San Francisco Youth Commission
Agenda
Monday, November 16th, 2020
5:00 pm-8:00 pm

Public Comment Call-in:
+1-415-655-0001
United States, San Francisco (toll)
Access Code: 146 122 1976

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. November 2nd, 2020
      (Document A)

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

5. Legislation Referred (All Items to Follow Discussion and Possible Action)
   A. [Inform + Decision] No. 201185 - [Administrative Code - Permanent Supportive Housing - Rent Contribution Standard]
      Sponsor: Supervisor Haney, District 6
      Presenters: Courtney McDonald, D6 Legislative Aide
      (Document B)

      Sponsor: Supervisor Haney, D6
      Presenters: D6 Staff
      (Document C)
C. [Inform + Decision] File No. 201273 - [Hearing - Meet and Confer Obligations with the Police Officers Association]  
Sponsor: Supervisor Mar, D4  
Presenters: Daisy Quan, D4 Legislative Aide  
(Document D)

Sponsor: Supervisor Mandelman, District 8  
Presenters: Joe Adkins, District 8 Administrative Aide  
(Document E)

6. Presentations (All Items to Follow Discussion and Possible Action)
   A. [Inform + Decision] Youth Specific Wellness Center  
      Presenter: Yanmi Leung, Kathryn Awren, Mimi Mier-Rosales; TAY Community Members  
      (Document F)
   B. [Inform + Decision] Department of Police Accountability Know Your Rights Presentation  
      Presenters: Vilma Gamero, Alexandra Schultheis, Kaneem Thorton, Department of Police Accountability  
      (Document G)

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

8. 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

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:

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 reunión. Llame a Derek Evans (415) 554-7702.

San Francisco Youth Commission  
Minutes ~ Draft  
Monday, November 2nd, 2020  
5:00 pm-8:00 pm

Public Comment Call-in:
+1-415-655-0001  
United States, San Francisco (toll)  
Access Code: 146 016 0104

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 at 5:07 pm. Quorum is met.
Technical issues noted for Commissioner Jones and Asfaw.
Commissioner Quick requests that we schedule the cisco meetings earlier to account for the time it takes to log on. Staff noted.

Roll Call Attendance:
Jayden Tanaka, present
Valentina Alioto-Pier, present
Lillian Tang, present
Plyfaa Suwanamalik-Murphy, present
Calvin Quick, present
Gabrielle Listana, present
Adrianna Zhang, present
Gracie Veiga, present
Ariana Arana, present
Rome Jones, present
Erika Morris, present
ARSEMA ASFAW, tardy
Sarah Cheung, present
Sarah Ginsburg, present
Nora Hylton, present
Amara Santos, present
Stephen “Rocky” Versace, present

2. Approval of Agenda (Action Item)
No public comment. Commissioner Quick motions to approve the agenda, seconded by Commissioner Zhang. By a roll call vote the motion passes.

**Roll Call Vote:**

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

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

   A. October 19th, 2020  
   (Document A)

No public comment. Commissioner Zhang, seconded by Commissioner Quick, motioned to approve the minutes. By a roll call vote, the motion passes.

**Roll Call Vote:**

Jayden Tanaka, aye  
Valentina Alioto-Pier, aye  
Lillian Tang, aye  
Plyf aa Suwanamalik-Murphy, aye  
Calvin Quick, aye  
Gabrielle Listana, aye  
Adrianna Zhang, aye  
Gracie Veiga, aye  
Ariana Arana, aye  
Rome Jones, aye  
Erika Morris, aye  
Arsema Asfaw,  
Sarah Cheung, aye  
Sarah Ginsburg, aye  
Nora Hylton, aye  
Amara Santos, aye  
Stephen “Rocky” Versace, aye
4. **Public Comment on Items not on Agenda (2 minutes per public comment)**

no public comment.

5. **Legislation Referred (All Items to Follow Discussion and Possible Action)**

   
   Sponsor: Supervisor Mandelman, District 8
   Presenters: District 8 Staff
   (Doc B)

   Staff Estrada- This ordinance is amending a code that exists that establishes safe sleeping sites which are organized encampments for homeless people. This legislation would expand the program beyond D5 and D8. It would be extended to the rest of the city and all homeless people who are interested. It would establish a network of safe sleeping sites and be required to accommodate to 150 homeless individuals. In addition, access to clean bathrooms to be open from 8am-8pm.

   **Questions**

   Commissioners Jones- Is this unrelated to other places homeless people sleep?

   Staff Estrada- Yes they should be, Currently the only encampments are in D5 and D8.

   Commissioners Quick- the current program is separate from navigation centers but structurally similar. They rely on the same building codes as the navigation centers. Both are related but the legislation would not expand the centers.

   Commissioners Veiga- yes this would not add to the navigation centers.

   Commissioners Hylton- Are there any other plans to other available resources at the site?

   Staff Estrada- the encampments would not have additional resources, only a place to sleep.

   Commissioners Santos- what is the long term goal for this? Are there any protections from people calling the cops on the houseless folx?

   Staff Estrada- From what i gathered this seems to be an immediate response to the houseless issue in SF. Legal encampments are being proposed due limited space in shelters. If someone were to call the cops, they would know the encampments are legal, therefore, they have rights.

   Commissioners Veiga- Lower cost effects than other plans. They are aiming to rescue people from streets due to the policing people face on the streets.

   Quick- Rolling process that would ask the needs of the community. That information will be used to help the community.

   Commissioners Asfaw- Are these encampments only for the pandemic?
Commissioners Quick- currently there is legislation on temp encampments due to covid. However, the legislation would be an extended measure of the legislation on an ongoing basis.

Commissioners Veiga- How does the need of housing being addressed?

Staff Estrada- data from Coalition on Homeslessness, surveys from homeless people, and reaching out to see if homeless people are interested in being in an encampment.

Commissioners Quick- questions on sponsors, What % of people in safe sleeping sites are TAY and how does that compare to the general TAY estimate of the population experiencing homelessness. Depending on the data whether it would be worth setting specific targets at TAY. Why are they staying for 9 months, when multiples were created in 6 months. Why is the urgency slowing down? For resources they should be specific on how to connect to coordinated entry program since it's a mess. They should have a link to the program and the ability to connect TAY to safe sleeping sites in specific to TAY specific services. Lastly, HSH cant use muni for people who are in safe sleeping cities, I would like clarity.

Commissioners Hylton- I would encourage D8 office to what it wants to be. To me it sounds like the bare minimum on what they could be doing especially during the pandemic. Other resources could be a helpful addition.

Commissioners Santos- I agree with Commissioners Hylton, especially because it is the bare minimum. It does not seem to have sustainability or a long term plan.

Commissioners Veiga- I agree with Commissioners Santos. A bare minimum should have more pandemic resources but I don't think it is long term.

No public comment.

open the floor for motion.

Commissioner Quick motions for the position of no position (neutral) with the questions and concerns as specified by staff earlier, seconded by Commissioner Arana. Motion passes with 13 Ayes and 4 Nays.

Roll Call Vote: 13 Ayes, 4 Nays
Jayden Tanaka, aye
Valentina Alioto-Pier, nay
Lillian Tang, aye
Plyfia Suwanamalik-Murphy, aye
Calvin Quick, aye
Gabrielle Listana, aye
Adrianna Zhang, aye
Gracie Veiga, aye
Ariana Arana, aye
Rome Jones, aye
Erika Morris, aye
Arsema Asfaw, nay
Sarah Cheung, aye
Sarah Ginsburg, aye
Nora Hylton, aye
Amara Santos, nay
Stephen “Rocky” Versace, nay

Commissioner Santos motion of no support (no), seconded by Commissioner Asfaw. Motion does not pass by 13 Nays and 4 ayes.

Roll Call Vote: 13 Nays, 4 Ayes
Jayden Tanaka, nay
Valentina Alioto-Pier, nay
Lillian Tang, nay
Plyfaa Suwanamalik-Murphy, nay
Calvin Quick, nay
Gabrielle Listana, nay
Adrianna Zhang, nay
Gracie Veiga, nay
Ariana Arana, aye
Rome Jones, nay
Erika Morris, nay
Arsema Asfaw, aye
Sarah Cheung, nay
Sarah Ginsburg, nay
Nora Hylton, nay
Amara Santos, aye
Stephen “Rocky” Versace, aye

Commissioner Veiga motion of support (yes), seconded by Commissioner Alioto-Pier. Motion does not pass by 13 Nays and 4 ayes.

Roll Call Vote: 13 Nays, 4 Ayes
Jayden Tanaka, nay
Valentina Alioto-Pier, aye
Lillian Tang, aye
Plyfaa Suwanamalik-Murphy, aye
Calvin Quick, nay
Gabrielle Listana, nay
Adrianna Zhang, aye
Gracie Veiga, aye
Ariana Arana, nay
Rome Jones, nay
Erika Morris, nay
Arsema Asfaw, nay
Sarah Cheung, nay
Sarah Ginsburg, nay
Nora Hylton, nay
Amara Santos, nay
Stephen “Rocky” Versace, nay

Staff Hosmon explains procedure - vote by the most recent motion proposed. Can only vote aye or nay. majority rule applies.
Commissioner Zhang, rather get something done than nothing at all.
Commissioner Veiga, I’m definitely not feeling strongly any way but felt like supporting with recommendations could be a good call since I do like the idea of this work getting done immediately.
Commissioner Santos they don’t read our papers, blue red nada - bleak, own autonomy here.
Commissioner Jones often feel like BOS send things and ask our opinions not really care and political positions don’t do their job with the best position for the people.
Commissioner Quick echo and rome just said ongoing problem and all sides and voting the same side.
Commissioner Versace- I notice we say yes to things we don't totally agree with but don't follow up. I want to stop normalizing saying yes to things that don't go far enough just to get something. At one point we forgot about something, this motion has nothing in relation to youth which is our job. I don’t trust the system after we say what we have to say.

Commissioner Asfaw- I think there is a perception we are going to play it nice but as YC it's important to take a firm stance and speak up.

B. [Inform + Decision] File No. 201227 - [Urging a Just Transition to a Fossil Fuel-Free Future for California]
Sponsor: Supervisor Mar, District 4
Presenters: Edward Wright, District 4 Legislative Aide
(Doc C)
Edward Wright- legislative aid to Mar. In 2019 SF declared a climate state of emergency. Continued extractions of oil is dangerous and increasing climate temperature, California is complacent in this. We have to leave fossil fuels in the ground, it urges discontinue permitting any new fossil fuels extraction to set up production align w/ Paris Agreement. There are many opportunities to create new jobs in the direction against lowering emissions. We need state leaders to stand w/ us to do just work. We cannot lose sight of our climate change, it is an economic and racial justice issue. Continued fossil fuel extractions continue disparities and negative health outcomes for people of color. The SF BOS urges Gavin Newsom to discontinue permitting new oil and gas extraction, fossil fuel infrastructure, or petrochemical projects in California; and urges the California State Legislature to enact legislation prohibiting new permits for oil and gas extraction in California.

