

From: [Wong, Linda \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Wong, Linda \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: public comment budget and appropriations
Date: Friday, March 5, 2021 11:53:04 AM
Attachments: [30 Right Now.docx](#)

From: Jonathan Meade <juandelosperros@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 3, 2021 1:54 PM
To: Wong, Linda (BOS) <linda.wong@sfgov.org>
Subject: public comment budget and appropriations

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Hello Linda - I wanted to speak today at the Budget and Appropriations committee but had to leave the meeting. I am going to attach my comments. If you could take care of getting them placed into the record, I would be very appreciative. thanks, jonathan meade

30 Right Now

JM – retired PM from the SFFD and I'm here in support of #30RightNow. Which would make sure that no one living in City operated supportive housing pays more than 30% of their income to rent.

First – let's get the money issue out of the way.

The budget legislative analyst puts the cost of 30 Right Now at around 6.1 million for one year or 12.2 million for two.

The proposed budget for HSH for this fiscal year is 567 million. So, not only is this a drop in the bucket there is a strong argument to be made that – in the long run – this rent subsidy will save the City money,

And finally, the City is estimating a budget surplus of 125 million for this fiscal year. So, this is not a money problem. It looks like a political problem.

Second – let's talk about fairness. The federal standard from HUD is that no tenant pays more than 30% of income to rent. There are several thousand tenants in supportive housing in SF who are benefitting from this 30% standard. But there are 2-3 thousand other people in the same type of supportive housing who are still paying 50% of their income to rent. Can any of you give me any kind of a reason why this acceptable. It's not fair. It's not acceptable. And we can fix it.

Third – I spent 30 years on the ambulance and on the streets of SF. Over that period of time, I'm sure I delivered care to thousands of people living in supportive housing. So I have some appreciation of how difficult it is to live as a low income person in SF. I don't know how you survive as a low income person if you are paying 50% of your income to rent. I know we can do better. So we are asking you to help us solve a political problem. Of course, that is one of your specialties. If you need any help, let us know. Thank you.

From: [Wong, Linda \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Wong, Linda \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Budget and Appropriations Committee--support for #30RightNow and social housing
Date: Friday, March 5, 2021 11:54:56 AM

From: Jennifer Feng <jenniferfeng97@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 3, 2021 3:13 PM
To: Wong, Linda (BOS) <linda.wong@sfgov.org>
Subject: Budget and Appropriations Committee--support for #30RightNow and social housing

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Dear Supervisors,

My name is Jennifer Feng and I'm writing in support of #30RightNow and social housing. We have an opportunity to address the crisis of houslessness, both immediately and long-term, and I urge you to support these proposals.

#30RightNow keeps people in their homes, especially with COVID-19 still raging through our communities. According to the most recent eviction report from the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, 60% of all non-payment notices of eviction came from the one-third of supportive housing sites with rent burdened tenants, and there are, in some sites, more notices of eviction in a year than there were tenants.

We have the money to do this. According to the Board of Supervisors Budget and Legislative Analyst, it would only cost \$6.1 million per year to make a difference in the lives of thousands of tenants. To put this in perspective, it costs the city more to respond to houselessness than it costs to provide real, dignified housing at 30% of income for only \$6.1 million per year. Put differently, the city spends \$8.6 million per year on over-policing public housing tenants through the San Francisco Police Department's District Housing Officers program. That's \$2.6 million more than the #30RightNow ask. Since Proposition E passed overwhelmingly last year, allowing for defunding the police, there is no excuse not to divert funding from carceral systems and into life-affirming services. It's imperative that the city funds this beginning in the FY21-22 Budget Cycle and beyond.

Secondly, we need to fund a pilot social housing program this year. In November's election, San Francisco voters resoundingly approved Proposition K with over 73% of the vote, giving the City the legal authority to create a municipal housing pilot program. Voters also approved the Proposition I transfer tax, half of which was intended to fund Social Housing — mixed-income affordable housing for an average household making below 80% of median income.

I strongly urge you to fund a pilot program for Municipal Housing for All in the two-year budget, alongside other models of Social Housing, using funds in the Housing Stability Fund. To this end, I

also encourage you to support the supplemental appropriation of Prop I revenues to the Housing Stability Fund in Board of Supervisors File #201364. These funds can be used to both study and create the necessary departmental structure to support municipal housing, including asset management and property management. They can also be used to fund initial acquisitions of buildings under the municipal housing model.

