

San Francisco Youth Commission Agenda Monday, February 1st, 2021 5:00 pm-8:00 pm

Public Comment Call-in: +1-415-655-0001 United States, San Francisco (toll)

Access Code: 146 736 2466

There will be public comment on each item.

Jayden Tanaka, Valentina Alioto-Pier, Lillian Tang, Plyfaa Suwanamalik-Murphy, Calvin Quick, Gabrielle Listana, Adrianna Zhang, Gracie Veiga, Ariana Arana, Rome Jones, Erika Morris, Arsema Asfaw, Sarah Cheung, Sarah Ginsburg, Nora Hylton, Amara Santos, Stephen "Rocky" Versace

- 1. Call to Order and Roll Call for Attendance (Discussion and Possible Action)
- 2. Approval of Agenda (Action Item)

3. Approval of Minutes (Action Item)

A. January 20th, 2021 (Document A)

4. Public Comment on Items not on Agenda (2 minutes per public comment)

5. Youth Commission Business (All Items to Follow Discussion and Possible Action)

- A. [Inform + Decision] Motion to Support SF Bike Coalition + TLCBD on Community Alternatives to Traffic Enforcements Sponsor: Transformative Justice Committee Presenter: Commissioners Listana and Hylton
- B. [Inform] [First Reading] Resolution No. 2021-AL-05 [Resolution Social Housing -598 Portola Dr. and Juvenile Hall] Sponsors: Commissioners Quick and Zhang Presenter: Commissioners Quick and Zhang (Document B)
- C. [Inform + Decision] Motion No. 2021-AL-06 [Motion of Support for SB 234] Sponsors: Commissioner Quick Presenters: Commissioner Quick (Document C)



- D. [Inform + Decision] Motion No. 2021-AL-07 [Motion to Approve a Letter to Governor Gavin Newsom and San Francisco's State Legislative Delegation on Lifting the Regional Stay-at-Home Order and on Eviction Protections] Sponsors: Commissioners Cheung, Asfaw, Quick, Santos, and Zhang Presenter: Commissioner Asfaw (Document D)
- E. [Decision] [1st Reading] Resolution No. 2021-AL-08 [Shelter-in-Place Hotels -Maximizing Shelter and Housing Through Federal Emergency Management Agency Reimbursement] Sponsors: Commissioners Quick, Tanaka, and Tang Presenter: Commissioner Tanaka (Document E)
- F. [Discussion] Youth Commission's Special Youth Budget Town Hall February 8th, 2021
 Presenters: Staff and Budget Planning Committee

6. Committee Reports (Discussion Only)

- A. Executive Committee
 - a. LAO
 - b. Comms
 - c. General Committee Updates
- B. Civic Engagement
- C. Housing and Land Use
- D. Transformative Justice
- E. OCOF
- 7. Staff Report (Discussion Only)

8. Announcements (This Includes Community Events)

9. 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:

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 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: sotf@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 Kiely Hosmon, Youth Commission Director [phone: 415-554-6464 email: Kiely.hosmon@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.



Document A

San Francisco Youth Commission Draft - Minutes Wednesday, January 20th, 2021 4:00 pm-6:30 pm

Link for Public Comment

There will be public comment on each item.

Jayden Tanaka, Valentina Alioto-Pier, Lillian Tang, Plyfaa Suwanamalik-Murphy, Calvin Quick, Gabrielle Listana, Adrianna Zhang, Gracie Veiga, Ariana Arana, Rome Jones, Erika Morris, Arsema Asfaw, Sarah Cheung, Sarah Ginsburg, Nora Hylton, Amara Santos, Stephen "Rocky" Versace

1. Call to Order and Roll Call for Attendance (Discussion and Possible Action)

Chair Hylton calls the meeting to order at 4:07 PM.

