

File No. 130605

Committee Item No. 3
Board Item No. _____

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Government Audit and Oversight Date October 24, 2013

Board of Supervisors Meeting Date _____

CMTE BOARD

- Motion
- Resolution
- Ordinance
- Legislative Digest
- Budget and Legislative Analyst Report
- Youth Commission Report
- Introduction Form
- Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report
- MOU
- Grant Information Form
- Grant Budget
- Subcontract Budget
- Contract/Agreement
- Form 126 – Ethics Commission
- Award Letter
- Application
- Public Correspondence

OTHER (Use back side if additional space is needed)

- SFPD - RESPONSE TO CIVIL GRAND JURY (CGJ)
- MAYOR'S OFFICE - RESPONSE TO CGJ
- PUBLIC HEALTH DEPARTMENT - RESPONSE TO CGJ
- RECREATION AND PARK DEPARTMENT / COMMISSION - RESPONSE
- CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORT
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

Completed by: Erica Dayrit Date October 17, 2013
Completed by: _____ Date _____

SUBMITTED w/9/1/2013
VIA EMAIL



Edwin M. Lee, Mayor
Philip A. Ginsburg, General Manager

September 19, 2013

The Honorable Cynthia Ming-mei Lee
Presiding Judge
Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco
400 McAllister Street
San Francisco, CA 94012

Re: 2012-2013 Civil Grand Jury report: "Golden Gate Park's Homeless Population: Are San Francisco's Policies Serving Us Well?"

Dear Judge Lee:

On behalf of the Recreation and Parks Department ("the Department") and the Recreation and Park Commission of the City and County of San Francisco, please accept this consolidated response to the above-referenced Grand Jury report's findings and recommendations.

FINDINGS

Finding 1. City agencies lack specific data on the characteristics of GGP dwellers, which prevents accurate profiling of individual problems and needs.

Response: *Agree in part, disagree in part.* The Recreation and Park Department is responsible for maintaining and stewarding public open spaces. The Department works with multiple city agencies to understand the general characteristics of GGP dwellers. On the whole, young, transient homeless are closer to the panhandle. Older, often military veteran, chronic homeless are on the west side of the park. Working cross-functionally with other City agencies, cross-departmental encounter data is available to the Department on many high-risk homeless individuals, including park dwellers, though additional information would be useful in planning for outreach, programs, and services.

Finding 2. With better information about GGP dwellers, their histories, and their needs, the City would be better able to move these individuals out of the Park, into a more stable situation.

Response: *Agree.*

Finding 3. Because the City does not track individual park dwellers and their interactions with social services, it is difficult to determine the efficiency and success of outreach efforts in reducing the park population.

Response: *Agree in part, disagree in part.* While individual park dwellers are not specifically tracked, to the extent they are high-utilizers of multiple City services, information on their service utilization is documented in CCMS. Golden Gate Park's homeless population has fallen over the last decade due to concerted outreach efforts. While there are still homeless encampments in the Park, this overall trend should be considered a success.

Finding 4. Outreach efforts to GGP encampments by EST are limited, which inhibits positive results.

Response: *Agree in part, disagree in part.* While EST outreach in GGP has occurred, it has not recently been routinely done or regularly scheduled. As the Grand Jury's report notes, EST assistance is available 24/7 if Department staff requests it. The Department will continue utilizing EST as a resource to connect the Park's homeless population to assistance and services.

Finding 5. The current system of issuing citations for nighttime sleeping and camping in the Park is not effective in reducing the current number of park dwellers.

Response: *Neither Agree nor Disagree.* As the Grand Jury's report notes, Golden Gate Park's homeless population has decreased significantly over the past decade. While their precise impact is unclear, some of this success may be attributable to the use of citations. It is imperative that the City provide the necessary resources to ensure that the citation process is effective.

Finding 6. Signs and information about the Park's closure time is inconsistent and confusing.

Response: *Agree.* Legislation currently pending before the Board of Supervisors will enable the Department to establish uniform hours of operation for Golden Gate Park and post clear information for the public. If the legislation passes the Department will work to quickly post signage.

Finding 7. Shopping carts facilitate moving personal items into the Park and setting up encampments.

Response: *Agree.*

Recommendation 1: The City should formalize a system to gather information on the characteristics of GGP dwellers and why they live in the Park.

Response: *Recommendation has already been implemented.* CCMS is a web-based database designed to function as an electronic charting, reporting, and communication tool for City teams working with homeless clients served across multiple systems of care. This system is used to

gather information on the homeless population as a whole and can be used to enter specific information on individuals in GGP.

Recommendation 2: Information about GGP dwellers should be used to tailor support services to specific populations, whose age and circumstances affect their needs and acceptance of services.

Response: *Recommendation will be implemented in the future.* With the additional information gleaned from dedicated EST outreach, support services could then be tailored to individual dwellers in the park.

Recommendation 3: The City should establish a system to track its outreach efforts among park dwellers and use the information to evaluate effectiveness in reducing the number of park dwellers.

Response: *Recommendation has been implemented.* Instead of establishing a new system to track outreach, CCMS will continue to be used to monitor service utilization by high-risk individuals accessing multiple City services. The information collected will be shared with the SFHOT, of which the Department is a partner, so that the individual's record is updated in CCMS and a support services response, including a further evaluation of the need for case management, can then be tailored to individual park dwellers and tracked over time.

Recommendation 4: The EST should conduct in-person, proactive outreach to park dwellers at different times of day and night in order to maximize their efforts.

Response: *Recommendation has been implemented.* EST policy has been changed to dedicate at least one outreach worker to conduct in-person, proactive outreach to GGP dwellers in tandem with SFPD and/or Rec & Park security. Additionally, the Mayor's HOPE Office will coordinate one SFHOT employee to attend the "Ops Park" monthly meeting with SFPD and Rec & Park staff to continually monitor the need for EST outreach at GGP.

Recommendation 5. The SFPD and Park Patrol should expand their outreach to GGP encampments to more areas of the Park and should vary the time.

Response: 1) SFPD and Park Patrol should expand their outreach to GGP encampments to more areas of the Park...: *This recommendation has been implemented.* The Department divides the park into six service areas and will continue to focus on all of these areas when conducting outreach and enforcement. 2) ...and should vary the time: *This recommendation requires further analysis.* As a matter of personal safety for park dwellers and Park Patrol staff alike, enforcement times should continue to be conducted when it can be done safely. The Department could provide outreach during the early evening hours in partnership with other City agencies.

Recommendation 6. References to the Park's closure time on all park signs, brochures and City websites should be made consistent with the Park Code and Rec & Park Commission resolutions.

Response: *This recommendation will be implemented in the future.* Legislation is currently pending before the Board of Supervisors. If it is passed, it will enable the Department to move


The Honorable Cynthia Ming-mei Lee, Presiding Judge
Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco
September 19, 2013
Page 4

quickly to post standardized signage, brochures, and electronic content about Golden Gate Park's hours.


Recommendation 7. The San Francisco Park Code should ban shopping carts in GGP in order to discourage living in the Park and to reduce litter.

Response: *This recommendation has been implemented.* Current policy already does not allow shopping carts in the park. Amending the park code is unnecessary; SFPD has a standing order regarding shopping carts which is enforced in all City parks. In addition, Park Patrol removes all abandoned property, including shopping carts, from park premises.

Sincerely,



Philip A. Ginsburg, General Manager
San Francisco Recreation and Park Department



Margaret A. McArthur, Commission Liaison
San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission

SUBMITTED 10/9/2013

FILE 130605

RECREATION AND PARK COMMISSION
City and County of San Francisco
Resolution No. 1309-012


GOLDEN GATE PARK
RESPONSE TO CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORT

RESOLVED, That this Commission does approve response to findings and recommendations in Civil Grand Jury Report dated June 20, 2013 entitled "Golden Gate Park's Homeless Population: Are San Francisco's Policies Serving Us Well?"

