

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#)
Cc: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [Laxamana, Junko \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: [SFB] File: 220535 (HSH COMMISSION CHARTER AMENDMENT), OPPOSE UNLESS AMENDED
Date: Thursday, May 19, 2022 12:41:15 PM

From: Laksh Bhasin <lakshbhasindeveloper@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 12, 2022 5:27 PM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Safai, Ahsha (BOS) <ahsha.safai@sfgov.org>; SafaiStaff (BOS) <safaistaff@sfgov.org>; Peskin, Aaron (BOS) <aaron.peskin@sfgov.org>; PeskinStaff (BOS) <peskinstaff@sfgov.org>; Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; ChanStaff (BOS) <chanstaff@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; MandelmanStaff, [BOS] <mandelmanstaff@sfgov.org>; jodav1026@gmail.com; Waltonstaff (BOS) <waltonstaff@sfgov.org>; Walton, Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>
Subject: Re: [SFB] File: 220535 (HSH COMMISSION CHARTER AMENDMENT), OPPOSE UNLESS AMENDED

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

Dear Supervisors,

I agree with Jordan Davis's email. The proposed Charter Amendment does not need to reinforce the role of Mayoral oversight over HSH. I request you to please work directly with supportive housing tenants such as Jordan, and other members of the SF Homeless Tenants Union, on amendments.

Moreover, it is concerning that this legislation contemplates a role for members of merchant or business associations appointed by the Mayor:

Seat 4 shall be held by a person with a record of participation in a merchants' or small business association, or neighborhood association.

Business owners should not have a role on a Homelessness Oversight Commission. I am deeply familiar with how, historically, business owners have derailed public housing efforts to maintain the supremacy of the private real-estate market. I do not see why they deserve any special representation, especially given their lack of subject matter or lived experience, and especially when supportive housing tenants are not explicitly represented on this Commission.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best,

Laksh Bhasin

On Thu, May 12, 2022 at 3:40 PM Jordan Davis <jodav1026@gmail.com> wrote:

To the clerk, please add this to the legislative file concerning the proposed HSH commission

Dear Supervisors,

As a person who has experienced homelessness and the bad conditions and awful rules of supportive housing, I strenuously OPPOSE the HSH charter amendment proposed by Supervisor Safa'i unless it is amended to not be majority mayoral appointments.

I know that we are all upset about that Chronicle expose on supportive housing, many supportive housing tenants, including myself, worked with Joaquin Palomino and Trisha Thadani on this story and more is to come. However, Supervisor Safa'i's attempt to Leeroy Jenkins a charter amendment without consulting affected individuals and proper community stakeholders is offensive and disgusting.

It's safe to say that the buck stops with the mayor's office, and that Newsom, Lee, and Breed have guided homeless policy for the past 20 years, and are responsible for the conditions within. Yet, if a majority of appointees are from the mayor's office, it will not lead to real oversight and will become a paper tiger, and that hurts people like me the most. The Sheriff's Commission charter amendment by Supervisor Walton passed with 68% of the vote, and was a majority BoS appointment commission, why can't we have the same for a proposed HSH commission? Newsom, Lee, and now Breed have had their thumb on the scale for way too long, and the charter amendment, as written, will lead to more prolonged meetings, where similar to the wars over anti-displacement at the Planning Commission, the wars over tasers at police commission, and the Redistricting Task Force, no matter how many people oppose a policy, the mayoral appointees will not listen.

The majority of the homeless population lives in D5, D6, and D9, and a lot of the services and housing are placed there, and yet a supervisor who does not represent a lot of homelessness and supportive housing and is an ally of the same mayor(s) that have allowed this to spin out of control has decided to introduce this? I urge Supervisor Safa'i to immediately cede this legislation to either Supervisors Preston or Ronen, because he should not be playing in this sandbox. If Dean Preston introduced a charter amendment around some issue in D11, you would rightfully be offended.

I also urge that, failing the ceding of the charter amendment to another supervisor, that the legislation be amended to not have a majority mayor appointment scheme. YOU NEED TO LISTEN TO PEOPLE WHO HAVE EXPERIENCED HOMELESSNESS AND THE CONDITIONS IN SUPPORTIVE HOUSING, WE ARE OFFENDED AND RETRAUMATIZED THAT SOMEONE WHO WE DON'T HAVE A RELATIONSHIP WITH IS TRYING TO RAM THIS THROUGH WITHOUT CONSULTING US. WE DO NOT WANT THIS TO BE A PAPER TIGER COMMISSION WHERE NOTHING GETS DONE!!

With disappointment.

-Jordan Davis (she/her)

Founder, #30RightNow Coalition

Member, SF Homeless Tenants Union

From: [Dennis Lu](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Regarding the HSH charter
Date: Monday, June 6, 2022 6:01:05 PM

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

Dear Board Of Supervisors

My name is Dennis, I live in the Mission District, and I am a former canvasser and volunteer. I am writing to you to

oppose the proposed HSH charter amendment (File: 220535) unless the following amendments are made.

