



# San Francisco Youth Commission Agenda

Monday, May 15, 2017

5:15 pm-8:00 pm

City Hall, Room 421

1. Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.

San Francisco, CA 94102

*There will be public comment on each item.*

Madeleine Matz (Chair), William Juarez (Vice Chair), Martin Krause, Lily Marshall-Fricker, Lisa Yu, Joshua Park, Cris Plunkett, Mary Claire Amable, Emma David, Noah David, Hugo Vargas, Cecilia Nicole Galeano, Jarrett Mao, Jonathan Mesler, Griffin Ng, Chiara Lind

- 1. Call to Order and Roll Call for Attendance**
- 2. Approval of Agenda (Action Item)**
- 3. Approval of Minutes (Action Item)**
  - A. May 8, 2017  
([Document A](#))
- 4. Public Comment on Items not on Agenda (Discussion Only)**
- 5. Legislation Referred by the Board of Supervisors (All Items to Follow Discussion and Possible Action)**
  - A. BOS File No. 170441 [Health Code - Banning the Sale of Flavored Tobacco Products]  
Sponsors: Malia Cohen, Ahsha Safai, London Breed, Mark Farrell, Jeff Sheehy, Katy Tang  
Presenter: Brittni Chicuata, Legislative Aide to District 10 Supervisor Malia Cohen  
(Document B)
- 6. Presentations (All Items to Follow Discussion and Possible Action)**
  - A. Presentation on CHALK Power Youth Movement Conference  
Presenter: Andrea Juarez, Director, Youth Funding Youth Ideas, CHALK
- 7. Youth Commission Business (All Items to Follow Discussion and Possible Action)**
  - A. [Second Reading] Resolution 1617-AL- 09 [Resolution to Highlight the Societal and Economic Impacts of Alcohol Density in San Francisco]  
Sponsor: Civic Engagement Committee  
(Document C)



- B. [Second Reading] Resolution 1617-AL- 10 [Resolution urging the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to investigate the reproductive health service needs of young San Franciscans in light of the impending closure of New Generation Health Center]  
Sponsor: Civic Engagement Committee  
(Document D)
- C. [Second Reading] Resolution 1617-AL- 12 [Resolution urging the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to ensure the implementation of the Sunlight Ordinance]  
Sponsor: Commissioner Lisa Yu  
(Document E)
- D. [Second Reading] Resolution 1617-AL- 13 [Resolution Urging the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to Adopt a Formal Definition of Family Housing]  
Sponsor: Commissioner Emma David  
(Document F)
- E. [Second Reading] Resolution 1617-AL- 14 [Resolution Urging the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to Adopt Legislation That Incentivize and Promotes the Construction of Family Housing and Prioritizes Families with Dependents in the Inclusionary Housing Selection Process]  
Sponsor: Commissioner Emma David  
(Document G)
- F. [Second Reading] Youth Commission Budget & Policy Priorities for Fiscal Years 2017-2018, and 2018-2019  
(Document H)
- G. Discussion on Key to the City: Youth Empowerment & Organizing Townhall  
Sponsor: Youth Commission Staff

## **8. Committee Reports (Discussion Only)**

- A. Executive Committee
- B. Housing, Recreation and Transportation Committee
- C. Immigration, Justice and Employment Committee
- D. Civic Engagement Committee
- E. Our Children Our Family Council

## **9. Staff Report (Discussion Only)**

## **10. Announcements (This Includes Community Events)**

## **11. Adjournment**



Any materials distributed to the members of the Youth Commission within 72 hours of the meeting or after the agenda packet has been delivered to the members are available for inspection—along with minutes of previous Youth Commission meetings and all supplementary information—at the Youth Commission office during regular office hours (9am to 6pm, Monday—Friday). The Youth Commission office is at:

City Hall, Room 345  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Phone: (415) 554-6446, Fax: (415) 554-6140  
Email: [youthcom@sfgov.org](mailto:youthcom@sfgov.org)  
[www.sfgov.org/yc](http://www.sfgov.org/yc)

KNOW YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review.

FOR MORE INFORMATION ON YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE OR TO REPORT A VIOLATION OF THE ORDINANCE, CONTACT THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE TASK FORCE, please contact:

Sunshine Ordinance Task Force  
City Hall, Room 244  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689  
Phone: (415) 554-7724, Fax: (415) 554-5784  
Email: [sof@sfgov.org](mailto:sof@sfgov.org)

Copies of the Sunshine Ordinance can be obtained from the Clerk of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, at the San Francisco Public Library, and on the City's website at <http://www.sfgov.org>.

The nearest accessible BART station is Civic Center (Market/Hyde Streets). Accessible MUNI Metro lines are the F, J, K, L, M, N, T (exit at Civic Center for Van Ness Stations). MUNI bus lines also serving the area are the 5, 5R, 6, 7, 7R, 7X, 9, 9R, 19, 21, 47, and 49. For more information about MUNI accessible services, call (415) 701-4485.

The ringing and use of cell phones, pagers, and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. The Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic device.

In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity, or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical-based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals.

To obtain a disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services to participate in the meeting, please contact Adele Carpenter, Youth Commission Director [phone: 415-554 7112; email: [adele.carpenter@sfgov.org](mailto:adele.carpenter@sfgov.org)] at least 48 hours before the meeting, except for Monday meetings, for which the deadline is 4:00 p.m. the previous Friday. Full Commission Meetings are held in Room 416 at City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place in San Francisco. City Hall is accessible to persons using wheelchairs and other assistive mobility devices. Ramps are available at the Grove, Van Ness and McAllister entrances.

LANGUAGE INTERPRETERS: Requests must be received at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting to help ensure availability. Contact Peggy Nevin at (415) 554-5184.



AVISO EN ESPAÑOL: La solicitud para un traductor debe recibirse antes de mediodía de el viernes anterior a la reunion. Llame a Derek Evans (415) 554-7702.

Paunawa: Ang mga kahilingan ay kailangang matanggap sa loob ng 48 oras bago mag miting upang matiyak na matutugunan ang mga hiling. Mangyaring tumawag kay Joy Lamug sa (415) 554-7712.

**翻譯 必須在會議前最少四十八小時提出要求**  
**請電 (415) 554-7719**



**San Francisco Youth Commission**  
**Minutes~ Special**  
**Monday, May 8, 2017**  
**5:15 pm~8:00 pm**  
**City Hall, Room 278**  
**1. Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.**  
**San Francisco, CA 94102**

*There will be public comment on each item.*

Madeleine Matz (Chair), William Juarez (Vice Chair), Martin Krause, Lily Marshall-Fricke, Lisa Yu, Joshua Park, Cris Plunkett, Mary Claire Amable, Emma David, Noah David, Hugo Vargas, Cecilia Nicole Galeano, Jarrett Mao, Jonathan Mesler, Griffin Ng, Chiara Lind

**1. Call to Order and Roll Call for Attendance**

Chair Matz called the meeting to order at 5:27pm.

Commissioners present: Madeleine Matz, William Juarez, Lily Marshall-Fricke, Lisa Yu, Joshua Park, Mary Claire Amable, Noah David, Cecilia Nicole Galeano, Jarrett Mao, Jonathan Mesler, Griffin Ng, Chiara Lind.

Commissioners absent: Krause, Plunkett, E. David, Vargas. There was quorum.

**2. Approval of Agenda (Action Item)**

Commissioner N. David, seconded by Commissioner Marshall-Fricke, motioned to approve the agenda. Motion was passed by acclamation. There was no public comment.

**3. Approval of Minutes (Action Item)**

- A. April 17, 2017  
([Document A](#))

Commissioner N. David, seconded by Commissioner Juarez, motioned to approve the minutes. Motion was passed by acclamation.

**4. Public Comment on Items not on Agenda (Discussion Only)**

Erin Merritt, Director of the YouthAware Program, wanted to know if Youth Commissioners had seen any of their free productions, such as Outspoken, in their schools. They are looking for teen buy in. No Youth Commissioners have seen any of their shows.

**5. Legislation Referred by the Board of Supervisors (All Items to Follow Discussion and Possible Action)**



- A. BOS File No. 170420 [Administrative Code - Relocation Assistance for Lawful Occupants Regardless of Age]  
Sponsor: Ronen; Yee, Breed, Sheehy, Fewer, Peskin and Safai  
Presenter: Carolyn Goosen, Legislative Aide to Supervisor Hillary Ronen  
(Document B)

The Ellis Act is a statewide law that allows landlords to move into their own buildings as long as they pay relocation fees to the family they are kicking out. Used to be used in good faith, but now Ellis Act is being illegally used as a way to get families to leave and then jack up the price for new, non-owner occupied move ins. However, a recent case of a family with a child that was only given two sums of money for the adults, but not the child as they didn't count as a "tenant". This legislation would say that children should also get relocation payments and that they do count as tenants. Getting relocation money for children could help families stay in SF. Ronen's office has asked the president to waive the 30 day rule because they know families are currently experiencing this right now.

Discussion:

Commissioner Marshall-Fricker-this seems pretty reasonable to me. We are the youth commission and this is about youth.

No public comment.

Commissioner Juarez, seconded by Commissioner Lind, motioned to support this legislation. The motion was passed by acclamation.

## **6. Presentations (All Items to Follow Discussion and Possible Action)**

- A. Presentation on Summer Stride, SFPL's Summer Learning Program  
Presenter: Ileana Pulu, Youth Development Coordinator, San Francisco Public Library  
(Document C)

Ileana presented on the Summer Stride program.

STEM programs are drop in programs so you can always come in  
YELL pilot program applications are now closed. You can contact your teen librarian to see if there are still spots open.

Summer Squad is also open (previously called Kid Power)

Commissioner Matz-how can we help roll this out? Participate, sign up, advocate, and engage with the teen services library about what kind of programs you'd want to see.

## **7. Youth Commission Business (All Items to Follow Discussion and Possible Action)**

- A. [Second Reading] Resolution 1617-AL- 08 [Resolution Supporting the Implementation of the Retail Workers Bill of Rights]  
Sponsor: Immigration, Justice and Employment Committee  
(Document D)

An updated version was circulated to the Commissioners for this resolution. It was read for the second time into the record.



There was no discussion, and Commissioner Marshall-Fricker, seconded by Commissioner Juarez, motioned to generally support this resolution. The motion was passed by acclamation.

There was no public comment.

- B. Discussion on San Franciscans for Municipal Fiber Youth Survey  
Sponsor: Executive Committee

Commissioners filled out the survey and/or outreached the link to other youth. So far we have 36 surveys filled out.

- C. [First Reading] Resolution 1617-AL- 10 [Resolution urging the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to investigate the reproductive health service needs of young San Franciscans in light of the impending closure of New Generation Health Center]  
Sponsor: Civic Engagement Committee  
(Document E)

This resolution was read into the record for the first time.

Commissioner Matz asked if we needed to add citations to all of the data/stats we use. Yes, however, the information for this resolution came from a fact sheet that also had no citations, but staff can cite the fact sheet. There was no public comment.

- D. [First Reading] Resolution 1617-AL- 11 [Youth Commission Recommendations for the 2018-2023 Youth Empowerment Allocation]  
Sponsors: Commissioners Amable and Matz  
(Document F)

This resolution was read into the record for the first time.

Comments: Commissioner N. David thinks it's a good first draft. Commissioner Matz noticed that DeVos name is misspelled and that they will do a thorough read for errors.

- E. [First Reading] Resolution 1617-AL- 12 [Resolution urging the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to ensure the implementation of the Sunlight Ordinance]  
Sponsors: Commissioner Lisa Yu  
(Document G)

This resolution was read into the record for the first time.

Discussion: Staff-this is well researched and wants to know if there is any data of how often it's used to turn down developments. Yu-Peskin brought this up because the planning department wasn't following and had forgotten that this was a thing to follow. Not a lot of people talking about Prop K, so staff thinks that research would be good to include in the second draft. Commissioner Amable says 5M development might be something to look in to in the tenderloin.

- F. [First Reading] Resolution 1617-AL- 13 [Resolution Urging the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to Adopt a Formal Definition of Family Housing]  
Sponsors: Commissioner Emma David  
(Document H)



This resolution was read into the record for the first time.

Comments:

Commissioner Amable-is family housing equivalent to affordable housing? No

Staff-family housing is making sure each unit has 2 or more bedrooms

Commissioner Amable-this is more about Yee's report? Yes, and Staff-it could be affordable housing or a percentage of it and could be included as an ask. So if a developer makes a complex, there could be a conversation of making a certain % that are allotted to family housing.

- G. [First Reading] Resolution 1617-AL- 14 [Resolution Urging the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to Adopt Legislation That Incentivize and Promotes the Construction of Family Housing and Prioritizes Families with Dependents in the Inclusionary Housing Selection Process]

Sponsors: Commissioner Emma David  
(Document I)

This resolution was read into the record for the first time.

Comments:

Amable-is what's going on now with Prop C around Breed and Safai ordinance around affordable housing, is there any way to connect this with what they are doing. Staff-you could enter that conversation with the BOS.

Commissioner Marshall-Fricker-we would have to see more about what they're doing. Staff-you can speak at public comment about this issue to see if the BOS will consider/earmark two or more units for families. Some of the whereas clauses are in the other resolution but they wanted to make this a standalone resolution so if anyone wants to co-author: Commissioner Mao wants to help on this one. Commissioner Amable would like to help co-sponsor or give more feedback.

- H. [First Reading] Youth Commission Budget & Policy Priorities for Fiscal Years 2017-2018, and 2018-2019  
(Document J)

The titles and recommendations of this draft were read into the record for the first time.

Staff-this is a great first start and we need to complete them quickly. Next Monday is our next full YC meeting which means we need them completed by this Friday for posting. Staff and commissioners can work on citations, graphs, images after Monday but the text needs to be ready and can't add substantive stuff after it's read into the record on the second reading.

Staff says BPP #'s 12 and 13 are very similar. Commissioner Mao-they need to be updated and were authored by Commissioner Plunkett so Commissioner Mao will connect with him. Staff reminded the Commissioners they can give frank feedback. Commissioner Marshall-Fricker wonders if we can do just one of these and doesn't understand the point of both of them.

- I. Discussion on Key to the City: Youth Empowerment & Organizing Townhall

Staff brought up details: children and youth fund (80-90 million dollars) where 3% goes to things that deal with youth initiated projects: BLING, Youth Advocacy Day, Project What, Campaign Academy, among other things, so as you review your resolution from Matz and Amable convincing DCYF to continue to fund youth organizing, think about why this is important. DCYF





is making its plan right now on how it will spend its money for the next 5 years and they didn't really give a lot of details about what that would look like and they want the Commission to help work with them on this. So the idea of TownHall is to help get youth feedback for DCYF and the importance of youth organizing. This is big because SF needs to understand how to use its money to fund youth organizing for the next 5 years and how we can prepare youth to sit in roles where youth can be on bodies in the city. This is an opportunity for what we think SF should be investing in which is a super important conversation.

Will be Wednesday, May 17<sup>th</sup> at the Mix from 4:30-7pm. It's not a YC meeting, but we ask that you come especially if you are connected to youth organizing. Interested in facilitating: Juarez, Galeano, Amable, Matz. DCYF Youth Advisory Board will help with this as well.

## **8. Committee Reports (Discussion Only)**

### **A. Executive Committee**

Commissioner Juarez shared they worked on youth fiber survey and doing outreach around that. Discussed postponing the YC meeting of last week.

### **B. Housing, Recreation and Transportation Committee**

Commissioner Yu shared they read through BPPs and edits.

### **C. Immigration, Justice and Employment Committee**

Commissioner Amable shared they met two weeks ago and discussed resolution status and everyone in their committee is sponsoring their own resolution and BPP. Then discussed TownHall details.

### **D. Civic Engagement Committee**

Commissioner Lind shared we discussed outreach for pre reg of 16 and 17 year olds. Sent emails to potential orgs to present at and edited BPPs.

### **E. Our Children Our Family Council**

Commissioner Galeano shared the last meeting was rescheduled and will be attending it.

## **9. Staff Report (Discussion Only)**

-Meeting with new Youth Commission applicants so those that are signed up to help with interviews from 4-7pm:

Tuesday-Hugo, Mary Claire, Chiara

Wednesday-Emma, Noah, Mary Claire, Jarrett, William, Lisa, Chiara (after EC meeting)

Thursday-Jonny, William (maybe)

- May 25<sup>th</sup> BPP presentation: Noah, Josh, Claire, William, Jarrett

-Next meeting is May 15<sup>th</sup>-need to show up and have quorum otherwise we'll have to reschedule our meeting to a different day.

-BOS softball game, have to be over 18 to play but can come and support if not 18.

-Youth Homelessness Hearing on Wednesday called by Supervisor Sheehy at 10:30 with item being called at 11:30ish. Would be great to have youth voices shared at this hearing.



-BOS is having a big policy debate related to housing debate and youth could go speak on public comment or in general public comment. Who's in: Amable.

-Staff thanks you for all of your work and we are in the home stretch. We can rest in June. Have approval to do food for a June meeting to celebrate.

## **10. Announcements (This Includes Community Events)**

Mesler-last weeks of April learned how to take the BART in Oakland and went to YC convention and was interesting to see what YCs around Bay Area were dealing with.

Talked with someone from Oakland YC and wants to know if Oakland YC and SF YC would be willing to do things together or do work together.

Mazt-affinity show on identity and how they are expressed at Urban. Matz is running it on Thursday and Friday at 6:30pm at Urban School.

Amable-this Thursday has been asked to be a keynote speaker for AYPS and will be speaking on behalf as D6 YC'er and youth empowerment. Anyone wants to share the spotlight let her know. Also, May 20<sup>th</sup> is barrio fiesta in SOMA and is a day that started in the 80s. Brings community together and are honoring longtime SOMA leader that died.