Adopted by the following vote:

Ayes	5
Noes	0
Absent	1

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted at the Recreation and Park Commission meeting held on September 19, 2013.


Margaret A. McArthur, Commission Liaison

RECEIVED 9/3/2012

VIA EMAIL

FILE NO. 130605



Edwin M. Lee, Mayor
Philip A. Ginsburg, General Manager

August 28, 2013

The Honorable Cynthia Ming-mei Lee
Presiding Judge
Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco
400 McAllister Street
San Francisco, CA 94012

Re: 2012-2013 Civil Grand Jury report: "Golden Gate Park's Homeless Population: Are San Francisco's Policies Serving Us Well?"

Dear Judge Lee:

On behalf of the Recreation and Parks Department ("the Department") of the City and County of San Francisco, please accept this response to the above-referenced Grand Jury report's findings and recommendations.

FINDINGS

Finding 1. City agencies lack specific data on the characteristics of GGP dwellers, which prevents accurate profiling of individual problems and needs.

Response: Agree in part, disagree in part. The Recreation and Park Department is responsible for maintaining and stewarding public open spaces. The Department works with multiple city agencies to understand the general characteristics of GGP dwellers. On the whole, young, transient homeless are closer to the panhandle. Older, often military veteran, chronic homeless are on the west side of the park. Working cross-functionally with other City agencies, cross-departmental encounter data is available to the Department on many high-risk homeless individuals, including park dwellers, though additional information would be useful in planning for outreach, programs, and services.

Finding 2. With better information about GGP dwellers, their histories, and their needs, the City would be better able to move these individuals out of the Park, into a more stable situation.

Response: Agree.

Finding 3. Because the City does not track individual park dwellers and their interactions with social services, it is difficult to determine the efficiency and success of outreach efforts in reducing the park population.

Response: Agree in part, disagree in part. While individual park dwellers are not specifically tracked, to the extent they are high-utilizers of multiple City services, information on their service utilization is documented in CCMS. Golden Gate Park's homeless population has fallen over the last decade due to concerted outreach efforts. While there are still homeless encampments in the Park, this overall trend should be considered a success.



Response: *Agree in part, disagree in part.* While EST outreach in GGP has occurred, it has not recently been routinely done or regularly scheduled. As the Grand Jury's report notes, EST assistance is available 24/7 if Department staff requests it. The Department will continue utilizing EST as a resource to connect the Park's homeless population to assistance and services.

Finding 5. The current system of issuing citations for nighttime sleeping and camping in the Park is not effective in reducing the current number of park dwellers.

Response: *Neither Agree nor Disagree.* As the Grand Jury's report notes, Golden Gate Park's homeless population has decreased significantly over the past decade. While their precise impact is unclear, some of this success may be attributable to the use of citations. It is imperative that the City provide the necessary resources to ensure that the citation process is effective.

Finding 6. Signs and information about the Park's closure time is inconsistent and confusing.

Response: *Agree.* Legislation currently pending before the Board of Supervisors will enable the Department to establish uniform hours of operation for Golden Gate Park and post clear information for the public. If the legislation passes the Department will work to quickly post signage.

Finding 7. Shopping carts facilitate moving personal items into the Park and setting up encampments.

Response: *Agree.*

Recommendation 1: The City should formalize a system to gather information on the characteristics of GGP dwellers and why they live in the Park.

Response: *Recommendation has already been implemented.* CCMS is a web-based database designed to function as an electronic charting, reporting, and communication tool for City teams working with homeless clients served across multiple systems of care. This system is used to gather information on the homeless population as a whole and can be used to enter specific information on individuals in GGP.

Recommendation 2: Information about GGP dwellers should be used to tailor support services to specific populations, whose age and circumstances affect their needs and acceptance of services.

Response: *Recommendation will be implemented in the future.* With the additional information gleaned from dedicated EST outreach, support services could then be tailored to individual dwellers in the park.

Recommendation 3: The City should establish a system to track its outreach efforts among park dwellers and use the information to evaluate effectiveness in reducing the number of park dwellers.

Response: *Recommendation has been implemented.* Instead of establishing a new system to track outreach, CCMS will continue to be used to monitor service utilization by high-risk individuals accessing multiple City services. The information collected will be shared with the SFHOT, of which the Department is a partner, so that the individual's record is updated in CCMS

need for case management, can then be tailored to individual park dwellers and tracked over time.

Recommendation 4: The EST should conduct in-person, proactive outreach to park dwellers at different times of day and night in order to maximize their efforts.

Response: Agree. Recommendation has been implemented. EST policy has been changed to dedicate at least one outreach worker to conduct in-person, proactive outreach to GGP dwellers in tandem with SFPD and/or Rec & Park security. Additionally, the Mayor's HOPE Office will coordinate one SFHOT employee to attend the "Ops Park" monthly meeting with SFPD and Rec & Park staff to continually monitor the need for EST outreach at GGP.

Recommendation 5. The SFPD and Park Patrol should expand their outreach to GGP encampments to more areas of the Park and should vary the time.

Response: 1) SFPD and Park Patrol should expand their outreach to GGP encampments to more areas of the Park...: This recommendation has been implemented. The Department divides the park into six service areas and will continue to focus on all of these areas when conducting outreach and enforcement. 2) ...and should vary the time: This recommendation requires further analysis. As a matter of personal safety for park dwellers and Park Patrol staff alike, enforcement times should continue to be conducted when it can be done safely. The Department agrees outreach should be done at varying times, keeping in mind staff capacity and safety. The Department could provide outreach during the early evening hours in partnership with other City agencies.


Recommendation 6. References to the Park's closure time on all park signs, brochures and City websites should be made consistent with the Park Code and Rec & Park Commission resolutions.

Response: This recommendation will be implemented in the future. Legislation is currently pending before the Board of Supervisors. If it is passed, it will enable the Department to move quickly to post standardized signage, brochures, and electronic content about Golden Gate Park's hours.

Recommendation 7. The San Francisco Park Code should ban shopping carts in GGP in order to discourage living in the Park and to reduce litter.

Response: Recommendation already implemented.. Current policy already does not allow shopping carts in the park. Amending the park code is unnecessary; SFPD has a standing order regarding shopping carts which is enforced in all City parks. In addition, Park Patrol removes all abandoned property, including shopping carts, from park premises and return to the owner.

Sincerely,


Philip A. Ginsburg, General Manager
San Francisco Recreation and Park Department

RECEIVED 8/20/2013
8:56PM



City and County of San Francisco
Edwin M. Lee
Mayor

San Francisco Department of Public Health

Barbara A. Garcia, MPA
Director of Health

August 19, 2013

The Honorable Cynthia Ming-mei Lee
Presiding Judge
Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco
400 McAllister Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: 2012-2013 Civil Grand Jury report, *"Golden Gate Park's Homeless Population: Are San Francisco's Policies Serving Us Well?"*

Dear Judge Lee:

The following is the response of the San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH) to the 2012-2013 Civil Grand Jury report, *"Golden Gate Park's Homeless Population: Are San Francisco's Policies Serving Us Well?"*

Since 2004, SFDPH's San Francisco Homeless Outreach Team (SFHOT) has successfully engaged and housed (a) chronically homeless adults with disabling conditions, including mental illness, addiction disorders, and significant medical conditions and (b) transitional age homeless youth 16-24 years of age who often have involvement in the mental health, foster care and juvenile justice systems. Additional priorities for SFHOT are homeless individuals who are public inebriates, aggressive panhandlers, and individuals with shopping carts and/or large amounts of belongings since these factors have demonstrated a higher risk of the individual being or becoming chronically homeless. The Engagement Specialist Team (EST) is the outreach arm of SFHOT and they have often been deployed to public spaces where homeless individuals sleep, such as encampments under bridges, freeways and parks.