Roll Call Attendance: 12 present, 1 absent, 4 running late Jayden Tanaka, present Valentina Alioto-Pier, present Lillian Tang, present Plyfaa Suwanamalik-Murphy, late Calvin Quick, present Gabrielle Listana, present Adrianna Zhang, present Gracie Veiga, present Ariana Arana, late Rome Jones, late Erika Morris, present Arsema Asfaw, present Sarah Cheung, absent Sarah Ginsburg, present Nora Hylton, present Amara Santos, absent Stephen "Rocky" Versace, present

Commissioner Hylton, seconded by Commissioner Santos, motion to excuse Commissioner Morris. A roll call vote was taken with unanimous support. No public comment.

There is no public comment. Commissioner Hylton motions to excuse Commissioner Santos and Cheung absences due to health concerns, seconded by Commissioner Quick.

2. Approval of Agenda (Action Item)



Commissioner Quick, seconded by Commissioner Zhang, motioned to approve the agenda. A roll call vote was taken and motion passed unanimously.

Jayden Tanaka, aye Valentina Alioto-Pier,ave Lillian Tang, present Plyfaa Suwanamalik-Murphy, Calvin Quick, ave Gabrielle Listana, ave Adrianna Zhang, aye Gracie Veiga, aye Ariana Arana, Rome Jones. Erika Morris, Arsema Asfaw,aye Sarah Cheung, aye Sarah Ginsburg, aye Nora Hylton, ave Amara Santos, ave Stephen "Rocky" Versace, aye

Minutes approval: no pc, motion to approve Tanaka, Ginsburg,

3. Approval of Minutes (Action Item)

A. January 4th, 2021 (Document A)

Commissioner Arana arrived at 4:12pm.

Commissioner Tanaka, seconded by Commissioner Ginsburg, motioned to approve the minutes. A roll call vote was taken and motion passed unanimously.

Jayden Tanaka, aye Valentina Alioto-Pier,ave Lillian Tang, present Plyfaa Suwanamalik-Murphy, Calvin Quick, ave Gabrielle Listana, ave Adrianna Zhang, ave Gracie Veiga, aye Ariana Arana, aye Rome Jones. Erika Morris, Arsema Asfaw,aye Sarah Cheung, aye Sarah Ginsburg, aye Nora Hylton, ave Amara Santos, ave Stephen "Rocky" Versace, aye



4. Public Comment on Items not on Agenda (2 minutes per public comment)

Commissioner Jones and Suwanamalki-Murphy arrived at 4:16pm.

Lily Carrillo, Legislative Aide to Supervisor Myrna Melgar, introduced herself via the chat function.

5. Legislation Referred (Discussion and Possible Action)

No legislation was referred this week.

6. Youth Commission Business (All Items to Follow Discussion and Possible Action)

A. [Discussion] Mid-Year Retreat Budget Advocacy 101 Presenters: YC Staff

Commissioners received a training on the City's budget and their role of advising on youth budget needs.

7. Committee Reports (Discussion Only)

- A. Executive Committee
 - a. LAO
 - b. Comms
 - c. General Committee Updates
- B. Civic Engagement
- C. Housing and Land Use
- D. Transformative Justice
- E. OCOF

This item was tabled at the call of the chair.

8. Staff Report (Discussion Only)

This item was tabled at the call of the chair.

9. Announcements (This Includes Community Events)

This item was tabled at the call of the chair.

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:29pm.

Document B

FILE NO.

