

**SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE**  
**Senator Thomas Umberg, Chair**  
**2021-2022 Regular Session**

AB 1487 (Gabriel)  
Version: June 25, 2021  
Hearing Date: July 6, 2021  
Fiscal: No  
Urgency: No  
TSG

**SUBJECT**

Legal Services Trust Fund Commission: Homelessness Prevention Fund: grants:  
eviction or displacement

**DIGEST**

This bill establishes the framework for a grant-based program to provide direct legal aid services, education, and outreach to low-income tenant households facing the threat of eviction or imminent displacement from their homes. The bill provides no funding for the program; such funding would be subject to appropriation.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

As is well-known and well-documented, California faces both a housing affordability crisis and a related homelessness crisis. The COVID-19 pandemic appears to have exacerbated both. In response, the U.S. Congress and the California Legislature have enacted a series of measures designed to address the problem. Most recently, California enacted new policies designed to limit the chances that tenant households get evicted for falling behind on payments while simultaneously providing rental assistance money to ensure that landlords are fully compensated for what they are owed. Because California processes evictions through the courts, the success or failure of these initiatives will be determined, in large part, by how well tenant households are informed of their rights and are able to exercise them. This bill aims to help combat housing insecurity and homelessness through the provision of legal aid services – direct representation, legal education, and outreach – to low-income tenant households facing the threat of eviction or imminent displacement. The bill proposes the framework for a grant-based program that would provide these services, though no actual appropriation of funds is currently included.

The bill is sponsored by Housing Now, Inner City Law Center, the Legal Aid Association of California, and Western Center on Law and Poverty. Support comes from legal aid practitioners, affordable housing advocates, and groups seeking to address homelessness. Opposition comes from realtors and landlords who object, in particular, to funding legal defense against evictions.

**PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE LAW**

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes a unique, fast-tracked set of summary judicial proceedings for the handling of eviction cases. (Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1159 *et seq.*)
- 2) Requires, until January 1, 2030, just cause to terminate a tenancy that meets specified conditions. (Civ. Code § 1946.2.)
- 3) Establishes heightened eviction protections for residential tenants pursuant to the COVID-19 Tenants Relief Act. (Civ. Code §§ 1179.01-05.)
- 4) Establishes a variety of affirmative defenses to unlawful detainer, which in turn require proper pleading of ultimate facts. (Code of Civ. Proc. §§ 1159 - 1179.07; Civ. Code §§ 1940-1997.270.)
- 5) Prohibits landlords from discriminating against tenants on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, gender, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, marital status, national origin, ancestry, familial status, source of income, disability, or genetic information in the provision of rental housing. (Gov. Code § 12955.)

This bill:

- 1) Makes a series of findings and declarations about California's housing and homelessness crisis, the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on that crisis, and the track records of legal aid programs in preventing eviction.
- 2) Establishes the Homelessness Prevention Fund, to be administered by the Legal Services Trust Fund Commission (LSTFC), under the State Bar of California, and to be funded upon appropriation by the Legislature.
- 3) Directs the LSTFC to distribute Homelessness Prevention Fund funds in the form of competitive grants, made to eligible applicants, for eligible services.
- 4) Directs the LSTFC to develop guidelines for a competitive grant process to implement the Homelessness Prevention Fund, including the following:
  - a) reservation of at least 20 percent of total funds for awards to eligible applicants in the Counties of Alpine, Butte, Del Norte, Fresno, Glenn, Humboldt, Imperial, Kern, Kings, Lake, Lassen, Madera, Mariposa, Merced, Modoc, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Joaquin, Shasta, Siskiyou, Stanislaus, Sutter, Tehama, Trinity, Tulare, and Yuba; and
  - b) development of a rubric to fairly and consistently evaluate grant applications.

