

File No. 230109

Committee Item No. _____

Board Item No. 34

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: _____

Date: _____

Board of Supervisors Meeting

Date: February 7, 2023

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
- Award Letter
- Application
- Public Correspondence

OTHER

- Draft Reparations Plan
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____

Prepared by: Arthur Khoo

Date: February 2, 2023

Prepared by: _____

Date: _____

1 [Accepting the Draft San Francisco Reparations Plan of the African American Reparations
2 Advisory Committee]

3 **Resolution accepting the Draft San Francisco Reparations Plan of the African American**
4 **Reparations Advisory Committee.**

5
6 WHEREAS, The African American Reparations Advisory Committee (AARAC) was
7 established by Ordinance No. 29-20 to advise the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, the
8 Human Rights Commission, and the public regarding the development, adoption, and
9 implementation of a San Francisco Reparations Plan that determines the scope and eligibility
10 for a citywide reparations program, examines the current and structural discrimination within
11 San Francisco, and proposed institutional reforms to guard against the need for future
12 redress; and

13 WHEREAS, The AARAC convened its inaugural meeting in June 2021; and

14 WHEREAS, The full committee and subcommittees have met consistently for the last
15 18 months to collect data, hear presentations from experts, and receive guidance from the
16 public on what information to include in the Draft San Francisco Reparations Plan; and

17 WHEREAS, The AARAC is required to submit within 18 months of its inaugural
18 meeting the Draft San Francisco Reparations Plan of the African American Reparations
19 Advisory Committee; now, therefore, be it

20 RESOLVED, That the San Francisco Board of Supervisors does hereby accept the
21 Draft San Francisco Reparations Plan of the African American Reparations Advisory
22 Committee in accordance with the Ordinance and Administrative Code, Section 5.46-5.

23
24
25

DRAFT San Francisco Reparations Plan

To:

San Francisco Board of Supervisors,
Mayor London N. Breed,
San Francisco Human Rights Commission

From:

San Francisco African American Reparations
Advisory Committee

Prepared by:

San Francisco Human Rights Commission Staff

Date:

December 2022

Subject:

Draft San Francisco Reparations Plan

**SAN FRANCISCO
HUMAN RIGHTS
COMMISSION**



CONTENTS

01.
Legacy of Civic Disenfranchisement in San Francisco
02.
AARAC - An Overview
03.
Lessons from Other Reparations Frameworks
04.
A History of Broken Promises: Lasting Institutional Harms
in San Francisco
05.
Reparations Recommendations
06.
Reparations: Objectives and Actions
07.
Where We Go From Here



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Since the forced enslavement of people of African descent, there has been both resistance to the institution of chattel slavery and demands for redress thereof. The genetic, psychological, financial, and racial trauma experienced by Black Americans through US chattel slavery is one of the greatest crimes against humanity perpetuated by our nation. The practice of slavery in the US was uniquely violent and disruptive wherein African Americans were foundationally and systematically disconnected from knowledge of their geographies, languages, names, relatives, and historic cultural practices. Despite the efforts to yield other outcomes, Black people in America have consistently built loving families and communities, provided a blueprint for American cuisine, constructed our nation's most notable monuments, and are the most influential creators of artistic expression globally through dance, music, fashion and language.

Though both the enslaved, formerly enslaved and their descendants, along with other activists, scholars and advocates have called for reparations for over 200 years in the United States, a pivotal contemporary point of activation and understanding of reparations came in 2014, when Ta-Nehisi Coates presented "The Case for Reparations" in *The Atlantic*. In the seminal essay, Coates expands on the common understanding of the purpose of reparations to encompass not only the atrocities committed by this country during the era of chattel slavery, but also call out the role of government in creating and perpetuating poverty by codifying racist practices in housing policy, particularly during the postwar era of urban history in the 1950s through 1970s known as urban renewal. Coates illustrates Black displacement and white flight using Chicago as an example, but is very clear that the effects reach far beyond the limits of the city in the prairie: "Chicago, like the country at large, embraced policies that placed [B]lack America's most energetic, ambitious, and thrifty countrymen beyond the pale of society and marked them as rightful targets for legal theft. The effects reverberate beyond the families who were robbed to the community that beholds the spectacle."

According to the United Nations, reparations "refers to measures to redress violations of human rights by providing a range of material and symbolic benefits to victims or their families as well as affected communities. Reparation must be adequate, effective, prompt, and should be proportional to the gravity of the violations and the harm suffered." In this context, reparations are being demanded by members of the Black/African American communities not to remedy enslavement, but to address the public policies explicitly created to subjugate Black people in San Francisco by upholding and expanding the intent and legacy of chattel slavery. While neither San Francisco, nor California, formally adopted the institution of chattel slavery, the tenets of segregation, white supremacy and systematic repression and exclusion of Black people were codified through legal and extralegal actions, social codes, and judicial enforcement.

This report joins the contemporary discourse about reparations—specifically expanding on the understanding of the role that city governments have played in perpetuating harms that further marginalize their African American communities. Moreover, the recommendations included are proposed to combat the ongoing, explicit, anti-Black discrimination that Black citizens in San Francisco continue to experience. For example, the San Francisco African American Reparations Advisory Committee (AARAC) names urban renewal and its continued economic impacts on African Americans as a primary example. The Committee identifies the ways that these harms were enshrined and perpetuated through policy decisions, corporate advocacy, and institutional choices across the last seven decades.

A Legacy of Civic Disinvestment

The San Francisco African American Reparations Advisory Committee has ultimately found that the effects of various programmatic and policy decisions by San Francisco's government have been generational and overlapping. Of particular focus has been the era of urban renewal, perhaps the most significant example of how the City and County of San Francisco as an institution played a role in undermining Black wealth and actively displacing the city's Black population. As the growth of San Francisco's African American population accelerated between 1940 and 1963, public and private entities facilitated and coddled the conditions that created near-exclusive Black communities within the city, limited political participation and representation, disinvested from academic and cultural institutions, and intentionally displaced Black communities from San Francisco through targeted, sometimes violent actions.

During preliminary research, the Committee studied several reports centered on San Francisco's Black communities commissioned by the City and County of San Francisco ranging from the 1960s to as recently as 2020 that reveal a pattern of disparate outcomes that reverberate across decades: Black people in San Francisco consistently have limited access to housing options, historically through the execution of racially restrictive covenants and today because of racial wealth disparities, Source of Income discrimination, and gentrification. Black people have faced a steady decline in population since the 1970 census, and, even as the city's overall wealth has grown with the fortunes of the technology industry, Black people have fallen behind in household income and wealth-building opportunities.

Though policy recommendations have accompanied each report, there has consistently been inaction on the part of the City and County of San Francisco to adequately and appropriately address the ongoing racial disparities Black citizens experience. It was not until the creation and implementation of the Dream Keeper Initiative in 2020/2021 that the city thoughtfully committed resources to San Francisco's diverse Black communities to address disparate social outcomes. While the Dream Keeper Initiative has been a successful start to investing in Black-led and Black-serving institutions, and is a promising catalyst for pursuing new possibilities, it is not reparations and there is still necessary work by the City for Black San Franciscans to fully receive redress for the city-sanctioned actions committed against them.

A Tool for Collective Action

The hope for this document is to be more than just a report; the AARAC wants this to be a living document that serves as a tool for community action. The Committee is charged with developing recommendations, and hopes that through public engagement and advocacy, external stakeholders will help get these recommendations implemented by the Board of Supervisors and/or the Mayor through collective action.

Methodology

Early in the AARAC's formation, the Committee decided to concentrate on four distinct areas: ***Economic Empowerment, Education, Health and Policy***. Subcommittees met at least monthly, and invited interested members of the public and guest speakers to join and offer their insights at these meetings. Ultimately, each Subcommittee conducted research and held meetings with experts to refine their recommendations. Committee members also got valuable insight from public comment during monthly full body meetings and from Listening Sessions, held during Summer 2022. Subcommittee Leads presented Draft Recommendations in early November 2022 and incorporated public feedback during the Special Meeting held on November 7, 2022 to reflect the community's desires.

Creating the San Francisco African American Reparations Advisory Committee

In 2019, the San Francisco chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) made an audacious proposal to the Board of Supervisors: The City and County of San Francisco should pay the debt it owes to Black residents for generations of disinvestment and displacement. At the time, City leadership said there were "no plans" to introduce legislation to support the effort.

The SF NAACP and other Black community members continued their advocacy efforts until, in February 2020, Board of Supervisors President Shamann Walton introduced a resolution supporting the creation of a San Francisco Reparations Plan. The Plan would comprehensively address the inequities that exist in San Francisco's African American communities as a result of chattel slavery's legacy of systemic oppression. This prescient resolution was adopted in August 2020, in the same year as a litany of events that would change national reparations discussions, namely the COVID-19 pandemic and the Black Lives Matter protests following the police murder of George Floyd by in Minneapolis, Minnesota. These events brought nationwide attention to the ways in which city and state actors have historically played a role in driving institutional anti-Black racism at a systemic and policy level. In addition to shining a light on the way that disproportionate policing impacts Black communities and how global health events had disproportionately fatal outcomes for Black people, 2020 illuminated other ways that government agencies have either passively or actively contributed to unjustifiable socioeconomic, health and educational disparities along racial lines.