## **11. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:10pm.

1 [Health Code - Banning the Sale of Flavored Tobacco Products]

2  
3 **Ordinance amending the Health Code to prohibit tobacco retailers from selling flavored**  
4 **tobacco products, including menthol cigarettes.**

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

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

13 Section 1. The Health Code is hereby amended by adding Article 19Q, entitled  
14 “Prohibiting the Sale of Flavored Tobacco Products,” consisting of Sections 19Q.1 through  
15 19Q.8, to read as follows:

16 **ARTICLE 19Q: PROHIBITING THE SALE OF FLAVORED TOBACCO PRODUCTS**

17  
18 **SEC. 19Q.1. FINDINGS.**

19 *(a) Tobacco use remains the leading cause of preventable death in the United States, killing*  
20 *more than 480,000 people each year. It causes or contributes to many forms of cancer, as well as heart*  
21 *disease and respiratory diseases, among other health disorders. Tobacco use remains a public health*  
22 *crisis of the first order, in terms of the human suffering and loss of life it causes, the financial costs it*  
23 *imposes on society, and the burdens it places on our health care system. The financial cost of tobacco*  
24 *use in San Francisco alone amounts to \$380 million per year in direct health care expenses and lost*  
25 *productivity.*

1 (b) Flavored tobacco products are commonly sold by California tobacco retailers. For  
2 example: 97.4% of stores that sell cigarettes sell menthol cigarettes; 94.5% of stores that sell little  
3 cigars sell them in flavored varieties; 84.2% of stores that sell electronic smoking devices sell flavored  
4 varieties; and 83.8% of stores that sell chew or snus sell flavored varieties. 70% of tobacco retailers  
5 within 1,000 feet of San Francisco schools sell flavored tobacco products other than menthol  
6 cigarettes, and nearly all sell menthol cigarettes.

7 (c) Each day, about 2,500 children in the United States try their first cigarette; and another  
8 400 children under 18 years of age become new regular, daily smokers. 81% of youth who have ever  
9 used a tobacco product report that the first tobacco product they used was flavored. Flavored tobacco  
10 products promote youth initiation of tobacco use and help young occasional smokers to become daily  
11 smokers by reducing or masking the natural harshness and taste of tobacco smoke and thereby  
12 increasing the appeal of tobacco products. As tobacco companies well know, menthol, in particular,  
13 cools and numbs the throat to reduce throat irritation and make the smoke feel smoother, making  
14 menthol cigarettes an appealing option for youth who are initiating tobacco use. Tobacco companies  
15 have used flavorings such as mint and wintergreen in smokeless tobacco products as part of a  
16 “graduation strategy” to encourage new users to start with tobacco products with lower levels of  
17 nicotine and progress to products with higher levels of nicotine. It is therefore unsurprising that young  
18 people are much more likely to use menthol-, candy- and fruit-flavored tobacco products, including not  
19 just cigarettes but also cigars, cigarillos, and hookah tobacco, than adults. Data from the National  
20 Youth Tobacco Survey indicate that more than two-fifths of U.S. middle school and high school smokers  
21 report using flavored little cigars or flavored cigarettes. Further, the Centers for Disease Control and  
22 Prevention has reported a more than 800% increase in electronic cigarette use among middle school  
23 and high school students between 2011 and 2015. Nicotine solutions, which are consumed via  
24 electronic smoking devices such as electronic cigarettes, are sold in thousands of flavors that appeal to  
25 youth, such as cotton candy and bubble gum.

1 (d) Much as young people disproportionately use flavored tobacco products including menthol  
2 cigarettes, the same can be said of certain minority groups. In one survey, the percentage of people  
3 who smoke cigarettes that reported smoking menthol cigarettes in the prior month included, most  
4 dramatically, 82.6% of Blacks or African-Americans who smoke cigarettes. The statistics for other  
5 groups were: 53.2% of Native Hawaiians or Other Pacific Islanders who smoke cigarettes; 36.9% of  
6 individuals with multiracial backgrounds who smoke cigarettes; 32.3% of Hispanics or Latinos who  
7 smoke cigarettes; 31.2% of Asians who smoke cigarettes; 24.8% of American Indians or Alaska Natives  
8 who smoke cigarettes; and 23.8% of Whites or Caucasians who smoke cigarettes. People who identify  
9 as LGBT and young adults with mental health conditions also struggle with disproportionately high  
10 rates of menthol cigarette use. The disproportionate use of menthol cigarettes among targeted groups,  
11 especially the extremely high use among African-Americans, is troubling because of the long-term  
12 adverse health impacts on those groups.

13 (e) Between 2004 and 2014, overall smoking prevalence decreased, but use of menthol  
14 cigarettes increased among both young adults (ages 18-25) and other adults (ages 26+). These  
15 statistics are consistent with the finding that smoking menthol cigarettes reduces the likelihood of  
16 successfully quitting smoking. Scientific modeling has projected that a national ban on menthol  
17 cigarettes could save between 300,000 and 600,000 lives by 2050.

18  
19 **SEC. 190.2. DEFINITIONS.**

20 For purposes of this Article 190, the following definitions shall apply:

21 “Characterizing Flavor” means a Distinguishable taste aroma or both, other than the taste or  
22 aroma of tobacco, imparted by a Tobacco Product or any byproduct produced by the Tobacco Product.  
23 Characterizing Flavors include, but are not limited to, tastes or aromas relating to any fruit, chocolate,  
24 vanilla, honey, candy, cocoa, dessert, alcoholic beverage, menthol, mint, wintergreen, herb, or spice. A  
25 Tobacco Product shall not be determined to have a Characterizing Flavor solely because of the use of

1 additives or flavorings or the provision of ingredient information. Rather, it is the presence of a  
2 Distinguishable taste or aroma or both, as described in the first sentence of this definition, that  
3 constitutes a Characterizing Flavor.

4 “Cigarette” has the meaning set forth in 21 U.S.C. § 387(3), as may be amended from time to  
5 time.

6 “Constituent” means any ingredient, substance, chemical, or compound, other than tobacco,  
7 water, or reconstituted tobacco sheet that is added by the manufacturer to a Tobacco Product during  
8 the processing, manufacture, or packing of the Tobacco Product.

9 “Director” has the meaning set forth in Health Code Section 19H.2.

10 “Distinguishable” means perceivable by either the sense of smell or taste.

11 “Establishment” has the meaning set forth in Health Code Section 19H.2.

12 “Flavored Cigarette” means a Cigarette that contains a Constituent that imparts a  
13 Characterizing Flavor.

14 “Flavored Tobacco Product” means any Tobacco Product, other than a Cigarette, that  
15 contains a Constituent that imparts a Characterizing Flavor.

16 “Labeling” means written, printed, pictorial, or graphic matter upon any Tobacco Product or  
17 any of its Packaging.

18 “Packaging” means a pack, box, carton, or container of any kind or, if no other container, any  
19 wrapping (including cellophane) in which a Tobacco Product is sold or offered for sale to a consumer.

20 “Tobacco Product” has the meaning set forth in Health Code Section 19H.2.

21  
22 **SEC 19Q.3. SALE OR DISTRIBUTION OF FLAVORED TOBACCO PRODUCTS**

23 **PROHIBITED.**

24 (a) The sale or distribution by an Establishment of any Flavored Tobacco Product is  
25 prohibited.

1           **(b) A Tobacco Product, other than a Cigarette, is presumed to be a Flavored Tobacco**  
2 **Product if a Manufacturer or any of the Manufacturer’s agents or employees, in the course of their**  
3 **agency or employment, has:**

4                   **(1) made a statement or claim directed to consumers or to the public that the**  
5 **Tobacco Product has or produces a Characterizing Flavor, including, but not limited to, text and/or**  
6 **images on the product’s Labeling or Packaging that are used to explicitly or implicitly communicate**  
7 **that the Tobacco Product has a Characterizing Flavor; or**

8                   **(2) taken actions directed to consumers that would be reasonably expected to result**  
9 **in consumers receiving the message that the Tobacco Product imparts a Characterizing Flavor.**

10  
11           **SEC 190.4. SALE OR DISTRIBUTION OF FLAVORED CIGARETTES PROHIBITED.**

12           **(a) The sale or distribution by an Establishment of any Flavored Cigarette is prohibited.**

13           **(b) A Cigarette is presumed to be a Flavored Cigarette if a Manufacturer or any of the**  
14 **Manufacturer’s agents or employees, in the course of their agency or employment, has:**

15                   **(1) made a statement or claim directed to consumers or to the public that the**  
16 **Cigarette has or produces a Characterizing Flavor, including, but not limited to, text and/or images on**  
17 **the product’s Labeling or Packaging that are used to explicitly or implicitly communicate that the**  
18 **Cigarette has a Characterizing Flavor; or**

19                   **(2) taken actions directed to consumers that would be reasonably expected to result**  
20 **in consumers receiving the message that the Cigarette imparts a Characterizing Flavor.**

21  
22           **SEC. 190.5. ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS.**

23           **The Director may adopt rules, regulations, or guidelines for the implementation and**  
24 **enforcement of this Article 190.**

1           **SEC. 19Q.6. ENFORCEMENT.**

2           The Director, or his or her designee, may enforce Sections 19Q.3 and 19Q.4 pursuant to  
3 Articles 19 et seq. of the Health Code, including but not limited to Article 19H.

4  
5           **SEC 19Q.7. NO CONFLICT WITH FEDERAL OR STATE LAW.**

6           Nothing in this Article 19.Q shall be interpreted or applied so as to create any requirement,  
7 power, or duty that is preempted by federal or state law.

8  
9           **SEC. 19Q.8. SEVERABILITY.**

10          If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or word of this Article 19Q, or any  
11 application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held to be invalid or unconstitutional by a court  
12 of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions or  
13 applications of the Article. The Board of Supervisors hereby declares that it would have passed this  
14 Article, and each section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, and word not declared invalid or  
15 unconstitutional without regard to whether any other portion of this Article or application thereof  
16 would be subsequently declared invalid or unconstitutional.

17  
18          Section 2. The Health Code is hereby amended by adding Section 19H.14-2, to read  
19 as follows:

20  
21          **SEC. 19H.14-2. CONDUCT VIOLATING HEALTH CODE ARTICLE 19Q (PROHIBITING**  
22 **THE SALE OF FLAVORED TOBACCO PRODUCTS).**

23          (a) Upon a decision by the Director that the Permittee or the Permittee's agent or employee  
24 has engaged in any conduct that violates Health Code Section 19Q.3 (Sale or Distribution of Flavored  
25



1 Tobacco Products Prohibited), the Director may suspend a Tobacco Sales permit as set forth in Section  
2 19H.19.

3 (b) Upon a decision by the Director that the Permittee or the Permittee’s agent or employee  
4 has engaged in any conduct that violates Health Code Section 19Q.4 (Sale or Distribution of Flavored  
5 Cigarettes Prohibited), the Director may suspend a Tobacco Sales permit as set forth in Section  
6 19H.19.

7 (c) The Director shall commence enforcement under this Section 19H.14-2 by serving either  
8 a notice of correction under Section 19H.21 or a notice of initial determination under Section 19H.22  
9 of this Article 19H.

10  
11 Section 3. Effective and Operative Dates.

12 (a) This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after enactment. Enactment  
13 occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the ordinance unsigned or  
14 does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board of Supervisors  
15 overrides the Mayor’s veto of the ordinance.

16 (b) This ordinance shall become operative on January 1, 2018.

17  
18  
19 APPROVED AS TO FORM:  
20 DENNIS J. HERRERA, City Attorney

21 By: \_\_\_\_\_  
22 Anne Pearson  
23 Deputy City Attorney

24 n:\legana\as2017\1700412\01185609.docx

## **LEGISLATIVE DIGEST**

[Health Code - Banning the Sale of Flavored Tobacco Products]

### **Ordinance amending the Health Code to prohibit tobacco retailers from selling flavored tobacco products, including menthol cigarettes**

#### **Existing Law**

Federal law bans the manufacture of cigarettes with characterizing flavors, other than the flavor of menthol and tobacco. Federal law does not ban the manufacture of menthol cigarettes or flavored tobacco products other than cigarettes.

#### **Amendments to Current Law**

The proposed ordinance amends the Health Code to prohibit local tobacco retailers from selling flavored tobacco products. The tobacco products that would be subject to the prohibition on sale would include, but not be limited to, flavored cigarettes, including menthol cigarettes, flavored cigars, flavored smokeless tobacco, flavored shisha, and flavored nicotine solutions that are used in electronic cigarettes.

The ordinance defines a flavored tobacco product as a tobacco product that contains a constituent that imparts a characterizing flavor. The ordinance would create a presumption that a tobacco product is flavored if the tobacco manufacturer makes a statement or claim that the product has a characterizing flavor. For example, if the packaging in which a tobacco product is sold is printed with the word “grape” or with an image of grapes, the tobacco product would be presumed to be flavored, and subject to the restriction on sale.

Violation of the ordinance would be punishable by a suspension of the retailer’s tobacco license.

#### **Background Information**

Tobacco use remains the leading cause of preventable death in the United States, killing more than 480,000 people each year. It causes or contributes to many forms of cancer, as well as heart disease and respiratory diseases, among other health disorders. The financial cost of tobacco use in San Francisco alone amounts to \$380 million per year in direct health care expenses and lost productivity.

Although federal law prohibits the manufacture of flavored cigarettes, it does not ban menthol cigarettes or other types of flavored tobacco products, which are widely available in flavors like bubble gum, cotton candy, banana, cherry and vanilla. Each day, about 2,500 children in

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco 94102-4689  
Tel. No. 554-5184  
Fax No. 554-5163  
TDD/TTY No. 554-5227

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Youth Commission  
FROM: Victor Young, Assistant Committee Clerk  
DATE: May 11, 2017  
SUBJECT: REFERRAL FROM BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

The Board of Supervisors has received the following, which at the request of the Youth Commission is being referred as per Charter Section 4.124 for comment and recommendation. The Commission may provide any response it deems appropriate within 12 days from the date of this referral.

**File: 170441**

**Ordinance amending the Health Code to prohibit tobacco retailers from selling flavored tobacco products, including menthol cigarettes.**

Please return this cover sheet with the Commission's response to **Erica Major, Assistant Committee Clerk, Public Safety and Neighborhood Services.**

\*\*\*\*\*

**RESPONSE FROM YOUTH COMMISSION**      Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ **No Comment**

\_\_\_\_\_ **Recommendation Attached**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Chairperson, Youth Commission**

the United States try their first cigarette, and another 400 children under 18 years of age become new regular, daily smokers. 81% of youth who have ever used a tobacco product report that the first tobacco product they used was flavored.

Flavored tobacco products promote youth initiation of tobacco use and help young occasional smokers to become daily smokers by reducing or masking the natural harshness and taste of tobacco smoke and thereby increasing the appeal of tobacco products. Menthol, in particular, cools and numbs the throat to reduce throat irritation and make the smoke feel smoother, making menthol cigarettes an appealing option for youth who are initiating tobacco use. Young people are much more likely to use menthol-, candy- and fruit-flavored tobacco products, including not just cigarettes but also cigars, cigarillos, and hookah tobacco, than adults.

Much as young people disproportionately use flavored tobacco products including menthol cigarettes, the same can be said of certain minority groups. In one survey, the percentage of people who smoke cigarettes that reported smoking menthol cigarettes in the prior month included, most dramatically, 82.6% of Blacks or African-Americans who smoke cigarettes. The statistics for other groups were: 53.2% of Native Hawaiians or Other Pacific Islanders who smoke cigarettes; 36.9% of individuals with multiracial backgrounds who smoke cigarettes; 32.3% of Hispanics or Latinos who smoke cigarettes; 31.2% of Asians who smoke cigarettes; 24.8% of American Indians or Alaska Natives who smoke cigarettes; and 23.8% of Whites or Caucasians who smoke cigarettes. People who identify as LGBT and young adults with mental health conditions also struggle with disproportionately high rates of menthol cigarette use. The disproportionate use of menthol cigarettes among targeted groups, especially the extremely high use among African-Americans, is troubling because of the long-term adverse health impacts on those groups.

Between 2004 and 2014, overall smoking prevalence decreased, but use of menthol cigarettes increased among both young adults (ages 18-25) and other adults (ages 26+). These statistics are consistent with the finding that smoking menthol cigarettes reduces the likelihood of successfully quitting smoking. Scientific modeling has projected that a national ban on menthol cigarettes could save between 300,000 and 600,000 lives by 2050.

1 [Resolution Highlighting the Negative Societal and Economic Impacts of Alcohol Density on  
2 Youth and Families in San Francisco]

3  
4 **Resolution urging Mayor Lee and the Board of Supervisors to reduce the alcohol-**  
5 **related impacts on the youth and families of San Francisco by requiring equity**  
6 **analyses on all alcohol policies developed; supporting the Budget Legislative Analyst**  
7 **Report on the Economic and Administrative Costs Related to Alcohol Abuse in the City**  
8 **and County of San Francisco by moving it to a public hearing; and by partnering with**  
9 **the San Francisco Prevention Coalition to develop an alcohol regulatory framework for**  
10 **the City and County of San Francisco.**

11  
12  
13 WHEREAS, according to the averages done by the Centers for Disease Control and  
14 Prevention (CDC), from 2006 to 2010, 503 underage youth die annually from alcohol related  
15 causes in California and excessive alcohol consumption<sup>1</sup>; and

16  
17 WHEREAS, excessive alcohol consumption by California youth leads to 30,236 years  
18 of potential life lost each year<sup>2</sup>; and

19  
20 WHEREAS, youth violence related to drinking costs California \$3.5 billion and results  
21 in 216 deaths annually, and youth traffic crashes related to drinking costs \$1.2 billion and results  
22 in 148 deaths annually<sup>3</sup>; and

23 \_\_\_\_\_  
24 <sup>1</sup> Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Alcohol-Related Disease Impact (ARDI). Atlanta,  
GA. [http://nccd.cdc.gov/DPH\\_ARDI/default/default.aspx](http://nccd.cdc.gov/DPH_ARDI/default/default.aspx). Accessed May 12, 2017.