In 2006, the estimated count of park dwellers was 200. In 2007, SFHOT was deployed to Golden Gate Park (GGP) to work with Park and Rec staff and SFPD to engage homeless individuals into needed services and to house them. As noted in the Grand Jury Report, five years later, the count had dropped to 50 dwellers with seasonal variations. Despite this recent successful trend, current estimates reveal that this population decline has plateaued. Unfortunately, homeless encampments continue to exist in the park. San Francisco has aggressively worked on this issue over the past decade.

In response, SFDPH's EST is dedicating at least one outreach worker to serve the GGP population on an ongoing, as-needed, and until needed basis. To assist with this additional focus on GGP dwellers, SFDPH will rely on its existing Coordinated Case Management Services System (CCMS), an electronic charting, reporting, and communication tool that routinely pulls client histories from twenty databases (e.g.,

The mission of the San Francisco Department of Public Health is to protect and promote the health of all San Franciscans.
We shall ~ Assess and research the health of the community ~ Develop and enforce health policy ~ Prevent disease and injury ~
~ Educate the public and train health care providers ~ Provide quality, comprehensive, culturally-proficient health services ~ Ensure equal access to all

barbara.garcia@sfdph.org ♦ (415) 554-2526 ♦ 101 Grove Street, Room 308, San Francisco, CA 94102

citations, psychiatric emergency, shelter) from five City departments and integrates them into one electronic medical record to provide critical information to teams working with high-need clients. SFPDPH has carefully considered the findings and recommendations of the Civil Grand Jury, and respectfully responds as follows:

FINDINGS

Finding 1. City agencies lack specific data on the characteristics of GGP dwellers, which prevents accurate profiling of individual problems and needs.

Response: *Agree in part, disagree in part.* City agencies understand the general characteristics of GGP dwellers. On the whole, young, transient homeless are closer to the panhandle. Older, often military veteran, chronic homeless are on the west side of the park. In addition, through the CCMS system, cross-departmental encounter data is available on many high-risk homeless individuals, including park dwellers, though additional information would be useful in planning for outreach, programs, and services.

Finding 2. With better information about GGP dwellers, their histories, and their needs, the City would be better able to move these individuals out of the Park, into a more stable situation.

Response: *Agree.* Additional information on park dwellers would be helpful. The dedicated EST worker will assist with this by performing the initial outreach, engagement and assessment of homeless individuals in GGP. The information collected will be shared with the larger SFHOT so that the individual's record is updated in CCMS and a support services response, including a further evaluation of the need for case management, can then be tailored to individual park dwellers.

Finding 3. Because the City does not track individual park dwellers and their interactions with social services, it is difficult to determine the efficiency and success of outreach efforts in reducing the park population.

Response: *Agree in part, disagree in part.* While individual park dwellers are not specifically tracked, to the extent they are high-utilizers of multiple City services, information on their service utilization is documented in CCMS. The GGP population has fallen over the last decade due to concerted outreach efforts. While there are still homeless encampments in GGP, this overall trend should be considered a success.

Finding 4. Outreach efforts to GGP encampments by EST are limited, which inhibits positive results.

Response: *Agree in part, disagree in part.* Currently, EST responds to requests for homeless outreach across the city. Requests come primarily from 311, SFPD, HOPE, and other city departments for outreach under bridges and freeways, in parks, and at other locations. While EST outreach in GGP has occurred, it has not recently been routinely done or regularly scheduled.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1: The City should formalize a system to gather information on the characteristics of GGP dwellers and why they live in the Park.

Response: *Recommendation has already been implemented.* CCMS is a web-based database designed to function as an electronic charting, reporting, and communication tool for City teams working with homeless clients served across multiple systems of care. CCMS currently has data imputed from SFDPH, Fire, Jail Health Services, Direct Access to Housing, and the Engagement Specialist Team. This system is used to gather information on the homeless population as a whole and can be used to enter specific information on individuals in GGP. Aggregate information, such as profiles of the population, can be developed through CCMS.

Recommendation 2: Information about GGP dwellers should be used to tailor support services to specific populations, whose age and circumstances affect their needs and acceptance of services.

Response: *Recommendation will be implemented in the future.* With the additional information gleaned from dedicated EST outreach, support services could then be tailored to individual dwellers in the park.

Recommendation 3: The City should establish a system to track its outreach efforts among park dwellers and use the information to evaluate effectiveness in reducing the number of park dwellers.


Response: *Recommendation will not be implemented.* Instead of establishing a new system to track outreach, CCMS will continue to be used to monitor service utilization by high-risk individuals accessing multiple City services. The information collected will be shared with the larger SFHOT so that the individual's record is updated in CCMS and a support services response, including a further evaluation of the need for case management, can then be tailored to individual park dwellers and tracked over time.

Recommendation 4: The EST should conduct in-person, proactive outreach to park dwellers at different times of day and night in order to maximize their efforts.

Response: *Recommendation has been implemented.* SFDPH has changed EST policy to dedicate at least one outreach worker to immediately and on an ongoing, as-needed, and until needed basis, conduct in-person, proactive outreach to GGP dwellers at optimum days of the week and times of day to occur in tandem with SFPD and/or Rec & Park security. Additionally, the Mayor's HOPE Office will coordinate one SFHOT employee to attend the "Ops Park" monthly meeting with SFPD and Rec & Park staff to continually monitor need for EST outreach at GGP.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this Civil Grand Jury report.

Sincerely,


Barbara Garcia, MPA
Director of Health

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



RECEIVED 8/20/13
5:20PM
EDWIN M. LEE VIA EMAIL
MAYOR

August 19, 2013

The Honorable Cynthia Ming-mei Lee
Presiding Judge
Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco
400 McAllister Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Judge Lee:

The following is in response to the 2012-2013 Civil Grand Jury report, "*Golden Gate Park's Homeless Population: Are San Francisco's Policies Serving Us Well?*"

Golden Gate Park is the crown jewel of the San Francisco's park system. An estimated 13 million people enjoy the fifth most visited urban park in the United States. In one day, a visitor could enjoy a museum, participate in a recreational activity, or simply meander through open space.

Sadly, homeless encampments continue to exist in the park. San Francisco has aggressively worked on this issue over the past decade. The City has made a concerted effort to assist those without a home, not just in the park but elsewhere, find permanent housing. In 2006, the estimated count of park dwellers was 200. Just five years later, the count had dropped to 50 dwellers with seasonal variations. Despite this recent successful trend, current estimates reveal that this population decline has plateaued.

In response, DPH's Engagement Specialist Team (EST), the outreach arm of the San Francisco Homeless Outreach Team (SFHOT), is dedicating at least one outreach worker to serve the Golden Gate Park population on an ongoing, as-needed, and until needed basis. To assist with this additional focus, City agencies will rely on the existing Coordinated Case Management Services System (CCMS), an electronic charting, reporting, and communication tool that routinely pulls client histories from twenty databases (e.g., citations, psychiatric emergency, shelter) from five City departments and integrates them into one electronic medical record to provide critical information to teams working with high-need clients.

Finally, proposed legislation is pending at the Board of Supervisors that would standardize park closure hours throughout the entire Recreation and Park Department (Rec Park) system. If adopted, a clear closing time would be established for Golden Gate Park.

In response, I have carefully considered the findings and recommendations of the Civil Grand Jury, as well as the response of DPH, SFPD, and Rec Park.

The Mayor's Office response to the Civil Grand Jury's findings is as follows:

Finding 1. City agencies lack specific data on the characteristics of GGP dwellers, which prevents accurate profiling of individual problems and needs.