It is within this context that the San Francisco African American Reparations Advisory Committee (AARAC) was formed. The San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed the ordinance officially establishing the San Francisco African American Reparations Advisory Committee (AARAC) in December 2020. Over the course of a two-year term, the fifteen member Advisory Committee is tasked with developing a San Francisco Reparations Plan that addresses the institutional, City-sanctioned harm that has been inflicted upon African American communities in San Francisco. The legislation specifically prioritizes improving education, housing, workforce development, economic opportunities, financial stability, small businesses, transit access and food security while reducing violence, health disparities and over-criminalization experienced in our city's Black communities.

Marches and protests cannot by themselves alter the living conditions of Blacks in San Francisco that are the result of decades of systemic racism. What is required to repair this historic injustice is the kind of urgent, significant action that John Lewis fought for during his career. It can and should mark the start of making long-overdue reparations to the Black community, by both the private and public sectors in San Francisco.”

- **Rev. Dr. Amos C. Brown**

As 2020 went on, Mayor London Breed, President Walton and other citywide decisionmakers answered the call from a growing nationwide movement demanding federal, state and local governments to acknowledge the harms that policy decisions have played in perpetuating racial inequities in the United States and take substantive actions to redress those harms. In this context, Mayor Breed launched the Dream Keeper Initiative in 2021, an intergenerational effort that aims to ensure San Francisco’s diverse Black communities are experiencing joy, feelings of safety, advancing educationally and economically, are holistically healthy, and are thriving.

AARAC Appointment and Composition

The fifteen Advisory Committee members went through a nomination process and were unanimously appointed to serve by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in May 2021.

The AARAC was designed with great intention, offering a seat at the table to a broad coalition of diverse perspectives from across San Francisco’s diverse African American communities. The requirements for each Committee seat are outlined below:

Composition of Advisory Committee Seats

Seat 1: An individual who works for a media outlet that principally serves the African American community, is a storyteller of African American stories, or is a historian with expertise in African American history.

Seat 2: An individual who has been displaced from San Francisco due to gentrification (residency in San Francisco not required).

Seat 3: An individual with expertise in private equity, venture capital, or fundraising in the financial industry.

Seat 4: An individual who is 65 years of age or older and who has lived in a predominantly African American community.

Seat 5: An individual who has been incarcerated.

Seat 6: An individual who has experienced discrimination in the workplace.

Seat 7: An individual who has experienced or is experiencing homelessness.

Seat 8: An individual with expertise in the impact of redevelopment activities in the Fillmore District and the Western Addition on Black communities.

Seat 9: An individual with experience as a small business owner principally serving the African American community.

Seat 10: A person who is employed by or in a leadership position in a charitable, social service, or religious organization principally serving the African-American community.

Seat 11: A person who works in the technology industry with experience in the field of technological equity.

Seat 12: A person who is between the ages of 14 and 24, inclusive, with experience working with community groups serving the African American community.

Seat 13: A person representing the sectors served by the Office of Economic and Workforce Development (construction, building and trades, hospitality, and medical sectors) with experience working in predominantly African American communities.

Seat 14: An individual with experience as a parent or caregiver of a child or children experiencing barriers to or disparate treatment in education.

Seat 15: An individual who has lived or is currently living in public housing.

Full List of Committee Members

- Dr. James Lance Taylor
- Tinish Hollins
- Eric McDonnell
- Rev. Dr. Amos Brown
- Omerede 'Rico' Hamilton

- Nikcole Cunningham
- Gloria Berry
- Daniel Landry
- Tiffany Carter
- Gwendolyn Brown
- Anietie Ekanem
- Starr Williams
- Shakeyla O’Cain
- Laticia Erving
- Yolanda Harris (*Resigned in November 2022*)

Committee Leadership

Eric McDonnell, Chair
Tinisch Hollins, Vice Chair

Subcommittee Leads

Gloria Berry | Education Subcommittee Lead
Rev. Dr. Amos Brown | Health Subcommittee Lead
Anietie Ekanem | Economic Empowerment Subcommittee Lead
Daniel Landry | Policy Subcommittee Lead

Committee Timeline and Milestones

The inaugural full body AARAC meeting was held on June 1, 2021. Meetings are held on the second Monday of each month, except when that date falls on a holiday, or in special circumstances as approved by the Committee. A full list of past meetings, along with meeting recordings, summaries and agendas can be found on the Human Rights Commissions website at <https://sf.gov/public-body/african-american-reparations-advisory-committee/past-meetings>

List of Past Meetings

2021

June 1, 2021
July 12, 2021
August 9, 2021
September 13, 2021
October 4, 2021
November 8, 2021
December 13, 2021

2022

January 10, 2022
February 7, 2022
March 14, 2022

May 9, 2022
June 27, 2022
July 11, 2022
August 8, 2022
September 12, 2022
October 12, 2022
November 7, 2022 (*Special Meeting*)
November 14, 2022
December 12, 2022

Committee Milestones

In December 2021, the Advisory Committee submitted a preliminary report to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor London Breed, and the Human Rights Commission outlining the research, outreach, and other efforts necessary to prepare the full San Francisco Reparations Plan in June 2023. The document, [Efforts to Support the Preparation of a San Francisco Reparations Plan](#), is attached to this document.

Looking Ahead

What's next after presenting recommendations?

This document is intended to elevate policy and program recommendations for a comprehensive Reparations Plan for Black San Franciscans. It is important to note that the AARAC serves as an *Advisory Committee*, and is only empowered to make *recommendations*; the body has no authority to implement these recommendations, and City officials are not required to implement any part.

While Black San Franciscans would benefit from the implementation of this Reparations Plan, Proposition 209, which bans government institutions from taking affirmative actions based on race, sex, or ethnicity, poses a challenge to the City to implement programs seen as giving preference. However, the current conditions for Black people in San Francisco merit local advocacy effort to challenge this state law by addressing ongoing racial disparities with the same precision as the discriminatory actions that were taken against this racial group. Through a reparations framework to redress harms done to Black communities, San Francisco has an opportunity to remedy harms with

As an Advisory Committee appointed by the Board of Supervisors, the AARAC occupies a unique position of power within the structure of San Francisco city government. The recommendations that the Committee makes are guaranteed to be delivered to key government actors, but passing legislation advancing African American Reparations in San Francisco will take a broad coalition of community advocates, leaders and other stakeholders applying pressure to local legislators and representatives to truly be effective.

This model of building power is called **Inside/Outside Strategy**.

Stakeholders within government institutions or with access to those with power are considered “**inside**” of the system, while community organizers, advocates and grassroots organizations are on the “**outside**.” (Of course, in San Francisco, the division between these two is often contextual.) An **Inside/Outside Strategy** requires an honest assessment of power dynamics, intentional organizing, and a strategic approach to accomplishing goals. This document is merely the first step in a larger advocacy process. It provides an initial blueprint for the actions necessary to repair the decades of harm experienced by San Francisco’s Black communities, and it will be up to the community to create the momentum to ultimately get these recommendations officially codified into San Francisco law.

ongoing discriminatory impacts.

Lessons from Other Reparations Frameworks

What are Reparations?

The City and County of San Francisco is not the first institution to embark on a journey towards reparations for its African American citizenry. Beyond the individual petitions for reparations, documented as early as 1783, government entities have distributed compensation as redress for actions taken against specific demographics, including for Japanese Internment, victims of forced sterilization, victims of the CDC’s Tuskegee Syphilis Study, victims of the Rosewood Massacre and more. In 2020, California was the first state to seat a formal commission on Reparations, with Assembly Bill 3121 establishing the Task Force to Study and Develop Reparations Proposals for African Americans. In 2021, Evanston, Illinois was the first city to enact a municipal Reparations plan. There are currently dozens of institutions– including universities, religious institutions, nonprofit organizations and local government bodies– exploring reparations as remedies to historical harms and their continued impacts. Two major coalitions: the **National Coalition of Blacks for Reparations in America (N’COBRA)**, established in 1987, and **National African-American Reparations Commission (NAARC)**, established in 2015, have led advocacy efforts for reparations and built outreach campaigns and strategies to guide the national reparations movement. These organizations have defined reparations under the framework offered by the United Nations. In order to be considered reparations, five key components must be met:

1. *Cessation, Assurances and Guarantees of Non-Repetition*

Under international law, a state responsible for wrongfully injuring a people “is under obligation to a) cease the act if it is continuing, and, b) offer appropriate assurances and guarantees of non-repetition”

2. *Restitution and Repatriation*

Restitution means to “re-establish the situation which existed before the wrongful act was committed.” Changes traced to the wrongful act are reversed through restoration of freedom, recognition of humanity, identity, culture, repatriation, livelihood, citizenship, legal standing, and wealth to the extent that they can be, and if they cannot, restitution is completed by compensation.