Questions

- Commissioner Quick- thank you for presenting. Last Chance Alliance, a lot of local youth led organizations have been advocating to raise awareness Newsom will not permit new oil and gas but has flip flopped. There is a lack of accountability at the state level. Have you talked to those organizations?
- Wright- I haven’t made directly about this resolution but will be happy to. It will be helpful to have the city and county in solidarity considering Newsom is the former mayor of SF. We think the timing is important now because of the election and have seen hints of momentum at the state level. We wanted to use that opportunity to work towards resolving that
on the state level. We want to talk the conversation and broaden and expand to all other forms of oil and gas extraction.

Commissioner Quick- Have you talked to other Senators or intend to?

Wright- That is actually part or the resolution we are awaiting.

Commissioner Quick- The use of natural gas in older/ existing buildings. Where are those discussions on the city level?

Wright- The legislative is moving forward, also there was a broad stakeholder engagement process that cumulative in a series of task force meetings. Our office has commissioned a report of resident bundling decarburization. We are finalizing it. We anticipate publishing it before the end of the year and holding a hearing on the report. Focused on how we move forward on new construction and old existing buildings on many different conversations.

Commissioner Santos- Thank you for presenting. SF environmental racism and impact on black indigenous and people of color. I want to know more information on that and what work is being done. pregnant mothers to Pregnant individuals.

Wright- Yes we can change the language. There are 3 separate documents the need to move to racial justice, black lives matter policy brief, numbers cited came from a study national defence council - who is at risk - disproportionate

Commissioner Zhang - What do opponents think?

Wright- no opponents but oppositions are workforce voices themselves. This is saying we are moving away from something into a just transition for workers. If we are telling people the industry is not helpful towards the planet, some people rely on it to pay bills. How can we help?

Commissioner Hylton- Youth language in the bill. Any plans to add language on the effects of growing up in an environment like this?

Wright- Thank you, if anyone has suggestions please let me know. We do not have any proposed solutions but I can look into it. A challenge is how recent the research. The environment health component does not have enough studies on the long term effects.

Commissioner Quick- recommendation is to add a youth lens, it might be useful around the youth stakeholders and groups who have been advocating at the state level.
Commissioner Santos- I recommended language change as well.

No public comment. Commissioner Quick motions to support with the following recommendations, seconded by Commissioner Viega:
- call out youth activism and stakeholders on this issue with a youth lens on public health effects of oil and gas extraction
- language changes to terms relating to pregnant mothers to pregnant individuals
- especially disproportionate impact to Black, Indigenous and communities of color.

By a roll call vote, the motion passes.

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

C. [Inform + Decision] File No. 201234 - [Hearing - Committee of the Whole - Shelter-in-Place Rehousing and Site Demobilization Plan - November 10, 2020, at 3:00 p.m.]
Sponsor: Supervisor Walton, District 10
Presenters: YC Staff

Staff Estrada- HSH transition out of hotels offered to houseless folx. Supervisors are concerned about the folks who rely on the hotels. There will be 4 phases to translate people out of hotel rooms into coordinated entry with the hopes of finding permanently supported housing or housing. HSH is doing this because it costs $200 per person per night which is a big expense because they receive no federal funding. Moving unhoused people into hotel rooms has had a positive impact on preserving their lives otherwise they would have been a vulnerable population.
Commissioner Quick- There are 2 considerations- hotels have been efficient but unsustainable due to budget and supervisor annoyed HSH is doing this very quickly, which began today. It is better to invest in long term housing over hotel rooms.

Staff Truong- Opportunity to reach out to appointee offices to find out more information.

Staff Hosmon- this legislation is a hearing.

Questions

Commissioner Quick- What % in SIP hotels are TAY, how does that compare to general population of TAY population. Recommendation- HSH needs to do a better job of reporting those numbers.

Commissioner Tanaka- Lack of language regarding youth in presentation. How are they including youth? If unlock federal funding, how will they be used for youth resources?

Commissioner Murphy- Clarification for coordinated entry resources?

Commissioner Quick- Coordinated entry- they are going to go into people living in hotel rooms and get them connected to coordinated entry. It is a place where the city can assist their position and relative risk of becoming a house less and match to the city's housing options. How are they planning to accomplish that? They are purposely vague and we should ask for more clarification.

Commissioner Quick- HSH mentioned re activate, congratulate, shelters which are shelters with many people in close proximity. We could tie in the youth lens, if they are going to be reopening how that entry w/ TAY center opened? Due to shelter limits, can there be more TAY navigation centers? I wonder if the city legally condemns hotel rooms on a temporary basis to reduce the cost of the current program?

No public comment.

----

Commissioner Zhang motion of position of yes position with recommendations previously stated, seconded by Commissioner Tanaka.

Motion passed by a unanimous roll call vote.

Jayden Tanaka, aye
Valentina Alioto-Pier, aye
Lillian Tang, aye
Plyfaa Suwanamalik-Murphy, aye
Calvin Quick, aye
Gabrielle Listana, aye
Adrianna Zhang, aye
Gracie Veiga, aye
6. **Presentations (All Items to Follow Discussion and Possible Action)**

   A. **[Inform + Decision] Defund SFPD Now - SF Police Officer’s Association Contract**

      Presenters: Lawrence Drinkard, Emily Messer, Alex Karim, Defund SFPD Now

      Edith Castorena, Lawrence Drinkard, Emily Messer- organizers of Defund SFPDNow. This campaign is a grassroots, abolitionist, org focused on defunding SFPD protecting Black and Brown lives against police violence. History of POA (Police Officer’s Association) - long history of opposing any civilian oversight of police in San Francisco. Despite demands of transforming public safety, the contract was negotiated behind closed doors. Core reasons against POA renegotiated contract- parity clause- tying fates to teachers, social workers- workers that provide real public safety, contact will now open in 2023, and approving it sets a precedent that BoS will cede power and rubber stamp anything. Timeline- Nov. 5th- GAO committee meeting, Nov. 17- likely first reading where Bos would discuss the contact, Dec 8.- Bos could vote and pass the contract, Dec. 15- latest possible point to vote. Asking to vote it down, if voted down would be sent back to human resources and POA. They are asking to join the organization, join in public comment on Nov. 5, and share the details of the upcoming public comments on social media.

      No public comment.

      **Discussion**

      Commissioner Hylton- thank you for presenting. I'm not the most educated on POA, confused how they tie into govt building vs outside association. Can I get clarification?

      Castorena- POA is a police fraternity, acting as representatives of police and employment contracts with the city. They are not a government body but on the negotiating side.

      Commissioner Veiga- Is there a union? police fraternity versus union

      Castorena-- something we are working on. Big differences between police union vs police fraternity.

      Commissioner Zhnag- by disapproving are we taking away something or just limiting?

      Lawrence Drinkard- we are not removing anything on the existing contact but not allowing them to put expiration on a contact during an election year and shuts down the parity clause.

      Commissioner Hylton- What kind of support would you want?
Castorena- we would love any support.

Commissioner Zhnag- if eliminating the funds, where would it go?

Castorena-- less about where the money’s going, more focused on them not getting the funds.

Lawrence- Those recommend years for raises, the budget is still not confirmed therefore, we do not know where they would receive the funds.

Roll Call Vote.

Commissioner Cheung motions to approve DEFUNDSFPDNOW 3 asks: join DefundSFPDNow in rejecting the POA contract, join in public comment tomorrow and in future bos meetings, and share the details of the upcoming public comment with network and on your social media accounts, seconded by Commissioner Jones. Motion passed with unanimous vote.

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

7. Committee Reports (Discussion Only)
   A. Executive Committee
      a. LAO
         i. hoping to hear legislation during our next meeting- chances to rent contributions which would make changes to supportive housing and use of hotels to shelter homeless people (more technical).
         ii. DHR racial inequality compliments
         iii. Some supervisors value YCs recommendations and other don't- an ongoing issue always going to face
         iv. some legislations still have not be heard but we cant pressure them if they aren't going to move forward
      b. Comms
         i. social media- after election debrief (optional)
         ii. week in the life of a Youth Commissioner sign ups!
      c. General Committee Updates
         i. buddy system due before the end of next week
ii. Attendance discussion- will create a new system
iii. implement pre prepared questions

B. Civic Engagement
   a. SF Chronicle seeking someone preferably 18 impacted by election results
   b. Watch party sent out
   c. Last phonebanking tomorrow 4-7

C. Housing and Land Use
   a. HLU priorities
   b. Omnibus priorities
   c. reviews BOS calendar
   d. Grand Challenge

D. Transformative Justice
   a. Worked on short term goals
   b. laid out priorities and set up work groups
   c. budget reallocation
   d. No More Kills Coalition
   e. DPA panels

E. OCOF
   a. nothing to report

8. Staff Report (Discussion Only)
   a. Staff here to support
   b. space to debrief
   c. self care guide
   d. Comms- post election debrief
   e. Itzel out of office- 11/7-11/15
   g. Meetings will set up at 4:50 and sending Google Calendar invites
   h. always will be meeting on Webex not Google Hangout
   i. Chronicle first time voter ideally 18 who will be impacted by election results
   j. Legislation referred check

9. Announcements (This Includes Community Events)
   a. Commissioner Jones, Quick, and Kiely working on getting paid roles- anyone interested? contact Kiely, Rome, or Calvin
   b. Interested in tabling? Contact Austin, Cavin, or other D5 members.
   c. Environmental task force (writing resolutions, letters of support) reach out to Nora

10. Adjournment
     Commissioner Hylton adjourned the meeting at 8:21 pm.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Youth Commission
FROM: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
DATE: November 10, 2020

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 No. 201185

Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to establish a standard of 30% of the monthly adjusted household income as the maximum contribution to rent for households participating in Permanent Supportive Housing Programs operated by the City and County of San Francisco.

Please return this cover sheet with the Commission's response to Erica Major, Assistant Clerk, Land Use and Transportation Committee at Erica.Major@sfgov.org.

RESPONSE FROM YOUTH COMMISSION Date: ______________________

____ No Comment

____ Recommendation Attached

__________________________________________
Chairperson, Youth Commission
[Administrative Code - Permanent Supportive Housing - Rent Contribution Standard]

Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to establish a standard of 30% of the
monthly adjusted household income as the maximum contribution to rent for
households participating in Permanent Supportive Housing Programs operated by the
City and County of San Francisco.

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

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

Section 1. Findings.

(a) The City and County of San Francisco contains approximately 8,000 units of Permanent Supportive Housing serving approximately 10,000 formerly homeless individuals and families that are funded by a variety of local, state, and federal programs.