- 1) That the commission not be mayoral-majority
- 2) That the commission have a seat for a permanent supportive housing tenant appointed by the Board of Supervisors.
- 3) That the seat for a merchant/neighborhood association member be eliminated.
- 4) That OCOH Oversight Board can advise the Board of Supervisors

Supervisor Safa'i, in drafting this charter amendment, did not listen to the community's needs, nor did he engage stakeholders, including those voices that are not often heard.

In the April 26 Chronicle expose on SROs used as supportive housing, it is well established that

the mayor's office has had their thumb on the scale for the past 20 years, and it has had a devastating effect on the quality of life of tenants, and there are other issues that still need to be elevated.

Furthermore, a permanent supportive housing tenant who is appointed by the Board of Supervisors would add a voice that is not often heard in conversations around homeless issues and that a voice that has been heard too much and must be removed from the charter amendment is neighborhood/merchant councils (currently Seat 4), who do not have an understanding of the complex programmatic issues involving housing homeless individuals.

We are also concerned about language that does not allow for the Our City, Our Home Oversight Board to advise the Mayor and Board of Supervisors. That needs to be removed from the charter amendment as well.

The public is supportive of commissions that don't have majority mayoral appointments. Prop D,

which put the Sheriff's Department over a 4 BOS-3 mayor oversight board, passed with 68% of

the vote in November 2020. There is no reason that that can't be replicated with real oversight over the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing.

Please oppose the charter amendment unless the four recommendations above are incorporated into it. The city is tired of paper tiger commissions that do nothing, and it harms all

stakeholders

Sincerely,
Dennis Lu

Mission SF

From: [Nurit B](#)
To: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: File 220535: Oppose HSH majority-Mayoral Commission unless amended
Date: Monday, June 6, 2022 4:40:15 PM

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

Dear Board Of Supervisors,

My name is Nurit Baruch, I live in District 2 but my son who has a mental disability lives in an SRO in Soma, and I am also a member of SF taxpayers steering committee. I am writing to you to oppose the proposed HSH Charter Amendment (File: 220535) unless the following amendments are made.

1.
That the commission not be majority appointed by the Mayor
2.
That the commission have a seat for a permanent supportive housing tenant appointed by the Board of Supervisors.
3.
That the seat for a merchant/neighborhood association member be eliminated.
4.
That the OCOH Oversight Board can advise the Board of Supervisors

Supervisor Safaí, in drafting this Charter Amendment, did not listen to the community's needs. Nor did he engage stakeholders, including the voices of permanent supportive housing tenants that are often not heard.

In the April 26 Chronicle exposé on SROs used as supportive housing, it is well-established that the Mayor's Office has had its thumb on the scale for the past 20 years, with devastating effects on the quality of life of tenants whose living conditions remain inhospitable. SRO tenants need a way to elevate these issues.

Furthermore, a permanent supportive housing tenant who is appointed by the Board of Supervisors would add a voice that is not often heard in conversations around homelessness issues. On the other hand, representatives from neighborhood and merchant councils (currently Seat 4) have been heard from too much, and must be removed from the Charter Amendment. They do not have an understanding of the complex programmatic issues involving housing homeless individuals.

I am also concerned about language that does not allow for the Our City, Our Home Oversight Board to advise the Mayor and Board of Supervisors. That needs to be removed from the Charter Amendment as well.

The public is supportive of commissions that don't have majority-Mayoral appointments. Prop D, which put the Sheriff's Department under a 4 BOS-3 Mayor oversight board, passed with 68% of the vote in November 2020. There is no reason that this structure can't be replicated with real oversight over the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing.

Please oppose the Charter Amendment unless the four recommendations above are incorporated. The city is tired of paper tiger commissions that do nothing, and it harms all stakeholders.

Sincerely,
Nurit Baruch
District 2

From: [Lea McGeever](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: File 220535: Oppose HSH majority-Mayoral Commission unless amended
Date: Sunday, June 5, 2022 3:14:31 PM

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

Dear Board Of Supervisors,

My name is Lea McGeever, and I live in District 6. I am writing to you to oppose the proposed HSH Charter Amendment (File: 220535) unless the following amendments are made.

1. That the commission not be majority appointed by the Mayor
2. That the commission have a seat for a permanent supportive housing tenant appointed by the Board of Supervisors.
3. That the seat for a merchant/neighborhood association member be eliminated.
4. That the OCOH Oversight Board can advise the Board of Supervisors

Supervisor Safaí, in drafting this Charter Amendment, did not listen to the community's needs. Nor did he engage stakeholders, including the voices of permanent supportive housing tenants that are often not heard.

In the April 26 Chronicle exposé on SROs used as supportive housing, it is well-established that the Mayor's Office has had its thumb on the scale for the past 20 years, with devastating effects on the quality of life of tenants whose living conditions remain inhospitable. SRO tenants need a way to elevate these issues.

Furthermore, a permanent supportive housing tenant who is appointed by the Board of Supervisors would add a voice that is not often heard in conversations around homelessness issues. On the other hand, representatives from neighborhood and merchant councils (currently Seat 4) have been heard from too much, and must be removed from the Charter Amendment. They do not have an understanding of the complex programmatic issues involving housing homeless individuals.

