

From: [Jordan Wasilewski](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [ChenStaff](#); [Chen, Chyanne \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Sauter, Danny \(BOS\)](#); [SauterStaff](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Anya Worley-Ziegmann](#); [Jennifer Friedenbach](#); [Christopher Mika](#); [ZonZoq Swiss](#)
Subject: PSH Decommissioning (File: 260412)
Date: Wednesday, April 29, 2026 2:26:11 PM

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

Hi, as a campaign winning PSH and SRO tenant advocate, I wanted to share my thoughts about the city's plan to decommission permanent supportive housing. These are just my preliminary thoughts and as more information comes out, I welcome re-evaluation.

It goes without saying that I NEVER want tenants to be displaced, and decommissioning PSH is and should be a delicate process and it needs to be said that there needs to be a just transition out that leaves the tenants better than before.

But with all that said, let's look at the Baldwin Hotel, which was featured in the Chronicle's Broken Home series from 4 years ago. The Baldwin hotel had a \$7.7 million annual contract for 191 tenants at a cost of ~40k per capita per year. It was a squalorous and spartan place with small rooms, common bathrooms, little amenities. The city thought that this was a cost efficient way to put a dent in the homeless issue, but as the expose said, the math wasn't mathing, and it was an unsuitable place to call home.

Some of the tenants were moved to the Garland Hotel, a place where all rooms had in-unit bathrooms, kitchenettes, and laundry. Although it only has 80 units, the annual contract is only \$2 million, or 25k per capita per year. That is a cost savings of 35-40% per year.

Although the Baldwin was a particularly egregious case, there are a number of sites in the PSH portfolio (especially in the legacy portfolio) that are mini-Baldwins, and, frankly, nobody wants to live there, and if there was a just transition, they would take it. For example, one of the tenants in my building is a graduate of the Mission Hotel, and he said "nobody really wants to live there".

I have been hearing from tenants that they want to be able to live in scattered site housing away from the TL/6th Street. Yet, from the same 2022 expose, SF's scattered site portfolio is only 11% compared to 30-68% in peer cities, and its unclear what makes a person eligible for scattered site. I can tell you, being away from downtown and not in a known PSH building can help people who are in recovery more than Dorsey's punitive measure.

With that said, any expansion of scattered site should probably be reserved as a "moving on" subsidy for cost and buy in reasons at first, which would still free up units. There also needs to be a framework with guardrails for future decommissioning of PSH with a right to remain that could be done legislatively.

In conclusion, I DON'T WANT TO BE PRESCRIPTIVE HERE. I do not want to really say that certain SROs should be closed or criteria for new scattered site housing plans. Instead, I would like to see a real cost-benefit analysis here with an equity lens and a holistic view of

impacts of housing formerly homeless tenants in ramshackle SROs (which may not only be costly in itself, but there may be externalities in other parts of the budget).

In community,

Jordan Wasilewski (she/they)

Instagram: @sfpsro