25 <sup>2</sup> Tso, S. M. (2016). Report of the Chief Legislative Analyst Report on Resolution to Support and/or Sponsor  
Legislation to Prohibit Powdered Alcohol (Vol. 15-0002-S123, pp. 1-7, Rep.). Los Angeles, CA.

<sup>3</sup> Tso, S. M. (2016). Report of the Chief Legislative Analyst Report on Resolution to Support and/or Sponsor  
Legislation to Prohibit Powdered Alcohol (Vol. 15-0002-S123, pp. 1-7, Rep.). Los Angeles, CA.

1 WHEREAS, the total cost to California of underage drinking is estimated at over \$6.7  
2 billion annually<sup>4</sup>; and

3 WHEREAS, in 2012, 5192 youth aged 12 to 20 years were admitted for alcohol  
4 treatment in California<sup>5</sup>; and

5 WHEREAS, estimates conclude that the City and County of San Francisco bears the  
6 cost of \$17.1 million annually for alcohol-related emergency medical transport, medical care of  
7 people with alcohol-related illnesses, alcohol abuse treatment and prevention, and disability  
8 and death due to alcohol use<sup>6</sup>; and

9  
10 WHEREAS, estimates conclude that the City and County of San Francisco bears the  
11 broader economic cost of \$655 million and total and the total quality-of-life cost of \$1 billion  
12 from alcohol abuse and related incidents, including costs related to years of life lost and  
13 hospitalizations due to alcohol-related illness and injury, injury and fatality due to motor  
14 vehicle collisions, fetal alcohol syndrome, high-risk sex, productivity loss, and crime<sup>7</sup>; and

15  
16 WHEREAS, in San Francisco, alcohol use ranks among the leading causes of  
17 premature mortality; the San Francisco Department of Public Health considers alcohol a major  
18 public health problem; and

19  
20 \_\_\_\_\_  
21 <sup>4</sup> <http://www.pire.org/documents/UDETC/cost-sheets/CA.pdf>

22 <sup>5</sup> Office of Applied Studies, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. Treatment Episode  
23 Data Set. (2013). Substance Abuse Treatment by Primary Substance of Abuse, According to Sex, Age, Race,  
24 and Ethnicity, 2011. Available [Online]: <http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/SAMHDA/studies/30462>

25 <sup>6</sup> Budget and Legislative Analyst's Office. (2017). Budget and Legislative Analyst Policy Analysis Report on  
Economic and Administrative Costs Related to Alcohol Abuse in the City and County of San Francisco (pp. 1-54,  
Rep.). San Francisco, CA: Budget and Legislative Analyst's Office.

<sup>7</sup> Budget and Legislative Analyst's Office. (2017). Budget and Legislative Analyst Policy Analysis Report on  
Economic and Administrative Costs Related to Alcohol Abuse in the City and County of San Francisco (pp. 1-54,  
Rep.). San Francisco, CA: Budget and Legislative Analyst's Office.

1           WHEREAS, census tracts show that neighborhoods such as Bernal Heights,  
2 Chinatown, Hayes Valley, Japantown, Nob Hill, North Beach, Potrero Hill, South of Market,  
3 the Tenderloin, and the Western Addition have a disproportionate share of alcohol sales  
4 outlets relative to their population size. These areas tend to have a higher density of violent  
5 crime as well as a higher proportion of residents with incomes below the poverty threshold<sup>8</sup>;  
6 and

7           WHEREAS, according to the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism,  
8 young people who begin drinking before age 15 are four times more likely to develop alcohol  
9 dependence and are two and a half times more likely to become abusers of alcohol than  
10 those who begin drinking at age 21<sup>9</sup>; and

11           WHEREAS, according to the California Department of Alcohol Beverage Control as of  
12 January 8, 2016, there are 3,809 retail businesses selling alcohol in San Francisco's 46.9  
13 square miles, making San Francisco the most alcohol retail-dense county in California<sup>10</sup>; and

14           WHEREAS, recent studies using advanced analytical methods by Toomey and  
15 colleagues (2007) show that a higher density of alcohol outlets is related to increased rates of  
16 crime, particularly homicides and assaults; and

17           WHEREAS, Treno and colleagues (2003) evaluated the effect of alcohol outlet density  
18 on driving after drinking among 15- to 20-year-olds, finding that higher alcohol outlet density is  
19 associated with greater prevalence of drunk driving; and  
20  
21  
22

---

23 <sup>8</sup> City and County of San Francisco. Budget Legislative Analyst Report: Economic and Administrative Costs  
24 Related to Alcohol Abuse in the City and County of San Francisco, April 2017, pg. 2

25 <sup>9</sup> <http://www.pire.org/documents/UDETC/cost-sheets/CA.pdf>

<sup>10</sup> California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs: Community Indicators of Alcohol & Drug Abuse Risk:  
San Francisco County 2004.

1           WHEREAS, preliminary findings from recent studies conducted by the University of  
2 California San Francisco (UCSF) at San Francisco General Hospital (SFGH) Trauma Center  
3 demonstrate that approximately 8% percent of alcohol-related trauma cases die from their  
4 injuries. Of a sample of 300 moderate-to-severe traumas, 59% occurred in patients with blood  
5 alcohol levels of .08 and above. The study found that patients with a positive blood alcohol  
6 level experienced more severe traumas, and therefore faced a greater risk of death<sup>11</sup>; and,  
7

8           WHEREAS, Analysis revealed that the highest rates of alcohol-related injuries treated  
9 at the Trauma Center occurred in San Francisco census tracts with a high density of alcohol  
10 outlets<sup>12</sup>; and

11           WHEREAS, states, cities and counties have the power to place a legal limit on the  
12 number of alcohol establishments in a neighborhood, city or county as a strategy to reduce  
13 alcohol consumption, alcohol-related health issues, and safety problems among the general  
14 population; and

15           WHEREAS, the San Francisco Prevention Coalition, which is made of several youth  
16 serving agencies including Asian American Recovery Services, Center for Open Recovery,  
17 Community Youth Center, Horizons Unlimited, Japanese Community Youth Council, South of  
18 Market Action Network, Vietnamese Youth Development Center, OMIE Beacon, and Youth  
19

20  
21  
22  
23 <sup>11</sup> Brondfield, M. N., Sciortino, S., Juillard, C., Fleisher, P., Schmidt, L. A., & Dicker, R. (2016). The Influence of  
24 Alcohol Outlets on Urban Trauma: A Pilot Study for Geospatial Modeling at a Fine Scale. Panamerican Journal  
of Trauma, Critical Care & Emergency Surgery, 5(1), 1-10. doi:10.5005/jp-journals-10030-1136

25 <sup>12</sup> Brondfield, M. N., Sciortino, S., Juillard, C., Fleisher, P., Schmidt, L. A., & Dicker, R. (2016). The Influence of  
Alcohol Outlets on Urban Trauma: A Pilot Study for Geospatial Modeling at a Fine Scale. Panamerican Journal  
of Trauma, Critical Care & Emergency Surgery, 5(1), 1-10. doi:10.5005/jp-journals-10030-1136



1 Leadership Institute, identify alcohol density as a critical health equity issue impacting youth  
2 and communities of color across San Francisco; and

3 WHEREAS, The San Francisco Prevention Coalition and a broad range of partners  
4 including the San Francisco Alcohol Policy Partnership Working Group, San Francisco Friday  
5 Night Live are working to ensure data and evidence analysis of alcohol density impacts in San  
6 Francisco are led by experts in alcohol prevention from SFPD, UCSF, and SFDPH; therefore  
7  
8 be it

9 RESOLVED, that the Youth Commission urges the City and County of San Francisco  
10 to require an equity analyses as it relates to all alcohol policies developed; and be it further

11 RESOLVED, that the City and County of San Francisco partner with the San Francisco  
12 Prevention Coalition, which is made of several youth serving agencies including Asian  
13 American Recovery Services, Center for Open Recovery, Community Youth Center, Horizons  
14 Unlimited, Japanese Community Youth Council, South of Market Action Network, Vietnamese  
15 Youth Development Center, and Youth Leadership Institute, Alcohol Policy Steering  
16 Committee, and DPH leaders to develop an alcohol regulatory framework to reduce the  
17 impact of alcohol density; and be it finally

18  
19 RESOLVED, the Youth Commission of the City and County of San Francisco hereby  
20 urge Mayor Lee and the Board of Supervisors to highlight the negative societal and economic  
21 impacts of alcohol density on youth and their families in San Francisco by moving the Budget  
22 Legislative Analyst Report on the Economic and Administrative Costs Related to Alcohol  
23 Abuse in the City and County of San Francisco to a public hearing.  
24  
25

1 [Resolution urging the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to investigate the reproductive health service  
2 needs of young San Franciscans in light of the impending closure of New Generation Health Center]

3 **Resolution urging the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to consider the outstanding needs of**  
4 **young San Franciscans to access reproductive health clinical services in a youth-specific**  
5 **environment**

6  
7 WHEREAS, New Generation “New Gen” Health Center started as a one-day-a-week clinic  
8 within San Francisco General Hospital and has been in the community for 45 years<sup>1</sup>; and

9 WHEREAS, Professor Phil Darney surveyed SF teens who did NOT use the teen clinics at SF  
10 General Hospital and showed that underserved teens preferred an anonymous, non-hospital setting  
11 specifically for contraceptive, pregnancy-related, and STI/HIV services; and

12 WHEREAS, a model clinic, New Gen was created for teens, and in 1997 the program moved to  
13 its current location at 625 Potrero Avenue; and

14 WHEREAS, the number of teens seen quickly doubled from that of the former SF General  
15 Hospital-located clinic; and

16 WHEREAS, New Gen patients are largely adolescents and young adults who come from  
17 marginalized and underserved backgrounds; and

18 WHEREAS, these adolescents and young adults already face significant challenges in  
19 accessing health care, and these barriers are even more challenging when they need to seek services  
20 for confidential reasons; and

21  
22 WHEREAS, this Center provides confidential, accessible, youth-friendly reproductive health  
23 clinical services and educational programs to young women and men in San Francisco’s highest risk  
24 communities; and

25 \_\_\_\_\_  
<sup>1</sup> All data and statistics taken from a New Generation Health Center one pager.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

WHEREAS, 92% of clients are below 150% of the poverty line; and

WHEREAS, 92% of clients are people of color: 49% are Latino/a, 25% are Black, and 14% are Asian; and

WHEREAS, 75% of New Gen patients are uninsured; and

WHEREAS, 65% of New Gen’s patients come from The Mission, Bayview/Hunters Point, and the southeast communities; the neighborhoods with the highest STI and teen pregnancy rates in the city; and

WHEREAS, 12% of patients are monolingual and many are undocumented; and

WHEREAS, primary care settings lack a teen-friendly environment and truly confidential services and New Gen provides both; and

WHEREAS, New Gen provided 4,239 visits to 2,231 patients in 2015; and

WHEREAS, the New Gen outreach program teaches free and comprehensive sexual health classes to SF teens and in 2015, reached 7,267 people; and

WHEREAS, this Center is an invaluable training site for UCSF students; shaping the future of teen reproductive health care; and

WHEREAS, New Gen has a patient satisfaction rate of over 95%; and

WHEREAS, the Center is a place that young people can trust and feel safe going to for health care, and we are afraid for those that will fall through the cracks, and of the impact that follows; and

WHEREAS, New Gen empowers youth and young adults to make informed and positive decisions about their health and future, particularly related to their reproductive health; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, that we urge the Board of Supervisors to stand by [Resolution 170102: Affirming Commitment to Maintaining Women’s Universal Access to Affordable Reproductive, Family Planning, and Sexual Health Services in San Francisco](#) and by holding a hearing to investigate the reproductive

1 health service needs of young San Franciscans being served by the New Generations Health Center;  
2 and be it finally

3 RESOLVED, we urge the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and Department of Public Health to  
4 consider the outstanding needs of young San Franciscans to access reproductive health clinical  
5 services in a youth-specific environment in light of the impending closure of New Generations Health  
6 Center at both a future hearing and in this year's upcoming budget process.

7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

FILE NO.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

[Resolution urging the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to ensure the implementation of the Sunlight Ordinance]

**Resolution urging the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to ensure the Planning Department is undertaking efforts to implementing Prop K (Sunlight) ordinance of 1984**

WHEREAS, Proposition K (1984) or also known as the Sunlight Ordinance is the process to implement Section 295 of the Planning Code, and

WHEREAS, Section 295 of the Planning Code mandates that new structures above 40 feet in height that would cast additional shadows on properties under the jurisdiction of, or designated to be acquired by the Recreation and Parks Department can only be approved by the Planning Commission if the shadow is determined to be insignificant, and

WHEREAS, the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department’s Mission is to provide enriching recreational activities, maintain beautiful parks and preserve the environment for the well-being of our diverse community, and

WHEREAS, children, youth, and their families regularly utilize our public parks, and

WHEREAS, sunlight and outdoor recreation are greatly beneficial to children and their health needs, and

WHEREAS, adequate sunlight in all SF parks is essential toward fulfilling the goals set out in the Children’s Outdoor Bill of Rights as well as the mission of the SF Recreation and Parks Department, now, therefore be it

RESOLVED, the San Francisco Youth Commission urges the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to call a hearing looking into the Planning Department’s implementation of the Sunlight Ordinance, Section 295 of the Planning Code.

1 [Resolution Urging the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to Adopt a Formal Definition of Family  
2 Housing]

3 **Resolution Urging the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to Adopt a Community Informed Formal**  
4 **Definition of Family Housing into San Francisco's General Plan**

5 WHEREAS, San Francisco is seeing a decrease in low and middle-income families due to  
6 income inequality and the shortage of housing; and

7 WHEREAS, the Planning Department had recently released the *Housing for Families with*  
8 *Children* report, commissioned by Supervisor Norman Yee, and

9 WHEREAS, Supervisor Yee had also requested a Board of Supervisors hearing on March 7  
10 2017 and March 20, 2017 to discuss the Planning Department's report; and

11 WHEREAS, Supervisor Norman Yee had presented to the Youth Commission in order to share  
12 the urgency of the family housing crisis in San Francisco; and

13 WHEREAS, according to the 2010 US Census Bureau, of the 12 largest cities in the United  
14 States, San Francisco ranks lowest for the percentage of households that are families with children  
15 (18% compared to the average of 29.4%);<sup>1</sup> and

16 WHEREAS, San Francisco has the least amount of children of any Bay Area county;<sup>2</sup> and

17 WHEREAS, families are extremely important to cities since they call for a higher quality of  
18 safety and livability, build a multi-generational community, and bring diverse cultures and perspectives;  
19 and

20  
21 WHEREAS, the two main housing aspects that impact family housing in San Francisco are  
22 affordability and unit size, and

23  
24 \_\_\_\_\_  
25 <sup>1</sup> Housing for Families with Children. San Francisco Planning Department. January 17, 2017:  
[http://default.sfplanning.org/publications\\_reports/Family\\_Friendly\\_Briefing\\_01-17-17\\_FINAL.pdf](http://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/Family_Friendly_Briefing_01-17-17_FINAL.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

1 WHEREAS, 91% of all home sale listings in SF were either unaffordable or less than 2  
2 bedroom<sup>3</sup>, and

3 WHEREAS, because of this, only 9% of the housing stock is available to families earning the  
4 median family income;<sup>4</sup> and

5 WHEREAS, according to the Planning Department’s *Housing for Families with Children* report,  
6 there’s a mismatch between people and spaces, and

7 WHEREAS, almost all of the homes that are suited for large families are occupied already, and

8 WHEREAS, families occupy only 30% of 3+ bedroom units; meanwhile, 25% of families with  
9 kids are living single room occupancies (SROs); and

10 WHEREAS, there is a lot of overcrowding in San Francisco, particularly in Chinatown,  
11 Visitacion Valley, Downtown, Civic Center, and Oceanview, and

12 WHEREAS, these neighborhoods also have the highest concentration of youth and families,  
13 and

14 WHEREAS, Chinatown is particularly suffering with 24% of households living overcrowded  
15 conditions, and

16 WHEREAS, 65% of families living in SROs reside in Chinatown, and

17 WHEREAS, SROs typically lack basic necessities like full bathrooms and kitchenettes, and

18 WHEREAS, the families living in SROs are generally the City’s working poor and have been on  
19 waitlists for housing for sometimes up to 10 years;<sup>5</sup> and  
20  
21  
22

23 \_\_\_\_\_  
24 <sup>3</sup> <http://www.governing.com/gov-data/other/family-housing-affordability-in-cities-report.html#calculation>

25 <sup>4</sup> Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> Housing for Families with Children. San Francisco Planning Department. January 17, 2017:

[http://default.sfplanning.org/publications\\_reports/Family\\_Friendly\\_Briefing\\_01-17-17\\_FINAL.pdf](http://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/Family_Friendly_Briefing_01-17-17_FINAL.pdf)

1           WHEREAS, research indicates that crowded environments can negatively affect children’s  
2 social adjustment; there was a sharp increase in children’s misbehaviors when living in homes with  
3 more than 2.3 residents per room,<sup>6</sup> and

4           WHEREAS, cities throughout the country and in the Bay Area have adopted a formal definition  
5 of Family Housing into their General Plan, and

6           WHEREAS, the Youth Commission firmly believes conversations between families and policy  
7 makers must take place in order to deeply explore the challenges to this housing crisis to inform viable  
8 solutions, now, therefore be it

9           RESOLVED, that the Youth Commission urges the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt a  
10 community informed definition of family-friendly housing into its General Plan, similar to other cities  
11 such as Emeryville, and be it further

12           RESOLVED, that the Youth Commission urges the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to urge the  
13 Planning Department to host a series of community located listening sessions to hear from families  
14 with children and youth the challenges to obtaining housing, and to solicit community input on a  
15 definition of family-friendly housing and desired characteristics.

