

1 [Board of Supervisors response to the 2007-2008 Civil Grand Jury Report entitled "The
2 homeless have homes, but they are still on the street"]

3 **Resolution responding to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court on the findings**
4 **and recommendations contained in the 2007-2008 Civil Grand Jury Report entitled "The**
5 **homeless have homes, but they are still on the street."**

6
7 WHEREAS, Under California Penal Code Section 933 et seq., the Board of
8 Supervisors must respond, within 90 days of receipt, to the Presiding Judge of the Superior
9 Court on the findings and recommendations contained in Civil Grand Jury Reports; and

10 WHEREAS, In accordance with Penal Code Section 933.05(c), if a finding or
11 recommendation of the Civil Grand Jury addresses budgetary or personnel matters of a
12 county agency or a department headed by an elected officer, the agency or department head
13 and the Board of Supervisors shall respond if requested by the Civil Grand Jury, but the
14 response of the Board of Supervisors shall address only budgetary or personnel matters over
15 which it has some decision making authority; and

16 WHEREAS, The 2007-2008 Civil Grand Jury Report entitled "The homeless have
17 homes, but they are still on the street" is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in
18 File No. 081018, which is hereby declared to be a part of this resolution as if set forth fully
19 herein; and

20 WHEREAS, The Civil Grand Jury has requested that the Board of Supervisors respond
21 to Findings Nos. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 10 as well as Recommendations Nos. 1, 2 and 9
22 contained in the subject Civil Grand Jury report (Note that the recommendations do not
23 correspond numerically with their associated findings); and

24 WHEREAS, Finding No. 1 states: "Homeless spending is large scale, complex and
25 dispersed, but the City has no mechanism for regularly monitoring it across departments;" and

1 WHEREAS, Finding No. 2 states: “Updating the six-year old 2001-2002 Budget
2 Analyst’s Report of direct and indirect homeless spending would provide worthwhile data to
3 aid in assessing whether the trend in ever-increasing spending on homelessness is
4 changing;” and

5 WHEREAS, Recommendation No. 1 states: “The Controller and the Board of
6 Supervisors’ Budget Analyst should update the 2001-2002 analysis of the City's homeless
7 spending;” and

8 WHEREAS, Finding No. 4 states: “Efforts to monitor the cost effectiveness of
9 supportive housing program have not been comprehensive, and have not included all cohorts
10 of the population at risk of homelessness;” and

11 WHEREAS, Finding No. 5 states: “The costs of different homeless housing programs
12 vary greatly for reasons which are poorly understood. Little analysis of these differences has
13 been done;” and

14 WHEREAS, Finding No. 6 states: “It is unclear whether current plans to create one
15 type of building over another or to develop new models are informed by past experience or by
16 any cost/benefit analysis;” and

17 WHEREAS, Finding No. 7 states: “The City is just beginning to develop simple
18 outcome measures of success relative to cost in its supportive housing program;” and

19 WHEREAS, Finding No. 8 states: “Greater freedom to experiment with different
20 approaches and levels of service could facilitate greater cost effectiveness in supportive
21 housing programs;” and

22 WHEREAS, Recommendation No. 2 states: “The City should order that comprehensive
23 cost/benefit analysis be performed on current supportive housing programs to include: (A)
24 costs of the supportive programs for various homeless populations compared to the cost
25 avoidance through reduced use of emergency services, hospitals, jails, etc., and (B)

1 comparative analysis of specific programs and supportive housing models to assess reasons
2 that the cost of providing supportive housing differs substantially between different programs
3 that seem equally successful in outcome;” and

4 WHEREAS, Finding No. 10 states: “San Franciscans’ continued support of efforts to
5 house the homeless may depend on their observing an improvement in quality of life
6 attributes such as aberrant street behaviors;” and

7 WHEREAS, Recommendation No. 9 states: “With the success of Housing First, the
8 City should address the quality of life issues that concern the welfare of all San Francisco
9 residents and should develop programs that enforce the law, demonstrate compassion, and
10 move the affected population from harm reduction to meaningful living;” and

11 WHEREAS, in accordance with Penal Code Section 933.05(c), the Board of
12 Supervisors must respond, within 90 days of receipt, to the Presiding Judge of the Superior
13 Court on Findings Nos. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 10 as well as Recommendations Nos. 1, 2 and 9
14 contained in the subject Civil Grand Jury report; now, therefore, be it

15 RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports to the Presiding Judge of the
16 Superior Court that it agrees with Finding Nos. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 10 as well as
17 Recommendation Nos. 1, 2 and 9 of the 2007-2008 Civil Grand Jury Report entitled “The
18 homeless have homes, but they are still on the street;” and, be it

19 FURTHER RESOLVED, Pursuant to Penal Code Section 933.05(c), the Board of
20 Supervisors responds to the findings and recommendations to which it agrees by hereby
21 urging the Mayor to cause the implementation of accepted findings and recommendations
22 through his/her department heads and through the development of the annual budget.

23
24
25