3. *Compensation*

The injuring state, institution or individual is obligated to compensate for the damage, if damage is not made good by restitution. Compensation is required for “any financially accessible damage suffered...” to the extent “appropriate and proportional to the gravity of the violation and circumstances.”

4. *Satisfaction*


Satisfaction is part of full reparations under international law for moral damage, such as “emotional injury, mental suffering, and injury to reputation.” In some instances where cessation, restitution, and compensation do not bring full repair, satisfaction is also needed. Apology falls under the reparative category of satisfaction.

5. *Rehabilitation*

Rehabilitation shall be provided to include legal, medical, psychological, and other care and services.

[Source: Movement 4 Black Lives Reparations Now Toolkit, “Defining Reparations”
<https://m4bl.org/policy-platforms/reparations/>]

Short History of Past Successful Reparations Movements



I. California State Reparations Task Force

In September 2020, Assembly Bill 3121 (AB3121) was enacted in California to establish the Task Force to study and develop reparations proposals for African Americans. Authored by then-Assemblymember Dr. Shirley Weber, the bill sought to educate Californians about the history of slavery, its generational impact, and create a roadmap for how states may provide reparations to descendants of chattel slavery. This legislation is a significant shift in truth and reconciliation, as no state has provided reparations for the legal institution of slavery or its legacy of anti-Black discrimination. Even after slavery was abolished, the racial caste system of white supremacy that justified the American slave trade remained intact, and continued to relegate the Black community to the status of second-class citizens. As a result, African Americans continue to face disproportionate adversity in almost all sectors of life. As written in the CA state task force interim report “[w]ithout a remedy specifically targeted to dismantle our country’s racist foundations and heal the injuries inflicted by colonial and American governments, the ‘badges and incidents of slavery’ will continue to harm African Americans in almost all aspects of life” (Interim Report Executive Summary 6).

The California Reparations Task Force was formed in the effort to accomplish three specific goals:

1. To study and develop reparation proposals for African Americans
2. To recommend appropriate ways to educate the California public of the task force findings
3. To recommend appropriate remedies in consideration of the Task Force’s findings

The Task Force is projected to be in place through July 2023 to complete their phased process. In June 1, 2021, the panel approved that a report would be issued in two parts, including the following topics:

1. Part 1, published June 1st 2022:
 - a. Institution of Slavery
 - b. Racial Terror
 - c. Disenfranchisement
 - d. Housing Segregation
 - e. Education Inequality
 - f. Environmental Inequality
 - g. Arts and Culture
 - h. Family
 - i. Health
 - j. Discrimination in Labor
 - k. Criminal Justice
 - l. Gap in Wealth Accumulation
2. Part 2, to be published July 1st 2023:
 - a. Apology
 - b. International law Justification

- c. Economic Rationale
- d. Eligibility
- e. Summary of Existing Reparations Schemes
- f. Recommendations
- g. How to Educate the California Population

In June 2022, the Task Force produced an [Interim Report](#) that documents the institution of slavery, the creation and maintenance of a white supremacy racial caste system, its impact on African Americans, and begins to outline what is owed to Black descendants of chattel slavery. In order to educate the California public on both the national and statewide history of anti-Black racial discrimination, the report details white supremacist hatred, torture, lynching and other forms of extreme racial violence towards Black people. “The interim report focuses on anti-Black, racist federal, state, and local government actions and negligence throughout American history and into the modern day.”

Citing international law and the United Nations, the report emphasizes that when a government is responsible for wrongful actions or negligence that causes injustice to a specific group of people, it has a duty to remedy those actions. Within the American court system, it is well recognized that parties must provide redress for the harms caused by their actions or omissions where there was a duty to act. This report houses quantitative data and qualitative narratives of the harm done to Black communities, the impact of racially discriminatory policy, and provides preliminary reparations recommendations to seek acknowledgement, redress, and closure for the existing injustice.

In addition to listing harms that took place in the United States, the report focuses on California’s responsibility in anti-Black discrimination, and, in particular, documents the multiple tactics that the San Francisco Bay Area used to discriminate against African Americans, as well as the historic and current conditions of the city’s Black communities.

In the early days of California’s founding, Black Americans experienced crime without the ability to seek recourse through the legal justice system. The California Supreme Court categorically barred any testimony from Black people. Facing discrimination from both codified laws and vigilante white citizens, Black communities left en masse in the early days of California’s founding in search of peace and freedom. Between 1850 and 1860, nearly 200 Black families in San Francisco fled to the British colonies to avoid persecution within the state.

Racial terror was a primary method used to discourage Black citizens from exercising their rights. Shortly after the release of *Birth of a Nation* in the 1920’s, the Ku Klux Klan established a San Francisco chapter, becoming the first iteration of the group in California. Group members held rallies, initiation events, and public parades that were attended by thousands. The California KKK gained significant political influence during their resurgence through positions of power. Members exerted their authority as elected officials, district attorneys, and police officers. Law enforcement from nearly every California city had a KKK influence, including 25 San Francisco police officers.

Scare tactics like harassment, vandalism, and arson were common tools used against Black Americans. The prevalence of white supremacy ideology created an atmosphere of fear for both Black citizens and white sympathizers that saw the racial caste system as morally unjust. At the same time, those who benefitted from the racial hierarchy were able to maintain their role as bystanders and reap the benefits. “The violence and subsequent silence surrounding the crimes committed against Black Californians demonstrates how white Californians viewed Black presence and homeownership as a threat to white dominance” (Interim Report 186).

Since its conception, the police department has harassed, brutalized, and killed African Americans at disproportionate rates than any other race. The stereotypes created to support slavery have shaped the modern day implicit biases against the Black population in the American public and within the police force. In the Bay Area, police brutality became such a prevalent concern that the Black Panther Party for Self-Defense, later known as the Black Panther Party, formed to protect African Americans from the police in the 1960s. One study found that 27 percent of the people killed in the San Francisco Bay Area were Black residents, even though they only comprised seven percent of the total population at the time.

Most of the suburbs in San Francisco were known as “sundown towns,” where Black people were prohibited from living or being present after sunset. Racially-restrictive covenants were commonplace throughout the city, which stipulated that only allowed white residents were allowed to live on the property described within deeds. These redlining practices were enforced in California as late as the 1940’s. Even after the U.S. Supreme Court case *Shelley v. Kraemer* deemed racially restrictive covenants unconstitutional in 1948, housing discrimination continued. Twenty years later, in an attempt to eliminate discriminatory housing practices, the Fair Housing Act of 1968 was passed. Despite its intention, the act was largely ineffective. The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) could not investigate complaints of discrimination, and lacked the enforcement authority to penalize the lawbreaker. Because of this, housing discrimination continued into the 1970s and 1980s. In 1988, an Amendment was passed to reinforce the policy. This allowed HUD to initiate and pursue complaints, with steeper penalties for cases of discrimination. Though this change corrected inefficiencies in the 1968 Fair Housing Act, it had little impact on the decades of discrimination that racially segregated San Francisco. The legacy created from redlining and other discriminatory housing policies has placed a higher energy burden on African Americans, more than any other racial group. Today, Black homeowners pay more for residential energy bills, which can be attributed to the older, energy-insufficient housing African Americans were relegated to for generations.

In 1945, California passed the Community Redevelopment Act, which allowed for the destruction and redevelopment of “blighted areas” in the community. Each of the conditions that legally defined blight were products of the harms of residential segregation. Buildings in the neighborhoods where Black San Franciscans were legally able to live were more likely to be overcrowded or in poorer conditions than the spaces restricted by racial covenants. Under the guise of urban development, the City of San Francisco declared the Western Addition blighted, which provided just cause to destroy a large portion of the Fillmore. Prior to its destruction, the Fillmore was known as the Harlem

of the West; an integrated neighborhood that was famous for its jazz venues and social clubs, and hosted artists from the likes of Ella Fitzgerald, Billie Holiday, Louis Armstrong, and more. In total, the demolition closed 883 businesses, displaced 4,729 households, destroyed 2,500 Victorian homes, and damaged the lives of nearly 20,000 people. In its aftermath, the city left the destroyed plots of land empty for years. Despite the efforts of civil rights advocates and the passage of progressive bills like the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Fair Housing Act, federal courts still found that San Francisco city housing authorities discriminated and maintained segregation.

To this day, Black-owned homes are valued significantly less than white-owned homes within the San Francisco metropolitan area. A study in 2020 found that Black-owned homes are devalued by 29 percent compared to their white-owned counterparts. This trend makes Black neighborhoods and homes particularly vulnerable to gentrification.

The urban renewal and gentrification that took place in San Francisco has created generational impact and decimated Black communities. One study from the National Community Reinvestment Coalition found that San Francisco was one of the most rapidly gentrifying cities from 2013-2017. Almost 90 percent of the currently gentrified areas in San Francisco were formerly redlined or deemed “definitely declining” by the Home Owners’ Loan Corporation. As a result of segregation, redevelopment, and rent spikes, the Black community has been forced to relocate from the city. In the 1970s, ten percent of San Francisco’s population identified as Black, compared to the five percent today.