- 5) Specifies that the Homelessness Prevention Fund grants shall support the following activities:
  - a) limited-scope legal services, as defined, that provide tenants with legal assistance designed to prevent eviction or displacement;
  - b) full-scope legal representation to qualified households facing eviction or imminent displacement, or the threat thereof;
  - c) education regarding tenant rights, fair housing laws, landlord obligations, and related legal topics meant to address factors causing the avoidable displacement of tenants. Provides that education may include the use of media or social media to enhance the delivery of information; and
  - d) Targeted outreach to buildings and neighborhoods where tenants are at heightened risk of displacement, in order to advise tenants of their rights, the availability of additional resources, and options to prevent or mitigate displacement.
  
- 6) Clarifies that eligible services are not to be provided to households whose income exceeds 80 percent of the area median income; further clarifies that, if funding for the Homeless Prevention Fund carries a different income eligibility requirement, the more inclusive requirement shall apply.
  
- 7) Provides that eligible legal services need not be provided in a traditional in-person setting, may be provided by volunteers who are supervised by attorneys, and may be provided through the use of technology that is accessible to tenants.
  
- 8) Sets the following qualification requirements for Homelessness Prevention Fund grantees:
  - a) qualified for Interest on Lawyer Trust Account (IOLTA) funding in the year of application;
  - b) agrees to provide one or more of the eligible services set forth in (4), above;
  - c) agrees to provide all of the services funded by the grant without charge to service recipients; and
  - d) agrees to serve recipients without regard to their immigration status, unless the applicant demonstrates a lack of capacity to, and documents efforts to secure partnerships to, provide services without regard to recipients' immigration status.
  
- 9) Instructs the LSTFC to give preference to applicants that demonstrate any of the following:
  - a) a track record of successfully delivering similar services to low-income renters and vulnerable populations;
  - b) an ability to provide services or access to services by community members who are limited English proficient, taking into account relevant languages spoken by populations in the proposed service area;

- c) partnerships with, or subgrants to, other entities that may enhance the program's reach, including, but not limited to, community-based organizations, nonprofit organizations, law schools, local governments, and local governmental agencies;
  - d) partnerships between organizations that allow services to be provided to a broader set of community members by addressing barriers related to organizational eligibility requirements;
  - e) an ability to provide the full range of eligible services, either by itself or through partnership with, or subgrants to, other entities;
  - f) a commitment to prioritize equity by addressing or mitigating barriers to receipt of services, and to provide services to particularly vulnerable or underserved populations; and
  - g) the use of technology, media, and other strategies to serve a larger number of recipients.
- 10) Requires a grantee to file a semi-annual report with the LSTFC describing, among other things, the services provided, the number of recipients of these services, and in the case of legal services, whether those services resolved the recipient's legal issue or the factors leading to displacement.
- 11) Provides the following additional guidelines regarding Homelessness Prevention Fund funds and grants:
- a) the State Bar may use up to five percent of Homelessness Prevention Fund funds for administrative costs, though in no case may these funds exceed the actual costs of administration;
  - b) a grantee may use 15 percent of its allocation for administrative costs in the first year it receives a grant, and 10 percent in every year thereafter; and
  - c) if a partner or subgrantee is a local government or local governmental agency, Homeless Prevention Fund funds may only supplement, and not supplant, funds already allocated to that government or agency for provision of eligible services.

### COMMENTS

#### 1. Background on California's rental housing affordability and homelessness crisis

Statistical evidence amply supports the widespread impression that California is experiencing a rental housing affordability crisis. Rents throughout California have been increasing at astronomical rates throughout much of the last ten years. According to media reports, the average annual rent increase in Oakland, San Francisco, and San Jose was over 10 percent in 2014.<sup>1</sup> Southern California has not fared much better.

---

<sup>1</sup> Pender, *After Lull, Bay Area Rents Are Rising Again, But Not Like Before* (Jan. 12, 2019) San Francisco Chronicle <https://www.sfchronicle.com/business/networth/article/After-lull-Bay-Area-rents-are-rising-again-but-13528213.php> (as of Jun. 16, 2021).