I am also concerned about language that does not allow for the Our City, Our Home

Oversight Board to advise the Mayor and Board of Supervisors. That needs to be removed from the Charter Amendment as well.

The public is supportive of commissions that don't have majority-Mayoral appointments. Prop D, which put the Sheriff's Department under a 4 BOS-3 Mayor oversight board, passed with 68% of the vote in November 2020. There is no reason that this structure can't be replicated with real oversight over the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing.

Please oppose the Charter Amendment unless the four recommendations above are incorporated. The city is tired of paper tiger commissions that do nothing, and it harms all stakeholders.

Sincerely,
Lea McGeever
District 6

From: [pj Koren](#)
Subject: Supervisor Safa'i's charter amendment
Date: Saturday, June 4, 2022 8:58:02 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to you to oppose the proposed HSH charter amendment (File 220535) as written. Oversight of the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing is clearly required—I've been appalled by the Chronicle's reports on the conditions in some of the supported housing units. But in drafting this charter amendment, Supervisor Safa'i did not listen to community needs nor engage stakeholders. I encourage the following amendments in order to create better oversight:

- The commission *not* be composed of a majority of mayoral appointees. Other oversight commissions (such as for the Sheriff's Dept., Streets & Sanitation and Public Works) do not have this majority mayoral structure.
- There should be a seat for a PSH tenant appointed by the Board of Supervisors.
- There should not be merchant/neighborhood specific seats.
- In addition, the Our City, Our Home Oversight Committee needs to be able to advise the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor.

Sincerely,
Patricia Koren, District 8 resident

From: [Jordan Davis](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FYI about a hunger strike I am doing for Supportive Housing Reform
Date: Friday, June 3, 2022 2:30:14 PM

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

Dear everyone,

As you may have heard, HSH has updated all the contracts making the 30% standard permanent in all PSH, so, I should be content with what we've won and rest on my laurels, right? RIGHT?

However, I can't. I have been reflecting on what it took to get us to this point that the 30% standard is now permanent, which is a great thing, as well as the Chronicle articles that have been coming out about the poor conditions, and we still have a lot of work to do. Everything that has happened in our PSH stock has happened due to a deep culture of corruption, ranging from a lack of oversight over HSH (and false solutions that have recently been proposed), DBI entering into contracts with the foxes to guard the henhouse, and the egregious bad actor THC who has had a history of mistreating both it's workers and tenants. I don't feel that the Board of Supervisors has done enough, and Mayor's Newsom, Lee, and Breed have had their thumb on the scale for too long. I am too old and too autistic to deal with this shit anymore.

That is why after much reflection, **effective 1pm on June, I have begun another hunger strike to call for reform of our broken system of supportive housing.**

I will remain on hunger strike until these three conditions are met.

Condition #1: A majority of the Board of Supervisors must commit to block Supervisor Safai's HSH charter amendment (File: 220535) unless amended to meet the following specific criteria

- a) The mayor cannot have the majority of appointees to the HSH commission
- b) There cannot be any merchant/neighborhood group specific seats, period
- c) There must be a seat for a PSH tenant appointed by the Board of Supervisors

While it is great that supervisors are pushing for an HSH commission, Supervisor Safa'i obviously did not consult with stakeholders, and having the commission be majority mayoral appointee would continue the Tammany Hall/Boss Daley style machine politics that led to our broken homes, exploited workers, and rent burdens. The three demands above are non-negotiable.

If the Sheriff's Oversight Board can have a 4 BOS 3 mayor split, and the Streets and Sanitation and Public Works commission can have a 2 BOS, 2 mayor, 1 controller split, then certainly, the HSH commission can have similar splits (preferably a 4 BOS, 3 mayor split of the former which passed with 68% of the vote).

It should also be noted that Supervisor Safa'i has supported all those non-majority mayoral appointee commissions, so it is arbitrary and capricious that he thinks an HSH commission should be majority mayoral appointee.

Condition #2: A majority of the Board of Supervisors must support the separation of the SRO collaboratives from non-profit landlords

The SRO Collaboratives are programs funded by DBI and administered by non-profits that are supposed to help empower tenants to hold landlords accountable. But they are administered by landlords. Here is a high level explanation of the issues.

<https://www.streetsheet.org/sro-collaboratives-the-city-and-the-nonprofits-in-between/>

Most egregious has been the Central City SRO Collaborative, who has tried to stifle issues, been way in the pocket of landlords, and almost killed the #30RightNow campaign in it's infancy. Here is a collection of YouTube videos of CCSRO reps saying anti-tenant things.

https://youtube.com/playlist?list=PL_T08aW2cLPT3f4jV0btLy62nJuYoRZRT

Although Supervisor Hillary Ronen has recently raised the issue with DBI, she has not yet been willing to challenge these perverse relationships in a substantial way. We need to put these collaboratives under non-profits that aren't also landlords in order to empower tenants to challenge power in an authentic and meaningful way, and the transition must be just and timely.