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

---

25 <sup>6</sup> Housing for Families with Children. San Francisco Planning Department. January 17, 2017:  
[http://default.sfplanning.org/publications\\_reports/Family\\_Friendly\\_Briefing\\_01-17-17\\_FINAL.pdf](http://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/Family_Friendly_Briefing_01-17-17_FINAL.pdf)



1 [Resolution Urging the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to Adopt Legislation That Incentivize and  
2 Promotes the Construction of Family Housing and Prioritizes Families with Dependents in the  
3 Inclusionary Housing Selection Process]

4 **Resolution urging the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt legislation that incentivize the**  
5 **Construction of two-or-more bedroom units and prioritizes families with dependents in the**  
6 **Below Market Rate (BMR) Inclusionary Housing Selection Process for units with two-or-more**  
7 **bedrooms**

8 WHEREAS, the Planning Department recently released the *Housing for Families with Children*  
9 report, commissioned by Supervisor Norman Yee, and

10 WHEREAS, San Francisco is seeing a decrease in low and middle-income families due to  
11 income inequality and the shortage of housing; and

12 WHEREAS, according to the 2010 US Census Bureau, of the 12 largest cities in the United  
13 States, San Francisco ranks lowest for the percentage of households that are families with children  
14 (18% compared to the average of 29.4%);<sup>1</sup> and

15 WHEREAS, San Francisco has the least amount of children of any Bay Area county, and

16 WHEREAS, the two main housing aspects that impact family housing in San Francisco are  
17 affordability and unit size, and

18 WHEREAS, 91% of all home sale listings in SF were either unaffordable or less than 2  
19 bedroom<sup>2</sup>, and

20 WHEREAS, because of this, only 9% of the housing stock is available to families earning the  
21 median family income;<sup>3</sup> and

---

24 <sup>1</sup> Housing for Families with Children. San Francisco Planning Department. January 17, 2017:  
[http://default.sfplanning.org/publications\\_reports/Family\\_Friendly\\_Briefing\\_01-17-17\\_FINAL.pdf](http://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/Family_Friendly_Briefing_01-17-17_FINAL.pdf)

25 <sup>2</sup> <http://www.governing.com/gov-data/other/family-housing-affordability-in-cities-report.html#calculation>

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

1 WHEREAS, almost all of the homes that are suited for large families are occupied already, and

2 WHEREAS, families occupy only 30% of 3+ bedroom units; meanwhile, 25% of families with  
3 kids are living single room occupancies (SROs); and

4 WHEREAS, there is a lot of overcrowding in San Francisco, particularly in Chinatown,  
5 Visitacion Valley, Downtown, Civic Center, and Oceanview, and

6 WHEREAS, these neighborhoods also have the highest concentration of youth and families,  
7 and

8 WHEREAS, Chinatown is particularly suffering with 24% of households living overcrowded  
9 conditions, and

10 WHEREAS, research indicates that crowded environments can negatively affect children's  
11 social adjustment; there was a sharp increase in children's misbehaviors when living in homes with  
12 more than 2.3 residents per room,<sup>4</sup> and

13 WHEREAS, the report from the planning department recommends the city look into  
14 underutilized ground floor and underbuilt lots as a way to add units to existing buildings, which would  
15 increase housing stock without significantly changing the neighborhoods, now, therefore be it

16 RESOLVED, that the San Francisco Youth Commission urges the Board of Supervisors and  
17 Mayor to adopt legislation that incentivize and promotes the construction of family housing and the  
18 production of two or more bedroom units, and be it further

19 RESOLVED, that the Youth Commission urges the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopt  
20 legislation that reserves affordable and inclusionary units that come online and are two or more  
21 bedrooms for families with dependent children and youth  
22

23

24

25 \_\_\_\_\_  
<sup>4</sup> Housing for Families with Children. San Francisco Planning Department. January 17, 2017:  
[http://default.sfplanning.org/publications\\_reports/Family\\_Friendly\\_Briefing\\_01-17-17\\_FINAL.pdf](http://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/Family_Friendly_Briefing_01-17-17_FINAL.pdf)

---

**YOUTH COMMISSION POLICY & BUDGET PRIORITIES**

---

2017-18 & 2018-19

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Priority 1: Resource Youth Organizing and Leadership Amidst Increased Attacks on Our Communities.....pg

Priority 2: Improve Voter Turnout and Civic Engagement through Pre-Registration of 16 and 17 Year Olds.....pg

Priority 3: Adopt a formal definition of family housing and to increase suitable housing availability for families with dependents.....pg

Priority 4: Ensure Full Implementation of the Retail Workers’ Bill of Rights.....pg

Priority 5: Expand Alternatives to Incarceration for 18-25 Year Olds .....pg

Priority 6: Protecting the City’s Parks Against Shadowing.....pg

Priority 7: Prioritize Youth Workforce Development in Mid-Market Community Benefit Agreements .....pg

Priority 8: Improve Services and Supports for Children with Incarcerated Parents and Support Family Unity by Increasing Opportunities for Youth to Visit Their Incarcerated Parent.....pg

Priority 9: Ensure Positive Youth-Police Relations Through Additional Training and a Chief’s Youth Advisory Roundtable.....pg

Priority 10: Highlight the Negative Societal and Economic Impacts of Alcohol Density on Youth and Families by Strengthening Current Regulations Related to Alcohol Density.....pg

Priority 11: Implement Efforts to Track LGBTQIQ Youth in City Services and Fund Cultural Competency Training Efforts.....pg

Priority 12: Fund and complete the Transitional Age Youth Housing Plan Contiguous with a TAY Navigation Center.....pg

Priority 13: Increase Services and Supports for Homeless Youth and Declare 2017 the Year of Recognizing Homeless Unaccompanied Youth in San Francisco.....pg

---

# PRIORITY 1: RESOURCE YOUTH ORGANIZING AND LEADERSHIP AMIDST INCREASED ATTACKS ON OUR COMMUNITIES

---

1-2 short sentence description/summary here

## BACKGROUND

In 2016, the San Francisco Youth Commission celebrated its 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary since its first class was sworn in after voters approved Proposition F creating a Youth Commission in 1995. Also in 2016, we celebrated the election of former San Francisco youth commissioners as the youngest Mayor in Berkeley's history, member of the City College Board of Trustees; and the appointment of still several more youth commission alumni to other posts, including the Student Trustee to the UC Board of Regents and the San Francisco County Juvenile Justice Commission. Finally, in 2016, we also saw the mobilization of hundreds of San Francisco high school students both in the halls of City Hall and the streets of their own neighborhoods in support of an historic effort to lower the local voting age. This was an especially important movement, given the pitch of political disagreement and cynicism that characterized national elections.

The legacy of youth-led efforts like the Free MUNI for youth campaign, Vote16, Solutions not Suspensions, and others is living proof that youth organizing works: both in changing hearts and minds, making lasting impacts in the lives of young people and developing their social justice leadership, and often—in winning real and lasting change.

The election of Donald Trump in November 2016, has led to increased attacks on our many communities, on public education, and on civic life. The hate, bullying, and anti-democratic values that were on display during the 2016 campaign season highlight the urgent need to develop young people's interest and capacity to participate in the ongoing work of building democracy, as well as to enlist them in developing solutions to the many ecological and social challenges they will face in the near future.

In 2017, Youth Commissioners took decisive action against the hate-filled rhetoric and racism that was on display in the President's attempted Muslim ban and roll back of protections for transgender students. They passed a resolution (1617-AL-02) "Resolution responding to the Presidency of Donald Trump and reaffirming San Francisco's Youth's commitment to the values of community, respect and solidarity, and urging the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to support young people's leadership during this critical time." We hosted a Youth Solidarity & Unity Rally with LGBT, Black, immigrant, Arab, and Muslim youth on the steps of City Hall in April.

In March, the Department of Children, Youth & Their Families released their draft Service Allocation Plan to guide its investments over the next five years, beginning in 2018 and ending in 2023. As part of both the original and subsequently reauthorized Children & Youth Fund, 3% of the fund is meant to be dedicated to youth-initiated and youth-led projects. Currently, this investment funds the annual Youth Advocacy Day, Youth Philanthropy (mini-grant-making), and a Youth Organizing Strategy.

Youth Commissioners believe that Youth Organizing is a key youth development practice. Youth organizing engages young people directly impacted by issues to acquire organizing skills, develop an emerging political consciousness, build their knowledge of community issues, and take collective action. Youth organizing builds young people's competencies, their investment in their community, and both individual and collective leadership. It allows young people to see tangible impacts and their own ability to make a difference. Research done with young people taking part in youth organizing efforts showed that students' grades improved and 60% reported that they took more challenging coursework due to their involvement in organizing. Eighty percent of youth reported plans to pursue a college education and half said they expected to obtain a graduate or other degree beyond college.

Furthermore, Youth Commissioners believe now is a particularly critical time to invest in the social justice leadership of young San Franciscans.

### **Why Now? The need to invest in the leadership of young San Franciscans:**

#### **Young San Franciscans need to have a say in shaping the future of a rapidly changing City**

- Gentrification and displacement
- Long time residents that have little say and are vulnerable to displacement

#### **Strong need for a community leadership pipeline to recruit and retain qualified and dedicated leaders**

- Challenges with city-funded CBO's recruiting and retaining qualified and committed leaders

#### **Increasing awareness of need for youth voice on decision-making bodies, but little dedicated support**

- OCOF, OAC, Soda Tax, JJC, JJCC, and other bodies

#### **Low voter turnout among young people and in communities of color**

- Lowest voter turnout in D10, area with most youth and children

#### **Increasing attacks on public education, the environment, and on immigrant, Black, Muslim, and LGBT communities**

- Trump executive orders
- Attacks on immigrant communities
- Resisting divide and conquer tactics, building leadership of those affected, and connecting issues

### **What principles should guide investments in young people's leadership?**

#### **We believe in...**

**The importance of youth organizing for social justice:** Youth organizing allows young people to research a systemic problem in their communities, develop specific asks of decision-makers, create a plan for addressing the problem, and bring people together to take action toward a vision of change. Youth organizing prepares young people to engage in advocacy, analyze community and system-level issues, change power relations, and create lasting change.

**Young people's capacity and right to lead change efforts:** Young people have historically been at the forefront of movements for social change, especially in San Francisco. Young people will be the most impacted by the effects of policy decisions that are made today, and they need to be involved in guiding our way forward. All young people have a right to work to improve the quality of life in their communities. They have ability and right to define the root causes of problems and to hold institutions and decision-makers accountable.

**Leadership by those most affected:** Those closest to the problem are closest to the solutions. The leadership of low-income youth of color and LGBTQ youth is urgently needed. *Traditional civic engagement models such as service-learning and voter engagement may not speak to the lived realities of youth of color. We need to diversify these traditional approaches, as well as invest in civic leadership opportunities—such as organizing—that appeal to low-income youth of color and LGBTQ youth.*

**Solidarity, unity and alliance:** All youth have a stake in social justice and the ability to do meaningful work for social justice, both on those issues that directly impact them, and in alliance with other communities. The issues of most concern to young people—environmental justice, racial justice, LGBTQ issues, and gender equality—are deeply inter-connected.

**Dedicated support for young people's participation.** Young people need and deserve more

than to simply be invited to show up and speak their truth. They deserve support to build the skills and analysis that will allow them to be effective agents for change. This includes political education and advocacy training, mentorship, and wherever possible, compensation for their work advising adults.

**Youth empowerment as youth development and community development:** Young people's discovery of their individual and collective power helps to shift their sense of self, their own agency, their educational motivation and performance, their social relationships, and their expectations for their futures. Young people's involvement in organizing can help improve neighborhoods, schools, and government decision-making and develop a base of trained leaders with long term commitments to community work.

**Developing leadership for the long term:** Young people will be living with the long-term effects of today's policy decisions. They will be charged with solving complex social and environmental problems and need to be building their leadership now. Youth who become involved in organizing plan to remain committed to activism for the long-term.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) **Support for the development of a citywide youth platform outlining issues of importance to young people**
- 2) **Investment in youth organizing**
  - Campaigns: demands and targets, learn structure of school district and local and state government, how decisions are made, allow young people to feel a sense of their own power
- 3) **Skill-building and training opportunities**
- 4) **Convenings where youth can engage across neighborhoods and issues**
  - Building strong and effective organizations requires opportunities for sharing and mutual learning. Through the creation of learning spaces and convenings, funders can promote strategic collaborations and partnerships. Youth organizing groups can connect their work with others across the country, learn from peers working on similar campaign issues, develop collective strategies, and share best practices and tools. As this paper points out, convening spaces provide an avenue to grow and strengthen important networks."
- 5) **Leadership Pipeline:**
  - HS age youth organizing opportunities
  - Mapping on to post-secondary education/training, fellowship, and employment opportunities
  - Scalable tools that allow students to learn organizing skills and analysis and take action in their neighborhoods and on their campuses
  - system of coordinated pathways, which introduces young people to organizing, develops them holistically, and transitions them to further opportunities within the social justice field (consistent with need to get young San Franciscans interested in the field of youth development and community service)."
  - agreements with insituitions/colleges connecting youth people to educational opps; employment opps
  - through deliberate agreements and "stepping stones" provides a clear road map for people to continue leadership development and expression as they age, thereby retaining their leadership and bolstering and sustaining the movement. A leadership pipeline spans the lifetime of an individual and ultimately, as the pipeline is deliberately assembled, has a large scale impact of creating a more socially just society, a vibrant, active and highly-inclusive democracy.
- 6) **Leadership development practices and opportunities integrated across city's investments in youth services**
- 7) **Investment in voter registration and turnout**
- 8) **Support for youth sitting on advisory bodies**

- Need to train a pool of potential applicants
- Mentorship and training
- Training for adult bodies including youth voices, support for youth seats on those bodies. Preparing adults to work in youth-adult partnerships

---

## PRIORITY 2: Improve Voter Turnout and Civic Engagement through Pre-Registration of 16 and 17 Year Olds

---

Urging the investment and recognition of the importance of youth civic participation in San Francisco, as well as supporting the new efforts to increase voter pre-registrations among 16 and 17 year olds by capitalizing on partnerships with the Department of Children, Youth, and their Families and the Department of Elections

### BACKGROUND:

San Francisco is leading the fight against President Trump at a time when our President is threatening our city and our values, and working to take away voting rights. As a way to combat an attack on voting rights, we will work on pre registering 16 and 17 year olds to vote.

“In 2014, Governor Jerry Brown signed Senate Bill 113 by Sen. Hannah-Beth Jackson (D-Santa Barbara) which allowed voter pre-registration beginning at age 16 once the California’s statewide voter registration database, VoteCal, was certified and California became the 21st state to allow pre-registration. VoteCal was certified in September 2016, and pre-registration was initially only offered through paper forms.”<sup>1</sup> Online registration is now available and as of May 2017, San Francisco has pre-registered 510 16 and 17 year olds.<sup>2</sup>

Strong voter turnout and voter engagement is the cornerstone of a healthy democracy. Data shows that there is a strong case that pre registering 16 and 17 year olds in San Francisco will bridge the gap between transitional aged youth and the ballot box and continue to build lifelong voters and strengthen our democracy.<sup>3</sup> During the 2012 election, only 46% of eligible Latino youth, 41% of Asian American/Pacific Islander eligible youth, 59% of white eligible youth, and 54% of African American eligible youth were registered to vote, and those numbers were still far lower during the 2014 mid-term elections. And according to the 2016 Youth Vote Student Survey, of 3,654 SFUSD high school students surveyed, 74.33% of students would either “absolutely” or “most likely” register and vote, if given the chance to do so at 16 or 17.<sup>4</sup> Educating and engaging more young people in the rights and responsibilities of voting is among the best ways to encourage everyone, including and especially young people, to vote. San Francisco is leading the fight against President Trump at a time where our President is threatening our city and our values, and working to take away voting rights. We have an opportunity to continue progress in the field of expansion of Voting Rights by taking advantage of the new state legislation of pre-registration of 16 and 17 year olds.



### RECENT UPDATES:

---

<sup>1</sup><http://www.sos.ca.gov/administration/news-releases-and-advisories/2017-news-releases-and-advisories/16-and-17-year-olds-can-now-pre-register-vote-online/>

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.sfelections.org/tools/election\\_data/](http://www.sfelections.org/tools/election_data/)

<sup>3</sup> Eric Plutzer, “Becoming a Habitual Voter: Inertia, Resources, and Growth,” *The American Political Science Review* 96/1 (March 2002), pp. 41-56.

<sup>4</sup> 2015-16 Youth Vote Student Survey Results. Provided by SFUSD Peer Resources



In May 2016 the Civic Engagement Committee contributed a major Budget and Policy request by asking the Board of Supervisors to invest in voter turnout and the civic and political development of young people by supporting a charter amendment lowering San Francisco's legal voting age to sixteen. At the time it was written the Youth Commission had just hosted the first joint Board of Supervisors and Youth Commission in which hundreds of youth showed up to the full board meeting and gave hours of public comment. This led to a 9-2 vote in favor of the expansion of municipal voting rights toward 16 and 17 year olds, and would allow this issue to be brought toward the voters of San Francisco in the form of a new name Proposition F. Unfortunately, in November 2016 Proposition F lost by just 2.1% at the polls, but Prop F's campaign showed the ability to unite young people and bring them to the table with local politicians and into the realm of San Francisco Politics. Proposition F was almost entirely youth run, and had the second largest group of campaign volunteers in San Francisco, made almost exclusively of Bay Area youth. Six of the Board of Supervisors who served during the 2016 term signed on as co-sponsors, as well as various San Franciscan Political groups: Harvey Milk LGBT Democratic Club, San Francisco Democratic Party (DCCC), Black Young Dems, SF Latino Democratic Club, SF Women's Political Committee, Asian Pacific Democratic Club supporting this campaign as well. All of this was accomplished by youth who believed in the ideal and ideas of the expansion of voting rights toward 16 and 17 year olds. Although this proposition did not pass, we at the Youth Commission feel the need to ride out this momentum through the newly introduced piece of state policy which allows 16 and 17 year olds to preregister to vote. The Youth Commission has also felt the negative effects of Trump being elected president, and now more than ever believe that encouraging youth to participate in any type of voting or elections is extremely critical, and being pre registered to vote at 16 or 17 is a first step into civic engagement.