(b) Recognizing the impacts of “rent burden” on low income households, providers of Permanent Supportive Housing subsidize rents in amounts based on the rules of the funding source for the respective housing unit, and calculate the household’s rent contribution accordingly.

(c) Due to the diversity of funding sources with different regulations, rent contributions can vary greatly between buildings, or even between units in a particular building. These inconsistent practices lead to inequities among Permanent Supportive
Housing clients based simply on the funding stream. This ordinance is intended to reduce such inequities.

Section 2. The Administrative Code is hereby amended by revising Section 20.54.1; adding a new Section 20.54.2; renumbering existing Sections 20.54.2 and 20.54.3 as Sections 20.54.3 and 20.54.4 respectively, and revising both of those Sections; adding a new Section 20.54.5; renumbering existing Section 20.54.4 as Section 20.54.6, and revising that Section; renumbering existing Section 20.54.5 as Section 20.54.7; and adding new Sections 20.54.8 and 20.54.9, to read as follows:

ARTICLE VI:

ENROLLMENT IN SOCIAL SERVICES

SEC. 20.54.1. TITLE.

This Article VI shall be known as the "Permanent Supportive Housing and Public Benefits Utilization Ordinance."

SEC. 20.54.2. FINDINGS.

(a) In 2004, the “San Francisco Plan to Abolish Chronic Homelessness” (the “Ten Year Plan”) prepared by the S.F. Ten Year Planning Council, developed the City’s “Housing First” policy, finding that “permanent supportive housing has been proven to be the most effective and efficient way to take chronically homeless off the streets.”

(b) The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (“HUD”) considers housing “affordable” if it costs no more than 30% of a household’s monthly income.

(c) Based on the U.S. Housing Act of 1937, and on the McKinney-Vento Act of 1987, HUD limits the monthly maximum rental occupancy charges for housing provided through the federal Continuum of Care Program (“CoC”) to the highest of: 1) 30% of the family's monthly adjusted
income; 2) 10% of the family's monthly income; or 3) the portion of a family’s welfare assistance that is designated for housing costs.

(d) It is in the best interest of the City and of the individuals living in Permanent Supportive Housing funded by the City and County of San Francisco, regardless of funding stream, to pay a standard rent contribution that is consistent with federal policy and regulations.

SEC. 20.54.23. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Article VI, the following definitions shall apply.

"CalFresh" shall mean the program that provides monthly benefits to low-income households that can be used for the purchase of food, as set forth in California Welfare and Institutions Code Sections 18900 et seq., including any future amendments to those sections.

"CALM" shall mean Cash Assistance Linked to Medi-Cal, as set forth in Administrative Code, Chapter 20, Article XVII, including any future amendments to that Article.

"CalWORKs" shall mean the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids program as set forth in California Welfare and Institutions Code Sections 11200 et seq., including any future amendments to those sections.

"City" shall mean the City and County of San Francisco.

"Client" shall mean any person residing in or seeking to reside in Permanent Supportive Housing. "Client" shall include any dependent children under 18 years of age residing with or seeking to reside with the Client in Permanent Supportive Housing.

“Contractor” shall mean any person or persons, firm, partnership, corporation, or combination thereof, or other entity that enters into a Housing-Related Contract with the City.

"General Assistance" shall mean the General Assistance Program as set forth under in Administrative Code, Chapter 20, Article VII, Sections 20.55 et seq. including any future amendments to that Article.
"Housing Provider" shall mean any Person Contractor that contracts with the Department of Human Services or the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, or other City departments to administer Permanent Supportive Housing.

"Housing-Related Contract" shall mean any City-funded contract, lease, memorandum of understanding, or other agreement or amendment thereto entered into on or after the operative date of this Article VI between the Department of Human Services or the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing City and a Housing Provider that provides for the administration of Permanent Supportive Housing paid for in whole or in part by the City to Clients of the Department of Human Services. "Housing-Related Contract" shall not include agreements between the San Francisco Housing Authority and the City, or contracts to provide City-funded services at Housing Authority developments.

"IHSS" shall mean the In-Home Supportive Services Program, as set forth in Administrative Code, Chapter 70, including any future amendments to that Chapter.

"Medi-Cal" shall mean the Medi-Cal Program as set forth in California Welfare and Institutions Code Sections 14000 et seq., including any future amendments to those sections.

"PAES" shall mean the Personal Assisted Employment Services Program, as set forth in Administrative Code, Chapter 20, Article IXVII, including any future amendments to that Article.

"Permanent Supportive Housing" shall mean housing units for Clients that include on-site supportive services, including, without limitation, intake and assessment of Clients' needs, outreach to the Clients to assist them with health or social needs, management of the health or social needs of Clients, mediation of disputes with the property management, and referrals for services to the Clients. "Permanent Supportive Housing" shall not include any shelter or site that offers temporary overnight sleeping space on a short-term basis provided by the City on City-owned or leased property or through a contractual arrangement.
"Person" shall mean an individual, proprietorship, corporation, partnership, limited partnership, limited liability partnership or company, trust, business trust, estate, association, joint venture, agency, instrumentality, or any other legal or commercial entity, whether domestic or foreign.

"Public Benefits" shall mean CalFresh, CalWORKs, General Assistance, Medi-Cal, SSI, VA Benefits, PAES, IHSS, SSIP, and CALM, or any comparable successor programs.

"SSI" shall mean Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Program for Aged, Blind, and Disabled as set forth in California Welfare and Institutions Code Section 12000 et seq., including any future amendments to those sections.

"SSIP" shall mean Supplemental Security Income Pending, as set forth in Administrative Code, Chapter 20, Article XIV/II, including any future amendments to that Article.

"VA Benefits" shall mean benefits and entitlements provided by the United States Department of Veterans Affairs, as set forth in 38 U.S.C. Sections 101 et seq., including any future amendments to those sections.

SEC. 20.54.34. CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS.

Every Housing-Related Contract executed after the operative date of this Article VI shall contain provisions in which the Housing Provider agrees to the following requirements:

(a) (1) The Housing Provider shall make reasonable efforts to help Clients determine the Public Benefits for which they may be reasonably eligible, and help Clients enroll in all Public Benefits for which they may be reasonably eligible. "Reasonable efforts" within the meaning of the previous sentence shall include but not be limited to meeting, or attempting to meet, with all Clients within three months of the Client's placement in Permanent Supportive Housing and at least once per calendar year thereafter to discuss the Public Benefits the Client is receiving, the Public Benefits for which the Client has applied, and the
Public Benefits for which the Client may be eligible but for which the Client has not applied. A Housing Provider satisfies the requirement of "attempting to meet" with a Client within the meaning of the previous sentence if the Housing Provider supplies the Client with a written notice of the date, time, and location of the proposed meeting at least two weeks before the meeting, then attempts to notify the Client at least twice by phone and at least once in person of the date, time, and location of the meeting. A Client "may be reasonably eligible" for a Public Benefit within the meaning of this Section 20.54 if the Housing Provider determines that the Client satisfies all of the criteria set forth on the worksheet created by the Department of Human Services Agency pursuant to Section 20.54.46 of this Article VI.

(2) During each meeting with the Client described in subsection (a)(1), the Housing Provider shall provide the Client with a document listing all Public Benefits for which the Client may be reasonably eligible and the different manners in which the Client may apply for those Public Benefits. The Provider shall assist the Client to apply for all Public Benefits for which the Client may be reasonably eligible by: making an intake appointment for the Client at the Department of Human Services Agency and providing the date, time and location of the appointment to the Client in writing; by assisting the Client to apply online; by assisting the Client to fill out and mail a paper application; or by assisting the Client to call the Department of Human Services Agency to apply by phone.

(b) During each meeting with the Client described in subsection (a)(1), the Housing Provider shall provide the Client with the release described in subsection (b) of Section 20.54.46 of this Article VI. The Housing Provider shall explain to the Client the purpose of the release.

(c) Each Housing Provider shall produce and provide to the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing and Department of the Human Services Agency a report each year that includes the following information:
1. (1) The percentage of Clients enrolled in each Public Benefit;
2. (2) The percentage of Clients who have applied for all of the Public Benefits for which they may be reasonably eligible;
3. (3) A summary of the reasonable efforts made pursuant to subsection (a) of this Section 20.54.34 to help Clients enroll in all Public Benefits for which they may be reasonably eligible; and
4. (4) If all Clients are not enrolled in the maximum Public Benefits for which they may be reasonably eligible, an explanation as to why a higher percentage of Clients are not so enrolled and a description of efforts that will be made to enroll more Clients in all Public Benefits for which they may be reasonably eligible.

A Housing Provider's first report required by this subsection (c) shall be due one year from the execution of any Housing-Related Contract entered into after the operative date of this Article VI.

(d) Each Housing Provider shall retain for three years copies of all documents generated or received pursuant to this Section 20.54.34 of this Article VI.

(e) Each Housing Provider shall cooperate fully with the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing when it conducts its annual contract monitoring visit, as well as any audits and investigations, including allowing the Department full and complete access to documents and employees.

(f) No Housing Provider shall discharge, reduce in compensation, or otherwise discriminate against any employee for notifying the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing of a possible violation of this Article VI.

**SEC. 20.54.45. STANDARD RENT CONTRIBUTION.**
(a) Every Housing-Related Contract executed after the effective date of this Section 20.54.5 (the effective date of the ordinance in Board File No. ______) shall contain provisions in which the City and Housing Provider agree to the following rent standards:

1. Housing Providers are not required to impose occupancy charges on clients as a condition of participating in Permanent Supportive Housing.

2. If rent is required, the rent contribution of clients participating in Permanent Supportive Housing Programs shall not exceed 30% of the household’s monthly adjusted income, as calculated in accordance with a specific project and/or unit’s prescribed calculation methodology. In any instance where the rent contribution calculation methodology is not governed by the project’s existing contracts, the calculation methodology set forth in 24 C.F.R. Sections 5.603 and 578.77, and related regulations, or any successor provisions, shall apply.

(b) All Housing-Related Contracts executed before the effective date of this Section shall be amended by October 1, 2023, to contain provisions in which the City and Housing Provider agree to the above stated rent standards.

SEC. 20.54.46. DOCUMENTS TO BE CREATED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY.

(a) The Department of Human Services Agency shall create a worksheet that lists the general criteria for eligibility for each Public Benefit. The Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing shall provide this worksheet to all Housing Providers and shall post this worksheet on its website. The Department of Human Services Agency shall regularly update this worksheet to reflect any changes that are made to the laws regarding eligibility for Public Benefits.

(b) The Department of Human Services Agency shall create a consent to release information form that allows the Housing Providers, other service providers, the Department of
Human Services Agency, and the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing to exchange information regarding the public aid status of the Client. The Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing shall provide this release to all Housing Providers and shall post this release on its website.

SEC. 20.54.57. NO CONFLICT WITH FEDERAL OR STATE LAW.