Impact of Proposition 209

The destruction and disregard of Black owned business is prevalent to this day. In most major metro areas across the country, including San Francisco, businesses in majority-white areas receive federal loans at a greater rate than businesses in majority-African American areas. An ongoing hindrance in California to equitable access in government contracting for Black people, women, and other marginalized identities is Proposition 209, a 1996 constitutional amendment banning affirmative action. Initially passed by a margin of 10 points, the stated intention of Prop. 209 was to ban discrimination and preferential treatment based on race, sex, and national origin, among other things.

The passage of Proposition 209 undermines Black-owned businesses that seek to obtain public contracts with the State of California and local governments. The consequences of Prop. 209’s passage has been the systematic exclusion of people of color and women. After its passage in 1996, Prop. 209 caused state and local governments to end race-conscious contracting programs, which led to the loss of about \$1billion every year for minority and women-owned businesses. Prior to the bill passage in the fiscal year 1994-1995, \$519 million was allocated to minority and women owned-businesses. When California ended the program, only a few businesses got their contracts with the state back, and some never recovered. Additionally, Prop. 209 has had adverse impacts for Black and brown people seeking access to public employment and initiated a precipitous decline in enrollment in California’s University of California system. In the City and County of San Francisco, about \$200 million per year was lost in minority and women-owned contracts. This loss was

caused by both Prop 209 and the 2004 Coral Construction Case, which ended San Francisco's race-conscious procurement program.

Child Welfare System

The child welfare system in San Francisco continues to separate families. San Francisco has sent the majority of its foster kids to other California counties every year for the past decade. According to data from the UC Berkeley California Child Welfare Indicators Project, in July 2022 San Francisco placed 65 percent of its foster kids in a different county. This is almost double the state average of 33 percent. Understanding the racial demographics that exist within the child care system further demonstrates the racial disparity that remains prevalent across the Bay Area. In San Francisco, the percentage of Black children in foster care in 2018 was more than 25 times the rate of white children. The kids sent away are effectively separated from their support network of family and friends, and are dropped into a foreign environment with foster parents they often have not met before.

Health Outcomes

Discrimination in healthcare for Black Bay Area residents has negatively affected the community's access to basic services. As early as 1853, Black San Franciscans were banned from receiving treatment at medical facilities, like the U.S. Marine Hospital. African Americans were confined to segregated sections of state hospitals. In the 1970s The Black Panther Party provided free, community-based healthcare clinics, to administer basic amenities and address the lack of service and medical discrimination experienced by Black Californians. At the clinics, medical professionals helped train health workers to administer services to patients. However, local governments like the Oakland Police Department retaliated against this movement, and harassed the Black Panther Party for soliciting clinic funds without proper permits.

Healthcare discrimination against Black Californians is worsened by the fact that there are not enough Black physicians in California to meet the needs of the Black population. Black physicians represent less than three percent of the entire medical profession in California, despite the African American population representing six percent of the state's population. The passage of Proposition 209 in California further limited this number by prohibiting the consideration of race, ethnicity, or national origin in public education, employment, and contracting. As a result, within California's private medical schools, the proportion of Black students graduating fell from six percent in 1990 to five percent in 2019.

In California, Black women are more likely to experience health complications during pregnancy, have premature births, die in childbirth, and lose their babies than their white counterparts. In San Francisco, Black babies have died at almost five times the rate of white babies in the past decade. A study has found that when a Black doctor is the primary physician in these cases, the infant mortality rate is cut in half.

Black LGBTQ Americans also suffer from adverse health conditions at higher rates than other demographics. Within the American West, the Black queer community is more likely to be

uninsured, and are more likely to be diagnosed with depression, asthma, diabetes, high blood pressure, high cholesterol, heart disease, and cancer. Additionally, a study in 2021 found that Black transgender women in the San Francisco Bay Area are at higher risk of suffering from hate crimes, because of the intersectional effects of transphobia and racism. This demographic has a higher likelihood to be the victim of battery with a weapon, compared to white transgender women who participated in the study.

II. A Legacy of Institutional Harms to San Francisco's Black Communities

San Francisco's international reputation as a liberal destination for free thought and uninhibited opportunities is undermined by its legacy of mistreatment, violence towards, and targeted racism against Black Americans. Founded in 1776 under Spanish colonial rule and later established in the 1840s, San Francisco experienced its first notable boom as a port city providing an entry to miners who had discovered gold up the Alta California coast. Being a land of opportunity, innovation, and self-made wealth is part of the city's identity, and something that has driven its international acclaim and attraction. Despite the reputation of liberalism, San Francisco has consistently imposed limitations on who has access to the City's abundant wealth. Since its founding, Black people in San Francisco have faced significant barriers to full participation in its society and economy. Through efforts to control the physical movement and financial attainment of Black people, San Francisco, and California more broadly, imposed laws that enshrined white supremacy and ensured the racial subjugation of African American and other non-white citizens.

Despite now being nearly 160 years away from the Emancipation Proclamation, the vestiges of chattel slavery in the United States deeply and directly continue to have a harmful effect on the current era social, economic, health, academic, legal, and cultural experiences and outcomes of Black and African American people in San Francisco. California and its localities meaningfully enforced and upheld slavery by perpetuating the racial caste system of subjugating Black Americans from the freedoms assured to them by the Declaration of Independence. The state's founders were proslavery; 36% of American-born Californians in the 1850s were white southerners who strategically sought statehood for California as a "free state" to avoid controversy and expedite access to federal resources. California's first elected governor, Peter Burnett, was a renowned racist who had established Oregon as a whites-only state through its legislature in 1844 and attempted to do the same in California in 1849. His efforts failed because of the desire of pro-slavery settlers to utilize, and economically benefit from, slave labor across the state.

While neither San Francisco, nor California, formally adopted the institution of chattel slavery, the tenets of segregation, white supremacy and systematic repression and exclusion of Black people were codified through legal and extralegal social codes and judicial enforcement. Non-white people initially could not serve as witnesses in cases involving white defendants in California, in 1852 California passed a fugitive slave act "that was harsher than the federal fugitive slave law, [making] California a more proslavery state than most other free states," voting rights were not enacted for Black men until the late 1870s, and school segregation was ruled legal by the California Supreme Court in 1874.

Beyond the enforcement of slavery's interpersonal relationship management in California, both individuals and organizations in California economically benefited from slave labor. Since the first enslaved Africans were brought to its shores in 1619, the United States was wholly supportive of and dependent upon the enslavement of African people and their descendants as the vehicle that established and propelled the country's economy. In San Francisco, despite not technically enforcing slavery, slaveholders were allowed to enter and leave the state with their enslaved property, exploiting and further profiting from their unpaid labor within California's state lines across a broad spectrum of work, including but not limited to, housekeeping, childcare, food service, and mining

San Francisco's Slavery Era Disclosure Ordinance

Institutionally, today's financial wealth in San Francisco can be tied to profits procured during enslavement. In 2006, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed the [Slavery Era Disclosure Ordinance](#) (SEDO), authored by former District 10 Supervisor Sophie Maxwell. This ordinance enumerates the legacy of systemic harms that have disproportionately affected the Black community as a result of the practice of slavery in the United States, and requires that city contractors providing insurance or insurance services; financial services, or textiles to the city, must complete an affidavit verifying whether the contractor, its parent company, or subsidiary has participated in or received profits from chattel slavery. If the company uncovers records that connect the business to chattel slavery, they are required to submit an affidavit to the City Administrator that identifies: "(1) the names of each Person Subjected to Slavery, each Slaveholder, and each person or entity who Participated in the Slave Trade or derived Profits from the Slave Trade, mentioned in the records, (2) a description of the type of transactions, services, or other acts evidenced by the records; and (3) the extent and nature of any Profits from the Slave Trade evidenced by the records." These documents are then made available to the public and included in a report to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors.

The SEDO offers precedent for the City and County of San Francisco to acknowledge its role in economically benefiting from those affected by this historical injustice. In compliance with the City and County of San Francisco's slavery disclosure ordinance (2006), the following companies have shared that their economic profits are historically tied to the institution of chattel slavery:

Bank of America

US Bank National Association

The ordinance also states that "the City will suffer actual damages due to contractors' failure to comply with this Ordinance". To date, no companies have provided any contributions to ameliorate the effects of slavery.