Average rent increases in Los Angeles County between 2011 and 2018 were 34 percent.<sup>2</sup> As a result, a majority of California tenant households qualify as “rent-burdened,” meaning that 30 percent or more of their income goes to the rent. Over a quarter of California tenant households are “severely rent-burdened,” meaning that they spend over half their income on rent alone.<sup>3</sup> Although rental prices briefly dipped in some urban centers after the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, they are now rising once again. There is no indication that this will abate any time soon. Average incomes, meanwhile, have not kept pace.<sup>4</sup>

The rental housing affordability crisis has spawned a homelessness crisis as well. Even prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, California had an estimated 161,000 residents living without a fixed shelter, an estimated 28 percent of the country’s total, and rates of homelessness were climbing at alarming rates.<sup>5</sup>

## 2. Evidence that provision of legal aid to low-income tenants reduces eviction rates

There is ample evidence that providing tenants with legal assistance of the type proposed in this bill helps to improve housing stability. Access to an attorney during the eviction court process, in particular, has been shown to reduce how often tenants get evicted.

In fact, the Legislature effectively tested this question when it launched the Sargent Shriver Civil Gideon Project in 2011. The Legislature specifically designed the Shriver Project as a set of pilots intended to test the theory behind Civil Gideon: whether the provision of legal counsel in life-critical civil matters would improve outcomes for low-income litigants and whether or not such legal representation might also achieve certain efficiencies for the courts. Accordingly, data collection and evaluation requirements formed an integral part of the Project’s enacting legislation. (Gov. Code § 68651(c).) To oversee the data collection and conduct the evaluation, the Judicial Council contracted with an independent, outside firm, NPC Research.

---

<sup>2</sup> Snibbe and Collins, *California Rents Have Risen to Some of the Nation’s Highest* (Feb. 15, 2018) Los Angeles Daily News <https://www.dailynews.com/2018/02/15/california-rent-rates-have-risen-to-some-of-the-nations-highest-heres-how-that-impacts-residents/> (as of Jun. 16, 2021).

<sup>3</sup> Kimberlin, *California’s Housing Affordability Crisis Hits Renters and Households With the Lowest Incomes the Hardest* (Apr. 2019) California Budget & Policy Center <https://calbudgetcenter.org/resources/californias-housing-affordability-crisis-hits-renters-and-households-with-the-lowest-incomes-the-hardest/> (as of Jun. 16, 2021).

<sup>4</sup> *Income*, Department of Finance, State of California <http://www.dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Economics/Indicators/Income/> (as of Jun. 16, 2021).

<sup>5</sup> Nichols, *California’s Homeless Population Rose 7% to 161,000 Ahead of the Pandemic* (Mar. 19, 2021) Capitol Public Radio <https://www.capradio.org/articles/2021/03/19/californias-homeless-population-rose-7-to-161000-ahead-of-the-pandemic-new-report-finds/> (as of Jun. 28, 2021).

NPC Research's initial findings, based on the data from the first three years of the Shriver Project, were promising. Accordingly, in 2016, the Legislature elected to lift the sunset on the Project. (SB 843, Committee on Budget, Ch. 33, Stats. 2016).

In July 2017, NPC Research submitted its final evaluation of the Shriver Project to the Legislature through the Judicial Council.<sup>6</sup> As summarized by the author of this bill, the Shriver Project Evaluation found that:

In the first five years, the ten pilot projects served nearly 27,000 individuals facing the loss of their homes, child custody disputes, or the urgent need for a family guardianship or conservatorship. The housing services, alone, affected over 73,000 individuals.

The study found that Shriver services improved outcomes for litigants, increased settlements, and resulted in reduced court costs. The evaluation clearly supports the important role of Shriver attorneys in representing their clients, in reaching settlements, and in helping ensure more efficient use of judicial resources.