Nothing in this Article VI shall be interpreted or applied so as to create any requirement, power, or duty in conflict with any federal or state law.

SEC. 20.54.8. UNDERTAKING FOR THE GENERAL WELFARE.

In enacting and implementing this Article VI, the City is assuming an undertaking only to promote the general welfare. It is not assuming, nor is it imposing on its officers and employees, an obligation for breach of which it is liable in money damages to any person who claims that such breach proximately caused injury.

SEC. 20.54.9. SEVERABILITY.

If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or word of this Article VI, or any application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held to be invalid or unconstitutional by a decision of a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions or applications of the Article. The Board of Supervisors hereby declares that it would have passed this Article and each and every section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, and word not declared invalid or unconstitutional without regard to whether any other portion of this Article or application thereof would be subsequently declared invalid or unconstitutional.
Section 3. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board of Supervisors overrides the Mayor’s veto of the ordinance.

Section 4. Scope of Ordinance. In enacting this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors intends to amend only those words, phrases, paragraphs, subsections, sections, articles, numbers, punctuation marks, charts, diagrams, or any other constituent parts of the Municipal Code that are explicitly shown in this ordinance as additions, deletions, Board amendment additions, and Board amendment deletions in accordance with the “Note” that appears under the official title of the ordinance.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
DENNIS J. HERRERA, City Attorney

By: /s/ Virginia Dario Elizondo
VIRGINIA DARIO ELIZONDO
Deputy City Attorney
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LEGISLATIVE DIGEST

[Administrative Code - Permanent Supportive Housing - Rent Contribution Standard]

Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to establish a standard of 30% of the monthly adjusted household income as the maximum contribution to rent for households participating in Permanent Supportive Housing Programs operated by the City and County of San Francisco.

Existing Law

S.F. Administrative Code Chapter 20, Article VI, defines Permanent Supportive Housing ("PSH") as housing with on-site supportive services, and requires agencies that contract with the City to administer PSH ("Housing Providers") to provide those PSH tenants with information regarding the availability of, and assistance in applying for, various public benefit programs for which those tenants may be eligible.

Amendments to Current Law

This amendment will require Housing Providers to set a standard rent contribution for tenants in Permanent Supportive Housing of 30% of the household's monthly adjusted income, as calculated in accordance with a specific project and/or unit's prescribed calculation methodology, or under the calculation methodology set forth in 24 C.F.R. Sections 5.603 and 578.77.

Background Information

The City and County of San Francisco contains approximately 8,000 units of Permanent Supportive Housing serving approximately 10,000 formerly homeless individuals and families that are funded by a variety of local, state, and federal programs. Recognizing the impacts of "rent burden" on low income tenants, providers of PSH subsidize rents in amounts based on the rules of the funding source for the respective housing unit, and calculate the tenant's rent contribution accordingly. However, due to the diversity of funding sources with different regulations, rent contributions can vary greatly between buildings, or even between units in a particular building. These inconsistent practices lead to inequities among PSH tenants based simply on the funding stream. This ordinance is intended to reduce such inequities and set a consistent 30% standard of adjusted household income rent contribution for all participants in PSH programs.
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Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to establish the Guaranteed Income Advisory Group to advise the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, and City departments regarding the establishment of a Guaranteed Income Pilot Program.
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Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to establish the Guaranteed Income Advisory Group to advise the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, and City departments regarding the establishment of a Guaranteed Income Pilot Program.
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Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to establish the Guaranteed Income Advisory Group to advise the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, and City departments regarding the establishment of a Guaranteed Income Pilot Program.
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Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Chapter 5 of the Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Article XLVII, consisting of Sections 5.47-1 through 5.47-6, to read as follows:

ARTICLE XLVII: GUARANTEED INCOME ADVISORY GROUP

SEC. 5.47-1. CREATION OF ADVISORY GROUP.

The Board of Supervisors hereby establishes the Guaranteed Income Advisory Group (the “Advisory Group”). Guaranteed Income, also referred to as Universal Basic Income, is an income-distribution program that provides individuals with a fixed amount of money each month to cover basic living expenses. The goal of a Guaranteed Income program is to prevent people from becoming poor or remaining in poverty, and consequently to promote a more just society.
SEC. 5.47-2. MEMBERSHIP.

(a) The Advisory Group shall consist of nine voting members, appointed as follows:

(1) Seats 1, 2, and 3 shall each be held by a person with expertise in economics, finance, political science, or public policy, and with experience researching and analyzing Guaranteed Income programs, appointed by the Board of Supervisors.

(2) Seat 4 shall be held by a person who has personally experienced poverty while living in San Francisco, appointed by the Board of Supervisors.

(3) Seats 5 and 6 shall each be held by a person with professional experience serving low-income individuals, families, or youth, and with training and expertise in social, racial, or gender equity, intersectional problem-solving, or cultural humility, appointed by the Board of Supervisors.

(4) Seat 7 shall be held by an employee of the Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector, appointed by the Treasurer.

(5) Seat 8 shall be held by an employee of the San Francisco Human Rights Commission (“HRC”), appointed by the Executive Director of HRC.

(6) Seat 9 shall be held by an employee of the Human Services Agency (“HSA”), appointed by the Executive Director of HSA.

(b) Seats 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 may not be held by employees of the City and County of San Francisco.

SEC. 5.47-3. ORGANIZATION AND TERMS OF OFFICE.

(a) Members of the Advisory Group shall serve at the pleasure of their respective appointing authorities and may be removed by the member’s appointing authority at any time. Each member may remain on the Advisory Group until the termination of the Advisory Group under Section
5.47-6, unless removed by the member’s appointing authority. A seat that is vacant on the Advisory
Group shall be filled by the appointing authority for that seat as provided in Section 5.47-2.

(b) Any member who misses three regular meetings of the Advisory Group within a three-
month period without the express approval of the Advisory Group at or before each missed meeting
shall be deemed to have resigned from the Advisory Group ten days after the third unapproved
absence. The Advisory Group shall inform the appointing authority and the Clerk of the Board of
Supervisors of any such resignation.

c) Service on the Advisory Group is voluntary and members shall receive no compensation
from the City, except that a City employee appointed to Seat 7, 8, or 9 shall receive compensation from
the City as an employee, because work on the Advisory Group shall be considered part of the
employee’s work for the City.
(d) The office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector shall provide administrative and clerical
support for the Advisory Group. All City officials and agencies shall cooperate with the Advisory
Group in the performance of its functions.

SEC. 5.47-4. POWERS AND DUTIES.

(a) The Advisory Group shall advise the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, and appropriate
City departments, commissions, boards, agencies, and the public regarding:

   (1) Different paths to economic security, modeled on the principles of Guaranteed
Income;

   (2) Best practices in the administration and delivery of Guaranteed Income
programs, and challenges in the implementation of such programs;

   (3) How a Guaranteed Income program may be associated with reductions in
poverty and violence (including gender-based violence, intimate partner violence, and community
violence), and improvements in personal financial savings, school attendance, youth engagement with
school and community programming, birth outcomes, health, and well-being;

(4) How a Guaranteed Income program affects work stability, economic security, consumer protections, and economic mobility:

(5) The recommended components of a Guaranteed Income pilot program for 500-1,000 participants, in which each participant would be provided with a minimum of $500/month to be used without restrictions, which components shall be informed by an analysis of:

(A) The need for partnerships between City departments and external stakeholders, foundations, advocacy organizations, philanthropists, and leading public policy makers to support a pilot program;

(B) Best practices in program design and evaluation;

(C) Potential target populations;

(D) Fundraising strategies and opportunities;

(E) Legislative proposals;

(F) The implications for program participants of the receipt of Guaranteed Income Benefits on eligibility for and/or receipt of public benefits;

(G) The tax implications for program participants of the receipt of Guaranteed Income Benefits;

(H) The method of disbursement of benefits; and

(I) Long-term sustainability, including the identification of future funding sources.

(b) By no later than December 1, 2021, the Advisory Group shall submit to the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor a final report summarizing its research, findings, and recommendations on the topics set forth in subsection (a), and any additional findings and recommendations that the Advisory Group concludes advances its goals and fulfills its duties.
(c) In conducting the research and making the recommendations required under this Article XLVII, the Advisory Group shall consider best practices and approaches from other jurisdictions and the perspectives of low- and moderate-income people who are directly impacted by the benefits of Guaranteed Income programs.

(d) After submitting its final report to the Board of Supervisors and until its termination under Section 5.47-6, the Advisory Group shall advise the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, and appropriate City departments, commissions, boards, agencies on strategies to implement the recommendations contained in its final report.

SEC. 5.47-5. MEETINGS AND PROCEDURES.

(a) The Board of Supervisors, the Treasurer, the Executive Director of the San Francisco Human Rights Commission, and the Executive Director of the Human Services Agency shall make initial appointments to the Advisory Group within 60 days of the effective date of the ordinance in Board File No. ________, enacting this Article XLVII, and the Advisory Group shall come into existence upon the appointment of five members. The Advisory Group shall have its inaugural meeting within 30 days of its coming into existence. Following the inaugural meeting, the Advisory Group shall hold a regular meeting not less than once each month until the sunset date set forth in Section 5.47-6.

(b) The Advisory Group shall elect a chair and may elect such other officers as it deems appropriate, and may establish bylaws and rules for its organization and procedures.

SEC. 5.47-6. SUNSET.

Unless the Board of Supervisors by ordinance extends the term of the Advisory Group, this Article XLVII shall expire by operation of law, and the Advisory Group shall terminate, two years after the effective date of the ordinance in Board File No. ________ enacting this Article. After that date, the City Attorney shall cause this Article XLVII to be removed from the Administrative Code.
Section 2. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board of Supervisors overrides the Mayor’s veto of the ordinance.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
DENNIS J. HERRERA, City Attorney

By: /s/ ANNE PEARSON
Deputy City Attorney
LEGISLATIVE DIGEST

[Guaranteed Income Advisory Group]

Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to establish the Guaranteed Income Advisory Group to advise the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, and City departments regarding the establishment of a Guaranteed Income Pilot Program.

Existing Law

Currently, there is no City advisory body dedicated to providing advice regarding the establishment of a Guaranteed Income Pilot Program.

Amendments to Current Law

The proposed ordinance would create a 9-member advisory body called the Guaranteed Income Advisory Group ("Advisory Group"). The Board of Supervisors would appoint six members, and the Treasurer, the Executive Director of the Human Rights Commission, and the Executive Director of the Human Services Agency would each appoint one member.

By no later than December 1, 2021, the Advisory Group would submit to the Board of Supervisors a final report with findings and recommendations regarding:

- Different paths to economic security, modeled on the principles of Guaranteed Income;
- Best practices in the administration and delivery of Guaranteed Income programs, and challenges in the implementation of such programs;
- How a Guaranteed Income program may be associated with reductions in poverty and violence (including gender-based violence, intimate partner violence, and community violence), and improvements in personal financial savings, school attendance, youth engagement with school and community programming, birth outcomes, health, and well-being;
- How a Guaranteed Income program affects work stability, economic security, consumer protections, and economic mobility;
- The recommended components of a Guaranteed Income pilot program for 500-1,000 participants, in which each participant would be provided with a minimum of $500/month to be used without restrictions.