Strengthening the San Francisco Slavery Era Disclosure Ordinance

Fund Relies on Voluntary Contributions


San Francisco's SEDO establishes a fund to “promote healing and assist in remedying depressed economic conditions, poverty, unequal educational opportunity and other legacies of slavery era among the population of the City” and encourages companies affected by the ordinance to contribute to the fund. However, contributions are voluntary; to date, there have been zero contributions to this fund. **The ordinance would have much more of an impact if contributions were mandatory.**

Considerable Exceptions Carved Out in Legislation

Contractors in a number of categories are exempted from this legislation, including companies that provide medical or dental insurance to City employees, and administrators of the City's Retirement fund. Holding these companies to different standards weakens the efficacy of the SEDO. **In order to have a greater impact, every company that has disclosed an economic benefit from slavery to the City and County of San Francisco should contribute a percentage of annual profits.**

Passive Enforcement Mechanism

The San Francisco SEDO includes language outlining an enforcement mechanism through the Office of the City Administrator; however the fines for noncompliance appear to be lenient, and the disclosures are voluntary. **To make this ordinance truly effective, there should be more strict enforcement and harsher financial penalties for noncompliance, which can be allocated to funding Reparations.**



III. Black Migration to San Francisco

One of San Francisco's founding fathers was a mixed-race Black and Jewish man named William A. Leidesdorff, Jr. A Caribbean immigrant, Leidesdorff first came to Yerba Buena (what became San Francisco) when the settlement had fewer than 100 inhabitants and helped to establish San Francisco as a growing coastal destination for investors and wealth seekers, alike. Leidesdorff was a savvy businessman and was extremely politically active, donating land to create the first public school (in San Francisco as well as California), was one of the city's first public school board

members, was elected City Treasurer, and was appointed US Vice Consul to Mexico, and is believed to be one of the first Black American millionaires due to his investments in steam boats and real estate.

A Growing Community

When the 1940 census was taken, San Francisco's Black population had reached 4,846, accounting for 0.8% of the city's total population. In 1941, the global course of history exploded those numbers. Between 1940-1950, nearly 350,000 Black people migrated to California during what became known as the second wave of the Great Migration. African Americans who were both fleeing racial terror in the south and seeking new job and life opportunities in the North and West traveled to San Francisco. Beyond seeking refuge and a piece of the American dream in the San Francisco Bay Area, African Americans were recruited to come West and fill labor shortages in factories and shipyards given the vacancy created by the number of white men who had gone off to war. African American men and women were needed to fulfill job duties that had previously been unavailable to them because of racial discrimination. Between the 1940 and 1950 Census, the African American population in San Francisco grew from 4,846 to 74,383 people. During this time, a broader contingent of Black artists, home caregivers, and children also migrated to San Francisco, joining a cadre of technically skilled job seekers and shifting the demographic landscape of the city.

Upon arrival in San Francisco, African Americans were met with hostile housing limitations imposed by the city's land use and planning codes, bank lending, and coordinated corporate business interests. Despite their limited new economic opportunities, the city government coordinated with local private entities and the federal government to restrict the physical and financial mobility of Black Americans across San Francisco. This was achieved through the enforcement of racially restrictive covenants, which were clauses written into property deeds that only allowed white/Caucasian people to dwell in a home; redlining, the banking practice of deeming Black and other communities of color blighted and thereby unworthy of bank lending due to the perceived risk of the investment; FHA lending discrimination, the discouragement of federal lending entities to extend lines of credit to nonwhite borrowers; and local zoning ordinances, which both added (e.g. highways) or divested (e.g. schools and grocers) construction in communities most populated by Black people. Various San Francisco entities perpetuated anti-Black racial discrimination and continue to operate today, including the San Francisco Planning and Urban Renewal Association (which later became the San Francisco Planning and Urban Research – SPUR), an organization that aggressively pushed for the redevelopment of the Fillmore and advocated for San Francisco to center white Anglo-Saxon Protestant values to the exclusion and displacement of other racial and identity groups.

As the growth of San Francisco's African American population accelerated between 1940 and 1963, public and private entities facilitated and coddled the conditions that created near-exclusive Black communities within the city, limited political participation and representation, disinvested from academic and cultural institutions, and intentionally displaced Black communities from San Francisco through targeted, sometimes violent actions.

Workforce Discrimination

African Americans in San Francisco were met with racial discrimination within the workforce. Before 1940, no Black worker was employed as a public school teacher, police officer, firefighter, streetcar conductor, bank teller, bus driver, cab driver. There were no Black streetcar workers until 1942. Within two years, the number of Black platform operators grew to 700, demonstrating that the lack of representation was not caused because there were no Black skilled workers. When the BART system was built in 1967, no Black workers were hired. The National Labor Relations Board-certified unions did not admit Black members, and BART refused to enforce non-discrimination policies for unions, despite the transit system being a government entity.

As thousands of Black migrants moved to San Francisco to find work in the shipyards during World War II, they were met with hostility and rejection. Large unions like the Boilermakers refused to admit African Americans. When President Roosevelt issued Executive Order 8802, which stated that no employer receiving federal funding for defense contracts could discriminate, the Boilermakers created segregated auxiliary branches. The members of these shunted groups had no right to vote for officers within the legitimate union branches.

In 1942, when the United States Navy demanded that the San Francisco Housing Authority segregate housing for the thousands of workers and their families at the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard. In response, San Francisco built five segregated projects, four of which were for whites only. Black workers and their families had to wait on application lists to receive housing while apartments earmarked for white workers sat empty. In 1952, the NAACP sued the San Francisco Housing Authority for continuing to only build housing units for white people, claiming that the city agency intended to localize the Black population to the Western Addition and away from white neighborhoods. Though the NAACP won the legal case, the city continued to build segregated housing.

Education Discrimination

Despite the anti-enslavement clause in California's constitution, Black enslaved people that were brought to California were generally denied the right to education. As early as 1855, state laws were established to prevent local governments from receiving extra funding when they taught a Black student. In 1863, a California law was passed that withheld state funds from schools that taught Black children. Although Black Californians were taxed to pay for the state's public schools, the money only paid for the education of white children. In 1874, the California Supreme Court upheld school segregation in San Francisco.

Schools that did provide education to Black students were generally provided less funding and resources compared to white schools, and were shamed for their quality. In San Francisco, the first all-Black school was established in the basement of a church. Six years after its creation, the San Francisco School Superintendent George Tait stated to his school board that "the room occupied by this school for the past few years is disgraceful to any civilized community" and was "squalid, dark, and, and unhealthy" (Interim Report 210). Even after segregated schools were deemed unconstitutional through *Brown v. Board of Education*, many school boards and districts refused to take the steps to integrate schools. As late as the 1970s, the San Francisco school district faced court desegregation orders from Black and Latino families.

At the same time, activists began organizing and protesting against the neglect and misrepresentation of people of color in California's public colleges and universities. The first Black Student Union on any campus in the United States was founded at San Francisco State University in 1966 by James Garrett and Jerry Varnado. The movement soon gained strong momentum. The creation of a BSU in San Francisco was propelled by national advocacy for the civil rights of Black people, as alive and fervent in the city by the Bay as it was in Selma, Alabama at the time.

In 1968, the Black Student Union, the Third World Liberation Front, faculty, campus staff, students, and other activists across the Bay Area all gathered at San Francisco State University and led a series of protests to define and shape their own educational experiences. After months of protests and negotiations around a list of student demands, the university agreed to establish a College of Ethnic Studies. This major geared toward communities of color was the first of its kind in the nation.

IV. Early Community Development

African Americans moving to San Francisco initially were legally limited to living in certain parts of the city due to exclusionary language in housing deeds called restrictive covenants, which only allowed white people to occupy the dwelling. Despite having residential development across the City of San Francisco, African Americans could only primarily live in Bayview Hunters Point and the Fillmore. In Hunters Point, many families lived in the small army barracks constructed for temporary shipyard workers. These were not intended for permanent inhabitation, but with limited resources and constraints on where they could live, Black families lived in these buildings until the 2000s, far longer than the initial timeline for their utilization.




Figure 4a: Example of a restrictive racial covenant.

When the industrial boom subsided in 1945 following the end of World War II, job opportunities declined and Black San Franciscans faced employment discrimination, rising unemployment rates, and housing disparities through a coordinated effort to limit and control the places in which Black people could work, live, and be educated. By refusing bank loans for homes in areas that government and private entities did not want Black people living, it limited the parts of the supply of available housing in San Francisco to African Americans. The pressures of housing demands exceeded the limited supply of housing available for black people and much of the Black population was heavily concentrated in the Western Addition and Bayview-Hunters Point.




Fig 4b. A map created by the Home Owners Loan Corporation (HOLC) government surveyors in the 1930s grades San Francisco neighborhoods based on perceived risk to financial institutions. Green is 'Best' while red is 'Hazardous.' These maps were the foundation of what's now commonly known as 'redlining,' a federal government-sanctioned practice of denying home mortgages, business loans and other financial services to certain neighborhoods. The effects of this practice are still felt today.