In the last few months since our 2016-2017 terms began we have worked on focusing the conversation to the importance of pre registration. According to Path to the Polls, a 2016 published report on pre registration in California, allowing pre registration can increase young voter turnout by up to 13 percentage points, and that people who vote at an early age are more likely to stay engaged and vote in later elections.<sup>5</sup> This data encourages us to believe wholeheartedly in the process of pre registration and the importance it has for young people, and to make specific requests from partnering agencies, departments, and organizations to help us achieve our goal of increasing the number of 16 and 17 year olds to pre-register. In February 2017, we met with Department heads of Department of Children Youth and their Families, and they have agreed that for any agency or organization who works with youth and becomes a grantee of DCYF after the request for proposal (RFP) process of 2017 that they will need to offer the option of pre registration to the youth they will work with. Also in February 2017, we have continued a partnership with the Department of Elections and have received a presentation on the current numbers of 16 and 17 year olds pre registered, a training on how to legally and ethically implement voter registration, and have acquired special pre-registration forms that will allow Department of Elections to track how many youth the Youth Commission have preregistered. In late April 2017, we met with the Student Advisory Council asking for feedback to increase voter registration outreach at the district level as well as asking for support in implementing the Board of Education Resolution 162-23A3 -- Encouraging Students to Exercise Their Voting Rights.<sup>6</sup> In early May 2017 we attended a Board of Education Curriculum and

---

<sup>5</sup> Path to the Polls: Preregistering California's Youth to Build a More Participatory Democracy. Alana Miller, Frontier Group Emily Rusch, CALPIRG Education Fund Rosalind Gold and Ofelia Medina, NALEO Educational Fund. September 2016:

<http://calpirgedfund.org/sites/pirg/files/reports/CALPIRG%20NALEO%20-%20Path%20to%20the%20Polls%20-%20Sept%202016.pdf>

<sup>6</sup> San Francisco Unified School District Board of Education Resolution 162-23A3 -- Encouraging Students to Exercise Their Voting Rights adopted April 12, 2016. Retrieved from <http://www.sfusd.edu/en/assets/sfusd-staff/about-SFUSD/files/board-agendas/Agenda4122016-1.pdf>

Program Committee meeting with the Student Advisory Council and we gave a presentation on the work that the Civic Engagement Committee has been doing this year on pre-registration of 16 and 17 year olds, and gave the suggestions on how to move this work forward at the school district level that the Student Advisory Council and the YC had brainstormed at the late April meeting. We will be meeting with individual members of the Curriculum and Program Committee who will help connect us to the staff in the Humanities Department of SFUSD in the hopes that we can start implementing a process in classes to outreach to sophomores and juniors in SFUSD. In mid April 2017 we applied for a Youth Leadership Institute B.L.I.N.G. (Building Leaders in Innovative New Giving) grant for a second time to move forward and fund some of our pre registration work for half of next year and found out in early May 2017 we received the grant!

Another exciting recent update is that the twenty-eighth Assembly District Assemblymember, Evan Low, has introduced Assembly Constitutional Amendment 10 (ACA 10) which would lower the voting age from 18 years-old to 17 years-old in the state of CA. The Civic Engagement Committee has written a resolution urging the Board of Supervisors to write their own resolution in support of state bill ACA-10 and the San Francisco Youth Commission passed [Resolution 1617-AL-05](#) [Resolution Urging the Board of Supervisors to Support Assembly Constitutional Amendment 10, Allowing 17 year Olds to Vote in State Elections] at the Monday, April 17, 2017 meeting, and are proud to support this important effort. Also, we have confirmation that District 8 Supervisor, Jeff Sheehy, will be sponsoring a resolution to have the Board of Supervisors possibly support this state amendment at an upcoming Board meeting and we are pending on hearing back from District 1 Supervisor Sandra Fewer and District 4 Supervisor Katy Tang to be co-sponsors.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

All of the above means close to nothing without your continued support of engaging San Francisco youth in the civic and voting process. We are hoping that you will do everything in your power to assist us in the pre-registration of 16-17 year old youth in the city.

- 1) Urge DCYF to require any 2017 youth serving agency or organization RFP grantee to offer the option of pre registration to the youth they will work with.
- 2) Consider funding a specific grantee of the DCYF 2017 RFP to create a position or campaign specifically aimed at increasing the pre registration of 16 and 17 year olds and voter outreach using peer-to-peer strategies.
- 3) Consider extra funding for a new staff person at the Department of Elections for youth voter outreach.
- 4) Write a resolution in support of the Assembly Constitutional Amendment 10 (ACA 10) which would lower the voting age from 18 years-old to 17 years-old in the state of CA.

**We urge Mayor Lee and the Board of Supervisors to continue to explore ways to increase participation and education of young voters, by supporting the Department of Children, Youth, and their Families RFP youth serving grantees to offer the option to pre-register to vote, continuing the already-successful student engagement programs led by the Department of Elections and to incorporate a newly paid staff member to focus solely on youth registration and voter outreach; by partnering with the school district to support its efforts to register students to vote; exploring opportunities for resourcing peer-led young voter pre-registration and engagement efforts targeting 16 and 17 year old San Franciscans, specifically through the Department of Children, Youth, and their Families, and writing a resolution in support of the ACA-10 which would lower the voting age from 18 years-old to 17 years-old in**

---

the state of CA.

---

# PRIORITY 3: ADOPT A FORMAL DEFINITION OF FAMILY HOUSING AND TO INCREASE SUITABLE HOUSING AVAILABILITY FOR FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENTS.

---

1-2 short sentence description/summary here

## BACKGROUND:

Due to income inequality and the shortage of housing, there is a decrease of families residing in San Francisco. This decrease is not a trivial one; in fact, San Francisco ranks lowest for the percentage of family households with a mere 18% of the twelve largest cities in the nation. Comparatively, the nationwide average is 29.4%. Additionally, San Francisco has the least children of any Bay Area county, which is problematic because children and families are extremely important to cities. The presence of families demands a higher quality of safety and livability, builds a multi-generational community, and brings diverse cultures and perspectives.

Supervisor Norman Yee especially recognizes the importance of families and children and commissioned a report by the Planning Department entitled Housing for Families with Children. This report explains the current challenges that low and middle-income families face and provides several family-friendly housing policies addressing these challenges. The Planning Department recognizes that the two main issues impacting family housing in the City are affordability and unit size. For instance, 91% of all home sale listings in SF were either unaffordable or less than 2 bedrooms, so only 9% is available to families earning the median family income.

The report also calls out a mismatch between people and spaces. Almost all of the homes that are suited for large families are already occupied. In fact, families occupy only 30% of 3+ bedroom units. Meanwhile, 25% of families are living in Single Room Occupancies (SROs). SROs typically lack basic necessities such as full bathrooms and kitchenettes. Overcrowding is a serious issue in San Francisco, especially in neighborhoods such as Chinatown, Visitacion Valley, Downtown/Civic Center, and Oceanview. Chinatown is particularly impacted with 24% of households living in overcrowded conditions and 65% of families living in SROs are in Chinatown.

Research indicates that overcrowded environments may negatively impact children's social adjustment. For instance, there was an increase in children's misbehaviors when living in homes with more than 2.3 residents per room. It is therefore imperative that we adopt legislation that supports the construction of family housing. Family housing is not simply about property rights; it is about human rights.

Cities across the county have formally adopted a definition of family housing into their General Plan. The planning department report provides Emeryville, Seattle, Vancouver, and Portland as good examples. For example, Emeryville included a Family Friendly section in their 2012 Residential Design Guidelines. Their focus is to "attract families into larger units instead of unrelated adults; 15% 3 bdrms, 35% 2 bdrms, maximum 10% studios in all 10+ unit developments."<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Family Friendly Briefing, SF Planning Department, 2017 (accessed on May 12, 2017)  
[http://default.sfplanning.org/publications\\_reports/Family\\_Friendly\\_Briefing\\_01-17-17\\_FINAL.pdf](http://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/Family_Friendly_Briefing_01-17-17_FINAL.pdf)

The inclusionary housing selections process is a useful tool in supporting families in staying in San Francisco. Unfortunately, families with dependents are often competing against single adults and couples with no dependents for the same unit(s).

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

### **1. Adopt a community informed definition of family housing into San Francisco's General Plan**

In order to approach the lack of access to family housing, the Youth Commission firmly believes conversations between families and policymakers must take place. We must deeply explore the challenges to this housing crisis to inform viable solutions. The presentation on March 20, 2017 concerning solutions to the family housing crisis suggested that the City must first adopt a definition of family-friendly housing into its General Plan like Emeryville. To meet this goal, the city should host a series of community located listening sessions to hear from families with children and youth the challenges to obtaining housing, and to solicit community input on a definition of family-friendly housing and desired characteristics.

### **2. Incentivize the Construction of Family Housing**

While building studio and one bedroom units are popular for developers because they yield higher profits and return on investments, these type of units do not meet the need for families. The Youth Commission urges the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to look into ways to incentivize the construction of two or more bed room units in both market rate and affordable housing developments. Consider Emeryville as a model.

### **3. Prioritize Families with Dependents in the Inclusionary Housing Selection Process**

The Youth Commission also urges the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to adopting legislation should reserve affordable/inclusionary units that come online and are 2 or more bedrooms for families with dependents, including children, youth, and seniors.

---

# PRIORITY 4: ENSURE FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RETAIL WORKERS' BILL OF RIGHTS

---

Urging for education, outreach, and enforcement, and technical assistance resources needed to protect formula retail workers in accordance with Formula Retail Employee Rights Ordinances

## BACKGROUND

In 2014, the Board of Supervisors unanimously passed the Retail Workers' Bill of Rights (RWBOR) also known as Formula Retail Employee Rights Ordinances (FRERO) that were primarily sponsored by then-Supervisors David Chiu and Eric Mar. Youth Commissioners held an afterschool hearing on the matter and voted to support the legislation at the time of its introduction.

The Formula Retail Employee Rights Ordinances subsequently took effect in July 2015 and address the fair scheduling needs of some 40,000 San Franciscans who work in formula retail establishments that have over 40 retail establishments worldwide. The ordinances curb unfair scheduling practices by giving workers advance notice of their schedules, compensation for cancelled shifts and hasty schedule changes, and offer part-time workers the right of first refusal on additional hours before employers make additional hires.

Formula retail establishments make up a large share of the early employment experiences of young San Franciscans. As young people and students, we know first-hand the type of unfair and unmanageable scheduling practices that take place in formula retail establishments, making it difficult for young workers to balance school, familial obligations, and other priorities needed to reach their future goals. Furthermore, young people are a particularly vulnerable populations in the labor force due to our lack of previous job experience and unawareness of our rights as workers.

Currently, enforcement and compliance efforts are complaint-driven. The Office of Labor Standards and Enforcement has one compliance officer assigned to FRERO enforcement. That compliance officer also maintains a minimum wage and paid sick leave caseload. The complaint-driven enforcement system is made difficult by the fact that few workers are aware of the new law. According to preliminary results from a Formula Retail Employee Outreach Survey conducted by Chinese Progressive Association, 0% of formula retail workers know their rights under the ordinances. At the time of writing, only 10 investigation requests have been received by OLSE, despite the widespread nature of FRERO non-compliance. City contracted outreach workers report that outreach to retail workers is extraordinarily difficult due to employer policies regarding employees' interaction with people providing outreach and education services on municipal labor laws.

Few managers and employers are aware of their obligations under the ordinance, as decision-makers for formula retail establishments are likely to reside at regional or national offices, local managers may have limited ability to affect change to local scheduling practices, regardless of legal obligations. At this time, the City has not yet supported any specific industry-level implementation efforts. However, industry-level capacity building support is available. The Center for Popular Democracy launched a compliance support program for fair scheduling laws, which partners with scholars to evaluate fair scheduling practices, supports the creation of auditing programs for enforcement agencies, and provides employers with technical assistance to rectify compliance barriers embedded in scheduling software in particular

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The Youth Commission has long been invested in the welfare of young workers and sees FRERO as a next step in bettering the status quo and outcomes for young workers. FRERO has been hailed as one of the most holistic, comprehensive, worker-first labor legislative packages passed in the United States. By ensuring the success of FRERO, San Francisco would lead the way and set a national example for worker rights benefiting vulnerable, low-wage workers. Therefore, we recommend:

- 1) **Board of Supervisors hold a hearing on progress towards the implementation and enforcement of FRERO.**
- 2) **The Department of Children, Youth, and Their Families require its 2018-2023 youth workforce development grantees to educate their participants on municipal labor laws, including the Retail Workers' Bill of Rights.** We would like to thank Dr. Maria Su, for meeting with youth commissioners in February 2016 and committing to engaging the Department's workforce grantees in municipal labor law education efforts.
- 3) **Mayor Lee and the Office of Labor Standards and Enforcement continue to fund community-driven outreach and education efforts specifically regarding FRERO.**
- 4) **Mayor Lee the Office of Labor Standards and Enforcement dedicate staff solely for the enforcement and investigation of FRERO.**

---

# PRIORITY 5: EXPAND ALTERNATIVES TO INCARCERATION FOR 18-25 YEAR OLDS

---

Invest in promising alternatives like the Young Adult Court and explore other means for reducing reliance on incarceration for Transitional Age Youth 18-25 years old

## BACKGROUND

In late 2015, the Board of Supervisors considered, and ultimately rejected, amendments to the 10-year capital plan, authorization of certificates of participation, and acceptance of state monies that would have authorized the construction of a new rehabilitation detention facility to replace the county jails at 850 Bryant. This issue was one that many young people in San Francisco had been mobilized and vocal about for years leading up to the Board of Supervisors' consideration. Due to the high level of interest from young San Franciscans on this issue, the Youth Commission held its own after school hearing, at which dozens of young people who were directly affected by the criminal justice system testified, and youth commissioners ultimately voted to oppose the construction of a new jail.

The Youth Commission's position was based, in part, on a commitment to family unity, and findings that San Francisco had an estimated 17,993 children with a parent incarcerated in 2010; As well as a 2015 survey of parents in our county jails found that 1,200 children had a parent in a San Francisco County jail on any single given day, and that a majority of those incarcerated in our county jails are parents. Youth commissioners also learned that 88% of people detained in our County Jails have not been sentenced and have not gone to trial. However, the Youth Commission's opposition to jail construction was also based in large part on the knowledge that a large number of people in San Francisco's county jails are still youth themselves.

In December 2015, President London Breed introduced a resolution creating a working group to plan for the permanent closure of county jail Nos. 3 and 4. This working group's goal was to develop a plan that will provide effective and humane investments in mental health; identify what new facility or facilities are needed; and seek to maintain San Francisco's eligibility to use State Public Works Board financing for those facilities. As part of this, the working group explored ways of reducing the overall demand for jail space.

## UPDATES

Among the working group's many findings was that 18-25 year olds take up the largest share of "bed days" of any age group in the county jails. Prisoners aged 18-25 occupied 28% of all bed days in our county jails while making up only 12% of San Francisco residents. The working group also found that 18-25 year olds have the longest stays in San Francisco's county jails. According to the Work Group to Re-envision the Jail Replacement Project's recent issue brief, 18-25 year olds accounted for 235,371 bed days per year, out of a total 837,890 bed days. Black youth 18-25 represented the highest number of bed days of any group in the system (135,578) overall. Youth Commissioners contend that finding alternatives to incarceration for transitional age youth is an integral part of reducing the overall demand for jail space.

In contrast to our City's high rate of incarcerating its young adults ages 18-25, the Juvenile Probation Department has met success in its efforts to find alternatives to incarceration for youth under age 18. Over the last several years, the Juvenile Probation Department has overseen a dramatic reduction in the number of juveniles held in out-of-home detention. The population at Juvenile Hall in January 2017 was 36 youth, compared to over 80 youth in 2013. The Juvenile Probation Department has employed many innovative means to reach these goals, including stream-lining risk assessment procedures, using a community assessment and



referral center, and working with a collaborative re-entry team to reduce recidivism.

San Francisco's Young Adult Court was established in summer 2015 as a partnership between the Superior Court, the District Attorney, the Public Defender, Department of Public Health, Adult Probation, the Department of Children, Youth and Their Families, the Police Department, and Family Service Agency. The court serves 18-25 year olds facing felony charges and engages them in a high-touch intensive case-planning approach as an alternative to jail time. The court is now successfully graduating its second cohort of 60-80 young people. However, the court has had to twice shut its doors to new referrals due to reaching its capacity. The San Francisco Veterans Justice Court represents another example of a collaborative approach to addressing the needs of particular populations in the adult criminal justice system and reducing reliance on incarceration.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) ***Hold a hearing to discuss alternatives to incarceration for 18-25 years olds in San Francisco's county jail.*** This hearing can explore promising approaches currently in use in the Young Adult Court; existing barriers to young adults' successful enrollment in or graduation from the Young Adult Court; insights learned from the Juvenile Probation Departments' successful efforts to develop alternatives to out-of-home detention for youth; and approaches being used by other states and counties to better address the needs of 18-25 year olds involved in the criminal justice system.
- 2) ***Explore opportunities to expand the capacity of the Young Adult Court.*** We ask that all eligible and willing justice-system involved young of people in San Francisco be given the opportunity to have access to the Young Adults Court. We believe this can help to reduce recidivism, as well as the population of transitional age youth in San Francisco's county jails.
- 3) ***Address the lack of developmentally appropriate, TAY-specific inpatient substance abuse and mental health treatment options.*** This will ensure that TAY affected by addiction and/or mental illness have necessary exits from the criminal justice system. This recommendation builds on similar recommendations made by youth commissioners since 2014-15.