Following the submission of its final report, the Advisory Group would advise on strategies to implement the recommendations contained in its report. The Advisory Group would terminate in two years, unless extended by ordinance adopted by the Board.
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Dear Clerks,

Please find attached the following for introduction today:

[Guaranteed Income Advisory Group]
Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to establish the Guaranteed Income Advisory Group to advise the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, and City departments regarding the establishment of a Guaranteed Income Pilot Program

Hi Abi,

Attached please find the ordinance establishing the UBI advisory group, which is approved as to form, and the legislative digest.

Thanks,
Anne

Anne Pearson – available by cell phone at 646-241-7670
Deputy City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney
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San Francisco, CA 94102
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anne.pearson@sfcityatty.org
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Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. Chapter 5 of the Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Article XLVII, consisting of Sections 5.47-1 through 5.47-6, to read as follows:

**ARTICLE XLVII: GUARANTEED INCOME ADVISORY GROUP**

**SEC. 5.47-1. CREATION OF ADVISORY GROUP.**

The Board of Supervisors hereby establishes the Guaranteed Income Advisory Group (the “Advisory Group”). Guaranteed Income, also referred to as Universal Basic Income, is an income-distribution program that provides individuals with a fixed amount of money each month to cover basic living expenses. The goal of a Guaranteed Income program is to prevent people from becoming poor or remaining in poverty, and consequently to promote a more just society.
**SEC. 5.47-2. MEMBERSHIP.**

(a) The Advisory Group shall consist of nine voting members, appointed as follows:

(1) Seats 1, 2, and 3 shall each be held by a person with expertise in economics, finance, political science, or public policy, and with experience researching and analyzing Guaranteed Income programs, appointed by the Board of Supervisors.

(2) Seat 4 shall be held by a person who has personally experienced poverty while living in San Francisco, appointed by the Board of Supervisors.

(3) Seats 5 and 6 shall each be held by a person with professional experience serving low-income individuals, families, or youth, and with training and expertise in social, racial, or gender equity, intersectional problem-solving, or cultural humility, appointed by the Board of Supervisors.

(4) Seat 7 shall be held by an employee of the Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector, appointed by the Treasurer.

(5) Seat 8 shall be held by an employee of the San Francisco Human Rights Commission (“HRC”), appointed by the Executive Director of HRC.

(6) Seat 9 shall be held by an employee of the Human Services Agency (“HSA”), appointed by the Executive Director of HSA.

(b) Seats 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 may not be held by employees of the City and County of San Francisco.

**SEC. 5.47-3. ORGANIZATION AND TERMS OF OFFICE.**

(a) Members of the Advisory Group shall serve at the pleasure of their respective appointing authorities and may be removed by the member’s appointing authority at any time. Each member may remain on the Advisory Group until the termination of the Advisory Group under Section
5.47-6, unless removed by the member’s appointing authority. A seat that is vacant on the Advisory Group shall be filled by the appointing authority for that seat as provided in Section 5.47-2.

(b) Any member who misses three regular meetings of the Advisory Group within a three-month period without the express approval of the Advisory Group at or before each missed meeting shall be deemed to have resigned from the Advisory Group ten days after the third unapproved absence. The Advisory Group shall inform the appointing authority and the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of any such resignation.

(c) Service on the Advisory Group is voluntary and members shall receive no compensation from the City, except that a City employee appointed to Seat 7, 8, or 9 shall receive compensation from the City as an employee, because work on the Advisory Group shall be considered part of the employee’s work for the City.

(d) The office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector shall provide administrative and clerical support for the Advisory Group. All City officials and agencies shall cooperate with the Advisory Group in the performance of its functions.

SEC. 5.47-4. POWERS AND DUTIES.

(a) The Advisory Group shall advise the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, and appropriate City departments, commissions, boards, agencies, and the public regarding:

   (1) Different paths to economic security, modeled on the principles of Guaranteed Income;

   (2) Best practices in the administration and delivery of Guaranteed Income programs, and challenges in the implementation of such programs;

   (3) How a Guaranteed Income program may be associated with reductions in poverty and violence (including gender-based violence, intimate partner violence, and community
violence), and improvements in personal financial savings, school attendance, youth engagement with school and community programming, birth outcomes, health, and well-being;

(4) How a Guaranteed Income program affects work stability, economic security, consumer protections, and economic mobility;

(5) The recommended components of a Guaranteed Income pilot program for 500-1,000 participants, in which each participant would be provided with a minimum of $500/month to be used without restrictions, which components shall be informed by an analysis of:

(A) The need for partnerships between City departments and external stakeholders, foundations, advocacy organizations, philanthropists, and leading public policy makers to support a pilot program;

(B) Best practices in program design and evaluation;

(C) Potential target populations;

(D) Fundraising strategies and opportunities;

(E) Legislative proposals;

(F) The implications for program participants of the receipt of Guaranteed Income Benefits on eligibility for and/or receipt of public benefits;

(G) The tax implications for program participants of the receipt of Guaranteed Income Benefits;

(H) The method of disbursement of benefits; and

(I) Long-term sustainability, including the identification of future funding sources.

(b) By no later than December 1, 2021, the Advisory Group shall submit to the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor a final report summarizing its research, findings, and recommendations on the topics set forth in subsection (a), and any additional findings and recommendations that the Advisory Group concludes advances its goals and fulfills its duties.
(c) In conducting the research and making the recommendations required under this Article XLVII, the Advisory Group shall consider best practices and approaches from other jurisdictions and the perspectives of low- and moderate-income people who are directly impacted by the benefits of Guaranteed Income programs.

(d) After submitting its final report to the Board of Supervisors and until its termination under Section 5.47-6, the Advisory Group shall advise the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, and appropriate City departments, commissions, boards, agencies on strategies to implement the recommendations contained in its final report.

SEC. 5.47-5. MEETINGS AND PROCEDURES.

(a) The Board of Supervisors, the Treasurer, the Executive Director of the San Francisco Human Rights Commission, and the Executive Director of the Human Services Agency shall make initial appointments to the Advisory Group within 60 days of the effective date of the ordinance in Board File No._________ , enacting this Article XLVII, and the Advisory Group shall come into existence upon the appointment of five members. The Advisory Group shall have its inaugural meeting within 30 days of its coming into existence. Following the inaugural meeting, the Advisory Group shall hold a regular meeting not less than once each month until the sunset date set forth in Section 5.47-6.

(b) The Advisory Group shall elect a chair and may elect such other officers as it deems appropriate, and may establish bylaws and rules for its organization and procedures.

SEC. 5.47-6. SUNSET.

Unless the Board of Supervisors by ordinance extends the term of the Advisory Group, this Article XLVII shall expire by operation of law, and the Advisory Group shall terminate, two years after the effective date of the ordinance in Board File No._________ enacting this Article. After that date, the City Attorney shall cause this Article XLVII to be removed from the Administrative Code.
Section 2. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board of Supervisors overrides the Mayor’s veto of the ordinance.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
DENNIS J. HERRERA, City Attorney

By: /s/
ANNE PEARSON
Deputy City Attorney
MEMORANDUM

TO: Kiely Hosmon, Director  
Youth Commission

FROM: John Carroll, Assistant Clerk,  
Government Audit and Oversight Committee

DATE: November 10, 2020

SUBJECT: REFERRAL FROM BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

The Board of Supervisors has received the following proposed legislation which is being referred to the Youth Commission 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 No. 201273

Hearing on the City’s meet and confer obligations and practices with the San Francisco Police Officers Association, including the threshold for determining when meet and confer is required; and requesting the Department of Human Resources to report.

Please return this cover sheet with the Commission’s response to John Carroll, Assistant Clerk, Government Audit and Oversight Committee.

**********************************************************************************************************************************************

RESPONSE FROM YOUTH COMMISSION  Date: ______________________

_____ No Comment

_____ Recommendation Attached

______________________________  Chairperson, Youth Commission
Introduction Form
By a Member of the Board of Supervisors or Mayor

I hereby submit the following item for introduction (select only one):

☐ 1. For reference to Committee. (An Ordinance, Resolution, Motion or Charter Amendment).
☐ 2. Request for next printed agenda Without Reference to Committee.
☑ 3. Request for hearing on a subject matter at Committee.
☐ 4. Request for letter beginning :"Supervisor [blank] inquiries"
☐ 5. City Attorney Request.
☐ 6. Call File No. [blank] from Committee.
☐ 7. Budget Analyst request (attached written motion).
☐ 8. Substitute Legislation File No. [blank]
☐ 9. Reactivate File No. [blank]
☐ 10. Topic submitted for Mayoral Appearance before the BOS on [blank]

Please check the appropriate boxes. The proposed legislation should be forwarded to the following:

☐ Small Business Commission ☐ Youth Commission ☐ Ethics Commission
☐ Planning Commission ☐ Building Inspection Commission

Note: For the Imperative Agenda (a resolution not on the printed agenda), use the Imperative Form.

Sponsor(s):
Mar

Subject:
Hearing - Meet and Confer Obligations with the Police Officers Association

The text is listed:
Hearing on the City’s meet and confer obligations and practices with the San Francisco Police Officers Association, including the threshold for determining when meet and confer is required; and requesting the Department of Human Resources to report.

Signature of Sponsoring Supervisor: /s/ Gordon Mar

For Clerk's Use Only
MEMORANDUM

TO: Kiely Hosmon, Director, Youth Commission
FROM: John Carroll, Assistant Clerk,
Public Safety and Neighborhood Services Committee
DATE: October 30, 2020
SUBJECT: LEGISLATIVE MATTER INTRODUCED

The Board of Supervisors’ Public Safety and Neighborhood Services Committee has received the following ordinance, introduced by Supervisor Mandelman on October 20, 2020. This item is being referred for comment and recommendation.

File No. 201187

Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to require the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing to establish a Safe Sleeping Sites Program to provide unsheltered persons with a safe place to sleep overnight; and affirming the Planning Department’s determination under the California Environmental Quality Act.

Please return this cover sheet with the Commission’s response to John Carroll, Assistant Clerk, Public Safety and Neighborhood Services Committee.