RESOLUTION NO. 2021-AL-05

1	[Social Housing - 598 Portola Dr. and Juvenile Hall]
2	
3	Resolution urging the City and County of San Francisco to prioritize affordable social
4	housing, including for youth and families, on City-owned property generally, and
5	specifically at 598 Portola Dr. and Juvenile Hall.
6	
7	WHEREAS, The City and County of San Francisco (the "City") owns property at 598
8	Portola Dr. currently leased to Twin Peaks Petroleum, Inc., doing business as Twin Peaks
9	Auto Care, and operated as a gasoline service station; and
10	WHEREAS, In late 2020, the Board of Supervisors (the "Board") considered a
11	proposed resolution, contained in BOS File No. 200965, to authorize a new 25-year lease for
12	the aforementioned property as a gasoline service station, with one five-year option to extend;
13	and
14	WHEREAS, However, on October 6, 2020, the Board sent the resolution in question
15	back to committee due to concerns about the long-term impact of leasing City property to be
16	operated as a gasoline service station; and
17	WHEREAS, According to the San Francisco Examiner, it is possible for the City-owned
18	property at 598 Portola Dr. to be developed as housing, since "a 2013 appraisal of the
19	property found the highest value of the property, at \$1.8 million, was as a residential or mixed
20	commercial and residential development of up to 26 units;" and
21	WHEREAS, Provided that the City conducts thorough and extensive environmental
22	remediation of the site, given its past and present use as a gasoline service station, housing
23	would be a better use of the City-owned property at 598 Portola Dr. than the current use; and
24	WHEREAS, The current gasoline service station at 598 Portola Dr. sits on a large
25	parcel of City-owned property that also includes the Youth Guidance Center, also known as

1 Juvenile Hall, which is required to close by December 31, 2021 as a result of Ordinance No.

117-19, contained in BOS File No.190392, effective July 2, 2019; and

2

WHEREAS, The Youth Commission strongly supports the closure of Juvenile Hall and
alternatives to incarceration for youth, as set out in YC File No. 1819-RBM-13; and

5 WHEREAS, The current so-called public safety mechanisms of policing and 6 incarceration, such as Juvenile Hall, do not achieve real public safety, and actively harm Black 7 and Indigenous, and other communities of color that have and continue to experience the 8 impacts racially motivated and systemic police brutality and mass incarceration policies; and 9 WHEREAS, Juvenile Hall is currently very underutilized, with only 11 youth detained as 10 of April 2020 due to a long-term decrease in youth arrests, as well as to releases during the

11 Covid-19 pandemic; and

WHEREAS, As of November 30, 2019, of 40 youth detained at Juvenile Hall, 72.5%
were African American and 20.0% were Latino, compared to 5.2% and 15.2% respectively in
the San Francisco population at-large; and

WHEREAS, A 2019 report by the Young Women's Freedom Center found that youth participants involved in the foster care, juvenile justice, and adult justice systems experienced extreme housing instability between the ages of 13 and 21, moving an average of 20.8% between the ages of 13 and 17, and an average of 16.3% between the ages of 18 and 21; and

WHEREAS, Affordable housing and Section 8 voucher waitlists remain a significant
barrier to accessing stable housing for system involved youth, and the absence of a
coordinated entry into systems of care, such as housing and supportive mental and behavioral
health services, further perpetuates hardship and inequity faced by system involved youth;
and

WHEREAS, Adequately funding social services, including truly affordable housing, has
 the potential to create real public safety for all youth and their communities in San Francisco;
 and

4 WHEREAS, On November 3, 2020, San Francisco voters approved Propositions I and 5 K, which respectively approved a increase to the real estate transfer tax on transactions of 6 over \$10 million in order to fund rent relief and affordable municipally-run social housing, and 7 an authorization for the City to own, develop, construct, acquire or rehabilitate up to 10,000 8 units of low-income rental housing in San Francisco, by 57.55% and 73.52% respectively; and 9 WHEREAS, The proposed ordinance contained in BOS File No. 201364, currently 10 being considered by the Board, would appropriate \$5,700,000 for the acquisition, creation and 11 operation of affordable, social housing under the Housing Stability Fund in Fiscal Year 2020-12 2021; and

WHEREAS, In April 2019, the Board adopted a resolution authored by Supervisor
 Mandelman, contained in BOS File No. 190222, declaring a climate emergency and urging
 San Francisco to achieve emissions reductions at emergency speed, thus signaling a wind
 down of fossil fuels; and

WHEREAS, In 2018, Governor Brown signed executive order B-55-18 pledging that
California must reach carbon neutrality no later than 2045, and then become carbon negative,
by reducing greenhouse gas emissions; and

WHEREAS, By providing a below market rate lease for the property at 598 Portola Dr,
 San Francisco is effectively reinvesting and continuing to subsidize the fossil fuel sector and
 fossil fuel infrastructure; and
 WHEREAS, Instead, San Francisco should be a leader in the climate change