Condition #3: A supermajority of the Board of Supervisors must support "Right To Pay Rent By Check Or Online":

Currently, many tenants in supportive housing are required to either have their benefits routed to the provider to cut out the rent and give back the remainder, and if they have direct deposit, must use money order. It's been a sore spot with me for years and it's been an issue with many tenants as well, especially in THC Case in point, in 2010, a tenant who was seeking a seat on the SRO Task Force mentioned the issue, and he was spurned for a tenant who was close with THC.

Well, there have been times that our checks have been delayed, and it's time to say enough is enough. The following conditions must be met.

- a) Tenants should have the right to direct deposit, unless there is substantial delinquency (I am willing to negotiate with providers on what that would be, but everything else is non-negotiable).
- b) Tenants should have the right to pay rent by check unless they bounced within the last three months (as per California Civil Code)
- c) Tenants should have the option (and per California Civil Code it must be an option) to pay rent by debit card through an online portal, in order to promote convenience, surety, and physical distancing.

Those are the three conditions. Conditions 1 and 2 were under consideration for some time and these reforms will make it easier to bring sunshine on these equity issues and organize for change, while Condition 3 is a specific issue that was elevated to top of mind just recently.

I did not want to have to do this, I am already precarious as it is, and I am putting myself at risk. But there are decades of collective trauma that have led up to this point, and if I can't, who will? Too many tenants in D3, D5, D6, and D9 have been dealing with this shit for years, and it's time to blow the whistle, and I hope that I can get these commitments.

Yours,

Jordan (she/her)

From: [LIZA murawski](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Grier, Geoffrey \(DPH - Contractor\)](#)
Subject: Opposed to a proposed HSH Charter Amendment (File: 220535)
Date: Thursday, June 9, 2022 11:41:43 PM

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

Dear Board Of Supervisors,

My name is Liza Murawski I live in District 5, and I am a member and Mentoring Co-Chair of the Tenderloins People Congress, and long time TL SRO resident. I am writing to you to oppose the proposed HSH Charter Amendment (File: 220535) unless the following amendments are made.

1. That the commission not be majority appointed by the Mayor
2. That the commission have a seat for a permanent supportive housing tenant appointed by the Board of Supervisors.
3. That the seat for a merchant/neighborhood association member be eliminated.
4. That the OCOH Oversight Board can advise the Board of Supervisors

Supervisor Safaí, in drafting this Charter Amendment, did not listen to the community's needs. Nor did he engage stakeholders, including the voices of permanent supportive housing tenants that are often not heard.

In the April 26 Chronicle exposé on SROs used as supportive housing, it is well-established that the Mayor's Office has had its thumb on the scale for the past 20 years, with devastating effects on the quality of life of tenants whose living conditions remain inhospitable. SRO tenants need a way to elevate these issues.

Furthermore, a permanent supportive housing tenant who is appointed by the Board of Supervisors would add a voice that is not often heard in conversations around homelessness issues. On the other hand, representatives from neighborhood and merchant councils (currently Seat 4) have been heard from too much, and must be removed from the Charter Amendment. They do not have an understanding of the complex programmatic issues involving housing homeless individuals.

I am also concerned about language that does not allow for the Our City, Our Home Oversight Board to advise the Mayor and Board of Supervisors. That needs to be removed from the Charter Amendment as well.

The public is supportive of commissions that don't have majority-Mayoral appointments. Prop D, which put the Sheriff's Department under a 4 BOS-3 Mayor oversight board, passed with 68% of the vote in November 2020. There is no reason that this structure can't be replicated with real oversight over the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing.

Please oppose the Charter Amendment unless the four recommendations above are incorporated. The city is tired of paper tiger commissions that do nothing, and it harms all stakeholders.

Sincerely,

Liza M. Murawski

From: [Curtis Bradford](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Dorsey, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [DorseyStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: File 220535: Oppose HSH majority-Mayoral Commission unless amended
Date: Friday, June 10, 2022 10:20:46 AM

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

Dear Board Of Supervisors,

My name is Curtis Bradford, co-Chair of the Tenderloin People's Congress and have lived and worked in the TL for about 15 years. I currently live in District 6 part of the TL. I am writing to you to oppose the proposed HSH Charter Amendment (File: 220535) unless the following amendments are made.

1. That the commission ***not*** be majority appointed by the Mayor.
2. That the commission have a seat for a permanent supportive housing tenant appointed by the Board of Supervisors.
3. That the seat for a merchant/neighborhood association member be eliminated.
4. That the OCOH Oversight Board can advise the Board of Supervisors

Supervisor Safaí, in drafting this Charter Amendment, did not listen to the community's needs. Nor did he engage stakeholders, including the voices of permanent supportive housing tenants that are often not heard.

In the April 26 Chronicle exposé on SROs used as supportive housing highlighted the devastating effects on the quality of life of tenants whose living conditions remain inhospitable. SRO tenants need a way to elevate these issues.

Furthermore, a permanent supportive housing tenant who is appointed by the Board of Supervisors would add a voice that is not often heard in conversations around homelessness issues. On the other hand, representatives from neighborhood and merchant councils (currently Seat 4) have been heard from too much, and must be removed from the Charter Amendment. They do not have an understanding of the complex programmatic issues involving housing homeless individuals.