1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, ROOM 200
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94102-4681
TELEPHONE: (415) 554-6141

Response: *Agree in part, disagree in part.* City agencies understand the general characteristics of park dwellers. On the whole, young, transient homeless are closer to the panhandle. Older, often military veteran, chronic homeless are on the west side of the park. In addition, through the CCMS system, cross-departmental encounter data is available on many high-risk homeless individuals, including park dwellers, though additional information would be useful in planning for outreach, programs, and services. To accurately profile the population, the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) could provide SFHOT with additional, specific information on individuals encountered during outreach.

Finding 2. With better information about Golden Gate Park dwellers, their histories, and their needs, the City would be better able to move these individuals out of the Park, into a more stable situation.

Response: *Agree.* Additional information on park dwellers would be helpful. The dedicated EST worker will assist with this by performing the initial outreach, engagement and assessment of homeless individuals in Golden Gate Park. The information collected will be shared with the larger SFHOT so that the individual's record is updated in CCMS and a support services response, including a further evaluation of the need for case management, can then be tailored to individual park dwellers.

Finding 3. Because the City does not track individual park dwellers and their interactions with social services, it is difficult to determine the efficiency and success of outreach efforts in reducing the park population.

Response: *Agree in part, disagree in part.* While individual park dwellers are not specifically tracked, to the extent they are high-utilizers of multiple City services, information on their service utilization is documented in CCMS. The Golden Gate Park population has fallen over the last decade due to concerted outreach efforts. While there are still homeless encampments in Golden Gate Park, this overall trend should be considered a success.

Finding 7. Shopping carts facilitate moving personal items into the Park and setting up encampments.

Response: *Agree.* As stated in the Rec Park response, SFPD has a standing order regarding shopping carts which is enforced in all City parks. In addition, Park Patrol removes all abandoned property, including shopping carts, from park premises.

The Mayor's Office response to the Civil Grand Jury's recommendations is as follows:

Recommendation 1: The City should formalize a system to gather information on the characteristics of Golden Gate Park dwellers and why they live in the Park.

Response: *Recommendation already implemented.* CCMS is a web-based database designed to function as an electronic charting, reporting, and communication tool for City teams working with homeless clients served across multiple systems of care. CCMS currently has data imputed from DPH, Fire, Jail Health Services, Direct Access to Housing, and the Engagement Specialist Team. This system is used to gather information on the homeless population as a whole and can be used to enter specific information on individuals in Golden Gate Park. Aggregate information, such as profiles of the population, can be developed through CCMS.

Recommendation 2: Information about Golden Gate Park dwellers should be used to tailor support services to specific populations, whose age and circumstances affect their needs and acceptance of services.

Response: *Recommendation will be implemented in the future.* With the additional information gleaned from dedicated outreach, support services could then be tailored to individual dwellers in the park.

Recommendation 3: The City should establish a system to track its outreach efforts among park dwellers and use the information to evaluate effectiveness in reducing the number of park dwellers.


Response: *Recommendation will not be implemented.* Instead of establishing a new system to track outreach, CCMS will continue to be used to monitor service utilization by high-risk individuals accessing multiple City services. The information collected will be shared with the larger SFHOT so that the individual's record is updated in CCMS and a support services response, including a further evaluation of the need for case management, can then be tailored to individual park dwellers and tracked over time.

Recommendation 7: The San Francisco Park Code should ban shopping carts in Golden Gate Park in order to discourage living in the Park and to reduce litter.

Response: *Recommendation will not be implemented.* Current policy already does not allow shopping carts in the park. Amending the park code is unnecessary; SFPD has a standing order regarding shopping carts which is enforced in all City parks. In addition, Park Patrol removes all abandoned property, including shopping carts, from park premises.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this Civil Grand Jury report.

Sincerely,



Edwin M. Lee
Mayor

130605

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco 94102-4689
Tel. No. 554-5184
Fax No. 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. 544-5227

DATE: June 21, 2013
TO: Members of the Board of Supervisors
FROM:  Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board
SUBJECT: 2012-2013 Civil Grand Jury Report

We are in receipt of the San Francisco Civil Grand Jury report released Thursday, June 20, 2013, entitled: **Golden Gate Park's Homeless Population: Are San Francisco's Policies Serving Us Well?** (Attached)

Pursuant to California Penal Code, Sections 933 and 933.05, the Board must:

1. Respond to the report within 90 days of receipt, or no later than September 19, 2013.
2. For each finding:
 - agree with the finding; or
 - disagree with the finding, wholly or partially, and explain why.
3. For each recommendation indicate:
 - when the recommendation was implemented;
 - when the recommendation will be implemented;
 - that the recommendation requires further analysis; or
 - that the recommendation will not be implemented, and explain why.

Pursuant to Administrative Code, Section 2.10, in coordination with the Committee Chair, the Clerk will schedule a public hearing before the Government Audit and Oversight Committee to allow the Board the necessary time to review and formally respond to the findings and recommendations.

The Office of the Budget and Legislative Analyst will prepare a resolution, outlining the findings and recommendations for the Committee's consideration, to be heard at the same time as the hearing on the report.

Attachment

- c: Honorable Cynthia Ming-mei Lee, Presiding Judge (w/o attachment)
- Martha Mangold, Foreperson, 2012-2013 San Francisco Civil Grand Jury (w/o attachment)
- Mayor's Office
- Ben Rosenfield, Controller
- Jon Givner, Deputy City Attorney (w/o attachment)
- Rick Caldeira, Legislative Deputy
- Debra Newman, Office of the Budget and Legislative Analyst
- Severin Campbell, Office of the Budget and Legislative Analyst

Orig: Leg Clerk
C: COB, g Dep. BOS-11 (directly)
GAD clerk, cpage

#3

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
CIVIL GRAND JURY



June 18, 2013

Angela Calvillo
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2013 JUN 18 AM 9:48
JH

Dear Ms. Calvillo,

The 2012 – 2013 Civil Grand Jury will release its report entitled, "Golden Gate Park's Homeless Population: Are San Francisco's Policies Serving Us Well?" to the public on June 20, 2013. Enclosed is an advance copy of this report. Please note that by order of the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court, Hon. Cynthia Ming-mei Lee, this report is to be kept confidential until the date of release.

California Penal Code §933.5 requires a response to the Presiding Judge no later than September 19, 2013. For each finding in the report, you must either (1) agree with the finding; or (2) disagree with it, wholly or partially, and explain why.

Further, as to each recommendation, your response must either indicate:

- 1) That the recommendation has been implemented, with a summary of how it was implemented;
- 2) That the recommendation has not been, but will be, implemented in the future, with a timeframe for implementation;
- 3) That the recommendation requires further analysis, with an explanation of the scope of that analysis and a timeframe for discussion, not more than six months from the release of the report; or
- 4) That the recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable, with an explanation. (California Penal Code § 933 and §933.05)

Please provide your response to Presiding Judge Lee at the address below.

Very truly yours,


Martha M. Mangold, Foreperson
2012 – 2013 Civil Grand Jury

400 McAllister Street, Room 008
San Francisco, CA 94102-4512
Phone: 415-551-3605

Golden Gate Park's Homeless Population

Are San Francisco's Policies Serving Us Well?

June 2013



City and County of San Francisco
Civil Grand Jury, 2012-2013

MEMBERS OF THE 2012-2013
CIVIL GRAND JURY
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Martha Mangold, Foreperson
Fred A. Rodríguez, Foreperson Pro Tem
Leslie Finlev, Recording Secretary
Maria Martinez, Corresponding Secretary

Jon Anderson
Jennifer Angelo
Jeanne Barr
Paul Cheng
Jerry Dratler
Hülda E. Garfola
D. Peter Gleichenhaus
Shelly Hing
Corinna Kaarlela
Daniel Kreps
Hilary Pedigo
Theresa Sabella
Suzanne Tucker
Thomas Walker
Stuart Williams

THE CIVIL GRAND JURY

The Civil Grand Jury is a government oversight panel of volunteers who serve for one year.
It makes findings and recommendations resulting from its investigations.