---

# PRIORITY 6: Protecting San Francisco's Parks Against Shadowing

---

1-2 sentence description here

## BACKGROUND:

Proposition K (1984) or also known as the Sunlight Ordinance is the process to implement Section 295 of the Planning Code. Section 295 of the Planning Code mandates that new structures above 40 feet in height that would cast additional shadows on properties under the jurisdiction of, or designated to be acquired by the Recreation and Parks Department can only be approved by the Planning Commission if the shadow is determined to be insignificant.

The San Francisco Recreation and Park Department's Mission is to provide enriching recreational activities, maintain beautiful parks and preserve the environment for the well-being of our diverse community.

In recent years, the Youth Commission has worked on ensuring equitable access to neighborhood parks through recommending a recreation and open space equity analysis. Ensuring our young people are receiving the full benefits of our public parks and open spaces, including adequate sunlight in all parks, is paramount. Supervisor Kim is quoted in a SFGate article saying, "Forty-two minutes in the summer is of significance if you are a dog owner or you are a youth wanting to enjoy extra minutes on the basketball court under the sun." The Children's Outdoor Bill of Rights, adopted by the Board of Supervisors and the Recreation and Parks Commission, states that all children should "explore the wild places of the city", and "visit and care for a local park"<sup>8</sup>. While these are worthwhile goals, our young people cannot receive the full benefits of our parks if large buildings cast a shadow and block direct access to sunlight.

Concerns of sunlight access are especially true for the Chinatown community. The commitment to Chinatown recreation is not enough to appease those who have fought to keep shadows out of city parks. Bill Maher, a former supervisor and former director of the Department of Parking and Traffic who wrote Prop. K, said trading shadows for dollars is "flatly illegal." Prop. K's shadow-limiting powers are clear, he said.

## RECOMMENDATIONS:

### 1. Hearing on the use of the Sunlight Ordinance

The Youth Commission urges the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to call a hearing looking into the Planning Department's implementation of the Sunlight Ordinance, Section 295 of the Planning Code.

---

<sup>8</sup> <http://www.sfusdsceince.org/sfcobr.html>

---

# **PRIORITY 7: PRIORITIZE YOUTH WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT IN MID-MARKET COMMUNITY BENEFIT AGREEMENTS**

---

Urging for inclusion of youth in community benefit agreement negotiations, the prioritization of youth workforce opportunities in the 2018 Mid-Market Community Benefit District negotiations, and investment in expanding opportunities for youth in the broader tech sector

## **BACKGROUND**

The Youth Commission has always championed youth voice. The creation of the body itself was an act in favor of youth involvement in politics, and its continued existence – and success – is testament to the power of youth to spearhead change. Charter SEC 4.124.c of the calls on the Youth Commission to “elicit mutual cooperation of private groups (such as fraternal orders, service clubs, associations, churches, businesses, and youth organizations) and city-wide neighborhood planning collaborative efforts for children, youth and families.” In accordance with this duty, the Youth Commission is represented on the Our Children, Our Families Council and the Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council and has consistently – and successfully--recommended youth seats on relevant councils and oversight bodies.

Last year, our predecessors researched Community Benefit Agreements, a binding contract any company residing in the Central Market Street and Tenderloin Area whose annual payroll expense exceeds one million dollars can enter into with the City Administrator, in order to receive an exclusion from the 1.5% payroll tax. Community Benefit Agreements may include commitments to engage in community activities and participate in workforce development opportunities in the Central Market Street and Tenderloin Area. They are drawn up by the companies, in conjunction with the Citizen’s Advisory Committee for the Central Market & Tenderloin Area. Currently, there are six companies engaged in CBAs: Twitter, Zendesk, Spotify, Zoosk, Yammer, and One Kings Lane. Last year’s Economic Justice and Immigration committee of 2015-201 recommended that one youth seat be added to the Citizen’s Advisory Committee.

In order to determine how the Mid-Market companies could further benefit their community, and especially youth, youth commissioners co-hosted a 2015 town hall with District 6 youth alongside the Mid-Market companies. Multiple needs and asks were brought up by the youth, such as affordable housing for transitional aged youth, but none were expressed as passionately as the young people’s desire for paid internships and entry level job opportunities at tech companies.

This year, youth commissioners met with youth workforce development agencies, the Mayor’s office, and city departments to discuss this priority. We believe that young people deserve to take part in the economic benefits of the tech boom. We also believe that young San Franciscans have a great deal to bring to this sector and that companies have a great deal to gain by making concerted efforts to develop pathways for hiring young local residents. We were inspired by the contributions of Salesforce and LinkedIn to create youth internships and participate in Mayor Lee’s Youth Jobs+ initiative. We believe that these demonstrations of forward-thinking approaches in this area provide a compelling example that it is possible to support young San Franciscans’ entry into the tech sector. Furthermore, we believe this should be a priority for the City and companies alike, in the 2018 Community Benefit Agreements.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

In light of the youth commission's consistent dedication to this issue and the increasing pace of gentrification in our city, the Youth Commission recommends:

- 1) Include at least one youth seat on the Citizen's Advisory Committees approving Community Benefit Districts and Community Benefit Agreements, in general, and the Mid-Market CAC in particular.
- 2) Prioritize provisions for local entry-level hiring of youth and/or skilled internship slots for high school students and disconnected TAY in the 2018 community benefit agreements for mid-market companies.

---

# PRIORITY 8: IMPROVE SERVICES AND SUPPORTS FOR CHILDREN WITH INCARCERATED PARENTS AND SUPPORT FAMILY UNITY BY INCREASING OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH TO VISIT THEIR INCARCERATED PARENT

---

Urging support of families with incarcerated parents by supporting implementation of time-of-arrest protocols; supporting family-friendly visiting policies; and assisting the school district's commitment to supporting students with incarcerated parents

## BACKGROUND

Over half of all U.S. prisoners in 2007 were parents of one or more children under the age of 18.<sup>9</sup> According to the Center for Youth Wellness, incarceration is one of the most adverse of childhood experiences and a DCYF Community Needs Assessment found that 17,993 children and youth were estimated to have had a parent who spent time in either county jail or state prison in 2010.<sup>10</sup> As this number does not include youth and children who had a parent that was incarcerated at any time during their childhood, and does not include transitional age youth, parental incarceration may affect an even greater number of San Francisco's young people.

Although there is no city or state department responsible for collecting data on youth and children with incarcerated parents (CIP), a recent survey of people in San Francisco county jails found that 536 (59%) reported being a parent or primary caregiver to a total of 1,110 children aged 25 years or younger. This report also states "...it can be conservatively estimated that, on any given day, there are more than 3,000 children aged 25 years or younger with parents in Alameda or San Francisco County jails,"<sup>11</sup> because there were a fair number of individuals not surveyed due to not being present in the housing units at time of the survey due to court appearances, medical appointments, and lawyer visits.

## UPDATES

### Time of Arrest

---

<sup>9</sup> Justice Strategies; "Children on the Outside: Voicing the Pain and Human Costs of Parental Incarceration," January 2011

<sup>10</sup> San Francisco Department of Children, Youth, and Their Families (DCYF). "Community Needs Assessment," published May 2011, Page 101.

<sup>11</sup> Kramer, K. and the Children of Incarcerated Parents Jail Survey Teams. *Descriptive Overview of Parents, Children and Incarceration in Alameda and San Francisco County Jails*. Alameda County Children of Incarcerated Parents Partnership & San Francisco Children of Incarcerated Parents Partnership. Zellerbach Family Foundation, (March 2016).

**43% of youth witnessed their parent's arrest**

**HALF of those youth (51%) reported witnessing violence or abuse by a police officer against their parent when they were arrested**

Courtesy of Project WHAT "We're Here and Talking," January 2016

In May 2014, the Police Commission passed new protocols<sup>12</sup> for supporting children at the time of their parents' arrest. The Police Department committed to establishing a roll call training on the new protocols for its officers. The video training includes real-life arrest scenarios involving parents and children and includes the voices of youth who were present at the time of their parent's arrest.

In January 2015, youth commissioners passed a resolution (1415-RC-02) commending SPFD and the Office of Citizen Complaints and their community partners on the establishment of DGO 7.04 officer training video.<sup>13</sup>

In 2016, the police department began including a new question in its incident reports, wherein officers ask people being arrested if they are responsible for a child under the age of 18. 'Yes' answers prompt the officer to confirm they complied with the provisions of the general order which require cuffing parents outside the presence of children when possible; reassuring the child they will be cared for; arranging for the child to be picked up by another adult whose background is verified with FCS; and arranging with school resource officers or school sites for children to be picked up from and cared for after school. In 2017, youth commissioners attended the Police Academy to view new recruit's training in DGO 7.04.

In 2016, two other arresting agencies are in the process of adopting or implementing similar protocols. The District Attorney's office has provided in-person training to DA Investigators on supporting children during a parent's arrest. The Sheriff's department is implementing protocols for deputies with arresting duties.

## **Visitation Policies**

The transfer of incarcerated people from state to county supervision due to realignment means we now have the opportunity to improve visiting policies that help children to maintain strong bonds with their parents during incarceration, and to set an example for the rest of the state.

Visitation and contact are major mediating factors in the adverse effect of parental incarceration.<sup>14</sup> Strict administrative and steep financial barriers to parental visitation, as well as the cost of phone calls, were among the top issues and concerns voiced by youth with incarcerated parents, formerly incarcerated people, and service providers during a youth participatory action research effort undertaken by San Francisco Project WHAT, a leadership program for CIP, in 2013-2015.<sup>15</sup>

In March 2015, youth commissioners, working in partnership with Project WHAT, passed a resolution (1415-AL-08) urging for the promotion of family unity for youth with incarcerated parents by lowering the visiting age in county jails to age 16 and urging the establishment of an

---

<sup>12</sup> SFPD Department General Order 7.04 "Children of Arrested Parents," Available at: <http://sf-police.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=27381>

<sup>13</sup> Youth Commission Resolution of Commendation 1415-RC-02:

<http://www.sfbos.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=51212>

<sup>14</sup> Joseph Murray, David P. Farrington; "Effects of Parental Imprisonment on Child Antisocial Behavior and Mental Health: A Systemic Review"; September 2009

<sup>15</sup> Project What 2016. *We're Here and Talking: Project What's Research Findings and Policy Recommendations Concerning Children of Incarcerated Parents in San Francisco*. San Francisco, CA

online inmate locator tool.<sup>16</sup> In March 2015, the visiting policy was amended by then-Sheriff Mirkarimi and a RFP was issued for the creation of an online inmate locator.

Youth Commissioners met with Sheriff Vicki Hennessy in April 2016, and were pleased that Sheriff Hennessy expressed commitment to implementing the 16 and 17 year old visiting policy; working with the youth commission to outreach for the new policy; and evaluating whether the current application process for the visiting program presents any barriers for young people wishing to visit their parents and guardians.

In 2017, only one young person had officially enrolled in the 16-17 year old minor visitation program. Youth commissioners met with both school board member, Matt Haney, and Sheriff Hennessy and confirmed their willingness to in participate in a working group aiming to coordinate efforts to support interested and qualified young people's enrollment in the Minor Visitation Program. The working group will coordinate young people's access to the identification and/or verification needed to substantiate their relationship to their incarcerated loved one; Align efforts to inform both young people and incarcerated parents about the minor visitation program, and to as well as to assist them in their

## As a result of a parent's incarceration...



Courtesy of Project WHAT "We're Here and Talking," January 2016

successful enrollment; Explore other opportunities for supporting youth maintaining contact with their incarcerated parents through in-person visitation; and make recommendations that would streamline young people's access to the Minor Visitation Program.

### School District Support

In March 2016, the SFUSD Board of Education unanimously passed a resolution "In Support of Staff Training, Curriculum and Services to Meet the Needs of SFUSD Students with Incarcerated Parents" introduced by Commissioners Matt Haney and Shamann Walton. The resolution commits to continued training for school counselors, social workers, nurses, wellness center staff, and school resource officers on an annual basis. It also commits the district to integrating awareness of the impacts of incarceration into curricula and school libraries; pursuing specific programming and services for students with incarcerated parents; assigning a district staff liaison to work with One Family, the organization providing parenting education and child visitation in San Francisco county jails, to allow for parent-teacher conferences in the jails and to

<sup>16</sup> Youth Commission resolution 1415-AL-08:

<http://www.sfbos.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=51714>

support students in establishing visitation; and adding information about parental incarceration to student surveys.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **1. Ensure regular evaluations of the Police Department's use of time-of-arrest protocols set forth in DGO 7.04.**

The Youth Commission commends the police department for developing a model policy for supporting children at the time of a parent's arrest. The Youth Commission also commends the Police department for developing a model training video that highlights the voices of impacted young people. The Youth Commission also urges the Mayor and Board to urge the Police Commission to commit to regular reviews of the time-of-arrest protocols, including reviewing the use of the new incident report question and compliance with the protocols.

### **2. Continue, advertise, and evaluate family-positive visiting policies.**

The Youth Commission commends Sheriff Hennessy's commitment to ensuring youth with parents incarcerated in San Francisco county jails have the right to in-person visits with their parents and guardians. We look forward to working with the Sheriff and the school district to ensure that both parents and teenagers are aware of the new 16- and 17-year-old visiting policy, and toward an application and enrollment process that is accessible and youth-friendly.

### **3. Assist the school district's efforts to support students with incarcerated parents by establishing a family-focused school-district liaison role inside the jails.**

Finally, youth commissioners commend the San Francisco Unified School District for undertaking a comprehensive approach to supporting students with incarcerated parents. The Youth Commission urges Mayor Lee and the Board of Supervisors to commit resources to establishing a staff role inside the county jails to provide family-focused support, liaison with school districts, and coordinate services with the Sheriff and parents inside.



---

## **PRIORITY 9: ENSURE POSITIVE YOUTH-POLICE RELATIONS THROUGH ADDITIONAL TRAINING AND A CHIEF'S YOUTH ADVISORY ROUNDTABLE**

---

Supporting the Police Department in its commitment to provide its officers comprehensive training on interacting with youth that is skill-based, scenario-based, and focused on de-escalation and regularly review issues impacting youth-police relations through a new quarterly roundtable.

### **BACKGROUND**

Since 2014, we have seen increased national attention on the issues of racial profiling, police-community relations, and youth-police relations with the death of Michael Brown in Ferguson, MO, and other officer-involved shootings in San Francisco and throughout the country. More than once, SFUSD students from multiple high school campuses have walked out to protest the death of Mario Woods, Alex Nieto, and others. What was made clear through these discussions in San Francisco and beyond is that tensions between community members and police departments across the country are strained to the breaking point and are in dire need of dedicated efforts to enhance mutual understanding, trust, transparency, and accountability. When we talk about trust between police and members of the community, it is our contention that young people should be at the center of the discussion.

For much of its 17 year history, the Youth Commission has focused its attention on the arena of youth-police interactions--from sponsoring two city-wide hearings in June of 2000 regarding the later-adopted state Constitutional Amendment and statute on Juvenile Crime known as Proposition 21; to putting on a town hall in December 2002 that drew over 200 youth, many of whom spoke about their experiences with police in schools; to working with the Police Department (SFPD) and the Department of Police Accountability staff to develop revisions adopted by the Police Commission in September 2008 to the SFPD's protocol on youth detention, arrest, and interrogation codified in Department General Order (DGO) 7.01; to holding the first ever joint Youth and Police Commission meeting on March 7, 2012 where over 70 young speakers shared their testimony.

Gathering all of the input and research provided, Youth Commissioners released a set of recommendations on improving youth-police relations in 2012. These recommendations included: 1) providing new targeted training for all police officers that addresses topics and policing tactics unique to juveniles; 2) ensuring widespread and regular distribution of SFPD "Juvenile Know Your Rights" pamphlets through all City agencies, the school district, and social media; and 3) establishing an active Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between SFPD and SFUSD.

There have been a number of strides towards the ends of improving youth-police relations in San Francisco. The Police Commission and SFUSD Board of Education mutually passed a memorandum of understanding (MOU) in 2014 outlining the role of police on school campuses. The MOU is one of the strongest of its type in the nation, and provides clear guidelines to assist SFUSD administrators in distinguishing between school discipline and criminal issues that may warrant a call to the police. The MOU also clearly defines when and how arrests should be made on school campuses and outlines several of the key provisions of DGO 7.01, the juvenile policing code, in the context of school campuses. The passage in the MOU has resulted in a

dramatic decline in the number of on-campus arrests.

Alongside these gains, youth commissioners continued to advocate for comprehensive police training on youth-police interactions that focuses on adolescent development and de-escalation, and is consistent with how police officers are trained (i.e. is skill-based and scenario-based), which remains an important outstanding need in avoiding unnecessary escalations between police and youth, and is a strong priority for the San Francisco Youth Commission. Such training has already been implemented successfully in other police departments, including Sacramento, Portland, Oregon and with school resource officers in San Diego.

## RECENT UPDATES

In 2016-17, there were several changes impacting the San Francisco Police Department. First, both the Department of Justice and Blue Ribbon Panel released series of recommendations for improving community and police relations. The Task Force for 21<sup>st</sup> Century Policing also released a landmark report, focusing several of its recommendations on juvenile policing.

The Police Department revised its Use of Force policy in December 2016. Youth commissioners visited several police commission meetings to encourage the development of systems and processes to ensure transparency and a clear timeline for implementing the policy, and auditing adherence. The new Use of Force policy prioritizes, among other things, rapport building, communication, crisis intervention, and de-escalation tactics. Importantly, the new policy also prohibits officers from firing at moving vehicles, a change which is especially important to youth, following the death of 17 year old San Franciscan, Sheila Detoy, in 1998. In addition to these changes, we are looking forward to continuing to work with the police department to increase awareness and training on youth issues.