More specifically, the Shriver Project Evaluation found, among other things, that:

- From October 2011 through October 2015, the six housing pilot projects provided services to more than 19,000 low-income tenants, as well as a small number of low-income landlords. These individuals' median monthly income was \$980. More than half of these individuals had minors living in the home. In all, approximately 55,000 household members were impacted by these services.<sup>7</sup>
- Seventy percent of the tenants with Shriver representation in eviction proceedings settled their cases and 5 percent resolved their cases via trial, versus rates of 34 percent and 14 percent, respectively, in cases involving self-represented tenants. Only 6 percent of Shriver-represented tenants were formally evicted, and while most ultimately moved under the terms of negotiated settlements, those with representation gained on average an additional 11 days before they had to move. Follow-up studies conducted a year later showed that 71 percent of Shriver clients had obtained new rental housing, versus only 43 percent of self-represented tenants.<sup>8</sup>

As the Assembly Judiciary Committee's analysis of this bill points out, these results are consistent with academic research showing that, on the whole, attorney representation

---

<sup>6</sup> NPC Research, *Evaluation of the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act (AB590)* (Jul. 2017) Judicial Council of California <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/lr-2017-JC-Shriver-civil-right-to-counsel.pdf> (as of Jun. 28, 2021).

<sup>7</sup> Evaluation, *supra*, at II.

<sup>8</sup> *Id.* at III-IV.

leads to significantly better outcomes for low-income individuals attempting to navigate the civil legal system for critical life needs. For example, a 2013 study conducted in Boston, Massachusetts area housing courts revealed that attorney representation in eviction proceedings led to twice as many tenants retaining possession of their units as compared to self-represented tenants in the control group.<sup>9</sup>

3. Recent COVID-19 related changes to landlord/tenant law increase the importance of competent legal outreach, education, and representation

Landlord/tenant law is complex in ordinary times. In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the U.S. Congress and the California Legislature have both enacted a series of policies that are intended to help enable financially-impacted tenants to remain in their homes. At the federal level, the Centers for Disease Control has issued and extended a moratorium on the eviction of individuals who are unable to stay current on their rent due to financial hardship related to the COVID-19 pandemic. At the state level, three bills -- the Tenant, Homeowner and Small Landlord Relief and Stabilization Act (AB 3088 (Chiu, Ch. 37, Stats. 2020)); its successor, the COVID-19 Tenant Relief Act (SB 91 (Budget, Ch. 2, Stats. 2021)); and most recently the COVID-19 Rental Housing Recovery Act (AB 832, Chiu et al, Ch. 27, Stats. 2021) – have all made modifications to how eviction court procedures work.

In every instance, however, the protections against eviction require tenants to take precise, proactive steps, and to do it within specified timeframes. For example, as things stand today, a tenant who is having difficulty making rent or utility payments because of financial impacts from the COVID-19 pandemic will still be able to stay in their home, provided that the tenant returns a signed declaration of COVID-19 financial hardship within 15 days of receive a demand to make up the unpaid amounts. However, in order for that protection to last beyond September 30, 2021, the tenant must pay the landlord at least 25 percent of all the rent that accumulated between September 30, 2020 and September 30, 2021 and the tenant must make this payment before September 30, 2021. There is ample rental assistance to help tenants make this payment; indeed there is now ample rental assistance to ensure that landlords get compensated for all of their tenant's rental debts. To obtain that money, however, tenants must apply for it and provide the necessary evidence that they are eligible. All of this means, ultimately, that legal education, outreach, and assistance to tenants is more crucial than ever.

---

<sup>9</sup> D. James Greiner, Cassandra W. Pattanayak & Jonathan P. Hennessy, *The Limits of Unbundled Legal Assistance: A Randomized Study in a Massachusetts District Court and Prospects for the Future* (2013) 126 Harvard L. Rev. 903.

4. Regarding allegations of unethical professional conduct by attorneys representing tenants in eviction cases

In their letter regarding the bill, the California Apartment Association and the California Apartment Association indicate that they have no objection to providing resources for legal education and outreach to tenants. They oppose the possibility of funding for legal representation, however, on the grounds that the legal aid attorneys who undertake this work do so unethically. In particular, they allege that many tenant attorneys engage in legal tactics that have no merit or purpose other than to delay the proceedings and an inevitable eviction.