Reports of the Civil Grand Jury do not identify individuals by name.
Disclosure of information about individuals interviewed by the jury is prohibited.
California Penal Code, section 929

STATE LAW REQUIREMENT California Penal Code, section 933.05

Each published report includes a list of those public entities that are required to respond to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court within 60 to 90 days, as specified.

A copy must be sent to the Board of Supervisors. All responses are made available to the public.

For each finding the response must:

- 1) agree with the finding, or
- 2) disagree with it, wholly or partially, and explain why.

As to each recommendation the responding party must report that:

- 1) the recommendation has been implemented, with a summary explanation; or
- 2) the recommendation has not been implemented but will be within a set timeframe as provided; or
- 3) the recommendation requires further analysis. The officer or agency head must define what additional study is needed. The Grand Jury expects a progress report within six months; or
- 4) the recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable, with an explanation.

Table of Contents

Issue	5
Summary	5
Background	6
Investigation	9
1. The Homeless Population and their Needs	9
a. Number and Overview	9
b. Permanent Dwellers	9
c. Transient Dwellers	10
d. Substance Abuse and Mental Disability	10
e. First-hand Encounters	10
Findings and Recommendations: The Homeless Population	11
2. Outreach and Enforcement Efforts	11
a. Homeless Outreach and Engagement Teams	12
b. Police and Park Patrol Engagement	13
c. Issuance of Citations	14
d. Park Closure Hours	15
Findings and Recommendations: Outreach and Enforcement Efforts	15
3. Litter Accumulation in Golden Gate Park	16
a. The Costs of Litter Removal	16
b. Shopping Carts in the Park	17
Finding and Recommendation: Litter Accumulation in Golden Gate Park	18
Response Matrix	19
Methodology	21
Appendix	21
Excerpts from Park Code, San Francisco Municipal Code	21
Endnotes	22

Issue

Homeless encampments continue to exist in Golden Gate Park. How effective are current City policies in mitigating the situation, assisting the vulnerable population who live in the Park, and keeping the Park green and clean?

Summary

The 2012-13 Civil Grand Jury investigated problems associated with people living in Golden Gate Park (GGP or the "Park"). The report covers:

1. the needs of vulnerable people living in an unprotected, exposed environment
2. the enforcement of City codes and outreach efforts to park dwellers
3. litter accumulation that is a direct result of campsites

While homeless individuals and their encampments are found across San Francisco, the Jury chose to focus on this hot-button issue in Golden Gate Park because it is the crown jewel of the City's Recreation and Parks Department (Rec & Park) and an extremely popular destination for both residents and tourists.

A key goal of the investigation is to provide recommendations that will improve the daily lives of those who call the Park "home." Addressing this issue also supports keeping the Park green and clean for visitors and Rec & Park staff.

Based on its investigation, the Jury concludes that the City lacks adequate information about park dwellers and their needs. With more information, the City would be better able to focus its efforts to move individuals out of the Park and into a more stable situation. The Jury found that current outreach efforts to inform park dwellers about support services are limited, and efforts that do take place are not documented in a way that makes it possible to analyze their efficiency or success. The current system of issuing citations for nighttime sleeping and camping in the Park has not been effective in reducing the number of park dwellers.

The investigation revealed that it is common for park dwellers to push shopping carts filled with personal belongings into the Park, a practice that facilitates setting up encampments and contributes to a litter problem. Encampments in the Park generate substantial litter, which impacts the time and budgets of City departments that are responsible for removal. The Jury also found inconsistent and confusing signage about park closure times.

The Jury recommends the following:

1. The City should formalize a system to gather information on the characteristics of GGP dwellers and why they live in the Park.
2. Information about GGP dwellers should be used to tailor support services to specific populations, whose age and circumstances affect their needs and acceptance of services.
3. The City should establish a system to track its outreach efforts among park dwellers and use the information to evaluate effectiveness in reducing the number of park dwellers.
4. The Engagement Specialist Team (EST) should conduct in-person, proactive outreach at different times of the day and night in order to maximize their efforts.
5. The San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) and the Park Patrol should expand their outreach to GGP encampments to more areas of the Park and should vary the time.
6. References to the Park's closure time on all park signs, brochures, City handouts, and City websites should be made consistent with the Park Code and Rec & Park Commission resolutions.
7. The San Francisco Park Code should ban shopping carts in GGP in order to discourage living in the Park and to reduce litter.

Background

Golden Gate Park is a 1,017-acre urban park designed as open space and located in the middle of western San Francisco. Human activity abounds throughout the Park, with daily visitors engaging in a wide variety of activities: physical exercise, meditation practices, art and education, sports, social gatherings, nature watching, and more. About 13 million people visit GGP in an average year,¹ and its attractions create exceptional experiences and memories for tourists and residents alike.

All is not idyllic, however, in this grand green space. The Park has a population of people who use the Park as a home, with the number of individuals varying with the seasons. Problems associated with these park dwellers have been the topic of media reports and editorials, public speeches, advocacy campaigns, and neighborhood outreach attempts.

No sections of the San Francisco Municipal Code, neither the Police nor the Park Codes, prohibit the presence of homeless individuals. However, the Park Code does prohibit sleeping in the Park between the hours of 8 p.m. and 8 a.m. and camping in the Park (see Appendix). Camping is

defined as having and using housing or camping equipment, household furniture, or cooking devices. Violators of these Park Code prohibitions usually are described as “homeless,” but in this report, we use the terms “park dweller” or “GGP dweller” to describe any person living in GGP regardless of code violation.

While the population of dwellers in the Park has decreased over the last decade, as a result of efforts detailed below, it was estimated to be about 200 dwellers in 2006 when then-Mayor Gavin Newsom ordered a cleanup campaign.² For reasons set out in this report, the Jury believes that there are still many GGP dwellers who can be helped to change their living conditions.

Throughout the Park and San Francisco’s other 220 parks and open spaces, the Recreation and Parks Department (Rec & Park) manages facilities, maintenance, staffing, and programs. Within the Department, Park Patrol is charged with enforcing the regulations set forth by the Park Code and protecting park property. Rec & Park divides the Park into six service areas (see Figure 1).




Figure 1: Golden Gate Park Service Areas³

The San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) partners with the Park Patrol in patrolling and issuing citations for infractions against either Police or Park Codes that occur on Rec & Park land. Two police stations are assigned jurisdiction over GGP (see Figure 2):

- Richmond Station is responsible for most of the Park, from Ocean Beach to a north/south line that runs through the general area of the Conservatory of Flowers.
- Park Station is responsible for the area east of the Conservatory, including the Panhandle.




Figure 2: SFPD jurisdictions across Golden Gate Park ⁴

Park staff, including administrative, program, and ground personnel, work at various facilities in GGP. Policymaking and operational oversight come from the Recreation and Parks Commission, an appointed seven-member board responsible for setting regulations regarding how the public may use and enjoy park spaces. It is the responsibility of Rec & Park to carry out these policies. In addition, the Mayor's Office and the Board of Supervisors have the ability to create and pass legislation that affect park operations and procedures.

Investigation

1. *The Homeless Population and their Needs*

City employees provided the following information about GGP dwellers and their characteristics.

a. Number and Overview

Determining the number of people living in the Park is difficult. Dwellers often hide, sleeping in protected and hidden places. Because they tend to be mobile, individuals are not in one place long enough to generate accurate data.

It is estimated that 40 to 200 people live in the Park, with fewer dwellers during cold, wet winter months and a higher number during the warmer, drier summer/fall months. One-half of the group is estimated to be transient – here en route to someplace else – and is in the Park for a short term, while the other half remains in San Francisco for a longer term, for a variety of reasons.