As Police Commissioners and Mayor Lee undertook the grueling task of selecting a new Chief of Police, youth commissioners shared recommendations that the incoming Chief commit to working closely on youth issues [Date, Memo #]. We were truly pleased with the appointment of Chief William Scott, as we were to have had the opportunity to meet with Chief Scott in person in April 2017. During our meeting, Chief Scott committed to following through on our recommendation to establish a Chief's Youth Advisory Roundtable. He subsequently assigned a Deputy Chief and other senior staff to work with us on the initiative. Chief Scott also indicated his interest in implementing a training on youth issues in accordance with the Youth Commission's long-standing recommendations. Commander of Youth and Community Engagement, Commander Lazar, confirmed that [#] SFPD School Resource Officers sat in on Strategies for Youth's "Policing the Teen Brain" training with a [nearby] police department on [date]. In May 2017, he also confirmed that the department was exploring a way forward for a wider implementation of the Policing the Teen Brain training.

Youth Commissioners are looking forward to working with the department to establish a training for new recruits, sergeants, and patrol officers that includes:

1. De-escalation skills and strategies for asserting authority effectively with youth.
2. Scenarios of real life police-youth interactions and include youth in training components.
3. Opportunities for officers to practice and apply their skills.
4. Address the issue of racial profiling and disproportionate police contact with youth of color.
5. Offer practical communication skills and best practices for working with youth that are grounded in developmental psychology. Topics that should be included are: adolescent

- cognitive development, mental health issues among youth, and recognizing and interacting with traumatized youth.
6. Focus on policing tactics unique to juveniles, and offer a comprehensive overview of the department's policies surrounding juvenile policing outlined in the Department General Order 7.01.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. **Train both new and advanced officers on effectively interacting with youth.**

The Youth Commission is looking forward to working with Chief Scott on the implementation of the seven youth-focused police training recommendations as outline above. This effort has been a long time in the making and we believe now is a critical time to make this change. We thank Chief Scott and his team for their proactive and swift approach to addressing this need.

2. **Establish a quarterly Chief's Youth Advisory Roundtable to discuss youth-relations**

Youth Commissioners would like to thank Chief Scott, Deputy Chief Redmond, and Commander Lazar for their swift follow through on this recommendation. We look forward to working with them to begin roundtable meetings early in the 2017-18 school year.

---

# PRIORITY 10: REDUCE THE NEGATIVE SOCIETAL AND ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF ALCOHOL DENSITY ON YOUTH AND FAMILIES BY STRENGTHENING CURRENT REGULATIONS RELATED TO ALCOHOL DENSITY

---

Urging to reduce the alcohol-related impacts on the youth and families of San Francisco by requiring equity analyses on all alcohol policies developed; supporting the Budget Legislative Analyst Report on the Economic and Administrative Costs Related to Alcohol Abuse in the City and County of San Francisco by moving it to a public hearing; and by partnering with the San Francisco Prevention Coalition to develop an alcohol regulatory framework for the City and County of San Francisco.

## BACKGROUND:

According to the averages done by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), from 2006 to 2010, 503 underage youth die annually from alcohol related causes in California and excessive alcohol consumption. Excessive alcohol consumption by California youth leads to 30,236 years of potential life lost each year. Youth violence related to drinking costs California \$3.5 billion and results in 216 deaths annually and youth traffic crashes related to drinking costs \$1.2 billion and results in 148 deaths annually. The total cost to California of underage drinking is estimated at over \$6.7 billion annually. In 2012, 5192 youth aged 12 to 20 years were admitted for alcohol treatment in California. Estimates conclude that the City and County of San Francisco bears the cost of \$17.1 million annually for alcohol-related emergency medical transport, medical care of people with alcohol-related illnesses, alcohol abuse treatment and prevention, and disability and death due to alcohol use.

In San Francisco, alcohol use ranks among the leading causes of premature mortality. The San Francisco Department of Public Health considers alcohol a major public health problem. Census tracts show that neighborhoods such as Bernal Heights, Chinatown, Hayes Valley, Japantown, Nob Hill, North Beach, Potrero Hill, South of Market, the Tenderloin, and the Western Addition have a disproportionate share of alcohol sales outlets relative to their population size. These areas tend to have a higher density of violent crime as well as a higher proportion of residents with incomes below the poverty threshold. Young people who begin drinking before age 15 are four times more likely to develop alcohol dependence and are two and a half times more likely to become abusers of alcohol than those who begin drinking at age 21. According to the California Department of Alcohol Beverage Control as of January 8, 2016, there are 3,809 retail businesses selling alcohol in San Francisco's 46.9 square miles, making San Francisco the most alcohol retail-dense county in California. Recent studies using advanced analytical methods by Toomey and colleagues (2007) show that a higher density of alcohol outlets is related to increased rates of crime, particularly homicides and assaults. Treno and colleagues (2003) evaluated the effect of alcohol outlet density on driving after drinking among 15- to 20-year-olds, finding that higher alcohol outlet density is associated with greater prevalence of drunk driving. Preliminary findings from recent studies conducted by the University of California San Francisco (UCSF) at San Francisco General Hospital (SFGH) Trauma Center demonstrate that approximately 8% percent of alcohol-related trauma cases die from their injuries. Of a sample of 300 moderate-to-severe traumas, 59% occurred in patients with blood alcohol levels of .08 and above. The study found that patients with a positive blood alcohol level experienced more severe traumas, and therefore faced a greater risk of death. Analysis revealed that the highest rates of alcohol-related injuries treated at the Trauma Center occurred in San Francisco census

tracts with a high density of alcohol outlets.

States, cities, and counties have the power to place a legal limit on the number of alcohol establishments in a neighborhood, city, or county as a strategy to reduce alcohol consumption, alcohol-related health issues, and safety problems among the general population. The SF Prevention Coalition began in the fall of 2010 with support from the SF DPH/Behavioral Health Services to organize prevention providers and youth they work with to address citywide youth alcohol and substance use issues with a focus on changing community conditions and norms that impact use. Since we began this coalition, youth leaders and adults have been at the table together, learning about the issues, setting priorities, and doing the work. In our first year, we looked closely at storefront alcohol advertising and promotion, gathering data to determine that many corner stores and liquor stores were violating state law around alcohol ads. Our vision is a city where SF's neighborhoods, communities and families foster healthy lifestyles and promote healthy choices through strong policies and norms that limit access and exposure to alcohol and other drugs.

The San Francisco Prevention Coalition, which is made of several youth serving agencies including Asian American Recovery Services, Center for Open Recovery Community Youth Center, Horizons Unlimited, Japanese Community Youth Council, South of Market Action Network, Vietnamese Youth Development Center, OMIE Beacon, and Youth Leadership Institute, identify alcohol density as a critical health equity issue impacting youth and communities of color across San Francisco. The San Francisco Prevention Coalition and a broad range of partners including the San Francisco Alcohol Policy Partnership Working Group, San Francisco Friday Night Live are working to ensure data and evidence analysis of alcohol density impacts in San Francisco are led by experts in alcohol prevention from SFPD, UCSF, and SFDPH.

#### **RECENT UPDATES:**

Over the course of the last five years, multiple stakeholders have come together to ensure the impacts of alcohol density are addressed through multiple policy advocacy efforts. In 2015, the San Francisco Prevention Coalition and partners passed a unanimous resolution by the Board of Supervisors which urges the California State Legislature and Governor to pass Assembly Bill 1554 and Senate Bill 819 that will ban the sale and distribution of powdered alcohol in California. This deadly product would have devastating impacts to an already saturated community. Youth leaders ages 12 - 24 provided powerful testimony regarding the potential impacts of substances like powdered alcohol.

Additionally, the San Francisco Prevention Coalition led efforts on a resolution focused on Non Traditional Alcohol Retail License applications from Starbucks and Taco Bell Cantina. This resolution was introduced on January 26, 2016, and it urges the California Department of Alcohol Beverage Control to deny alcohol license applications of Formula Retail food and drink establishments who do not traditionally sell alcohol in San Francisco. In a city that has over 5000 places to access alcohol, we knew that fast food establishments applying for alcohol licenses could have a domino effect across San Francisco. Key stakeholders engaged in partnership with the Prevention Coalition include the San Francisco Health Improvement Partnerships Alcohol Policy Working Group's Steering Committee, San Francisco Police Department's Alcohol Liaison Unit, UCSF, and Department of Public Health's Population Health Division, which has impacted our work positively.

Most recently, the Prevention Coalition and stakeholders worked with Supervisor Mar to request a Budget Legislative Analyst Report that would focus on the City and County of San Francisco, informed by state and national community-focused approaches to calculating Alcohol-related harm costs and applying regulatory solutions to address those costs. The report highlights the costs are broadly construed, including not only the cost to

individuals or aggregated individuals, but costs to society and city services. There are both a direct and indirect costs associated with alcohol, all which should be considered. We requested that harms associated with the health and safety of children and families in SF be included in the overall framework. We know that alcohol-related harms to children and young people are especially costly.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Addressing the issue outlined above requires support for the Board of Supervisors to protect the health of San Francisco youth. We are hoping the City and County of San Francisco will reduce and ultimately eliminate the negative societal and economic impacts of alcohol density on youth and families in San Francisco by.

1. Understanding the impacts of alcohol density on Transitional Age Youth.
2. Requiring an equity analyses as it relates to all alcohol policies developed.
3. Moving the Budget Legislative Analyst Report on the Economic and Administrative Costs Related to Alcohol Abuse in the City and County of San Francisco to a public hearing.
4. Partnering with the San Francisco Prevention Coalition, which is made of several youth serving agencies including Asian American Recovery Services, Center for Open Recovery, Community Youth Center, Horizons Unlimited, Japanese Community Youth Council, South of Market Action Network, Vietnamese Youth Development Center, and Youth Leadership Institute, Alcohol Policy Steering Committee, and DPH leaders to develop an alcohol regulatory framework to reduce the impact of alcohol density.

**We urge Mayor Lee and the Board of Supervisors to continue to explore ways to reduce the negative societal and economic impacts of alcohol density on youth and their families in San Francisco by being informed on the impacts of alcohol density on Transitional Aged Youth; requiring equity analyses on all alcohol policies developed; supporting the Budget Legislative Analyst Report on the Economic and Administrative Costs Related to Alcohol Abuse in the City and County of San Francisco by moving it to a public hearing; and by partnering with the San Francisco Prevention Coalition to develop an alcohol regulatory framework for the City and County of San Francisco.**

---

# **PRIORITY 11: Implement Efforts to Track LGBTQIQ Youth in City Services and Fund Cultural Competency Training Efforts**

---

Urging for dedicated support to ensure that youth-serving City Departments are undertaking efforts to identify the needs of LGBTQIQ youth, use inclusive intakes, assume best practices, and train staff in accordance with section 12(N) of the admin code

## **BACKGROUND**

Adopted in June of 1999, Chapter 12N of the San Francisco Administrative Code—entitled *Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, and Questioning Youth: Youth Services Sensitivity Training*—mandates training with very specific criteria regarding Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Questioning (LGBTQIQ) youth sensitivity of all City employees who work with youth and all City contractors who receive \$50,000 or more in City (or City-administered) funds.

For the past eighteen years, this well-intentioned mandate that was designed to help queer youth access culturally competent services has been an unfunded mandate. In 2012, the Department of Public Health (DPH), the Human Rights Commission (HRC), and the Youth Commission prepared a pilot training tool being used by DPH. However, there are few resources to support other departments in developing relevant staff trainings, developing capacity to make appropriate referrals for LGBTQIQ youth, or identifying administrative barriers that keep queer and trans youth from equally accessing their services. Notably, most city departments and contractors do not currently collect information regarding the sexual orientation or gender identity of youth they serve. As a result, there are few means of determining how and whether queer and trans youth are accessing services, let alone determining what outcomes they experience.

Fifteen years after the passage of 12N, San Francisco's LGBTQIQ youth are still very in need of excellent services. Nationally, 20-40% of homeless youth identify as LGBTQIQ.[1] LGBTQIQ youth in San Francisco are harassed more than their heterosexual peers. There is a lack of research on how suicide risk affects transgender youth, but one study among adults and young adults found that 30.1 percent of transgender individuals surveyed reported having ever attempted suicide; this is 6-7 times higher than the general young adult population.[2] SFUSD middle schoolers reported they heard more than a 10% increase in homophobic slurs between 2013 to 2015. [3] Additionally, more than half of students that identify as LGB reported increased harassment due to homophobia. These youth also experience a higher risk of attempted suicide and this risk is highest in transgender students. [3] LGBT youth represent a disproportionate amount of homeless youth in the SF area. [3]

In June 2013, Supervisor Avalos, along with co-sponsoring Supervisors Campos and Wiener, sponsored a hearing in Neighborhood Services and Safety regarding various city departments' efforts to implement 12N. DPH, HRC, Department of Children Youth and their Families (DCYF), Department of Human Resources (DHR), Juvenile Probation Department (JPD), and Human Services Agency (HSA) were all in attendance. Several departments had initiated notable efforts to create supportive environments for LGBTQIQ youth. However, no departments had means of tracking service outcomes for LGBTQIQ youth. Save for DPH's pilot training, none of these efforts were specifically aligned with the scope of the ordinance. Since this hearing, DCYF has begun offering some LGBTQ competency workshops through the

technical assistance & professional development opportunities it offers grantees.

This hearing made clear both the willingness and enthusiasm of the City family to address the needs of LGBTQIQ youth, as well as the need for a well-supported implementation plan for the ordinance. In January 2014, Youth Commissioners, Supervisor Avalos' office, and staff from the Human Rights Commission, DPH, and DCYF teamed up to begin hosting working group meetings with members of key youth-serving city departments. To date, staff from the JPD, DCYF, DPH, HSA,, Recreation and Parks Department (RPD), San Francisco Public Library (SFPL), the Human Rights Commission, TAY SF, the Youth Commission, and Supervisor Avalos' office have participated in these meetings to discuss their respective efforts to implement best practices for serving LGBTQIQ youth as well as to share insights about what types of competency trainings would be most supportive of staff in their departments.

Several departments submitted questionnaires detailing the nature, scope, and setting of youth services they provide, including providing key insights regarding gender-segregated, residential, detention, and contracted services. These insights will be critical in ensuring that efforts to implement the ordinance are carried out in ways that substantively impacts the lives of LGBTQIQ youth. We commend all participating departments for their effort and look forward to our continued work together.

In January 2015, youth commissioners passed a resolution (1415-RC-01) commending the Department of Public Health for its leadership in implementing a training on Chapter 12N of the city's administrative code, and recognizing the department's commitment to providing excellent services to LGBTQIQ youth.

## **UPDATES**

In October 2015, Assemblymember David Chiu's legislation AB 959 "Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Disparities Reduction Act" was passed. The bill requires four state departments in the course of collecting demographic data, to collect voluntary self-identification information pertaining to sexual orientation and gender identity. The bill pertains to the State Department of Health Care Services, the State Department of Public Health, the State Department of Social Services, and the State Department of Aging.

In April 2016, Supervisor Wiener introduced a similar local ordinance (File No. 160362) that would require city departments and contractors that provide health care and social services to seek to collect and analyze data concerning the sexual orientation and gender identity of the clients they serve. The legislation would pertain to DPH, Department of Human Services (DHS), the Department of Aging and Adult Services (DAAS), DCYF, and the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD).

In February 2017, youth commissioners and staff met with the heads of DCYF, Director Maria Su, Laura Moye, and Aumijo Gomes, where commissioners shared their recommendations for the department regarding 12N implementation. The meeting ended in unanimous support from the representatives, where they stated their intent to implement 12N LGBTQ cultural competence training in the next fiscal year.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Youth Commission would like to thank members of the Board of Supervisors for attention to this matter, as well as key youth-serving city departments for participating in working group meetings over the years, especially the Department of Public Health and the Department of Children, Youth, and their Families.

### **1. Dedicate funds to Chapter 12N implementation.**

The Youth Commission respectfully urges Mayor Lee, the Board of Supervisors, and City



Departments to identify and dedicate funding sources to support implementation of 12N competency trainings and to support planning and coordination of 12N implementation efforts.

**2. Urge youth-serving city departments to collect data on sexual orientation and gender identity.**

The Commission additionally requests that the Board of Supervisors, in its ongoing considerations of data collection requirements for city departments, consider including those city departments which have the heaviest impact on the lives of youth and young adults, including those youth involved in the juvenile justice and/or foster care systems.

**3. Commit to providing the staff training needed to successfully implement the data collection efforts.**

Youth Commissioners also recommend dedicating support to departments to ensure a successful and comprehensive roll out of the sexual orientation and gender identity data collection efforts, including the institution of professional development training for city staff and contractors to prepare to ask clients, especially youth, sensitive questions about their sexual orientation and gender identity, in order to ensure city staff and contractors are properly trained to address or refer out for support needs that arise through such discussions. Not all youth want to or will access specialty teen services designed for LGBTQIQ youth, and the city can support them by bringing up the baseline at all programs, so that staff are ready to: intervene on bullying, ask and respect answers regarding sexual orientation and gender identity, and make appropriate referrals. If staff begin to ask for this information, it is important that there is a framework for sensitivity receiving and handling the information.

**4. Urge that the gender identity data collection compliance plan being submitted to the City Administrator in 2017 include 12N.**

The Youth Commission recommends that the gender identity data collection compliance plan being submitted to the City Administrator by city departments, and especially DCYF and those that serve young people, include a plan to pilot and later scale up LGBTQIQ competency trainings for contractors and grantees. The plan should align with chapter 12N, focus on building capacity to respectfully address issues and concerns that arise in the course of asking program participants about sexual orientation and identity, and cover strategies for intervening on bullying and harassment and providing referrals. Finally, the Commission urges the plan to include LGTBQIQ competency training in contract language with DCYF grantees funded during next year's Request For Proposals (RFP) process.