As the Assembly Judiciary Committee analysis of this bill points out, to the degree that these allegations are true, there are existing mechanisms within the State Bar's disciplinary process for addressing them. (Asm. Jud. Analysis of AB 1487 (2021-2022 Reg. Sess.) March 18, 2021 Version at p. 7-8.). It seems more likely, however, that these allegations are not so much objective truth as the product of the sort of professional acrimony that frequently develops between repeat legal combatants in the adversarial process. One litigant's passionately held conviction is often frivolous nonsense in the judgment of their legal adversary. As a case in point: the opposition to this bill provided a list of examples of cases in which landlord attorneys assert that tenants' counsel have used questionable legal tactics or advanced unfounded claims. In response, tenants' attorneys produced a similar set of examples of supposedly unethical behavior by attorneys for landlords.<sup>10</sup>

Moreover, the opposition's arguments do not appear to account adequately for tenant attorneys' ethical duties of competency and loyalty to their clients. For instance, the opposition concedes that tenants, like landlords, have a right to have their eviction case decided by a jury of their peers, should they so desire. The opposition goes on to argue that the regular exercise of that right by some tenant attorneys is unethical because it is used to obtain better outcomes for their clients. Yet, for the very same reason, a strong argument can be made that the opposite is true: any tenant attorney who believes that requesting to have a jury hear the case is likely to lead to a better outcome for their client would be breaching their ethical duties of competency and loyalty to their client if they did *not* do so.

Ultimately, California law provides landlords with a swift, summary legal proceeding for determining the appropriate disposition their rental property. (Code Civ. Proc. § 1179a.) Because eviction cases proceed on a fast-track and people's shelter is at stake, ensuring that due process does not get shortchanged along the way takes on heightened

---

<sup>10</sup>Among other things, tenant attorneys alleged that they regularly observe landlord attorneys: demanding that pro per tenants agree to pay attorney's fees when there is no legal basis for such a demand; advising pro per tenants that it is their best interest to sign settlement agreements with terms that are even worse than what the tenant would obtain by losing at trial; proceeding to obtain eviction judgments against tenants when they are fully aware that the tenants have already moved out.



importance. The presence of attorneys – though often facilitating tidy resolution of the case with minimal court involvement – will also sometimes prolong the process with all the sorts of things that attorneys appropriately do: file motions, demand discovery, request jury trials, and appeal adverse rulings. It is understandable that landlords sometimes find such legal procedures galling. After all, those procedures can temporarily delay – and in some instances may even ultimately prevent – the landlord from achieving the landlord’s goal of kicking the tenants out. It does not follow, however, that tenant attorneys’ zealous representation of their clients is inappropriate or unethical.

#### 5. Ensuring equal access to legal aid services for all Californians

Legal aid agencies serve clients who are otherwise unable to afford an attorney. Legal aid clients do not pay for the legal services they receive. To continue providing their services, legal aid agencies must seek grants and fundraise.

One major potential source of funding for legal aid agencies is the federal government’s Legal Services Corporation (LSC). In order to accept funds from LSC, however, a legal aid agency must agree not to serve undocumented clients, with specified exceptions having to do with things like human trafficking. LSC’s rule is both an affront to the dignity of undocumented residents and bad policy. By virtue of their immigration status, undocumented residents are already especially vulnerable to exploitation. Depriving them of access to legal services just makes it even harder for undocumented residents to combat such abuses, thus facilitating exploitation, undercutting the competitiveness of businesses and employers who play by the rules, and undermining the rule of law generally. Nonetheless, financial necessity drives some California legal aid providers to accept LSC money.