24 movement and be committing by its actions to tackling climate change; and

1 WHEREAS, Additionally, according to a 2017 report by the Planning Department 2 entitled Housing for Families with Children, San Francisco ranks lowest among large cities in 3 the United States by percentage of households that are families, with only 18% compared to 4 the nationwide average of 29.4%; and 5 WHEREAS, According to the 2019 Point in Time Count, 18% of individuals 6 experiencing homelessness in San Francisco on any given night are Transitional-Aged Youth 7 (TAY) between the ages of 18 and 24, and yet affordable housing and Section 8 voucher 8 waitlists remain long and the City has still not met its goal of operating 400 units of permanent 9 supportive housing for TAY by 2015, raising doubts about the long-term stability of youth 10 exiting homelessness beyond the supportive system; and 11 WHEREAS, Existing housing production strategies have failed to provide for low-12 income households, as well as for families, who are increasingly priced out of the City due to 13 the high cost of living; and 14 WHEREAS, A municipally-operated social housing program would decouple production 15 of affordable housing from market fluctuations by moving beyond existing funding 16 mechanisms that have, by and large, completely failed to anticipate or respond to the housing crisis; and 17 18 WHEREAS, Insofar as the existing uses on the City-owned parcel at 598 Portola Dr. 19 and Juvenile Hall are contrary to City and State policy on the climate crisis and transformative 20 justice, the City has the opportunity to invest in new strategies for progressive and sustainable 21 housing policy by developing the aforementioned properties as affordable social housing; 22 now, therefore, be it 23 RESOLVED, That the Youth Commission urges the City to prioritize affordable social 24 housing, including for youth and families, on City-owned property at 598 Portola Dr. and

Juvenile Hall, provided that the City conducts thorough environmental remediation of the land
 upon which the gasoline service station currently stands; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Youth Commission urges the City to explore issuing
 housing vouchers for youth formerly and currently detained at Juvenile Hall to have priority
 access to deeply affordable housing, including a period of rent-free housing for system
 involved youth to find stable employment and support; and, be it
 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Youth Commission urges the City to confront the
 failures of existing planning and funding mechanisms for affordable housing, and to explore

9 and invest in non-market based and countercyclical housing production strategies, particularly

10 emphasizing municipal operation and ownership; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Youth Commission urges the City to systematically
 prioritize land for affordable and social housing on all City-owned parcels throughout San
 Francisco.

- 14
- 15
- 16

- 18
- IQ
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

Document C

FILE NO.

1	[Motion to Support SB 234 (California State Legislature 2021-2022): Transition Aged Youth Housing Program]
2	
3	
4	Supplementary Information:
5	Letter of Support approved as attached (see below).
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

February 1, 2021

The Hon. Scott Wiener California State Senate State Capitol, Room 5100 Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Support for SB 234: Transition Aged Youth Housing Program.

Dear Senator Wiener,

The San Francisco Youth Commission supports your bill SB 234: Transition Aged Youth Housing Program. This bill would establish a Transition Aged Youth Housing Program to fund \$100,000,000 worth of grants to local government agencies and nonprofits for the purposes of acquiring, building, or converting permanent supportive housing for youth experiencing homelessness.

The SF Youth Commission is a body of 17 youth from San Francisco between the ages of 12 and 23. Created by the voters under a 1995 amendment to the City Charter, the commission is responsible for advising the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor on policies and laws related to young people. The SF Youth Commission is also charged with providing comment and recommendation on all proposed laws that would primarily affect youth before the Board takes final action.

The failure to provide shelter, housing, and supportive services to the thousands of youth who experience homelessness on any given night in California is one of the enduring failures of our state. In San Francisco alone, according to the 2019 Point-in-Time Count, there are approximately 1,145 unaccompanied children and transitional-age youth (TAY) experiencing homelessness on any given night, over three quarters of which are unsheltered.¹ Of youth experiencing homelessness in San Francisco, 46% identify as LGBTQ+, and are disproportionately Hispanic/Latinx, Black, or multi-racial.