The Housing Stability Fund was set up to prioritize the “acquisition and creation of affordable housing that lacks access to traditional state and federal affordable housing funding.” Municipal housing — with \$0 in funding at present — fully meets this priority definition, alongside other forms of under-funded Social **Housing such as community land trusts.**

Please support #30RightNow and the creation of a pilot municipal housing program.

Sincerely,
Jennifer
D3 renter

From: [Wong, Linda \(BOS\)](#)
To: [Wong, Linda \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: B and A Agenda Item #210157 -- PSH Rent Burden Ordinance Funding for HSH and DPH FY21 and FY22 Budgets
Date: Friday, March 5, 2021 11:56:31 AM

From: Matthew Steen <msteen@conard.org>
Sent: Wednesday, March 3, 2021 3:33 PM
To: Haney, Matt (BOS) <matt.haney@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Wong, Linda (BOS) <linda.wong@sfgov.org>
Cc: Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; Mar, Gordon (BOS) <gordon.mar@sfgov.org>; Ronen, Hillary <hillary.ronen@sfgov.org>; Anne Quaintance <anne@conard.org>; Zou, Han (BOS) <han.zou@sfgov.org>; Mcdonald, Courtney (BOS) <courtney.mcdonald@sfgov.org>
Subject: B and A Agenda Item #210157 -- PSH Rent Burden Ordinance Funding for HSH and DPH FY21 and FY22 Budgets

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

March 3, 2021

Members,
Budget and Appropriations Committee
Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco

Chair Matt Haney and Committee Members,

Conard House is urging this Committee and the Mayor's Office to fund the cost of implementing Ordinance 3-21, PSH Rent Contribution Standard, beginning the next fiscal year and annually thereafter. We feel and know this to be a high budget priority for the 2,887 permanent supportive housing residents currently paying far in excess of this new standard of rent burden, defined as a maximum of 30% of income to rental expenses. The great majority of these tenants live on extremely limited social security, disability and general assistance incomes, for many years paying a major portion of fixed incomes to marginally survive.

Our organization has been a major supportive housing provider for both HSH and DPH, housing 705 formerly chronic homeless in 27 SRO and cooperative housing sites funded from multiple sources. We currently have 185 residents paying in excess of 40% income in our DPH; of these, 65 tenants are paying in excess of 60% income and another 39 tenants in excess of 70% income for rent every month, some for many years. On the HSH side, we have 196 tenants paying in excess of 40% income; of these, 103 are at 50% income for rent. **In total we have 381 tenants who are severely rent burdened – 54% of our entire portfolio.** And, of course, other PSH providers share similar

ratios. Most of our tenants are aging-in-place, 22% are Latinx and 27% are black, and all are suffering a significant reduction in quality of life from the heavy burden of excessive rent.

We note that while HSH has requested this Ordinance be funded at a \$6M level, its actual FY21 and FY22 budget requests to the Mayor's Office has not planned for annual funding, as a result of the Mayor's budget instructions for department reductions. **We further note that DPH has also not included funding for this Ordinance in its budget submission to the Mayor's Office.**

We believe that funding the PSH rent burden ordinance falls squarely within one of this Committee's budget principles, housing affordability, unanimously adopted by the Board yesterday as well as one of the Mayor's budget priorities – "prioritize programs with demonstrated outcomes centered around equity". Recently, the Board endorsed AB 71, co-sponsored by Assemblyperson Chiu; part of this legislation incorporates the definition of maximum rent burden at 30% of household income. We feel it is imperative to equally fund both HSH and DPH dollar needs to fulfill the meaning and intent of this Ordinance at the earliest opportunity.

We urge your Committee to remember these 2,887 severely rent burdened supportive housing residents, already living with medical and mental health challenges, in recovery from many years of homelessness. The single act of funding the implementation of this Ordinance at the start of the next fiscal year will enormously impact many lives and renew hope.

Thank you for your attention.

Matthew

Matthew Steen
Senior Advisor,
Policy and Planning
Conard House, Inc.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10