LSC-funded agencies will be eligible for grants from the Homelessness Prevention Fund proposed by this bill. In order to ensure that state resources are not spent on the provision of legal services that are not equally available to all California residents regardless of immigration status, the bill contains a provision requiring that grantees who cannot serve undocumented individuals must partner with another entity that can. Grants can be awarded to legal services programs which cannot serve undocumented Californians only if the program documents its efforts to secure partnerships with other entities that can serve undocumented clients and those efforts have proven unsuccessful. To serve the policy purpose behind this provision, it must be vigilantly enforced. The Legal Services Trust Fund should review grant applications to ensure that equal access to services means more than merely providing people with the contact information of other legal entities that may or may not actually provide similar services. Where the Trust Fund proposes to fund an application from a legal aid agency that cannot serve undocumented clients on an equal basis, the Fund should first ascertain whether the grantee has truly exhausted all possible options for partnerships that could

create equal access, including exploring creative solutions such as assisting in the formation of new legal aid agencies and partnering with private attorneys.

6. Arguments in support of the bill

According to the author:

Access to justice shouldn't depend on your bank account balance or your ability to afford an attorney. This bill will help to ensure that one of the most vulnerable groups in California is provided with much-needed legal representation. It builds upon an approach that has been proven to save taxpayer resources and improve the fairness and efficiency of our judicial system.

As sponsor of the bill, Housing Now! writes:

In addition to an unprecedented number of tenants facing extreme rent burdens, California's eviction process is severely unbalanced, with most landlords represented by attorneys, but about 90% of tenants forced to defend their cases without access to legal assistance. When tenants are also represented by attorneys, they are more likely to have their rights protected, more likely to reach agreements that allow them to resolve their cases without being forced out of their homes, and as a result, less likely to experience homelessness following an eviction. In a context in which research has shown a direct link between rising evictions and increased COVID exposure and deaths, it is critical California level the playing field in the eviction context and ensure tenants are able to successfully use the protections the legislature has enacted.

In support, the State Bar of California writes:

In 2019 the State Bar issued the California Justice Gap Study which found that while more than half of Californians had experienced at least one civil legal problem in the previous year, approximately 85 percent of them received zero, or inadequate, legal assistance for their civil legal needs, including eviction defense. Making matters worse, we anticipate that the lifting of eviction moratoriums across the state will only increase the demand for legal services even while the primary source of funding for legal services – Interest on Lawyers' Trust Accounts (IOLTA) – has declined precipitously because of the drop in interest rates. [...] The result will be a dramatic reduction in legal services funding available to assist low-income Californians at precisely the time when it is most needed.

AB 1487 will provide critical support to address the need for legal services in housing matters and other matters essential to keeping people housed.

7. Arguments in opposition to the bill

In opposition to the bill, the California Apartment Association and the California Association of Realtors jointly write:

While we do not object to the provisions of AB 1487 that will provide funding for education about tenant rights, fair housing laws, and landlord obligations, we do oppose additional dollars for eviction defense programs that have been used by unethical legal organizations that routinely violate rule 3.2 of the State Bar's Rules of Professional Conduct which provides that, "In representing a client, a lawyer shall not use means that have no substantial purpose other than to delay or prolong the proceeding or to cause needless expense." These groups pursue unwarranted claims simply as a way to delay evictions for months and to extract favorable settlements for their clients.

In further opposition to the bill, the California Rental Housing Association writes:

Given the eviction moratorium, SB 91, the rent assistance program now available through the state that supports vulnerable renters, and just cause policies recently passed by the Legislature, etc. we feel that renters have sufficient protections. Imposing further restrictions will interfere with providing well managed housing communities and homes and will cause unnecessary harm to our industry.