V. Mid-1960s: Elevated Cultural Profile of African Americans in San Francisco

The exponential growth of the African American population in San Francisco during the wartime era proved influential in establishing the city's arts and cultural national profile. African American musicians and artists were increasingly attracted to and visiting the "Harlem of the West"-- a vibrant corridor in San Francisco's Fillmore district that became a gateway for Black jazz musicians thanks to the concentration of Black-owned and Black-serving venues and hotels. The Fillmore Corridor was a vibrant destination for the city's Black population, with restaurants, theaters, hotels, and other businesses that catered to a Black clientele when other businesses in San Francisco providing identical services refused entry to African American people. Business leader Charles Sullivan was foundational in establishing the Fillmore as the cultural epicenter of San Francisco and the region. Additionally, community building was happening in Bayview Hunters Point where there had been rapid housing construction and growing homeownership for African Americans.



Fig 6a. An original Certificate of Preference, issued by San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Executive Director Justin Herman to a Bayview Hunters Point resident in 1972.

Beyond these disparate housing conditions, the jobs economy for African Americans in San Francisco also began to retract with the return of soldiers, wherein new opportunities for skills building and economic prosperity were rescinded to prioritize access to white GIs. This consequently grew the unemployment rate for Black residents, whose desires for permanent placemaking were resented and unwelcome. As San Francisco enters the 1960s, the Summer of Love is also a preamble to years of targeted decision making that will aggressively displace tens of thousands Black citizens from San Francisco.

VI. Urban Renewal and Redevelopment Backlash

The California Community Redevelopment Act (CCRA) was enacted in 1945, and later expanded in 1951, allowing cities to create redevelopment agencies. (Governor’s Redevelopment Proposal, 2011). Upon passage, the objective of redevelopment agencies was to allow cities and counties to confront identified blighted areas that created “physical and economic liabilities, requiring redevelopment in the interest of the health, safety, and general welfare of the people of these communities and of the state”. (CA Health & Safety Code, 1945) Urban renewal was added to the Housing Act in 1954, initiating a national land redevelopment program marketed as an opportunity to revitalize economically depressed communities and bring economic development, growth, and private investments. The actual impact was catastrophic interruption and violent displacement of Black communities in major cities across the country, including San Francisco.

Redevelopment was a federally-funded program, enacted through local agencies in coordination with private capital, subsidizing community-development projects to bulldoze communities. The singular objective of urban renewal was economic development. By identifying target areas in cities where Black people, and other undesired communities, lived in clusters, redevelopment was sold as an opportunity to reduce crime rates, increase property value, spur job growth and beautify the city’s landscape. While not all communities that were razed through urban renewal were African American, Black communities were always included in a city’s urban renewal plan. In San Francisco, this manifested as the razing of 40-square blocks in the Fillmore, and the displacement of nearly 20,000 people who were given no legal protection and offered no moving costs, temporary housing, or other remedies. The impact of this expulsion of a community was not only limited to the Fillmore; in many ways Bayview Hunters Point shifted to receive and welcome people displaced by urban renewal across town. When Black community residents and businesses were displaced, they often moved to another historically Black San Francisco community.

Redevelopment was a menacing, devastating project executed with precision on primarily Black residents and business owners in an era of concentrated Black economic wealth in San Francisco. This action by the redevelopment agency had no accountability or recourse, since removal was framed as an action with a public purpose (eminent domain). Residents and businesses were given worthless promissory notes that they could one day return, but historically Certificates of Preference

have not been tracked and have rarely been honored.

The aftermath of the disruptive actions of redevelopment have been government manufactured inequities yielding stunted economic security, mobility, and opportunity of a specific ethnic group in San Francisco: African Americans. Throughout it all, Black residents have worked to maintain connectedness and a sense of community and belonging in a city that they helped to build, fighting for inclusion in the face of the racial exclusion written into the landscape through public policy decisions and private advocacy.

The contemporary landscape for San Francisco's diverse Black populations is shaped by persistent disinvestment in population stabilizing strategies and a lack of recourse for anti-Black discrimination. Federal and local policies since the 1990s have shaped San Francisco's landscape by continuing a practice of forcefully displacing communities through decisions driven by race. In 1996, the Clinton Administration announced the One Strike law, a public housing drug policy that evicted not only the violator, but their entire family, if they were caught using marijuana or any other drug in any quantity. Planning decisions, coupled with employment discrimination and disparities, accelerated housing development in ways that pushed low-income Black people out of their homes and further into the margins. The impacts are borne on San Francisco's streets where 70% of the unhoused population was previously housed in San Francisco and nearly 40% of the unhoused population is Black.

Black San Francisco residents have also been subject to environmental racism, due to limited access to housing options in ecologically hazardous locations. The historically Black neighborhood of Bayview Hunters Point has been contaminated by radioactive material from the nearby shipyards, houses the city's only waste water processing facility and, because of this proximity, the neighboring community experiences disproportionate rates of chronic conditions and cancers. This phenomena is not experienced by whiter, wealthier areas of the city. Oil production facilities are located in close proximity to Black neighborhoods as well.

The impact of environmental injustice, as well as the myriad of social determinants of health that affect Black San Franciscans has significantly shortened the lifespan of this racial group as compared with other San Franciscans. African Americans have the lowest life expectancy compared to any other group in San Francisco. In addition, Black Californians also have the highest mortality rate in nine out of the top ten causes of death in San Francisco. Predominantly Black communities have disproportionately higher rates of chronic disease, including asthma and lower birth weights. Black communities are more vulnerable to industrial and military-grade toxic, radioactive water exposure, and asbestos-contaminated dust.

While San Francisco's city government has emphasized its positions against slavery, discrimination, and anti-Black racism through hundreds of resolutions, ordinances, research papers, and hearings, including but not limited to the following (and also noted in the ADDENDUM at the end of this document):

Resolution declaring anti-Black racism as a human rights and public health crisis in San Francisco, August 21, 2020

Report of the San Francisco Mayor's Task Force on African-American Out-migration, 2009

The Unfinished Agenda – the Economic Status of African Americans in San Francisco 1964-1990, February 1993

Report of the Interim Committee on Human Relations, October 8, 1964

Mayor Breed Announces Spending Plan for Historic Reinvestment in San Francisco's African American Community (what later became the Dream Keeper Initiative), February 25, 2021

Mayor London Breed Issues Executive Directive to Encourage Recruitment and Retention of Diverse Workforce, September 20, 2018

San Francisco Office of Cannabis, Cannabis Equity Report, November 29, 2017

CAREN Act, an ordinance making it unlawful and providing damages for racially motivated calls to the police, October 27, 2020

Slavery Era Disclosure Ordinance requiring contractors providing insurance services, financial services or textiles to the City to disclose any participation in the slave trade, November 17, 2006

Resolution urging Recreation and Parks to remove the name of Justin Herman from the plaza located at the intersection of The Embarcadero and Market Street and condemning the target actions of Justin Herman as an actor of the city to remove African American and Japanese san Francisco residents, September 29, 2017

Resolution "AFFIRMING THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO'S COMMITMENT TO MAKING THE FILLMORE JAZZ PRESERVATION DISTRICT," May 26, 2000

Ordinance creating the African American Arts and Cultural District, December 11, 2018

Ordinance Establishing the African American Reparations Advisory Committee, December 18, 2020

African American Citywide Historic Context Statement

Dozens of hearings on the state of African American employment and economic mobility in San Francisco

Creation of the Abundant Birth Project to address infant mortality and maternal morbidity in the African American community

Multiple hearings on the African American student achievement gap

Creating Malcolm X, Willie Brown, June Jordan Academy

VII. CONCLUSION

San Francisco's international reputation as a shining progressive gem in the west is undermined by its legacy of mistreatment, violence towards, and targeted racism against Black Americans. While neither San Francisco, nor California, formally adopted the institution of chattel slavery, the values of segregation, white supremacy and systematic repression and exclusion of Black people were legally codified and enforced. Still, the promise of social liberties for all through innovative governing is not elusive. Through every experience, Black people have found joy, built community, and continued to advocate for their human and civil rights in San Francisco. This San Francisco Reparations Plan is guided by quantitative data, the conclusions from previous reports on the status of African American communities in San Francisco, and extensive qualitative feedback shared by people with first-hand lived experience as Black citizens in San Francisco. The city's government has the opportunity to take steps that redress the discriminatory actions taken to violently displace, limit political participation, invisibilize, restrict the physical and financial mobility of, and otherwise harm Black people across San Francisco. Through a tailored plan, San Francisco can redress the public policies explicitly created to subjugate Black people in San Francisco by upholding and expanding the intent and legacy of chattel slavery, whose vestiges continue to have impacts today.