Since the 2000s, the SF Youth Commission has supported San Francisco's 2015 TAY Housing Plan, which set a target of building 400 units of permanent supportive housing for TAY by 2015. However, due to the virtual abandonment of this goal for several years during the recession, San Francisco is over 100 units short of that goal, over five years after the target date. At a time when stable housing is even more key for youth experiencing homelessness to weather the Covid-19 pandemic, the lack of dedicated funding at both the local and state levels for the acquisition and/or construction of permanent supportive housing for TAY is unacceptable. Expanding the supply of permanent supportive housing for TAY will improve local agencies' ability to provide real exits from homelessness to all youth experiencing homelessness.

For all these reasons, we support SB 234, and we thank you for your attention to this issue.

Sincerely,

¹ 2019 San Francisco Youth Homeless Count & Survey Report

FILE NO.

1	Delegation on Lifting the Regional Stav-at-Home Order and on Eviction Protections]
2	
3	
4	Supplementary Information:
5	Letter of Support approved as attached (see below).
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	11
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

February 1, 2021

The Hon. Gavin Newsom Governor of California 1303 10th Street, Suite 1173 Sacramento, CA 95814

The Hon. Scott Wiener California State Senate State Capitol, Room 5100 Sacramento, CA 95814

The Hon. David Chiu California State Assembly State Capitol, Room 4112 Sacramento, CA 95814

The Hon. Phil Ting California State Assembly State Capitol, Room 6026 Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Lifting the Regional Stay-at-Home Order, Eviction Protections.

Dear Governor Newsom,

The San Francisco Youth Commission is concerned about a number of recent developments at the state level regarding California's response to the COVID-19 pandemic and related crises. On January 26, 2021, you announced that all regional Stay-At-Home orders based on ICU capacity would be lifted and the state would return to the tier-based system, with counties like San Francisco reopening outdoor dining and personal services in the purple tier. On the same day, state legislative leadership and yourself announced a tenant protection and rent relief package, Senate Bill 91, which raises a number of concerns about the prioritization of landlord interests. The Youth Commission has previously expressed concerns with the state and local response to COVID-19,¹ and we are concerned that both of these actions will negatively impact San Francisco and California youth.

Data from the White House Coronavirus Report has shown that although COVID-19 cases are decreasing, the daily average still remains at nearly 20,000 people a day—5 times more than it was in March 2020. Despite the 26% drop in new cases within a week, California is still at five times the upper limit of high community transmission with half of counties still in the "red zone."² Additionally, emergency department visits relating to COVID-19 have stayed the same for the past five weeks in California. Lifting the stay-at-home order will disproportionately put the lives of Black, Latine, Indigenous, and Pacific Islander people at risk, as these communities continue to lead in COVID-19 deaths, with a death rate of double or more than White and Asian

¹ YC File No. <u>1920-AL-11</u>.

² Coders Against Covid, (Unofficial) WH Coronavirus Task Force Report, accessed January 28, 2021.

Americans on a national level, according to the APM Research Lab.³ Given the state's abysmal record of persecuting Black and Indigenous populations in particular, and the well-established history of hospitals discriminating against Black and Indigenous people when providing (or withholding) treatment, trust in public health institutions is already justifiably low. Basing reopening on the California Department of Public Health's 4-week projection of whether or not ICU capacity is greater than or equal to 15% is not sufficient or conclusive enough to reopen each region, especially when this projection is only based on the number of ICU patients and not ICU beds. With San Francisco still in the purple tier, while still relaxing restrictions and reopening outdoor dining, the possibility that we will move down to the red tier or better in order for schools to reopen is unlikely.