**SUPPORT**

Housing Now! (sponsor)

Inner City Law Center (sponsor)

Legal Aid Association of California (sponsor)

Western Center on Law and Poverty (sponsor)

Abundant Housing Los Angeles

Affordable Housing Network of Santa Clara County

AIDS Healthcare Foundation

Alameda County Democratic Party

Alameda County Homeless Action Center

All Home

Alliance of Californians for Community Empowerment

Anti-Eviction Mapping Project  
Asian-Americans Advancing Justice  
BASTA, Inc.  
Bay Area Regional Health Inequities Initiative  
Bend the Arc: Jewish Action, Southern California  
Berkeley Tenants Union  
Best Friends Animal Society  
Bet Tzedek  
California Catholic Conference  
California Democratic Party Renters Council  
California Housing Partnership Corporation  
California Latinas for Reproductive Justice  
California Women's Law Center  
Central California Legal Services  
Child Care Law Center  
Community Legal Aid SoCal  
Community Legal Services in East Palo Alto  
Congregations Organized for Prophetic Engagement  
Courage California  
Democratic Party of the San Fernando Valley  
East Bay Housing Organizations  
East Yard Communities for Environmental Justice  
Ensuring Opportunity Campaign to End Poverty in Contra Costa County  
Eviction Defense Network  
Faith in Action Bay Area  
Faith in Action East Bay  
Faith in the Valley  
Family Violence Appellate Project  
Healthy Housing Foundation  
Homeless Action Center  
Housing and Economic Rights Advocates  
Housing Equality & Advocacy Resource Team  
Housing Now!  
Housing Rights Center  
Hunger Action Los Angeles  
Inland Equity Partnership  
Inner City Law Center  
Inquilinos Unidos  
Justice in Aging  
Korean Resource Center  
LA Forward  
LA Voice  
Leadership Counsel for Justice & Accountability  
Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles

Legal Aid of Sonoma County  
Legal Aid Society of San Diego  
Liberty Hill Foundation  
Long Beach Residents Empowered  
City of Los Angeles  
Los Angeles Community Action Network  
Los Angeles Continuum of Care  
Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors  
Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority  
Los Angeles Right to Counsel Coalition  
Los Angeles Tenants Union  
Monument Impact  
National Association of Social Workers, California Chapter  
National Council of Jewish Women Los Angeles  
Neighborhood Legal Services of Los Angeles County  
NextGen California  
One LA-IAF  
Orange County Congregation Community Organization  
Organize Sacramento  
People Organized for Westside Renewal  
The People's Resource Center  
PICO California  
Public Counsel  
Public Advocates  
Showing Up for Racial Justice Bay Area  
Sonoma Valley Housing Group  
South Bay Community Land Trust  
State Bar of California  
Strategic Actions for a Just Economy  
Silicon Valley at Home Action Fund  
Tenants Together  
Union Station Homeless Services  
The Women's Building  
Womens' Empowerment

#### **OPPOSITION**

Apartment Association of Greater Los Angeles  
Apartment Association of Orange County  
Berkeley Property Owners' Association  
California Apartment Association  
California Association of Realtors  
California Rental Housing Association  
East Bay Rental Housing Association

NorCal Rental Property Association  
North Valley Property Owners' Association  
Santa Barbara Rental Property Association  
Small Property Owners of San Francisco Institute  
Southern California Rental Property Association

**RELATED LEGISLATION**

Pending Legislation: None known.

Prior Legislation:

AB 2272 (Gabriel, 2020) was substantially similar to this measure. AB 2272 was held in the Assembly Judiciary Committee due to bill restrictions related to the COVID-19 pandemic.

AB 330 (Gabriel, Ch. 217, Stats. 2019) increased fees on specified court filings by \$15 in order to fund an expansion of the Shriver Project's legal representation for low-income litigants in three kinds of potentially life-altering civil matters: probate conservatorships, housing-related matters including eviction, and family law.

SB 843 (Committee on Budget, Ch. 33, Stats. 2016) lifted the sunset date from the Shriver Civil Counsel Act statute, thus extending the Project indefinitely.

AB 590 (Feuer, Ch. 457, Stats. 2009) enacted the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act, which raised fees on certain court filings and directed the proceeds to fund a series of grants for pilot projects to test the impact of providing legal representation to low-income individuals in probate conservatorship, eviction, and child custody matters.

**PRIOR VOTES:**

Assembly Floor (Ayes 58, Noes 17)

Assembly Judiciary Committee (Ayes 9, Noes 2)

\*\*\*\*\*