VIII. Eligibility for Reparations

Checklist for eligibility:

- REQUIRED:**
 - An individual who has identified as 'Black/African American' on public documents for ***at least 10 years***
 - 18 years or older

- You must meet at least TWO (2) criteria from the following list (must have supporting documentation):
 - Born in San Francisco between 1940 and 1996 and has proof of residency in San Francisco for ***at least 13 years***
 - Migrated to San Francisco between 1940 and 1996 and has proof of residency in San Francisco for ***at least 13 years***
 - Personally, or the direct descendant of someone, incarcerated by the failed War on Drugs
 - Record of attendance in San Francisco public schools during the time of the consent decree to complete desegregation within the school system
 - Descendant of someone enslaved through US chattel slavery before 1865
 - Displaced, or the direct descendant of someone displaced, from San Francisco by Urban Renewal between 1954 and 1973
 - Listed, or the direct descendant of, a Certificate of Preference holder
 - Member of an historically marginalized group that experienced lending discrimination in San Francisco between 1937 and 1968 or, *subsequently*, experienced lending discrimination in formerly redlined San Francisco communities between 1968 and 2008

IX. Recommendations

The recommendations are presented by the subcommittee issue areas that led the process of procurement, informed by feedback from public meetings, outreach engagements and surveys, in addition to ongoing research conducted by the Subcommittees. Several recommendations emerged consistently across Subcommittee Areas. These are presented as **Overall Recommendations**.

Overall Recommendations

- I. The City and County of San Francisco and its agencies should issue a formal apology for past harms, and commit to making substantial ongoing, systemic and programmatic investments in Black communities to address historical harms.
- II. Establish an independent Office of Reparations within the City to execute this plan. This agency must be charged with tracking and ensuring the continued success of programs that come out of these recommendations.
- III. Create and fund a committee of community stakeholders –such as a Reparations Stakeholder Authority or similar– to ensure equity and continuity in the implementation of relevant policy initiatives, independent of the City and County of San Francisco.

ECONOMIC EMPOWERMENT

FINANCIAL REPARATIONS

Objective 1: Create a comprehensive suite of financial reparations that is made immediately available to those who qualify under the eligibility parameters set forth by the Committee.

Actions

1.1 Provide a one-time, lump sum payment of \$5 million to each eligible person.

Rationale: A lump sum payment would compensate the affected population for the decades of harms that they have experienced, and will redress the economic and opportunity losses that Black San Franciscans have endured, collectively, as the result of both intentional decisions and unintended harms perpetuated by City policy.

1.2 Supplement African-American income of lower income households to reflect the Area Median Income (AMI) annually for at least 250 years (\$97,000 in 2022').

Rationale: Racial disparities across all metrics have led to a significant racial wealth gap in the City of San Francisco. By elevating income to match AMI, Black people can better afford housing and achieve a better quality of life.

1.3 Provide access to a spectrum of financial education, from beginning to advanced.

Rationale: While traditional financial education emphasizes basic financial literacy, there is a need to provide a 'ladder' of financial education that encompasses all levels of financial knowledge so that resources match the broad spectrum of financial levels that exist throughout the community.

1.4 Create public bank framework² to ensure that unbanked people have fair options and expanded access to credit, loans, financing and other tools for leveraging financial power.

Rationale: The ongoing quest for a public bank provides an opportunity for the City to offer options for populations that have historically been denied access to traditional financial institutions. Similar to credit unions, a public bank can be a safety net to ensure that those on the financial margins have access to competitive rates and can access traditional pathways to build financial resilience.

1.5 Recruit a Black-owned community bank to San Francisco or expand an existing institution with a Black-owned partner financial institution or a Freedman's Bank.

While the public bank framework is targeted toward marginalized communities broadly, a *Black Owned Community Bank or Credit Union* must:

- Allocate [Community Reinvestment Act](#) funds from banks that are specifically earmarked to meet the credit needs of low- and moderate-income communities and invest them in the communities they are intended to benefit;
- Increase lending in Black business owners and homeowners in Black communities;

1. <https://sfmohcd.org/sites/default/files/Documents/MOH/BMR%20Ownership/2022%20AMI-IncomeLimits.pdf>

2. A public bank for San Francisco is moving forward, this week.
<https://48hills.org/2022/05/a-public-bank-for-san-francisco-is-moving-forward-this-week/>

- Offer additional grants to supporting Black people in historically redlined neighborhoods or who have been denied banking options from other financial institutions;
- Offer alternatives to traditional credit scores or other means of qualification including matching or augmenting community giving frameworks;
- Support fair and equitable appraisals for all types of transactions

1.6 Finance a comprehensive debt forgiveness program that clears all educational, personal, credit card, payday loans, etc.

Rationale: Black households are more likely to hold costlier, riskier debt, and are more likely to have outstanding student loan debt.³ When this is combined with lower household incomes, it can create an inescapable cycle of debt. Eliminating this debt gives Black households an opportunity to build wealth.

1.7 Offer retirement planning services, and services available to augment current retirees' financial state, particularly for low-wage workers.

Rationale: Those who have already reached retirement age have undoubtedly endured racial discrimination

1.8 Introduce tax credits for those who qualify for Reparations: Payroll tax, business tax, property tax, etc.

1.9 Create a Black Reparations Trust or other entity that can accept funds for the sole purpose of investing in Black communities. Such an entity should:

- a) Allow donations from individuals and corporations who want to give their land, real property or financial assets to the Reparations effort;
- b) Explore and create structures and pathways to mitigate tax consequences for recipients of Reparations funds;
- c) Create mechanisms for enforcement and accountability for all activities related to Reparations.

1.10 Create legal structures to protect those who receive Reparations from financial speculators or predators including court block accounts/trust accounts

Rationale: Given the history of financial institutions preying on underbanked communities– and especially given the vulnerability of subsets of this population such as seniors and youth– this body recommends putting legal parameters and structures in place to ensure access to funds and to mitigate speculative harm done by others.

RENTAL HOUSING AND HOMEOWNERSHIP

3. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/christianweller/2021/12/28/households-of-color-owe-costlier-riskier-debt-hurting-their-chances-to-build-wealth/?sh=7a12f8e55600>

Objective 2: Ensure that all members of the affected community have access to affordable, quality housing options at all income levels.

Actions

Rental Housing

2.1 The Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) should remove barriers to qualification for subsidized and Below Market Rate (BMR) rental units; MOHCD should offer first choice for rental units to those who qualify for Reparations, and the City should cover any cost differentials that may serve as a barrier to qualification.

Rationale: Housing is a human right, and increasingly, even BMR units are unattainable for renters because affordability thresholds are too high to be affordable to those with moderate or low

incomes. By removing these barriers and/or subsidizing rents for those who qualify, the City creates expanded opportunities for people to access rental housing.

Homeownership

2.2 Guarantee continued funding for the Dream Keeper Down Payment Assistance Loan Program (DK-DALP) and convert the program from a loan to a forgivable grant over the course of 10 years, which shall be offered to eligible Reparations recipients, regardless of income.

Rationale: Using the standards of a Special Purpose Credit Program (which allows you to use race as a factor in affirmatively furthering fair housing), we can improve the DK-DALP program. DK-DALP is an innovative program that builds on the City’s standard DALP program and expands market-rate homeownership opportunities for Black San Franciscans. By eliminating the repayment requirements for this program and converting it from a 30 year no interest, no payment loan into a fully-forgivable grant, the City can make a meaningful investment in retaining and growing its African American population. It also represents a commitment to addressing the loss in homeownership and household wealth that occurred as a result of displacement caused by Urban Renewal in the 1960s and 1970s.

2.3 The City and County of San Francisco should cover additional monthly costs (e.g. Homeowners Association fees, parking fees, etc) related to housing stabilization in new constructions

Rationale: Many available homeownership opportunities are in condominiums or tenancy-in-common (TIC) buildings that incur additional monthly costs in addition to the standard Principle, Interest, Taxes and Insurance costs. Homeownership Association (HOA) fees can add hundreds of dollars to monthly costs and act as an affordability barrier for property ownership. This recommendation would allow more people to access these housing opportunities by minimizing financial barriers.

2.4 The City and County of San Francisco should underwrite costs associated with refinancing existing mortgage loans.

Rationale: Mortgage refinancing allows homeowners to lower their monthly mortgage costs. Assuming the costs associated with this expands this opportunity to a larger pool.

2.5 The City and County of San Francisco and MOHCD should offer grants for home maintenance and repair costs.

Rationale: The existing [Senior Home Repair Program](#) offers a model for maintenance and repair grants. This program can be expanded for all homeowners who qualify for Reparations.

2.6 MOHCD should address and remove barriers built into the BMR program that limits wealth-building potential

Rationale: Currently, MOHCD's guidelines prevent BMR inhabitants from building wealth through homeownership. BMR owners do not realize the full appreciation of their home's value if/when they choose to sell, are barred from renting their property to both short- and long-term tenants, and should a lease holder pass away, the property cannot be inherited by their descendant. While the AARAC acknowledges that these stipulations were presumably put in place to mitigate the potential for using subsidized housing for profit and to maintain a pool of affordable properties, the impact is that this effectively creates a tiered system that further perpetuates the racial wealth gap. Therefore, MOHCD should amend these practices to offer BMR owners opportunities to realize capital benefits from their property.

2.7 Convert public housing units into condominiums with a \$1 buy-in for qualifying residents so the residents can own not only their unit but all of the common areas, as well.

2.8 Create a market of culturally relevant affordable housing development professionals, establish programs that give preference to developments that build units for 50-80% AMI, including fast track for approvals, bonding and other builder support.