The San Francisco Homeless Point-in-Time Count & Survey,⁵ conducted every two years, does not collect data on GGP separately from City districts. The 2011 report estimated that 38 percent (1,181) of the City's 3,106 unsheltered homeless were residents in the two districts that encompass the Park (districts 5 and 6 on the map used for the survey). Of those, 211 persons were counted as living in vehicles, encampments, or parks.

A common characteristic of GGP dwellers is possession of one or more dogs, used for companionship and warmth during the night. Park dwellers often are suffering from mental health issues and drug abuse. Most park dwellers are men; one Rec & Park staff member estimated that the ratio is about five men to each woman.

b. Permanent Dwellers

It is common for permanent dwellers to be older people, often military veterans. They typically settle in the west side of the Park (Service areas 5 and 6 in Figure 1), alone or in very small groups. Although permanent dwellers tend to be aware of City homeless services, they usually choose not to receive assistance. Mental health issues and drug use are common. Many of these dwellers have lived in this area of the Park for years, including one man who has used the Park as a home for 20 years. The Jury believes it relevant that the Veterans Affairs Medical Center is only five blocks north of the Park.

c. Transient Dwellers

Transient dwellers are usually younger and often live in small and rotating groups. Campsites are generally close to the east edge of the Park, near Lake Alford and Haight Street (Service area 1 in Figure 1). Individuals in this group often come to the Park with the intention of leaving after a time. They are less likely to be familiar with City homeless services, and often come from difficult backgrounds, such as an abusive home. Many of these dwellers are seasonal and regional transients who follow a mass homeless migration along the west coast from Southern California to Oregon and Washington.

City employees interviewed for this report believe that proactive outreach efforts to move individuals out of the Park are most likely successful with transient, younger park dwellers, particularly if there is housing that includes support services and job training. Most of these individuals are substance abusers. Because of their youth, it is believed that help can get them off the path of alcohol, drugs, and homelessness. According to leaders in San Francisco's program for homeless housing, the City does have Transitional Age Youth Housing, operated by the Community Housing Partnership, but the number of beds is limited.

d. Substance Abuse and Mental Disability

One City employee with extensive outreach experience in the Park characterized a major portion of GGP dwellers in another way: men in their 40s or 50s who have had a substance abuse condition for much of their lives and likely have psychiatric issues that have escalated to a critical point that leads to homelessness. It is estimated that as many as 60 percent of dwellers exhibit these characteristics. Since the 4 a.m. outreach efforts first began (discussed below), these dwellers have been the most receptive to offers of City services.

e. First-hand Encounters

In researching this report, Jurors accompanied a regular 4 a.m. patrol to observe inhabited encampments in GGP. The patrol team had 13 interactions with park dwellers in four separate camps. Three campsites were inhabited by multiple people, mostly men. Three dogs were seen in three separate camps. Most of the park dwellers were in their late teens or early 20s. One man, in a sleeping bag apart from other dwellers, appeared to be in his 50s. The offer of City services each time was identical and consisted of information about emergency housing. One dweller accepted services and arranged transit to the services site.

The patrols were conducted in the eastern-most area of GGP, considered home to the more transient population. Jurors' interactions with park dwellers revealed that most were not originally San Franciscans and had arrived in the Park during the previous few days. Although a few seemed familiar with the area and were aware of the 4 a.m. patrol and the proffered homeless services, the most were not.

While age and gender are noted on citations, no other demographic information about a park dweller is recorded. The patrol team did not ask dwellers about their veteran status, their city of origin, or the circumstances that led them to the Park for the night. Evidence of alcohol consumption was found, but was not noted on citations.

Findings and Recommendations: The Homeless Population

Finding 1: City agencies lack specific data on the characteristics of GGP dwellers, which prevents accurate profiling of individual problems and needs.

Recommendation 1: The City should formalize a system to gather information on the characteristics of GGP dwellers and why they live in the Park.

Finding 2: With better information about GGP dwellers, their histories, and their needs, the City would be better able to move these individuals out of the Park, into a more stable situation.

Recommendation 2: Information about GGP dwellers should be used to tailor support services to specific populations, whose age and circumstances affect their needs and acceptance of services.

2. Outreach and Enforcement Efforts

Contact with dwellers in Golden Gate Park is currently a combined enforcement and outreach effort led by the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) and Park Patrol.

Two Park Codes directly relate to GGP dwellers (See Appendix 1 for full text of these codes.):

- Section 3.12: prohibits camping in any City park
- Section 3.13: prohibits sleeping in any park between 8 p.m. and 8 a.m.

Violations of these codes are infractions and a citation with an associated fee is issued to offenders. Regular 4 a.m. patrols by SFPD and the Park Patrol provide the main means for outreach in GGP. At the time of contact, City services are also offered in lieu of a citation.

a. Homeless Outreach and Engagement Teams

This current combination of enforcement and outreach is a direct result of previously successful practices.

In 2004, a collaborative assessment of homeless issues was conducted by six entities: SFPD, Rec & Park, the Mayor's Office, Department of Public Health (DPH), Human Services Agency (HSA), and Community Awareness and Treatment Services (CATS), a non-profit organization dedicated to providing homeless services. This work led to the creation of the San Francisco Homeless Outreach Team (SF HOT), with a mandate to assess homeless individuals in the field, to determine their needs, and to provide access to appropriate services.

Initially, members of SF HOT were deployed to downtown areas of San Francisco. By 2007, the team was also a daily presence in the Park. At that time, it was reported that about 200 people were illegally dwelling there. The SF HOT visits began in the Park as a three-month pilot program, with team members walking from encampment to encampment at 4 a.m., talking directly with dwellers, and offering and explaining services. The SF HOT team focused on engagement, rather than enforcement. However, SFPD and Park Patrol, also part of these daily outreach visits, issued citations for illegal camping or sleeping during prohibited hours.

The SF HOT program was conducted for three and a half years. It helped an estimated 300 people into more permanent housing, and about 90 people into shelters where they could stay as long as necessary while finding permanent housing. Because of the success of the 4 a.m. outreach, SF HOT funding was made more permanent, thereby maintaining a staff of six full-time employees with four solely dedicated to the Park.

By 2011, the park population decreased to about 50 dwellers, with some seasonal variations.

The 2011 San Francisco Homeless Point-in-Time Count & Survey noted that the number of homeless individuals citywide in emergency, transitional, or other types of shelter increased from 26.9 to 39.3 percent over the prior two years. In the same period, the homeless living outdoors, on streets, in parks and encampments had decreased from 51.2 to 27.7 percent.

A former SF HOT member reported that the acceptance of services reached a plateau in 2011. Although the outreach team had continued success drawing a small number of GGP dwellers into accepting services, it was determined that the team would be more effective offering outreach in a variety of other locations in San Francisco. Since that time, the number of chronic GGP

dwellers has remained roughly stagnant and the number of transient dwellers varies with the season.

SF HOT is a grant recipient of the San Francisco Community Clinic Consortium, which is funded mainly by federal, state, and philanthropic sources. In 2012, SF HOT joined with the CATS Mobile Assistance Program to form the Engagement Specialist Team (EST). Similar to SF HOT, EST functions in the field citywide to engage, assess, and extend services to the homeless population. EST does not make regular outreach visits to the Park, but an EST representative is on call 24/7 if assistance is requested by Rec & Park staff or SFPD.

b. Police and Park Patrol Engagement

With the cessation of regular outreach visits by a social services team such as EST to the Park, SFPD and Park Patrol took over, continuing to cite violators of the Park Code and offering homeless services information. Current outreach/enforcement patrols follow a common routine. Police officers and Park Patrol rangers (usually three or four people, depending on other calls being answered at the time) visit areas known to be campsites. They awaken park dwellers and ask them to move. Violators of Park Code Sections 3.12 or 3.13 are offered City services and cited for code violations. If applicable, other Police and Park Code violations are then addressed. This exchange gives the patrol team an opportunity to assess the dwellers to see if anyone needs medical attention or will accept City services.