RESPONSE FROM YOUTH COMMISSION Date: November 2, 2020

No Comment
Recommendation Attached

Chairperson, Youth Commission
YOUTH COMMISSION

MEMORANDUM

TO: John Carroll, Clerk, Public Safety and Neighborhood Services Committee
FROM: Youth Commission
DATE: Tuesday, November 2, 2020
RE: Referral response to BOS File No. 201187 - [Administrative Code - Safe Sleeping Sites Program]

At our Monday, November 2, 2020, meeting, the Youth Commission voted to take no position on the following motion:

No position on BOS File No. 201187 - [Administrative Code - Safe Sleeping Sites Program]

The Youth Commissioners voted to include the following questions, comments, and recommendations:

Questions:

- What is the long-term goal of this legislation to bridge the needs of houseless folks?
  Similarly, are these encampments just because of the pandemic or a longer term strategy?
- How is this related, or does it include, other places homeless people sleep (for example, homeless people using their vehicles)?
- How does this incorporate taking care of not only physical safety but also mental and emotional safety?
- What other/alternative plans do they have to provide resources at the sites?
- How is the need of housing included in this legislation?
- What percentage of people in Safe Sleeping Sites are Transitional Aged Youth (TAY) and how does this compare to the general TAY population experiencing homelessness?
- Since many Safe Sleeping Sites have been opened in the last 6 months why is there a slowing of urgency when the COVID-19 pandemic is still happening?
- Why is public transportation not available for those using Safe Sleeping Sites?

Recommendations:

- Using data, specific targets should be set based on the number of TAY in Safe Sleeping Sites so TAY needs aren’t excluded
- There should be clear links to coordinated entry and be explicit on how this is connected to the coordinated entry as well as
- Be explicit and intentional with connecting TAY in Safe Sleeping Sites to TAY specific services since their needs are different than adults
Comments:

- The Youth Commission advises the legislative sponsors to expand their idea of what this legislation could be. As there was no legislative expert from a sponsoring office to speak on this legislation, the Youth Commission posed concerns of the long-term sustainability.
- The broad sentiment from the Youth Commission is that this seems “bare minimum” and there was overall concern that there was nothing mentioned on TAY specific population and their needs.
- In general, more intentional focus is needed not only on TAY specific resources and support but also more emphasis on resources and support as a response to a global pandemic (PPE/masks, etc.) to keep this particular population safe and healthy.

***
Youth Commissioners thank the Board of Supervisors for their attention to this issue. If you have any questions, please contact our office at (415) 554-6446, or your Youth Commissioner.

Nora Hylton, Chair
Adopted on November 2, 2020
2020-2021 San Francisco Youth Commission
Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to require the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing to establish a Safe Sleeping Sites Program to provide unsheltered persons with a safe place to sleep overnight; and affirming the Planning Department’s determination under the California Environmental Quality Act.

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

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

Section 1. Environmental Findings.

The Planning Department has determined that the actions contemplated in this ordinance comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.). Said determination is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. ____ and is incorporated herein by reference. The Board affirms this determination.

Section 2. General Findings.

(a) San Francisco has struggled with homelessness for nearly four decades. Since the 1980’s, successive mayoral administrations have implemented different and sometimes divergent strategies to address the City’s most enduring crisis.
In 1982, Mayor Dianne Feinstein launched a network of church-based emergency winter shelters and soup kitchens. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, Mayor Art Agnos took a different approach, unveiling the “Beyond Shelter” plan to provide unhoused people access to supportive services and a pathway to long-term housing. In 1990, Mayor Agnos opened the City’s first two Multi-Service Centers, which were homeless shelters with onsite mental health and substance use disorder services.

In 1993, Mayor Frank Jordan instituted the Matrix Program which tasked police officers accompanied by social workers or health aides with clearing unhoused people from City streets and connecting them to services. In the first six months of the program, police issued over 6,000 citations for quality-of-life misdemeanors, such as public inebriation or sleeping in doorways. In 1992, voters approved Mayor Jordan’s Proposition J, which banned aggressive panhandling. Voters also approved Mayor Jordan’s 1994 ballot measure, also named Proposition J, which banned loitering within 30 feet of an automated teller machine for more than one minute.

After his election in 1996, Mayor Willie Brown declared homelessness unsolvable at a local level, and insisted any measurable improvement would require state and federal dollars to fund the housing and services needed to keep people off the streets. During his two terms in office, Mayor Brown’s administration nonetheless added thousands of units of affordable and subsidized housing, including leasing and renovating single room occupancy hotels for low-income and unhoused people.

Prior to his election as Mayor in 2004, as a member of the Board of Supervisors, Gavin Newsom authored a 2002 ballot measure, entitled “Care Not Cash,” which reduced City-funded General Assistance cash payments to unhoused people, and redirected the savings to fund services and supportive housing. According to a 2008 City Controller’s audit, the Care Not Cash program housed 2,127 people between its implementation in 2003 and
December 2007. The Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing ("HSH") estimates that Care Not Cash led to the creation of 1,300 units of permanent supportive housing.

(f) In 2004, Mayor Newsom introduced his “Ten Year Plan to Abolish Chronic Homelessness," which proposed to create 3,000 units of permanent supportive housing by 2010, and to replace shelters with 24-hour crisis clinics and sobering centers. By 2014, the City was still 300 units shy of the 3,000 pledged units, and had reduced the number of shelters beds by a third, from 1,910 beds in 2004 to 1,145 beds in 2014.

(g) Mayor Newsom authored two additional voter-approved ballot measures aimed at responding to homelessness: Proposition M in 2003, which amended the City’s panhandling and loitering bans, and Proposition L in 2010, which made it illegal to sit or lie on sidewalks citywide from 7am to 11pm.

(h) Mayor Ed Lee oversaw the opening of the City’s first Navigation Center in 2015, and in 2016 created HSH, pledging to spend at least $1 billion over the next four years to address homelessness. Mayor Lee directed implementation of the City’s Coordinated Entry system, seeking to improve the coordination of services by consolidating the dozens of City-funded homeless service groups into one system with a shared database. In the winter of 2017, shortly before his death, Mayor Lee pledged to move 1,000 unhoused people off the streets, and open two more Navigation Centers.

(i) Today, nearly four decades after Mayor Feinstein first attempted to respond to rising homelessness in San Francisco, the issue continues to vex the City. According to the Homeless Point-in-Time Count conducted on January 24, 2019, more than 8,035 people were experiencing homelessness at that time, a 17% increase from 2017. Among those surveyed, 5,180 were unsheltered, with 86% of unsheltered individuals sleeping outdoors in streets, parks or tents. According to a database of homeless individuals who use health care and
other services, the number of people experiencing homelessness over the course of a year is estimated to be much higher than the number of people who experience homelessness on a given night, with estimates that more than 17,500 people experience homelessness in San Francisco during a given year.

(j) During those same four decades, San Francisco has earned an international reputation for the severity of its homelessness crisis, with widespread reports of the City’s street conditions appearing in media outlets around the world. In January 2017, Leilani Farha, a United Nations Special Rapporteur on adequate housing, issued a report finding that San Francisco’s response to its unhoused population constitutes cruel and inhumane treatment, and is a violation of international human rights law including laws establishing the rights to life, housing, health and water and sanitation. Her report further stated “[T]he scope and severity of the living conditions in informal settlements make them one of the most pervasive violations of the human rights of dignity, security, health and life worldwide.”

(k) San Francisco voters expressed their own dissatisfaction with the current state of homelessness in a Dignity Health CityBeat Poll conducted in January 2020. 71% of San Francisco voters identified homelessness and street conditions as the top issue facing the City, and 89% stated that homelessness and street behavior had gotten worse in the past few years.

(l) The COVID-19 pandemic and the City’s Shelter in Place response exacerbated street conditions and contributed to an increase in the number of tent encampments citywide, with large numbers of unhoused people seeking shelter in neighborhoods throughout the City. This was at least partly due to a 75% reduction in available shelter beds, and a halt on new admissions to the shelter system in the early days of the pandemic, in compliance with guidance from the Centers for Disease Control requiring social distancing in the City’s homeless shelters, thus necessitating a decrease in the shelter capacity. This reduction in
shelter capacity is estimated to have forced nearly 1,000 unhoused people to return to City streets. From January to May 2020, the number of tents citywide increased by 71%.

(m) Although encampments increased across the City during Shelter in Place, the increase and related impacts were felt more severely in neighborhoods where homelessness was most acute prior to COVID-19. In the Tenderloin, the number of tents increased 285% between January and May 2020.

(n) On May 4, 2020, UC Hastings Law School filed a lawsuit on behalf of a group of Tenderloin residents and business owners over conditions in the neighborhood. As part of a settlement, the City agreed to achieve a 70% reduction in the number of tents by July 20, 2020. By July 3, 2020, the number of tents in the Tenderloin decreased by 65%. By July 10, 2020, the City reduced the number of tents in the Tenderloin by over 73%. As of August 18, 2020, the City had moved 87% of tents from the Tenderloin, and placed more than 600 people into Shelter in Place (SIP) hotels or other shelter. Since the Hastings lawsuit, three other lawsuits have been filed against the City. These lawsuits, except one filed by a plaintiff proceeding in propria persona, have been dismissed.

(o) Following the issuance of new guidance from the Department of Public Health (“DPH”) regarding street encampments, the City’s Healthy Streets Operations Center began resolving encampments in other neighborhoods as well, subject to the availability of alternative placements.

(p) Notwithstanding such efforts, conditions on our streets remain unacceptable. While some progress has been made in parts of the City, many thousands of people continue to sleep in unregulated, unsafe encampments without access to basic services such as water, food, sanitation, or bathrooms.

(q) As demonstrated by the summary of mayoral initiatives above, the reality that thousands of individuals remain without homes or shelter is not for lack of effort or investment
in solutions by the City. Since 2004, San Francisco has housed 26,000 homeless people.

Today, the City has more than 8,000 units of permanent supportive housing which house approximately 10,000 formerly homeless individuals every night who would otherwise be homeless.

(r) Since 2015, the City’s development of the Navigation Center model has represented a significant expansion of shorter-term shelter as well. Navigation Centers are unlike traditional emergency shelters because they are service-intensive and low-barrier, and provide case management, meals, showers, laundry, and 24-hour access, and allow guests to bring their partners, pets, and belongings.

(s) Since 2015, HSH has opened eight Navigation Centers, four of which are currently operating. According to HSH, from the launch of Navigation Centers in 2015 through the end of 2019, 48% of Navigation Center exits were either to permanent housing or reunifications with family or friends through the Homeward Bound program. Over 5,000 clients have been served at Navigation Centers from 2015 to December 2019.

(t) In October 2018, Mayor Breed announced a commitment to open at least 1,000 additional shelter beds, including Navigation Center beds, by the end of 2020. Prior to the outbreak of the coronavirus pandemic, the City was close to meeting this goal, and anticipates opening 880 of the proposed 1,000 beds by March 2021.