---

[1] Gay and Transgender Youth Homelessness by the numbers. <<http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/lgbt/news/2010/06/21/7980/gay-and-transgender-youth-homelessness-by-the-numbers/>>

[2] San Francisco Unified School District, Student Support Services for LGBTQ Youth. <<http://www.healthiersf.org/LGBTQ/index.php>>

[3] San Francisco Unified School District, Student Support Services for LGBTQ Youth. <http://www.healthiersf.org/resources/documents/Support%20Services%20for%20LGBTQ%20Youth%20-%20Program%20Snapshot%20as%20of%2010.13.16.pdf>

---

## **PRIORITY 12: Fund and complete the Transitional Age Youth Housing Plan contiguous with a TAY Navigation Center**

---

Urging for an increase the availability and accessibility of TAY Housing streamlined with a TAY-inclusive navigation center

### **BACKGROUND**

In San Francisco, it is estimated that there are near 8,000 disconnected transitional-aged youth – youth between the ages of 16 and 24 who will not make a successful transition into adulthood;[1] 7,700 TAY lack a high school diploma, 6,000 are completely uninsured and 9,000 neither work nor go to school.[2] As a result, many TAY experience substantial periods of unemployment, homelessness, and a disproportionately high number of these young people have some degree of involvement with the criminal justice system. These numbers however are likely even higher as homeless individuals often shy away from self-reporting to government entities.[3]

In response to these numbers, the Youth Commission adopted a resolution in 2005 calling on then-Mayor Gavin Newsom to create a task force that would propose methods to better serve this population.[4] Mayor Newsom created a task force in 2006 and after a year of intensive, collaborative work between City officials, community-based service providers, and TAY, the Mayor's Transitional Youth Task Force (TYTF) released its report in October 2007, "Disconnected Youth in San Francisco: A Roadmap to Improve the Life Chances of San Francisco's Most Vulnerable Young Adults." This document contained 16 comprehensive recommendations for City agencies "to address the problem of the current fragmented policies and programs, with a comprehensive, integrated approach towards disconnected transitional age youth." [5] Among the report's 16 recommendations to the City's policy makers was "more accessible housing for disconnected TAY."

Some City Departments responded to the TYTF report with great vigor. For example, the Mayor's Office of Housing (MOH) convened a TAY Housing Work Group with a variety of stakeholders to create a plan to meet the housing goals established by the Task Force. The goal of the TAY Housing Plan was to create 400 additional units for TAY by 2015, using a variety of housing models. This priority was reaffirmed by a recommendation in the TAYSF Policy Priorities for Transitional Age Youth 2014-16 document, released in Spring 2014, which called for plans to continue the pipeline of housing for TAY to meet or exceed the 400 unit goal by 2015.[6]

The TAY Housing Work Group concluded that there is no one "best model" of housing for youth, rather a wide range of models is needed for different populations. MOH went ahead and issued its first Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) exclusively for projects serving TAY in 2009. Unfortunately, due to stigma against TAY and homeless youth, some proposed affordable TAY housing projects have faced considerable neighborhood opposition, as was the case of the Booker T. Washington project, which took years to be officially approved. The recession of 2010 also delayed the completion of many TAY housing units. *Fortunately, the John Burton Foundation Housing Complex at Booker T. Washington is now underway with plans to have it completed by June*

2017<sup>17</sup>. Two other buildings with TAY housing also saw the completion of construction in 2015, including 1100 Ocean and Edward the 2nd.

It is now 2017, two years past the year of the projected 400 unit deadline. While there has been progress, there continues to be 120 units that still need to be identified.[7] To date, 280 TAY units have been identified, and a total of 188 units have been completed. 25 units are presently under construction, while 37 units are in predevelopment, and 30 units have been land-identified.[8]

In 2014, youth commissioners hosted a youth town hall on housing and affordability which was attended by over sixty youth and advocates. Youth participants were joined by several City staff who came to share their insights. In the TAY breakout at this event, participants noted that in addition to limited slots in dedicated TAY housing programs, TAY also face other barriers when searching for housing, including age discrimination, a lack of credit history, and not being aware of their rights as tenants.

In 2013 and 2014, the Youth Commission recommended the development of an evaluation tool that measures the quality and effectiveness of TAY housing and its supportive services which includes direct feedback from TAY. The need for TAY housing is much bigger than what is available. Therefore, it is necessary to see that funds are invested wisely. The Mayor's Office of Housing decided in 2014 that it was vital to see how effective the TAY housing was at serving TAY and their diverse needs. They conducted a TAY housing assessment in conjunction with the Corporation for Supportive Housing (CHS). In late 2014, the Youth Commission met with The Corporation for Supportive Housing, Harder+Company, Human Services Agency, and the Mayor's Office of Housing to receive an update on the assessment. CHS conducted its assessment through focus groups, surveys and direct outreach to TAY, and in consultation with TAY ED network, TAYSF and the San Francisco Youth Commission.

It's evident that the severity of homelessness in San Francisco has increased; this is especially true for our Transitionally Aged Youth. San Francisco's youth homeless population is at an all-time high, and is comparable to the severity of youth homelessness during the great depression.[9] San Francisco Citizens were quick to voice their concerns about this ongoing epidemic, and in June of 2016, it was announced that homelessness was the number one concern of all citizens, and housing affordability a strong second in June of 2015.[10] In response to this, numerous Supervisors, including then-Supervisors Campos and Supervisor Kim, announced a possibility of declaring of a state of emergency on homelessness allowing the city to seek additional state and federal funds for homeless services. Then-Supervisor Campos also introduced legislation to increase the number of Navigation Centers in the City of San Francisco.

The Navigation Center model has been successful in getting long-term, disconnected homeless adults into permanent housing.[11] Unfortunately, the criteria used does not explicitly include TAY, nor does the current Navigation Center have designated areas for TAY, a population that would greatly benefit from the innovative model. San Francisco only has one TAY-designated housing facility, Lark Inn, which houses only 45 individuals. Adding to this, the unemployment rate of TAY ages 20-24 is double the rate of homeless adults[12] and 72% of homeless youth said they wish to attend school.[13] According to the 2015 TAY Housing Assessment: "Without housing, young people face significant challenges in achieving their education and employment goals. For many youth, having a stable place to live is also critical to reducing their involvement and exposure to street culture, including sex work using or selling drugs and violence." [14]

In April of 2016, Youth Commissioners met with Navigation Center Director, Julie Leadbetter, and Emily Cohen, Deputy Director at Mayor's Office of Housing Opportunity, Partnership & Engagement, to discuss the creation of TAY-designated areas within Navigation Centers. They informed commissioners that in order for a Navigation Center model to be successful, there

---

<sup>17</sup> Communication with Anne Romero

must be a 2:1 ratio – meaning that for every one client in a Navigation Center, there must be at least two potential long-term housing units available. With a proposed designated TAY Navigation Center with a 75-person maximum capacity, the city still has a long way to go to satisfying both the housing and shelter needs for TAY. Again, according to the TAY housing assessment,” the supply of affordable housing options for transitional aged youth is completely insufficient”.[15]

The Youth Commission supports including TAY beds and services in the future Navigation Centers. Moreover, we also recognize the importance of creating long-term, permanent housing options for San Francisco’s most disconnected young people while simultaneously intervening to serve their immediate housing and shelter needs.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **1. Complete the 2015 TAY Housing Plan**

The San Francisco Youth Commission urges the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor to urge the Mayor’s Office of Housing, the Department of Public Health, and the Human Services Agency to implement the housing recommendations of the Transitional Youth Task Force and the TAYSF 2014-2016 priorities document,[16] including and especially the goal of identifying the remaining 120 housing units in the 2015 TAY Housing Plan.

### **2. Recommit to the TAY Housing Plan by establishing a new TAY housing goal.**

The Youth Commission urges the City to establish a new TAY Housing goal for the years ahead. Ensuring more designated TAY units are created in the near future, beyond the TAY housing plan 2015 goal of 400 units will create necessary exits for homeless and marginally housing TAY.

### **3. Plan for the on-site supportive service needs of TAY in supportive housing and address TAY emergency housing needs in the interim.**

The Youth Commission encourages the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to also begin planning for the commitment of applicable funds for on-site case management and other services associated with the construction of the remaining units; as well as to assess the outstanding interim needs for emergency shelter and residential treatment programs for transitional age youth. The Youth Commission is also interested in participating in conversations around TAY inclusion in the Navigation Center model.

### **4. Invest and explore other ways to promote positive housing outcomes for TAY.**

Finally, while we recognize the paramount importance of creating housing units for our City’s most disconnected and extremely low-income young people, we recommend analyzing housing outcomes for TAY who would not normally be eligible for TAY housing programs, and consider additional less resource-intensive supports for them achieving positive housing outcomes, including financial education, move-in costs or rental subsidies, apartment-hunting support, and tenants’ rights education.

---

[1] Policy Priorities for Transitional Aged Youth, Vision and Goals 2014-2016

[2] IBID

[3] Coalition on Homelessness, June 2015, The Roadmap: A 5 Five-Year Plan to End the Crisis of

## Family Homelessness in San Francisco

[4] Youth Commission Resolution 0405–005, Resolution urging the Mayor to Ordain a Transitional Youth Task Force. (2005).

[5] Disconnected Youth in San Francisco, p. 50

[6] Transitional Age Youth—San Francisco (TAYSF) Initiative, TAYSF 2011 Progress Report, retrieved from <http://www.taysf.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/TAYSF-Progress-Report-2011.pdf>.

[7] Personal communication with Anne Romero, Project Manager with the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development, May 9, 2017.

[8] Supportive Housing for Transition-Aged Youth, prepared by Mayor’s Office of Housing, Updated May 2017.

[9] IBID

[10] SF Chronicle: Homelessness Soars to No. 1 Concern in SF, New Poll Finds. 2016, March 16. <<http://www.sfgate.com/bayarea/article/Most-see-SF-moving-in-wrong-direction-poll-finds-6892152.php>>

[11] Emily Cohen and Julie Leadbetter, Presentation to the Housing Environment and City Services Committee, San Francisco Youth Commission, April 2016

[12] Larkin Street, June 2014, Youth Homelessness in San Francisco: 2014 Report on Incident and Needs

[13] IBID

[14] Corporation for Supportive Housing (CHS), November 2015, *Providing Stability and Support: An Assessment of San Francisco’s Transitional Age Youth Housing and Services System*. Retrieved from <http://www.csh.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/TAY-Housing-Svcs-System-Assmt-11.3.15.pdf>

[15] IBID

[16] TAYSF, Policy Priorities for Transitional Age Youth, Recommendations to Improve the Lives of TAY in San Francisco. Retrieved from <http://www.sfbos.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=48565>.

---

# PRIORITY 13: INCREASE SERVICES AND SUPPORTS FOR HOMELESS YOUTH AND DECLARE A YEAR OF RECOGNIZING HOMELESS YOUTH IN SAN FRANCISCO

---

Urging declaration of 2017 as the Year of Recognizing Homeless Youth, and a revisit the homeless youth count

## BACKGROUND

In the spirit of prior goals made by great leaders, Congress and the Obama Administration set a federal goal of ending homelessness for youth, children, and families by 2020.<sup>[1]</sup> During their 2015-2016 term Youth Commissioners collaborated with the Youth Advisory Board of Larkin Street to bring awareness to the City of the homeless youth population in San Francisco. Larkin Street is a service provider that caters to homeless youth in San Francisco, and provides varied types of assistance. Together, we then and continue to recognize despite the current investments in homeless youth in San Francisco, this growing population is often overlooked and underserved. With few services, youth have difficulty getting on the right track towards living a healthy life.

In wake of an uncertain future with the transition of a new Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and the new presidential administration, Americans across the nation fear the likely possibility of the declination of housing and shelters for individuals in most need. LGBT youth also face homophobic and transphobic discrimination, and are disproportionately represented in the homeless youth population. As many as 40 percent of the nation's homeless youth identify as LGBT, while between 5-10 percent of the overall youth population is LGBT.<sup>[7]</sup>

On any given day in the United States, there are between 353,000 - 503,000 youth ages 12- 24 who experience homelessness,<sup>[2]</sup> with only about 4,000 youth shelter beds available across the country.<sup>[3]</sup> In San Francisco alone there are approximately 3,200 homeless children under age nineteen live in San Francisco, a 94% increase over the homeless youth population in 2007.<sup>[4]</sup> Each year, approximately 5,000 young people die on the streets in the U.S. because of illness, assault, or suicide.<sup>[5]</sup> These youth are also susceptible to incarceration and the dangers accompanying living on the streets: One third of this population has been involved with the juvenile justice system, 75% have used illegal substances, 20% of San Francisco youth traded sex for a place to stay compared to 5% in 2013, and one in three are approached by a recruiting "pimp" within the first forty-eight hours of being on the street.<sup>[6]</sup>

The United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has required public agencies and service providers to conduct a Point in Time count of the homeless population in their cities every odd-numbered year since 2005. Beginning in 2007, San Francisco was among the first cities to count homeless youth as a distinct population from the adult homeless population.<sup>[8]</sup> In San Francisco's 2013 Point-in-Time count, 1,902 homeless children and transitional age youth (TAY) were counted, accounting for more than one-fourth of all homeless individuals counted. Unfortunately, even with these counts and statistics, a large amount of homeless youth are unaccounted for.

The San Francisco homeless count had two primary components: a Point-in-Time enumeration of unsheltered homeless individuals and families (those sleeping outdoors, on the street, in parks, in vehicles, etc.) and a Point-in-Time enumeration of homeless individuals and families who have temporary shelter (those staying in an emergency shelter, transitional housing, or

using stabilization rooms).<sup>[9]</sup>

While important in establishing a snapshot of some of the city's homeless individuals, the Point-in-Time Count is not a hard-and-fast number. The commission is concerned that the count methodology could rely too heavily on the assumption that all homeless people are visible on the street, or that they look and act a particular way, this may lead to undercounts particularly of youth. That said, the commission recognize the incredible difficulty in administering such a large survey of individuals.

The homeless youth population is not homogenous, representing many different needs. However, all homeless youth need shelter, food, water, and clothing. Indeed, we have seen that when these needs are addressed, these youth take the lead and graduate from intensive training programs <sup>[10]</sup> and serve the City as policy advisors, youth commissioners and community advocates. When given the opportunity, many homeless and formerly homeless youth contribute meaningfully to San Francisco. Nevertheless, to make this successful transition out of homelessness, young people need the stability of housing as well as access to flexible supportive services.

The Youth Commission thanks Mayor Lee for his leadership in creating a Department on Homelessness and Supportive Housing (DHS), and congratulate Director Jeff Kositsky on completing his first year leading the department.

## **UPDATES**

Since coming online, the DHS has made meaningful steps to address the needs of homeless youth. Ali Schlageter was brought on as the Youth Programs Manager, the staff person dedicated to youth and TAY homelessness. The Youth Commission is excited to work with Ms. Schlageter and the department on the needs for homeless youth.

In 2016, DHS launched an application to be considered a community for HUDs Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program (YHDP) grant on behalf of San Francisco. Thankfully, HUD announces in early 2017 that San Francisco was selected for the YHDP grant, and DHS has been working with services providers, city agencies, SFUSD, and the Youth Commission to create a community plan for how the YHDP award will be spent. The Youth Commission looks forward to seeing the completed plan, and the impact the YHDP grant will make in serving our homeless youth. The commission also look forward to working with the YHDP Youth Advisory Board (YAB).

In April 2017 Supervisor Sheehy introduces a hearing request to look into Youth Homelessness across San Francisco and in district 8 specifically. In that hearing request, the Youth Commission was asked to present its findings and policy recommendation regard youth homeless. The hearing took place on May 10, 2017 in the Public Safety and Neighborhood Services Committee, and was continued until the next committee meeting. The Youth Commission looks forward to the Board of Supervisors continuing the conversation on the needs for homeless youth, and the policy and budget decision that arise from the discussion.

The commission believes in ending the cycle of poverty and homelessness, especially for children, youth, and TAY. As the city looks to address the immediate needs of homelessness for young San Franciscans, we should also look create and support exits out of homelessness.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **1. Declare a Year of Recognizing Homeless Youth and their needs.**

As the nation aims to eradicate youth homelessness by 2020, the Youth Commission, along with the Youth Advisory Board of Larkin Street, urges the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, and the

Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing to declare a Year Recognizing Homeless Youth. In making this declaration, we urge the city to make meaningful investments into ending youth homelessness in San Francisco, support flexible shelter and housing practices that meet the unique needs of this population, adopt best practices coming out of the Youth Homelessness Demonstration Program Community Plan, and create space and support for service providers to work collaboratively together and with the city.

## **2. Revisit the youth homeless count methodology and create an annual report on youth and TAY homelessness**

The Youth Commission urges the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing to conduct a more comprehensive and accurate homeless count so the City and the Greater Bay has an accurate idea of the size of the population and can therefore properly address it. Locally, we have multiple homeless counts conducted by different organizations, and which vary substantially, including: The 2015 Point-In-Time Count, Larkin Street Youth Services, and counts conducted by the Coalition on Homelessness. We recognize the effort and dedication it takes to conduct the homeless count, and are grateful to those who help plan and administer the count. Additionally, we ask that the department establish an annual report on Youth and TAY homelessness that includes both qualitative and quantitative data on youth exiting homelessness.

---

[1] The United States Interagency on Homelessness; [http://usich.gov/opening\\_doors/](http://usich.gov/opening_doors/)

[2] Youth Homelessness in San Francisco: 2013 Report On Incidence and Needs, p. 1

[3] "National Campaign for Youth Shelter seeks Housing for homeless LGBT youth." GLAAD. <http://www.glaad.org/blog/national-campaignyouth-shelter-seeks-housing-homeless-lgbt-youth>

[4] Coalition on Homelessness, June 2015, The Roadmap: A 5 Five-Year Plan to End the Crisis of Family Homelessness in San Francisco

[5] "Streetwork: Homeless Youth Facts." Safe Horizon.

<http://www.safehorizon.org/index/what-we-do-2/helping-youth-14/streetwork-homeless-youth-facts-220.html>

[6] Applied Survey Research, January 2015, Homeless Unique Youth Count and Survey

[7] "National Campaign for Youth Shelter seeks Housing for homeless LGBT youth." GLAAD. <http://www.glaad.org/blog/national-campaignyouth-shelter-seeks-housing-homeless-lgbt-youth>

[8] IBID

[9] IBID

[10] Year Up; <http://www.yearup.org/>