To best conduct interactions with park dwellers, SFPD has incorporated homeless outreach training into the overall police training curriculum. The SFPD also has a citywide unit of 17 specialist homeless outreach officers, including at least three who specifically patrol GGP.

Park Patrol does not provide homeless outreach training for its officers or have homeless outreach staff. Neither the job description nor the required experiences for a Park Patrol Officer (Class 8208) or Head Park Patrol Officer (Class 8210) address social services or homeless outreach. However, Park Patrol does conduct the 4 a.m. outreach visits when accompanied by the SFPD. If the SFPD cannot make a particular patrol, it is cancelled. While the primary responsibility of SFPD and Park Patrol officers is enforcement of regulations, the EST focuses on social services in its interactions with park dwellers.

Currently there is no official mandate that 4 a.m. patrols happen at all; it has been a concerted effort on the part of individual SFPD and Rec & Park staff to address park dwellers. Moreover, no official directive dictates the timing or routes of these field efforts. The patrol visits occasionally occur in other areas of GGP but mainly focus on the same homeless sites. Because the SFPD Park Station leads the efforts, the most targeted areas are in the eastern part of the Park, near Haight Street, Lake Alford and McLaren Lodge, which typically has the highest density of park dwellers. The patrols were commonly referred to as "4 a.m. sweeps" or "4 a.m. outreach

efforts,” indicating that it was unlikely for the patrols to occur at a much different hour. Because of the routine nature of the patrols, little contact with park dwellers in other parts of the GGP occurs.

c. Issuance of Citations

When a citation is issued, the violator is asked to sign the citation as an acknowledgement that the person understands the cause for issuance and requirement to appear in court at a prescribed time and date. A fine of \$187 is attached to the citation and late fees are added if it is not paid in full by a specified date. An alternate method of clearing the violator’s record is also offered: a card is given with the citation that offers a hearing in a Neighborhood Court if the violator is found eligible.

According to several City employees, the issuance of citations is not an effective way of eliminating the incidence of violations. In most cases, they do not prevent future violations. Park dwellers are given citations for separate incidents; consequently individuals can have multiple violations open at the same time. The Jury learned of one park dweller with 67 active citations pending against him.

In 2012, The San Francisco County Superior Court, in collaboration with City departments and the SFPD, developed a pilot program to address chronic offenders in a stricter manner by holding them in contempt of court. In January 2013, after four months in operation, the California Court of Appeals ruled that the program was unconstitutional.⁶

Enforcement staff members interviewed for this report said they believed that the legal system in San Francisco is currently incapable of adequately processing all citations. They stated that many violators of Park Codes 3.12 and 3.13 ignore citations, choosing not to pay, and ignoring court dates. Late fees are added to the fine, making it even harder for the offender to pay. Typically, the citation is bundled with other similar citations and defended by a pro bono legal team created by a homeless advocacy group. Regardless of the outcome, once the citation is issued, it is beyond the purview of the issuing officer.

In 2011, out of a total of 305 citations issued, the SFPD issued 277 citations for violations of the sleeping and camping prohibitions of the Park Code. Between January and September 2012, violations of these two codes were responsible for 420 out of 620 total citations. Examples of other violations include urinating in public, drinking in public, etc.

Three data points pertaining to park dweller citations are recorded: the number of citations issued, the reason for the citation, and the general location in the Park where the issuance takes place, e.g., Sharon Meadow.

This limited amount of statistical recordkeeping prevents an accurate accounting or analysis for effective homeless services. Neither SFPD nor Rec & Park keeps records of citations linking a

person's name to health records or veteran status. Without such data being recorded and publicly reported, it is difficult for the general public to fully appreciate the impact of park dwellers in GGP.

d. Park Closure Hours

While it is illegal to sleep in GGP (and other San Francisco parks) between 8 p.m. and 8 a.m., a person's physical presence in the Park between these hours is not against any Park Code. The creation of official closure hours would require amendment of the Park Code by the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor. Such legislation would have to be drafted to exclude official events taking place in the Park and individuals who are en route through the Park.

In the early 1990s, the Rec & Park Commission passed several resolutions recommending that 51 San Francisco parks institute evening closing times. We learned through our interviews that these resolutions are expressions of the Rec & Park Commission's desire and are non-binding. Only one area of the Park, the Lake Alford area, was a part of these resolutions. Neither SFPD nor Park Patrol currently issues citations for being in the Park during closure hours.

There are discrepancies and contradictions among signs posted throughout the Park. The Jury observed that Rec & Park has posted signs at sites around the perimeter of the Park stating that it is closed between the hours of 10 p.m. and 6 a.m., between 10 p.m. and 5 a.m., or between midnight and 5 a.m., except for "thru" traffic. The Rec & Park website (www.sfrecpark.org) states that the Park is closed between sunset and sunrise. Park Code Sec. 3.02, cited on these closure signs, mandates that "posted signs must be obeyed." One S.F. employee stated that many signs are "non-enforceable" because closure times are posted even though they were not formally approved by Rec & Park resolution. This employee said that the department is aware of the questionable legality of the signs and intends to remove them. However, as of this report's publication, removal has not occurred.

Findings and Recommendations: Outreach and Enforcement Efforts

Finding 3: Because the City does not track individual park dwellers and their interactions with social services, it is difficult to determine the efficiency and success of outreach efforts in reducing the park population.

Recommendation 3: The City should establish a system to track its outreach efforts among park dwellers and use the information to evaluate effectiveness in reducing the number of park dwellers.

Finding 4: Limitations on outreach efforts by EST, SFPD, and Park Patrol to GGP encampments has an inhibiting effect on positive results.

Recommendation 4: The Engagement Specialist Team (EST) should conduct in-person, proactive outreach to park dwellers at different times of the day and night in order to maximize their efforts.

Finding 5: The current system of issuing citations for nighttime sleeping and camping in the Park is not effective in reducing the current number of park dwellers.

Recommendation 5: The SFPD and Park Patrol should expand their outreach to GGP encampments to more areas of the Park and should vary the time.

Finding 6: Signs and public information about the Park closure time are inconsistent and confusing.

Recommendation 6: References to the Park's closure time on all park signs, brochures and City websites should be made consistent with the Park Code and Rec & Park Commission resolutions.

3. Litter Accumulation in Golden Gate Park

One direct result of GGP dwellers is the accumulation of litter. Every City employee who was asked about problems related to park dwellers cited this issue. Items such as food packaging, clothing, household goods, and other objects are found daily, scattered throughout the park. Claimed items are not considered litter; if individuals take responsibility for any item, they must keep it in their possession at all times. Sometimes litter is near roads and trails, but often it is amassed deep in the wooded parts of the park.

a. The Costs of Litter Removal

Recreation and Park staff is charged with cleaning and removing litter from GGP. Unclaimed items collected from park encampments are considered abandoned and are taken to a specific 20 cubic-yard dumpster near the Park's Structural Maintenance Yard. This dumpster is emptied by Recology, the waste management company, on Tuesdays and Fridays. Park management stated that the weekly dumpster weight averages 3.3 to 3.5 tons and the 2012 pickup cost of this dumpster was \$5,678 per month, or \$68,136 per year. This number reflects homeless encampment litter only; it does not include trash accumulated and removed from public garbage cans throughout the Park.

Rec & Park does not track time spent on individual workday tasks, so there is not a definitive figure on staff time spent removing litter associated with park encampments. However, three gardeners were asked by the Jury to estimate how much of their day is devoted to cleaning homeless encampments. Two estimated that about 25 percent of their work day was used solely for encampment cleanup; the third gardener chose to dedicate little time to the encampments and instead to focus on plant maintenance, saying that cleaning encampments would be “endless.” Since the number of gardeners has diminished over the recent years, there is a need to optimize their efforts on essential GGP tasks.