We are concerned about the apparent departure from scientific evidence in these latest reopening plans as school districts continue to move towards a return to in-person instruction. Without increased funding and logistical support for school districts, returning to in-person schooling will not foster a safe learning environment for the over 6 million students in California. While your Safe Schools for All Plan proposed on December 30, 2020 promises \$2 billion in funding for reopening schools safely, its distribution according to your guidelines is inherently inequitable. With areas of higher COVID-19 transmission unable to meet the threshold to reopen, which are disproportionately low-income communities of color, funds normally spent on schools in those areas would instead be used to reopen schools in more affluent areas. Some large school districts cannot even afford the testing requirements in order to return to in-person learning. Students wary of health risks will likely not attend school, causing short-term chaos and deepening long term educational issues and inequities.

The experience of many disconnected youth during this pandemic, including youth involved with the juvenile justice system, has been one of abandonment. As of January 25, 2021, 185 youth at the Division of Juvenile Justice statewide had been diagnosed with Covid-19, due to the absence of investment in a plan to release youth into supportive communities and transitional or permanent housing, and to meaningfully reduce population density in youth correctional facilities. Given the disproportionately Black and Latine composition of the population detained at DJJ, these failures reinforce and compound existing inequities in California's pandemic response.

To compound this chaotic situation, the tenant protection and rent relief package contained in Senate Bill 91, while a welcome source of respite for the many tenants who will be able to stay in their homes as a result of the extension of the statewide prohibition on evictions for nonpayment of rent, builds troubling inequities into the rent relief portion that will let vulnerable tenants, including families, slip through the cracks. Notably, while landlords may claim 80% of rent due from the state under the rent relief program if they forgive the remaining 20%, the tenant only receives support for 25% of rent due if the landlord does not forgive the rent, just the bare minimum to prevent the landlord from seeking eviction for non-payment. This clearly keeps the door open for landlords to harass tenants who cannot afford to pay rent due to loss of income during the pandemic.

According to an Urban Institute study, 19% of renters nationwide did not pay rent through mid-May 2020, compared to 27% of black renters and 25% of Latine renters.⁴ The Urban

³ APM Research Lab, <u>The Color of Coronavirus: Covid-19 Deaths by Race and Ethnicity in the U.S.</u>, accessed January 28, 2021.

⁴ Urban Institute, <u>New Data Suggest COVID-19 is Widening Housing Disparities by Race and Income</u>, accessed January 28, 2021.

Institute also reported in April 2020 that younger renters (aged 35 and under) were already disproportionately impacted by high rents, with a third reporting often or sometimes experiencing difficulties paying rent in 2019.⁵ Given that 30% of younger household heads reported working in the food and accommodation, entertainment, retail, and transportation sectors, which have been heavily impacted by the pandemic-induced economic crisis, it is clear that young people are facing increased burdens upon entering the workforce during the pandemic. These disparities have not been seriously addressed and resolved by the state, deepening our concern that loopholes in the latest tenant protection measures will further exacerbate them.

We urge the state to not cave to political expediency in deciding when and how to reopen, and to instead focus on providing support to all Californians who are suffering during this pandemic by providing them with the means to stay healthy, safe, and housed without needing to place themselves at risk of exposure.

Sincerely,

⁵ Urban Institute, <u>COVID-19 Policy Responses Must Consider the Pandemic's Impact on Young Renters and Renters</u> of Color, accessed January 28, 2021.

Document E

FILE NO.

RESOLUTION NO. 2021-AL-08

Resolution urging the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing to take
advantage of 100% reimbursement of costs related to the City's Shelter-in-Place hotels
program by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and to expand the City's
portfolio of permanent supportive housing.