(u) In November 2018, the voters approved Proposition C ("Prop. C"), creating a new gross receipts tax on high-grossing companies estimated to generate over $300 million annually for homeless housing and services. In June 2020, a state appeals court upheld a lower court decision validating Prop. C, and on September 9, the California Supreme Court denied further legal review, freeing up nearly $500 million in revenue that had been collected but remained unspent pending resolution of the litigation.
During Shelter in Place, the City has acquired over 2,441 SIP hotel rooms to provide shelter to homeless individuals determined to be medically vulnerable to COVID-19. The cost of providing a hotel room is approximately $260 per person per night, although the City anticipates that 75% of costs may be reimbursed by the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

On September 29, the Board of Supervisors enacted the Fiscal Year 2020-21 budget, which includes funding for the acquisition or leasing of an additional 1,500 permanent supportive housing units over the next two years, largely funded through Prop. C revenue. These units, proposed in Mayor Breed’s Homelessness Recovery Plan, represent the largest one-time expansion of permanent supportive housing in San Francisco in 20 years. The budget for HSH increased from $367,690,818, in Fiscal Year 2019-20, to $850,065,660, for Fiscal Year 2020-21, with the bulk of the increase paying for Shelter in Place hotel rooms and new permanent supportive housing units.

San Franciscans are justifiably frustrated that after multiple decades and many billions of dollars of investment in additional shelter bed capacity, hotel placements, and permanent supportive housing units, thousands of unsheltered people continue to sleep on the streets night after night, and that the City relies on residential neighborhoods to serve as campsites of last resort for unhoused people, including individuals struggling with significant behavioral health conditions and substance use disorders.

The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in a case entitled Martin v. City of Boise, 902 F.3d 1031 (9th Cir. 2018), held that the Eighth Amendment’s prohibition on cruel and unusual punishment bars a city from criminally prosecuting people for sleeping on public property when those persons have committed no offenses other than sleeping on public property, and the city has not offered alternative shelter.
(z) Notwithstanding the many investments described above, San Francisco has never established a comprehensive citywide strategy for meeting the shelter needs of the unhoused. Safe sleeping sites offer a potential strategy for addressing the needs of thousands of people who continue to suffer outside every night.

(aa) Safe sleeping sites are designated and officially sanctioned outdoor spaces for unsheltered people, providing an organized area to stay with access to amenities and services that may include handwashing stations, bathrooms, daily meals, social services, and access to the City’s Coordinated Entry System.

(bb) Safe sleeping sites offer a scalable and sustainable strategy for addressing the needs of those people who continue to shelter outside every night and for whom the City does not have an available housing unit or shelter available.

(cc) On May 8, 2020 the Board of Supervisors unanimously enacted Resolution 191-20, urging the City to establish safe sleeping sites for unsheltered people, to encourage social distancing, improve sanitation, and slow the spread of COVID-19.

(dd) Subsequent to introduction of Resolution 191-20, on May 5, 2020 Supervisors Sandra Lee Fewer and Gordon Mar introduced legislation authorizing the use of San Francisco park property for temporary shelter and other measures in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, and directed the Recreation and Park Department (“RPD”) to provide to the Board of Supervisors with a list of potential locations for such uses. RPD and the Real Estate Division submitted a list of 42 potential sites. The sponsors tabled the legislation on May 18, 2020.

(dd) On May 13, 2020, the City established its first sanctioned and supervised safe sleeping site on Fulton Street between the Asian Art Museum and the Main Library, which provides space for safely distanced tents, 24/7 access to bathrooms and handwashing stations, daily meals, and health care services. As of October 14, 2020, the City has opened
six Safe Sleeping Sites, five of which are active. In total, the active Safe Sleeping sites provide a place to sleep to approximately 213 unhoused individuals. Safe sleeping sites are a proven model providing safe places to sleep and access to services for unhoused individuals who were otherwise unable to access housing, shelter or services. However, the HSH Fiscal year 2020-21 Budget includes funding for only 150 safe sleeping site placements, with funding decreasing to just 50 placements in 2021-22.

(ff) Because the City’s safe sleeping sites provide outdoor space with socially distanced areas for sleeping, access to sanitation and bathrooms, and 24/7 onsite security, guests are at lower risk of contracting and spreading COVID-19 than in congregate shelters where guests sleep in confined indoor spaces close to others, or unregulated encampments where there is little access to sanitation and no enforcement of social distancing.

(gg) Safe sleeping sites are a preferred option of unhoused people. According to a survey of 584 unhoused individuals conducted by the Coalition on Homelessness between June 3 and August 30, 2020, 58% of unhoused people surveyed prefer a “legal free campsite” to existing shelters.

(hh) Because the City lacks sufficient capacity in the shelter system or adequate housing alternatives to accommodate the thousands of people still living in tent encampments, far too many unhoused people continue to seek shelter on the streets. By establishing a network of safe sleeping sites so that every unsheltered person who is unable to access a shelter bed or housing unit can be offered a placement, San Francisco can ensure that all unhoused people have a safe place to spend the night, and no neighborhood’s sidewalks need serve as shelter of last resort.

Section 3. The Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding Chapter 118, consisting of Sections 118.1 to 118.8, to read as follows:
CHAPTER 118:
SAFE SLEEPING SITES

SEC. 118.1. TITLE.
This ordinance shall be known as “A Place for All Ordinance.”

SEC. 118.2. SAFE SLEEPING SITE POLICY.
It shall be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco (“City”) to ensure that every person experiencing homelessness in San Francisco has a safe place to sleep overnight. First and foremost, the City is committed to expanding opportunities for safe, affordable, and permanent housing for all residents. To supplement permanent housing, the City is committed to expanding opportunities for people experiencing homelessness to have temporary shelter, including but not limited to, Navigation Centers, adult emergency shelters, crisis stabilization units, family shelters, and shelters for transitional aged youth (“TAY”). To the extent that there is insufficient permanent housing and temporary shelter for people experiencing homelessness in San Francisco, it shall be the policy of the City to expeditiously establish and operate a network of temporary Safe Sleeping Sites where individuals may safely take shelter for the night, and to provide transportation as reasonably needed to and from such locations.

SEC. 118.3. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE SAFE SLEEPING SITES PROGRAM.
(a) Subject to the budgetary aid fiscal provisions of the Charter, the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (“HSH”) shall establish a Safe Sleeping Sites Program (the “Program”). By no later than 18 months after the Effective Date, the City shall have opened as many Safe Sleeping Sites as are necessary to accommodate all of the Unsheltered people in San Francisco.
who are willing to accept a referral to such sites, based on the most recent estimate prepared by HSH pursuant to Section 118.5, with such excess capacity as HSH reasonably determines may be necessary to ensure that a space at a Safe Sleeping Site will generally be available for anyone accepting such placement.

(b) HSH shall coordinate with the Division of Real Estate, the Recreation and Park Department, the Human Services Agency, the Port of San Francisco (“Port”), the Public Utilities Commission (“PUC”), the Municipal Transportation Agency (“MTA”), and such other City departments, offices, agencies, boards, and commissions as may be necessary or appropriate for successful implementation of the Program.

SEC. 118.4. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Chapter 118, the following words or phrases shall mean:

“City” means the City and County of San Francisco.

“Effective Date” means the effective date of the ordinance in Board File No. 201187, enacting this Chapter 118.

“Safe Sleeping Site” means an outdoor lot or facility meeting the operational requirements set forth in Section 118.7, as may be applicable, where Unsheltered individuals may sleep overnight in their own tent or bedding and may access services.

“Unsheltered” means having a primary nighttime residence that is a public or private place not designed for or ordinarily used as a regular sleeping accommodation for human beings, including a car, park, abandoned building, bus or train station, airport, or camping ground.

SEC. 118.5. ANNUAL ESTIMATE OF THE NUMBER OF UNSHELTERED PEOPLE.

Within 60 days of the Effective Date, and every year thereafter, HSH shall prepare an estimate of the number of Unsheltered people in San Francisco who are willing to accept a referral to a Safe
Sleeping Site, which estimate shall be used to determine the number of Safe Sleeping Sites that the City is required to operate, consistent with Section 118.3. HSH shall calculate the estimate in collaboration with the Controller, using the most accurate and current data sources available, including but not limited to the Point-in-Time Homeless Count, tent counts, and data collected and maintained by HSH and other City departments reflecting the rate of acceptance of referrals to Safe Sleeping Sites among people who are offered such placement.

SEC. 118.6. SURVEY OF REAL PROPERTY.

(a) The Director of Real Estate shall conduct a survey of real property in the City to identify lots appropriate for use as Safe Sleeping Sites, and shall submit the findings of such survey to the Board of Supervisors no later than three months after the Effective Date. The survey shall include vacant or unused sites owned or controlled by the City; sites owned or controlled by the City that are being used for other purposes but could feasibly be converted to a Safe Sleeping Site; private property, including property owned by non-City agencies, that could be leased or acquired by the City; and such other information, if any, as the Director of Real Estate deems appropriate to aid in identifying lots as intended by this Section 118.6. As part of the survey, the Director of Real Estate, in consultation with the Planning Department, shall note whether the use of a particular lot as a Safe Sleeping Site would require a variance, conditional use permit, or amendment of the Planning Code.

(b) The Director of Real Estate shall annually update the survey of real property required by subsection (a) and shall submit such updated survey to the Board of Supervisors.

SEC. 118.7. OPERATIONAL REQUIREMENTS.

(a) Applicability of Requirements. The location of a facility or lot on property under the jurisdiction of the MTA, PUC, or the Port requires the approval of the agency with jurisdiction over the property.
(b) **Operational Requirements for Safe Sleeping Sites.** Each Safe Sleeping Site shall:

1. Accommodate up to 150 Unsheltered individuals;
2. Prepare and implement a Safety Plan to ensure that the site is safe and secure;
3. Prepare and implement an Intake Plan designed to support Unsheltered people and address street encampments;
4. Prepare and implement an Exit Plan to assist clients who are exiting the site to relocate to places other than the street;
5. Provide access to clean and regularly-serviced bathroom facilities, and may also provide access to showers;
6. Be open and available for use during hours to be established by HSH, but at a minimum shall be open from 8:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m.

(c) **Transportation.** HSH shall ensure that transportation is provided between Safe Sleeping Sites and designated HSH shelter reservation sites, access points, and other designated pick-up/drop-off locations to persons who have been assigned a reservation at a Safe Sleeping Site by HSH or its designee, and shall provide expanded pick-up/drop-off service during wet weather events and emergency conditions. For purposes of this subsection (c), “transportation” shall not include bus or light rail service operated for public transportation by the MTA.

**SEC. 118.8. IMPLEMENTATION.**

(a) The Director of HSH may issue rules, regulations, and/or guidelines, applicable to the Program, consistent with the objectives and requirements of this Chapter 118.

(b) To the extent consistent with Charter requirements, the Director of HSH may enter into contracts or other agreements with other City departments, public agencies, and private entities to aid in the administration of this Chapter 118.
(c) All City officers and entities shall cooperate with the Director of HSH in the implementation and administration of this Chapter 118.