I am also concerned about language that does not allow for the Our City, Our Home Oversight Board to advise the Mayor and Board of Supervisors. That needs to be removed from the Charter Amendment as well.

The public is supportive of commissions that don't have majority-Mayoral appointments. Prop D, which put the Sheriff's Department under a 4 BOS-3 Mayor oversight board, passed with 68% of the vote in November 2020. There is no reason that this structure can't be replicated with real oversight over the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing.

Please oppose the Charter Amendment unless the four recommendations above are incorporated. The city is tired of paper tiger commissions that do nothing, and it harms all stakeholders.

Sincerely,
Curtis Bradford

From: [Kasey Rios Asberry](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: jodav1026@gmail.com
Subject: File 220535: Oppose HSH majority-Mayoral Commission unless amended
Date: Friday, June 10, 2022 10:27:42 AM

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

Dear Board Of Supervisors,

My name is Kasey Rios Asberry, I live in District 5, and I am a member of Tenderloin Peoples Congress. I am writing to you to urge you to oppose the proposed HSH Charter Amendment (File: 220535) unless the following amendments are made.

1. That the commission not be majority appointed by the Mayor
2. That the commission have a seat for a permanent supportive housing tenant appointed by the Board of Supervisors.
3. That the seat for a merchant/neighborhood association member be eliminated.
4. That the OCOH Oversight Board can advise the Board of Supervisors

Supervisor Safaí, in drafting this Charter Amendment, did not listen to the community's needs. Nor did he engage stakeholders, including the voices of permanent supportive housing tenants that are often not heard.

In the April 26 Chronicle exposé on SROs used as supportive housing, it is well-established that the Mayor's Office has had its thumb on the scale for the past 20 years, with devastating effects on the quality of life of tenants whose living conditions remain inhospitable. SRO tenants need a way to elevate these issues.

Furthermore, a permanent supportive housing tenant who is appointed by the Board of Supervisors would add a voice that is not often heard in conversations around homelessness issues. On the other hand, representatives from neighborhood and merchant councils (currently Seat 4) have been heard from too much, and must be removed from the Charter Amendment. They do not have an understanding of the complex programmatic issues involving housing homeless individuals.

I am also concerned about language that does not allow for the Our City, Our Home Oversight Board to advise the Mayor and Board of Supervisors. That needs to be removed from the Charter Amendment as well.

The public is supportive of commissions that don't have majority-Mayoral appointments. Prop D, which put the Sheriff's Department under a 4 BOS-3 Mayor oversight board, passed with 68% of the vote in November 2020. There is no reason that this structure can't be replicated with real oversight over the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing.

Please oppose the Charter Amendment unless the four recommendations above are incorporated. The city is tired of paper tiger commissions that do nothing, and it harms all stakeholders.

Sincerely,
Kasey Rios Asberry
District 5

From: [Anne Bluethenthal](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: File 220535: Oppose HSH majority-Mayoral Commission unless amended
Date: Friday, June 10, 2022 10:34:47 AM

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

Dear Board Of Supervisors,

My name is Anne Bluethenthal, I work in District 5, and I am a member of ABD/Skywatchers in the Tenderloin. I am writing to you to oppose the proposed HSH Charter Amendment (File: 220535) unless the following amendments are made.

1. That the commission not be majority appointed by the Mayor
2. That the commission have a seat for a permanent supportive housing tenant appointed by the Board of Supervisors.
3. That the seat for a merchant/neighborhood association member be eliminated.
4. That the OCOH Oversight Board can advise the Board of Supervisors

Supervisor Safai, in drafting this Charter Amendment, did not listen to the community's needs. Nor did he engage stakeholders, including the voices of permanent supportive housing tenants that are often not heard.

In the April 26 Chronicle exposé on SROs used as supportive housing, it is well-established that the Mayor's Office has had its thumb on the scale for the past 20 years, with devastating effects on the quality of life of tenants whose living conditions remain inhospitable. SRO tenants need a way to elevate these issues.

Furthermore, a permanent supportive housing tenant who is appointed by the Board of Supervisors would add a voice that is not often heard in conversations around homelessness issues. On the other hand, representatives from neighborhood and merchant councils (currently Seat 4) have been heard from too much, and must be removed from the Charter Amendment. They do not have an understanding of the complex programmatic issues involving housing homeless individuals.

I am also concerned about language that does not allow for the Our City, Our Home

Oversight Board to advise the Mayor and Board of Supervisors. That needs to be removed from the Charter Amendment as well.

The public is supportive of commissions that don't have majority-Mayoral appointments. Prop D, which put the Sheriff's Department under a 4 BOS-3 Mayor oversight board, passed with 68% of the vote in November 2020. There is no reason that this structure can't be replicated with real oversight over the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing.

Please oppose the Charter Amendment unless the four recommendations above are incorporated. The city is tired of paper tiger commissions that do nothing, and it harms all stakeholders.