7

8 WHEREAS, Since the beginning of the Covid-19 pandemic, the City and County of San 9 Francisco ("City") has housed people experiencing homelessness who are considered 10 vulnerable to Covid-19 in over 2,600 hotel rooms across 29 Shelter-in-Place ("SIP") hotel 11 sites, through the statewide Project Roomkey, whose purpose is to provide non-congregate 12 shelter options for people experiencing homelessness, protect human life, and minimize strain 13 on health care system capacity according to the California Department of Social Services; and 14 WHEREAS, For most of duration of the pandemic, the SIP hotel program, as part of 15 Project Roomkey, was enabled by a 75% reimbursement by the Federal Emergency 16 Management Agency ("FEMA") of costs associated with housing people experiencing homelessness who are considered vulnerable to Covid-19 in SIP hotels; and 17 18 WHEREAS, FEMA has defined people who have tested positive for Covid-19, have been exposed to COVID 19, or are "high risk" of health complications (aged 65 up, underlying 19 20 condition, etc.) as eligible for reimbursable housing in the SIP hotel program; and 21 WHEREAS, In late October 2020, the San Francisco Department of Homelessness 22 and Supportive Housing ("HSH") announced that due to an unspecified anticipation of FEMA 23 reimbursement being cut off at some point in the future, the City would be winding down the 24 SIP hotel program in phases by June 2021 and arranging exits from homelessness into 25 housing for the more than 2,300 individuals currently housed in SIP hotels; and

WHEREAS, Service providers and advocacy organizations criticized this plan as too
 vague and premature, given that housing exits had not been identified to cover all residents in
 SIP hotels and there was no immediate threat of FEMA reimbursement being cut off; and
 WHEREAS, On November 2, 2020, the Youth Commission unanimously voted to
 support the Board of Supervisors' hearing on the SIP Rehousing and Site Demobilization

Plan, on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 201234, and to include
questions and comments highlighting concerns with the aforementioned Plan; and

8 WHEREAS, Specifically, the Youth Commission expressed concerns around the lack 9 of attention given to youth, including Transitional Aged Youth ("TAY") in documents describing 10 the SIP Rehousing Plan, despite the need for TAY to receive attention to their specific needs 11 and situations as part of any housing referral process; and

WHEREAS, On December 23, 2020 the Mayor signed an emergency ordinance
unanimously approved by the Board of Supervisors on December 15, 2020, on file with the
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 201328, extending the SIP hotels program, with
the first group of residents moving out of SIP hotels into housing by March 2021; and

16 WHEREAS, Under this new plan, unhoused people would fill 60% of vacant SIP hotel 17 rooms as existing residents moved out, with the other rooms being wound down so as to not 18 require the City to move residents out without a rehousing plan should FEMA reimbursement 19 be cut off; and

WHEREAS, However, on January 21, 2021, the federal administration announced that
 FEMA would henceforth reimburse 100% of the cost of housing eligible individuals
 experiencing homelessness in SIP hotels through the end of the pandemic; and
 WHEREAS, Other regional FEMA offices in the United States are already reimbursing
 local governments for the cost of housing more individuals than are strictly considered

25 vulnerable under federal guidelines; and

WHEREAS, Housing is a human right, and especially during a pandemic that has
 disproportionately impacted unhoused and homeless individuals, as well as the Black and
 Latinx communities which are already overrepresented in the population experiencing
 homelessness, the need for all residents to have access to safe and stable non-congregate
 shelter, such as a hotel room, cannot be overstated; and

6 WHEREAS, There are currently over 6,500 people unsheltered in San Francisco, in
7 addition to those sheltered in SIP hotels, Safe Sleep Sites, and other programs; and

8 WHEREAS, The lack of adequate stable housing available for people exiting the 9 program coupled with available FEMA funding currently makes SIP hotels the most viable 10 option to keep people housed, off the streets, and safe amidst the pandemic; and

WHEREAS, Alternatives to continuing to expand SIP hotels, such as Safe Sleep Sites,
congregate shelters, or organized encampments, can be just as costly as SIP hotels but lack
the benefit of federal reimbursement; now, therefore, be it

14 RESOLVED, That the Youth Commission urges the City to immediately take action to 15 maintain and expand the SIP hotels program, and fill vacant hotel rooms at a one for one rate 16 at least, while renegotiating with FEMA authorities to allow for individuals who do not currently 17 qualify for the program to be included; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Youth Commission urges HSH to continue to invest in permanent exits from homelessness, especially including expanding the City's portfolio of permanent supportive housing, including permanent supportive housing for TAY, with the objective of providing stable housing to all individuals in the SIP hotel program.

22

23

24