(d) Within 60 days of the Effective Date, HSH shall submit to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors a plan to open enough Safe Sleeping Sites to serve 500 Unsheltered people within nine months of the Effective Date, and enough Safe Sleeping Sites to meet the requirements set forth in Section 118.3 within 18 months of the Effective Date (“Implementation Plan”). The Implementation Plan shall include, but not necessarily be limited to:

(1) An estimate of the cost of implementing the Safe Sleeping Sites program during the 18-month implementation period, and the annual cost of operating the Program once it is fully operational. These estimates shall specify what portion of the costs, if any, can be paid for out of money that has already been appropriated to HSH’s budget, and what portion of the costs would require a new appropriation;

(2) An analysis of the cost-effectiveness of different Safe Sleeping Site models;

(3) A description of any services to be provided on the site of a Safe Sleeping Site, including but not limited to case management, treatment referrals, and/or coordinated entry referrals;

(4) A description of any accommodations that may be provided at some or all of the Safe Sleeping Sites, such as but not limited to cots, tents, pods, tuff sheds, and/or tiny homes.

(5) A description of the method by which HSH intends to select contractors or grantees to implement and/or operate the Safe Sleeping Sites Program.

(e) Within two years of the Effective Date and annually thereafter, the Controller shall submit to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors, as well as HSH, a report evaluating the Program, including an assessment of the number of Unsheltered persons served, the number of safe sleeping spaces made available, the average nightly occupancy rate for each Safe Sleeping Site, and data showing the number and percentage of exits from Safe Sleeping Sites that are made to permanent
housing, shelter, the streets, or another location, and any programmatic recommendations, along with
a resolution to accept the report.

Section 4. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after
enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the
ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board
of Supervisors overrides the Mayor’s veto of the ordinance.

Section 5. Undertaking for the General Welfare. In enacting and implementing this
ordinance, the City is assuming an undertaking only to promote the general welfare. It is not
assuming, nor is it imposing on its officers and employees, an obligation for breach of which it
is liable in money damages to any person who claims that such breach proximately caused
injury.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
DENNIS J. HERRERA, City Attorney

By: /s/
    ANNE PEARSON
    Deputy City Attorney
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LEGISLATIVE DIGEST

[Administrative Code - Safe Sleeping Sites Program]

Ordinance amending the Administrative Code to require the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing to establish a Safe Sleeping Sites Program to provide unsheltered persons with a safe place to sleep overnight; and affirming the Planning Department’s determination under the California Environmental Quality Act.

Existing Law

Currently, there is no law requiring the City to operate outdoor sites where unsheltered people may sleep overnight and receive access to services.

Amendments to Current Law

The proposed ordinance, known as the “A Place for All Ordinance,” would establish that it is the policy of the City and County of San Francisco (“City”) to expeditiously establish and operate a network of temporary Safe Sleeping Sites where individuals may safely take shelter for the night, and would require the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (“HSH”) to establish a Safe Sleeping Sites Program.

Subject to the budgetary aid fiscal provisions of the Charter, and within 18 months of the effective date of the ordinance, HSH would be required to open as many Safe Sleeping Sites as are necessary to accommodate all of the unsheltered people in San Francisco who are willing to accept a referral to such sites, with such excess capacity as may be necessary to ensure that a space at a Safe Sleeping Site shall generally be available for anyone accepting such placement. HSH would conduct an annual estimate of the number of unsheltered people willing to accept referral to a site to inform the number of Safe Sleeping Sites that must be opened.

Once opened, Safe Sleeping Sites would be required to accommodate up to 150 unsheltered individuals; prepare and implement a safety plan, intake plan, and exit plan; provide access to clean and regularly-serviced bathrooms; and be open and available for use from at least 8:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m. In addition, HSH would be required to provide private transportation between Safe Sleeping Sites and designated HSH shelter reservation sites, access points, and other designated pick-up/drop-off locations to persons who have been assigned a reservation at a Safe Sleeping Site.
Background Information

As of January 2019, more than 8,035 people in San Francisco were experiencing homelessness. 5,180 of these individuals were unsheltered, 86% of whom were sleeping outdoors in streets, parks or tents.

The COVID-19 pandemic and the City’s Shelter in Place response exacerbated street conditions and contributed to an increase in the number of tent encampments citywide, with large numbers of unhoused people seeking shelter in neighborhoods throughout the City. This was at least partly due to a 76% reduction in available shelter beds, and a halt on new admissions to the shelter system in the early days of the pandemic, in compliance with guidance from the Centers for Disease Control requiring social distancing in the City’s homeless shelters, thus necessitating a decrease in the shelter capacity. This reduction in shelter capacity is estimated to have forced nearly 1,000 unhoused people to return to City streets. From January to May 2020, the number of tents citywide increased by 71%.

On May 13, 2020, the City established its first sanctioned and supervised safe sleeping site on Fulton Street between the Asian Art Museum and the Main Library, which provides space for safely distanced tents, 24/7 access to bathrooms and handwashing stations, daily meals, and health care services. As of October 14, 2020, the City has opened six safe sleeping sites, five of which are active. In total, the active safe sleeping sites provide a place to sleep to approximately 213 unhoused individuals.

Safe sleeping sites are a preferred option of unhoused people. According to a survey of 584 unhoused individuals conducted by the Coalition on Homelessness between June 3 and August 30, 2020, 58% of unhoused people surveyed prefer a “legal free campsite” to existing shelters.
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TAY stands for Transitional Aged Youth & consists of people ages 16 to 25
About Us: MHASF TAT Team

The purpose of the Mental Health Association of San Francisco TAY Advisory Team is to advocate for statewide mental health initiatives surrounding the needs of the TAY population.

We are a group consisting of passionate TAY mental health advocates and providers committed to collaborating with state and local ordinances to establish resources for youth with lived mental health experiences.
OUR BIG ASK

“
To have a one-stop-shop TAY-focused Navigation Center within San Francisco that provides a wide range of services & opportunities suited to the wants and needs of TAY.
"
OBJECTIVES

SF TAY are in need of a one-stop-shop to access the support and services a Navigation Center has to offer. As many TAY who have come across a Navigation Center that does not meet their needs are left to navigate the City’s resources on their own, which can be a tiring and often discouraging journey.

Additionally, TAY are often limited by where they go to school or live when it comes to finding a center near them that has proper resources for them.
**DO YOU PARTICIPATE IN MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

15/31 (48%) reported that they participate in mental health services.

19% of our survey rated services in SF as not being the best.

58% of our survey rated services in SF as adequate. These participants may have better resources as they were rating this scale.
Why We're Asking for a TAY Specific Wellness Center

❤️ There are little to no TAY specific wellness centers in San Francisco - especially apart from schools

❤️ Peer support is empowering and encourages a wellness model rather than a medical model

❤️ Youth led spaces *for youth* cultivate a more comfortable and safe sense of community
Career Counseling
TAY are in need of career counseling outside of a school setting. A school setting typically only discusses college within their career counseling curriculum, however other options are available such as vocational schools.

Education on Drug Safety
TAY should be able to have a space where they can participate in open conversations regarding drug usage. More often than not TAY become educated about drugs by themselves because of the harmful scare tactics used in schools to scare them away from drugs.
What type of resources would you like to see in a youth specific wellness center?

- More diverse employment programs and information on trade professions and schools
- Meditation, mindfulness, yoga, career and skill development, art, music and writing workshops, culinary and nutrition education, nonviolent communication skills trainings, and financial planning, budgeting and investing resources.
- Resources for homeless youth to know where they can get shelter for the night that is up-to-date with shelter-in-place and COVID, and resources specifically for them to able to take advantage of.
- More community service based programs to help youth to and educate them of essential parts of becoming an upcoming adult.
My experiences with wellness centers have not been entirely positive. As a teenager, I utilized the wellness center during school hours, but often found that it was not as helpful. There were moments that I felt awkward walking in the space as I only used therapy services. The wellness center didn’t inform me of all the different services they offered, which made me feel unwelcome. A problem that I encountered with the traditional wellness centers were that it operated in schools, which meant that if I was too depressed to go to school, I wouldn’t receive services. I eventually dropped out of High School and that meant my services were cut. If there were more wellness centers that operated outside of regular school hours, more students will be utilizing these wellness centers and could create better teen communities.
RECRUITMENT FOR MHASF TAT MEMBERS

We need more and more volunteers to get involved and support our advocacy! If you’re interested, please reach out to one of us. We’d love to have all of you to be part of our team :)

THANKS

Do you have any questions?

youth@mentalhealthsf.org

www.mentalhealthsf.org
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To promptly, fairly, and impartially investigate complaints against the San Francisco Police Department, make policy recommendations regarding police practice, investigate all officer-involved shootings, and conduct periodic audits of the San Francisco Police Department.
WAYS TO FILE A COMPLAINT

You can file with DPA 24/7, 365 days a year

- **Online:** www.sfgov.org/dpa
- **Telephone:** (415) 241-7711 | TTY (415) 241-7770
- **In person or mail:** 1 South Van Ness Ave, 8th Floor San Francisco, CA
- Complaints can also be filed at local Police district stations
Goals of KYR Workshops

• Engage with SF youth/parents and inform them of youth rights in relation to law enforcement

• Present information in a way that is retainable and engaging
Goals of KYR Wallet Card

• Reinforce information from KYR Workshops
• Increase awareness about youth rights with law enforcement
• Present information in a way that is accessible and easy
KYR Wallet Card

Consensual Contact
An encounter with an officer where you are FREE TO LEAVE at any time. First, ask the officer “Am I free to go?”
- If “YES,” then walk away
- If “NO,” then your encounter with the police officer is detention.

PAT SEARCH
If police suspect you are armed or dangerous, they may:
- Pat down clothing
- Search for a weapon
- SFPD 7.01 REQUIRES that youth be searched by an SFPD officer of the same gender.

Consent
If you agree (consent), then the police can search you and your property without suspicion.
- When police ask “do you mind if I search you/your car/your home,” they are requesting your consent.
- Anything an officer finds during a consensual search can be used against you.
- If you don’t want to give consent, CALMLY say “I do not consent to a search.”

Useful Resources
- SF DPA: (415) 241-7711
- Asian Law Caucus: (415) 896-1701
- Legal Services for Children (415) 853-3762
- SF Public Defender’s Office: (415) 753-7601
- S.F. Immigrant Legal Education Network (415) 200-1548

Scan this QR Code using your cell phone camera to read more about youth rights in San Francisco!
HOW TO FIND US

1 SO. VAN NESS AVE., 8TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103

PHONE: (415) 241-7711
FAX: (415) 241-7733
TTY: (415) 241-7770

WEBSITE: sfgov.org/dpa

DIRECTIONS BY MASS TRANSIT

Major cross-streets
Market St. & Van Ness Ave.

BART: Just blocks from Civic Center BART Station
MUNI: Routes 47 and 49, drop off on Van Ness Ave.