Sincerely,

Anne Bluethenthal

Associate Artistic Director, ABD Productions / Skywatchers

<http://www.abdproductions.org>

"The function of art is to do more than tell it like it is – it's to imagine what is possible."

– bell hooks

From: [Eleana Binder](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: File 220535: Amend HSH Commission Charter Amendment
Date: Monday, June 13, 2022 10:53:13 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

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

Dear Honorable Board of Supervisors,

My name is Eleana Binder, and I am writing on behalf of GLIDE. We support the creation of an oversight commission for the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, but only if there is balance in appointment authority, such that the Mayor appoints no more than three seats. In order to have more balanced accountability and oversight, the fourth seat could be appointed by the Controller or the Health Officer. In addition, one of the seats should go to a Permanent Supportive Housing tenant. Finally, the wording related to the Our City Our Home Oversight Committee should be changed to ensure that the Committee can make recommendations to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors, not just the Commission, as follows:

17¶ → (3) → Amends Article XLI of Chapter 5 of the Administrative Code and Section
18¶ 2810 of Article 28 of the Business and Tax Regulations Code, to provide that the Our City, Our
19¶ Home Oversight Committee (“Oversight Committee”) shall advise and make recommendations
20¶ to the Commission and the Health Commission, as well as the Mayor and the Board of
21¶ Supervisor, in lieu of advising and making recommendations to the Mayor and the Board of
22¶ Supervisors, on administration of the Our City, Our Home Fund (“Fund”) and on monies
23¶ appropriated from the Fund, which monies are subject to the City budget approval process set
24¶ forth in Article IX of the Charter, and to provide that the needs assessment conducted by the
25¶ Oversight Committee shall inform the Department’s strategic planning process. This subsection

Please adopt these amendments so that the HSH Commission is the most effective it can be.

Thank you,

Eleana

--

Eleana Binder
Policy Associate
Center for Social Justice
GLIDE 330 Ellis Street, Room 511, San Francisco, CA 94102

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender. Please note that any views or opinions presented in this email are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Glide. Finally, the recipient should check this email and any attachments for the presence of viruses. GLIDE accepts no liability for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this email.

From: [Lea McGeever](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: File 220535: Oppose HSH majority-Mayoral Commission unless amended
Date: Sunday, June 5, 2022 3:14:31 PM

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

Dear Board Of Supervisors,

My name is Lea McGeever, and I live in District 6. I am writing to you to oppose the proposed HSH Charter Amendment (File: 220535) unless the following amendments are made.

1. That the commission not be majority appointed by the Mayor
2. That the commission have a seat for a permanent supportive housing tenant appointed by the Board of Supervisors.
3. That the seat for a merchant/neighborhood association member be eliminated.
4. That the OCOH Oversight Board can advise the Board of Supervisors

Supervisor Safaí, in drafting this Charter Amendment, did not listen to the community's needs. Nor did he engage stakeholders, including the voices of permanent supportive housing tenants that are often not heard.

In the April 26 Chronicle exposé on SROs used as supportive housing, it is well-established that the Mayor's Office has had its thumb on the scale for the past 20 years, with devastating effects on the quality of life of tenants whose living conditions remain inhospitable. SRO tenants need a way to elevate these issues.

Furthermore, a permanent supportive housing tenant who is appointed by the Board of Supervisors would add a voice that is not often heard in conversations around homelessness issues. On the other hand, representatives from neighborhood and merchant councils (currently Seat 4) have been heard from too much, and must be removed from the Charter Amendment. They do not have an understanding of the complex programmatic issues involving housing homeless individuals.

I am also concerned about language that does not allow for the Our City, Our Home

Oversight Board to advise the Mayor and Board of Supervisors. That needs to be removed from the Charter Amendment as well.

The public is supportive of commissions that don't have majority-Mayoral appointments. Prop D, which put the Sheriff's Department under a 4 BOS-3 Mayor oversight board, passed with 68% of the vote in November 2020. There is no reason that this structure can't be replicated with real oversight over the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing.

Please oppose the Charter Amendment unless the four recommendations above are incorporated. The city is tired of paper tiger commissions that do nothing, and it harms all stakeholders.

Sincerely,
Lea McGeever
District 6

From: [Nurit B](#)
To: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \[BOS\]](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors. \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: File 220535: Oppose HSH majority-Mayoral Commission unless amended
Date: Monday, June 6, 2022 4:40:15 PM

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

Dear Board Of Supervisors,

My name is Nurit Baruch, I live in District 2 but my son who has a mental disability lives in an SRO in Soma, and I am also a member of SF taxpayers steering committee. I am writing to you to oppose the proposed HSH Charter Amendment (File: 220535) unless the following amendments are made.

1.
That the commission not be majority appointed by the Mayor
2.
That the commission have a seat for a permanent supportive housing tenant appointed by the Board of Supervisors.
3.
That the seat for a merchant/neighborhood association member be eliminated.
4.
That the OCOH Oversight Board can advise the Board of Supervisors

Supervisor Safaí, in drafting this Charter Amendment, did not listen to the community's needs. Nor did he engage stakeholders, including the voices of permanent supportive housing tenants that are often not heard.