In addition, two 4-person environmental crews are tasked solely with clearing and hauling litter and personal belongings from GGP encampments. These crews work 32 hours per week, with schedules that cover all seven days. These positions (Class 9916) are funded by economic stimulus monies from San Francisco Human Services Agency and are dependant upon future federal budgetary decisions. The Rec & Park supervisors of crews in charge of individual buildings and facilities in the Park have the option of using their own staff to deal with encampment litter or calling the environmental crews to deal with the issue. The Jury did not find any data to describe time spent on litter clean up by these staff members.

b. Shopping Carts in the Park

The Jury learned that part of the reason for the high cost of litter removal is the weight and bulk of shopping carts, often used by park dwellers to store and transport personal items. Although many types of wheeled conveyances are used, shopping carts are the most common. Rec & Park staff said several abandoned carts are collected each week. It is not uncommon for a park dweller to have multiple carts, further increasing the potential volume of personal items.

At present, no park code prohibits shopping carts in the Park, provided they are in the control of an individual. Found carts are assumed by Rec & Park staff to have been stolen from local grocery stores, but none were aware of any stores prosecuting the perpetrators of these thefts. Although SFPD will proactively question the ownership of shopping carts and confiscate stolen ones, Rec & Park does not determine if, indeed, they are stolen property. Rec & Park does not confiscate shopping carts unless they are abandoned or if the individual in possession of the cart has an active arrest warrant.

Unclaimed carts and their contents are picked up by Rec & Park staff and taken to the Maintenance Yard, where they are held for one month. If they are not claimed during this period, the contents are hauled away by the Park’s trash collection service and the carts are picked up by a City-contracted vendor for return to grocery stores and reward payments. Carts confiscated from individuals because of police warrants must be cataloged and stored for the owner to claim later.

Jurors who participated in the 4 a.m. patrols observed three shopping carts overflowing with personal belongings and scattering litter. While some of the objects appeared to be camping items like blankets and clothing, other items appeared to be food wrappers, bottles, random household items, and many unidentified goods. In each situation, the volume of the belongings in the carts exceeded the volume that one person could carry.

Finding and Recommendation: Litter Accumulation in Golden Gate Park

Finding 7: Shopping carts facilitate moving personal items into the Park and setting up an encampment.

Recommendation 7: The San Francisco Park Code should ban shopping carts in GGP in order to discourage living in the Park and to reduce litter.

Response Matrix

Findings	Recommendations	Responses Required
1. City agencies lack specific data on the characteristics of GGP dwellers, which prevents accurate profiling of individual problems and needs.	1. The City should formalize a system to gather information on the characteristics of GGP dwellers and why they live in the Park.	Rec & Park DPH Mayor
2. With better information about GGP dwellers, their histories, and their needs, the City would be better able to move these individuals out of the Park, into a more stable situation.	2. Information about GGP dwellers should be used to tailor support services to specific populations, whose age and circumstances affect their needs and acceptance of services.	Rec & Park DPH Mayor
3. Because the City does not track individual park dwellers and their interactions with social services, it is difficult to determine the efficiency and success of outreach efforts in reducing the park population.	3. The City should establish a system to track its outreach efforts among park dwellers and use the information to evaluate effectiveness in reducing the number of park dwellers.	Rec & Park DPH SFPD Mayor
4. Outreach efforts to GGP encampments by EST are limited, which inhibits positive results.	4. The EST should conduct in-person, proactive outreach to park dwellers at different times of the day and night in order to maximize their efforts.	Rec & Park DPH
5. The current system of issuing citations for nighttime sleeping and camping in the Park is not effective in reducing the current number of park dwellers.	5. The SFPD and Park Patrol should expand their outreach to GGP encampments to more areas of the Park and should vary the time.	Rec & Park Rec & Park Commission SFPD

Findings	Recommendations	Responses Required
6. Signs and public information about the Park's closure time is inconsistent and confusing.	6. References to the Park's closure time on all park signs, brochures and City websites should be made consistent with the Park Code and Rec & Park Commission resolutions.	Rec & Park Rec & Park Commission
7. Shopping carts facilitate moving personal items into the Park and setting up encampments.	7. The San Francisco Park Code should ban shopping carts in GGP in order to discourage living in the Park and to reduce litter.	Rec & Park Rec & Park Commission Mayor

Methodology

Research for this report included informational interviews with City employees who have first-hand knowledge of issues related to persons living in Golden Gate Park. We conducted more than 20 interviews, accompanied the SFPD as they encountered park dwellers (including one 4 a.m. survey of illegal camps), attended Rec & Park Department meetings, and researched media articles, editorials, online sites, and City reports.

Appendix

Excerpts from Park Code, San Francisco Municipal Code

(Full code can be found at www.sfrecpark.org).

SEC. 3.02. SIGNS TO BE OBEYED.

No person shall willfully disobey the notices, prohibitions or directions on any sign posted by the Recreation and Park Commission or the Recreation and Park Department.

SEC. 3.12. CAMPING PROHIBITED.

No person shall construct or maintain or inhabit any structure, tent or any other thing in any park that may be used for housing accommodations or camping, nor shall any person construct or maintain any device that can be used for cooking, except by permission from the Recreation and Park Department or Commission. No person shall modify the landscape in any way in order to create a shelter, or accumulate household furniture or appliances or construction debris in any park.

SEC. 3.13. SLEEPING PROHIBITED DURING CERTAIN HOURS.

No person shall remain in any park for the purpose of sleeping between the hours of 8:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m., except that special permission may be granted by the Recreation and Park Department to persons providing security services between said hours in any park or for other unusual events. A person cited under this section shall not be in violation of this section if: 1) he or she does not have an outstanding citation for violation of this section; and, 2) within 30 hours of issuance of the citation, her or she accepts Social Services offered by the city, another public entity, or a private, non-profit agency. For the purpose of this section, the term "Social Services" shall mean temporary or permanent housing, residential substance abuse treatment, Homeless Outreach Team Case Management services, or admission to a hospital or other residential facility for medical treatment. For purposes of this section, "outstanding citation" shall mean a citation that is not paid or that is under appeal.

SEC. 3.15 BUILDING MATERIALS

No person shall place, pile, deposit or leave any building material in any park without first having obtained a permit to do so from the Recreations and Parks Department.

Endnotes

¹ Source: www.sfrecrepark.org.

² Cecilia M. Vega, Heather Knight, S.F. Chronicle, "Crackdown in Golden Gate Park / Few homeless leave on deadline; city wants to offer help, services, 09/29/06

³ Golden Gate Master Plan, www.sfrecrepark.org

⁴ SFPD District Map, www.sf-police.org.

⁵ Applied Survey Research, 2011 San Francisco Homeless Point-in-Time Count & Survey, p. 16

⁶ Sara Gaiser, Bay City News, "Appeals Court: SF's Chronic Offenders Program Unconstitutional", 01/04/13

Introduction Form

By a Member of the Board of Supervisors or the Mayor

Time stamp
or meeting date

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 [] inquires"
- 5. City Attorney request.
- 6. Call File No. [] from Committee.
- 7. Budget Analyst request (attach written motion).
- 8. Substitute Legislation File No. []
- 9. Request for Closed Session (attach written motion).
- 10. Board to Sit as A Committee of the Whole.
- 11. Question(s) submitted for Mayoral Appearance before the BOS on []

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 a Imperative

Sponsor(s):


Clerk of the Board

Subject:

Hearing - Civil Grand Jury Report - "Golden Gate Park's Homeless Population: Are San Francisco's Policies Serving Us Well?"

The text is listed below or attached:

Hearing on the recently published 2012-2013 Civil Grand Jury report entitled "Golden Gate Park's Homeless Population: Are San Francisco's Policies Serving Us Well?"

Signature of Sponsoring Supervisor: 

For Clerk's Use Only: