and negotiated settlements. She said that prior to that, Whitney worked at the Eviction Defense Center in Oakland, and also clerked at the San Francisco EDC, at the San Francisco Public Defender's Office, at GAAP, and at the formerly known as UC Hastings Civil Justice Clinic. Director Varner told the Board that she presented the department's fiscal years 2025-2026 and 2026-2027 budget at the Board of Supervisors on June 13 with Deputy Director Texidor in attendance, and the budget process moved smoothly through the Board of Supervisors phase with no issues. She said that the department hopes to certify the budget after Mayoral certification at the end of the month. With regard to the Rent Board fee, Director Varner said that the Controller's Office has certified the Rent Board fee rate for fiscal year 2025-2026 at \$59 per dwelling unit and \$29.50 per SRO hotel guest unit, with half of the costs paid by the landlord being able to be passed through to the tenant. She said that delinquency notices for non-payment of the 2025 fee that was due on March 1 were sent out last month to the owners of approximately 20,000 parcels and that owners have until July 29 to pay any outstanding 2025 Rent Board fee obligations with penalty. She said that after July 29, a referral will be made to the Bureau of Delinquent Revenue at the Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector where the fee will then be charged both with penalty and a commission on top. As of the meeting, the department has collected over \$11.8M and is nearing 90% of its 2025 collection target. With regard to the Housing Inventory, Director Varner said that over 18,000 more licenses have been generated in 2025 compared with 2024, with a few months left in the cycle. She thanked owners for complying. She said that reports into the Inventory now total 128,191 reports over 22,486 parcels with 112,816 licenses now having been issued. With regard to outreach, Director Varner said that the week of the June board meeting, Rent Board Public Information Unit analyst Abe Field presented a recorded training for SF Apartment Association members on decreased housing services and what to expect at hearings and mediations. She said that on June 20, an outreach event was conducted with Eviction Defense Collaborative staff, as well as staff from MEDA and the Anti-Displacement Coalition and that on June 21, staff conducted outreach at the HomeSF Housing Resource Fair at USF, which was a successful event. She said that looking forward, the department will participate in the Office of the Assessor-Recorder's Family Wealth Forum – Building Intergenerational Wealth on August 16 at City College. With regard to legislation, Director Varner said that Senator Aisha Wahab's state Senate Bill 436 that would extend the notice period for non-payment of rent from 3 days to 14 days was passed by the Senate on June 2, 2025, and now heads to the Assembly but no action has yet been scheduled. Director Varner said that Board of Supervisors (BOS) File Number 240803 introduced by Supervisor Melgar is still at Land Use. She said that among other changes to the Planning Code, it will require that whenever a property owner enters into a regulatory agreement with the City that subjects newly constructed dwelling units to the Rent Ordinance, the Planning Department shall note the existence of the recorded regulatory agreement in the Property Information Map or other similar, publicly accessible website. Director Varner said that Supervisor Melgar's BOS File No. 231224, originally introduced on November 28, 2023, which would amend the Housing Code to authorize occupants of residential dwelling units to sue a property owner to enforce the prohibition on substandard housing conditions, is still at Land Use. She said that Supervisor Melgar had on July 16, 2024 requested that this matter remain active for an additional six

months until January 16, 2025, and on January 13, 2025, Supervisor Melgar requested that this matter remain active for an additional six months until July 2025. She said that BOS File No. 241069, sponsored by Supervisor Engardio, which amends the Subdivision and Planning Codes to create a process by which property owners may convert certain new or existing ADUs and associated primary dwelling units into condominiums, was passed unanimously by the full Board of Supervisors on July 1, 2025, and was signed by the Mayor on July 11, 2025. Director Varner invited questions from the Commissioners regarding her report and Commissioner Haley inquired as to whether the Rent Board could increase outreach regarding Rent Board appeal consideration procedures at Commission meetings. Commissioner Mosbrucker suggested that this item be discussed under New Business in the August 12 board meeting and no objections were raised.

IX. Old Business

*There was no Old Business.*

X. New Business

*There was no New Business.*

XI. Calendar Items

August 12, 2025 – regular in-person meeting at 25 Van Ness Ave, Room 610.

Reader of the Ramaytush Ohlone Land Acknowledgement – Commissioner Hung.

A. Consideration of Appeals

a. 8 appeal considerations

B. New Business

a. Outreach Regarding Commission Procedures

XII. Adjournment

Vice President Mosbrucker adjourned the meeting at 7:34 p.m.