In the April 26 Chronicle exposé on SROs used as supportive housing, it is well-established that the Mayor's Office has had its thumb on the scale for the past 20 years, with devastating effects on the quality of life of tenants whose living conditions remain inhospitable. SRO tenants need a way to elevate these issues.

Furthermore, a permanent supportive housing tenant who is appointed by the Board of Supervisors would add a voice that is not often heard in conversations around homelessness issues. On the other hand, representatives from neighborhood and merchant councils (currently Seat 4) have been heard from too much, and must be removed from the Charter Amendment. They do not have an understanding of the complex programmatic issues involving housing homeless individuals.

I am also concerned about language that does not allow for the Our City, Our Home Oversight Board to advise the Mayor and Board of Supervisors. That needs to be removed from the Charter Amendment as well.

The public is supportive of commissions that don't have majority-Mayoral appointments. Prop D, which put the Sheriff's Department under a 4 BOS-3 Mayor oversight board, passed with 68% of the vote in November 2020. There is no reason that this structure can't be replicated with real oversight over the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing.

Please oppose the Charter Amendment unless the four recommendations above are incorporated. The city is tired of paper tiger commissions that do nothing, and it harms all stakeholders.

Sincerely,
Nurit Baruch
District 2

From: [Dennis Lu](#)
To: [Young, Victor \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Regarding the HSH Charter
Date: Monday, June 6, 2022 6:01:31 PM

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

Dear Board Of Supervisors

My name is Dennis, I live in the Mission District, and I am a former canvasser and volunteer. I am writing to you to

oppose the proposed HSH charter amendment (File: 220535) unless the following amendments are made.

- 1) That the commission not be mayoral-majority
- 2) That the commission have a seat for a permanent supportive housing tenant appointed by the Board of Supervisors.
- 3) That the seat for a merchant/neighborhood association member be eliminated.
- 4) That OCOH Oversight Board can advise the Board of Supervisors

Supervisor Safa'i, in drafting this charter amendment, did not listen to the community's needs, nor did he engage stakeholders, including those voices that are not often heard.

In the April 26 Chronicle expose on SROs used as supportive housing, it is well established that

the mayor's office has had their thumb on the scale for the past 20 years, and it has had a devastating effect on the quality of life of tenants, and there are other issues that still need to be elevated.

Furthermore, a permanent supportive housing tenant who is appointed by the Board of Supervisors would add a voice that is not often heard in conversations around homeless issues and that a voice that has been heard too much and must be removed from the charter amendment is neighborhood/merchant councils (currently Seat 4), who do not have an understanding of the complex programmatic issues involving housing homeless individuals.

We are also concerned about language that does not allow for the Our City, Our Home Oversight Board to advise the Mayor and Board of Supervisors. That needs to be removed from the charter amendment as well.

The public is supportive of commissions that don't have majority mayoral appointments. Prop D,

which put the Sheriff's Department over a 4 BOS-3 mayor oversight board, passed with 68% of

the vote in November 2020. There is no reason that that can't be replicated with real oversight over the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing.

Please oppose the charter amendment unless the four recommendations above are incorporated into it. The city is tired of paper tiger commissions that do nothing, and it harms all

stakeholders

Sincerely,
Dennis Lu

Mission SF

From: [Laksh Bhasin](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#); [ChanStaff \(BOS\)](#); [StefaniStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [PeskinStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Marstaff \(BOS\)](#); [PrestonStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MelgarStaff \(BOS\)](#); [MandelmanStaff, \(BOS\)](#); [RonenStaff \(BOS\)](#); [Waltonstaff \(BOS\)](#); [SafaiStaff \(BOS\)](#)
Cc: [Berniecrats SF](#); [Breed, Mayor London \(MYR\)](#)
Subject: SF Berniecrats / Mayoral HSH Commission (Safai) — Oppose Unless Amended
Date: Thursday, May 5, 2022 8:13:00 AM
Attachments: [Mayoral HSH Commission SF Berniecrats Position Letter 2022-05-05.pdf](#)

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My name is Laksh and I coordinate the San Francisco Berniecrats Housing Committee. I have attached a letter from the SF Berniecrats expressing our opposition to the proposed majority-Mayoral Commission (Safai) over HSH, unless amended to no longer be majority-Mayoral, through (for instance) the inclusion of Board of Supervisors appointees and tenants chosen by tenants themselves.

We urge you to not place any such majority-Mayoral Charter Commission on the ballot unless amended to be more democratic as described in our letter. We are happy to meet and discuss this with you further, but primarily encourage you to **engage longtime supportive housing activists and people with lived experience of homelessness** on developing a truly-democratic Charter Commission.

Thank you,
Laksh Bhasin

CC: Mayor London Breed



May 5, 2022

Re: Mayoral HSH Commission (Safai) — Oppose Unless Amended

Dear Board of Supervisors,

The San Francisco Berniecrats believe that everyone deserves an affordable and well-maintained home. As highlighted in a recent SF Chronicle investigation, our city is failing its most vulnerable tenants in permanent supportive housing, who are forced to suffer in substandard living conditions — in buildings where elevators regularly break, vermin run rampant, and ceilings literally fall apart. There is a clear need for more funding to care for residents in dilapidated SRO hotels, and a need for more oversight over the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH).

Despite the need for a Charter commission over HSH, we oppose any such commission if it has a majority of its members appointed by the Mayor. Instead, we urge you to amend Supervisor Safai's proposed Charter amendment so that power is shared co-equally among Board of Supervisors appointees, tenants chosen by permanent supportive housing tenants themselves, and – if necessary – the Mayor.

A majority Mayoral-appointed commission would not offer real oversight, and would be indistinguishable from the current oversight structure over HSH, which reports directly to the Mayor. As highlighted by the Chronicle's investigation, the Mayor's office has repeatedly opposed attempts at oversight and accountability over HSH.

Furthermore, Supervisor Safai's proposal did not include community input from supportive housing activists or people with lived experience of homelessness. We believe decisions about SRO tenants must only be made with their express approval.

In general, our City's strong mayor system exacerbates corruption in government and is un-democratic, concentrating power in the hands of one official. As mentioned by one of the authors of San Jose's Charter, "Big California cities that have a strong mayor form of government such as Los Angeles, San Francisco and Oakland have suffered from institutional corruption for as long as I can remember. **It hurts cities because it favors those in power and their close allies and neglects the public interest.**"

Favoring well-connected individuals or contractors is the exact antithesis of what the Chronicle's investigation into HSH and supportive housing sought to accomplish.

We urge you to not place any such majority-Mayoral Charter Commission on the ballot unless amended to be more democratic as described above: through the co-equal inclusion of tenants chosen by tenants and Board of Supervisors appointees.

Sincerely,

San Francisco Berniecrats

From: [Harlo Pippenger](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing Strong Mayor Commission for HSH Unless Amended
Date: Tuesday, May 3, 2022 5:59:44 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to oppose any Charter Amendment establishing a commission over the SF Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, if this commission has a majority of its members appointed by the Mayor. According to this [Chronicle article](#), this appears to be what you are considering to improve oversight over HSH.

A majority Mayoral-appointed commission would not offer real oversight. Instead, you may consider amending this proposal such that power is shared co-equally among Board of Supervisors appointees, tenants chosen by permanent supportive housing tenants themselves, and the Mayor.

SF's strong mayor system exacerbates corruption in City government. It concentrates power in the hands of one person, which is definitionally un-democratic, unlike Board of Supervisors appointments that are less subject to the whims of one person. As mentioned in this [Mercury News article](#) by an author of San Jose's charter, "Big California cities that have a strong mayor form of government such as Los Angeles, San Francisco and Oakland have suffered from institutional corruption ... **It hurts cities because it favors those in power and their close allies and neglects the public interest**" (emphasis mine).

Favoring well-connected individuals is the exact antithesis of what the Chronicle's investigation into HSH and supportive housing sought to accomplish.

I urge you to not place any such Charter Amendment on the ballot unless amended to be more democratic as described above: through the co-equal inclusion of tenants and Board appointees.

Thank you,
Harlo Pippenger

From: [Laksh Bhasin](#)
To: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#); [Chan, Connie \(BOS\)](#); [Stefani, Catherine \(BOS\)](#); [Peskin, Aaron \(BOS\)](#); [Mar, Gordon \(BOS\)](#); [Preston, Dean \(BOS\)](#); [Haney, Matt \(BOS\)](#); [Melgar, Myrna \(BOS\)](#); [Mandelman, Rafael \(BOS\)](#); [Ronen, Hillary](#); [Walton, Shamann \(BOS\)](#); [Safai, Ahsha \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: Opposing Strong Mayor Commission for HSH Unless Amended
Date: Monday, May 2, 2022 6:12:40 PM

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to urge you to oppose any Charter Amendment establishing a commission over the SF Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, if this commission has a majority of its members appointed by the Mayor. According to this [Chronicle article](#), this appears to be what you are considering to improve oversight over HSH.

A majority Mayoral-appointed commission would not offer real oversight. Instead, you may consider amending this proposal such that power is shared co-equally among Board of Supervisors appointees, tenants chosen by permanent supportive housing tenants themselves, and the Mayor.

SF's strong mayor system exacerbates corruption in City government. It concentrates power in the hands of one person, which is definitionally un-democratic, unlike Board of Supervisors appointments that are less subject to the whims of one person. As mentioned in this [Mercury News article](#) by the author of San Jose's charter, "Big California cities that have a strong mayor form of government such as Los Angeles, San Francisco and Oakland have suffered from institutional corruption ... **It hurts cities because it favors those in power and their close allies and neglects the public interest**" (emphasis mine).

Favoring well-connected individuals is the exact antithesis of what the Chronicle's investigation into HSH and supportive housing sought to accomplish.

I urge you to not place any such Charter Amendment on the ballot unless amended to be more democratic as described above: through the co-equal inclusion of tenants and Board appointees.

Thank you,
Laksh Bhasin