2.9 Offer special consideration to Certificate of Preference (COP) holders, including:

- a) Offer COP holders automatic qualification and first right of refusal to any rental or home

Existing Black-Led Housing Cooperatives

- 1) Midtown Park Apartments Ownership
 - 1415 Scott Street
- 2) Robert B. Pitts Apartment Homes
 - 1150 Scott Street
- 3) Martin Luther King and Marcus Garvey Cooperative Apartments
 - 1680 Eddy Street
- 4) Lauren Gardens
 - 1555 Turk Street
- 5) Fillmore Marketplace
 - 1223 Webster
- 6) Saint Francis Square Cooperative
 - 10 Bertie Minor Lane
- 7) Plaza East
 - 1398 Eddy Street
- 8) Buchanan Park
 - 1150 Webster
- 9) Thomas Paine Square
 - 1086 Golden Gate Ave
- 10) Frederick Douglas Haynes Apartments
 - 1049 Golden Gate Ave

- 11) Freedom West Homes
 - 820 McAllister Street
- 12) Loren Miller Homes, A Cooperative Housing Community
 - 937 McAllister Street
- 13) Friendship Village Apartments
 - 40 Friendship Court
- 14) Banneker Homes
 - 725 Fulton Street
- 15) Ammel Park Cooperative Homes
 - 656 Grove Street
- 16) Banneker Homes, Inc.
 - 725 Fulton Street
- 17) Prince Hall Apartments
 - 1170 McAllister Street
- 18) Westside Courts
 - 2501 Sutter Street
- 19) Hayes Valley North
 - 705 Hayes Street
- 20) Hayes Valley South
 - 409 Page Street

Existing Black-Led Housing Cooperatives

Accompanying Map will go here in final version

ownership opportunities, with all financial eligibility needs met by the city.

b) Offer a moving stipend for Certificate of Preference (COP) holders for all housing in the City and County of San Francisco.

c) Create transparent and user-friendly methods for people to check their COP status.

d) Eliminate the housing lottery process for COP holders

e) Ensure that the descendants of COP holders are able to access the same benefits that their COP-holding ancestors would have received.

f) Fund awareness campaign and augment staff to locate COP holders and their descendants.

e) Ensure that the COP has a monetary value with a baseline of two times the average cost of a home in San Francisco County.

2.10 Section 8 voucher holders.

Apply the entirety of Action 2.9 to Section 8 voucher holders.

2.11 Establish (and provide **at least** five years of initial funding for) a community land trust governed by Black residents to procure and develop properties in target neighborhoods. In addition to housing, this Land Trust would own commercial and retail properties, investing particularly in vacant storefronts along commercial corridors in Black cultural districts like the Southeast sector, and would offer flexible leases at discounted rates to African-American tenants.

2.12 Make all residential vacancies of 3 or more months immediately available to Black homeowners or renters as part of COP, Section 8 voucher holders and/or Reparations recipients.

Rationale: According to [a 2022 report](#) from the Office of the Budget and Legislative Analyst, there are 61,000 vacant housing units in San Francisco– the highest number of vacancies since 2010. These vacant units should be offered immediately to unhoused residents and then offered to COP recipients, Section 8 voucher holders or Reparations recipients.

SPATIAL JUSTICE, COOPERATIVES AND COMMUNITY SPACE OWNERSHIP

Objective 3: Support and promote collective ownership models and “nontraditional” pathways to ownership.

Actions

3.1 Promote the development of new and continued growth of existing Black-led housing cooperatives by taking actions to expand available opportunities including:

a) Incentivize Black homeownership within Black-led housing cooperatives by subsidizing purchases in cooperative communities.

b) Make renovation grants available to existing Black-led housing cooperatives.

c) Offer Black-led housing cooperatives tax credits to offset property taxes.

d) Seed Black-led housing cooperatives with an initial five years of operating expenses

e) Create easier pathways to establish housing coops and provide public funding to do so.

f) Waive fees associated with converting housing typologies, e.g. converting a multifamily home to a tenancy in common (TIC) or condo in eligible co-op communities.

3.2 Dedicate significant funding and resources to restore and preserve historic landmarks, cultural centers, murals and other vital assets of importance to San Francisco's diverse Black communities across all neighborhoods in the city.

Objective 4: Create and sustain thriving, complete neighborhoods that include commercial activity, open spaces, safe streets and affordable housing for Black San Franciscans, in order to address the impact and legacy of displacement in the Redevelopment Era.

Objective 5: Create vibrant community hubs and support cultural institutions centered on the Black community (e.g. *1550 Evans, Fillmore Heritage center, African American Arts and Culture Complex, SF African American Arts and Culture District, others identified through community outreach*)

Actions

5.1 Purchase and run Black historical/focused community centers and cultural institutions or expand city departments (such as the public library) to provide these services.

Rationale: Civic investments in cultural institutions play an important role in formally solidifying a community's permanence in the city. For example, the Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture in Harlem is a world-renowned research institution affiliated with the New York Public Library. In addition to maintaining archives and other traditional library services, the Schomburg Center acts as a cultural hub in the community and hosts public programs, events and exhibitions. The Schomburg attracts scholars, researchers and community members alike thanks to its notable collection and storied history in the neighborhood. Currently, there is no similar public institution in San Francisco dedicated to the Black community. The AARAC imagines a future where the City makes a transformational investment in a cultural institution that addresses the needs of its diverse Black communities, honors their legacies and offers space for celebrating joy.

5.2 Fully fund African-American cultural districts and seed them with the first five to ten years of operating expenses to set them up for success.

JOB CREATION AND SUCCESSION

Objective 6: Prioritize Black San Franciscans in local growth industries. Align educational, professional and economic development pathways to ensure successful outcomes across all employment levels in these industries.

Actions

6.1 Expand Opportunities for All to include more positions in City government so that government employment represents a viable pathway for attaining job security and economic mobility.

6.2 Improve the City and County of San Francisco's Department of Human Resources to ensure

accountability and consequences for racial discrimination.

6.3 Create grant opportunities for internships to ensure Black people have access and can take on unpaid internships which have a positive effect on creating industry knowledge and getting hired.

6.4 Prioritize members of San Francisco's current and past African American communities for employment opportunities, training programs, professional certification, partnerships and contracting. Additionally, create dedicated placement services to assist both experienced, mid-career and entry-level candidates.

BLACK BUSINESS OWNERSHIP AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Objective 7: To support Black entrepreneurs and ensure that Black-owned businesses thrive in San Francisco.

Actions

7.1 Invest in direct payments and training programs.

7.2 Tax relief and incentives: Exemptions from payroll tax and property tax; Assistance from the City with outstanding taxes to ensure that people are up-to-date on tax liabilities.

7.3 Establish benchmarks for approval for equity applicant programs, e.g. 99% approval within 30 days. Those eligible for Reparations should receive prioritized licensing for all services.

7.4 Through an Economic Trust and a Land Trust, create industry campuses which house industry incubators, potentially including:

- a. International Business Hub
- b. Fostering international trade and foster trade with diaspora partners
- c. Manufacturing businesses Hub
- d. Black PDR Hub
- e. Cannabis Hub
- f. Culture, Journalism and Media Hub.
- g. Artificial Intelligence Hub
- h. Biotech Hub

Rationale: A campus with real-estate owned by the trust(s) to create industry incubators that will train, provide jobs, and provide space and investment for Black people getting into emerging industries or already practicing.

7.5 Use the reduced commercial real estate occupancy in Downtown San Francisco as an opportunity to invest in building acquisition to house a multi-industry campus.

Objective 8: Fill funding gaps for Black entrepreneurs and expand opportunities to access capital.

Actions

8.1 Bolster foundation support and San Francisco government-financed grant programs for entrepreneurs and business owners.

8.2 Use the City’s existing Legacy Business Rent Stabilization Grant program⁴ as a model for creating a grant/loan program for Black business owners to purchase commercial real estate.

8.3 Leverage the Community Reinvestment Act to offer 0%/low interest rate loans (convertible to grants) to qualifying business owners.

EDUCATION

FORMAL RECOGNITION OF INSTITUTIONAL HARMS

Objective 1: Acknowledge the harm done to past generations of Black students in San Francisco and take steps to prevent future harms.

Actions

1.1 The San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) and the City and County of San Francisco should formally acknowledge the historic failure to adequately serve Black children in San Francisco due to past racist practices. The over-representation and identification of Black children in Special Education (especially as “emotionally disturbed” which dramatically impacts future career outcomes), systemic disinvestment in schools on the city’s southeast side and the lack of comprehensive wrap around care owed to students and families perpetuate harm and negative impact student achievement.

1.2 Ensure funding to African American Student Achievement, including the continued funding of the African American Achievement and Leadership Initiative.

1.3 Identify and distribute local, state and federal funding available for school infrastructure to update school buildings that are outdated, unhealthy, and in disrepair.

1.4 Incentivize the state education agency to conduct deep racial equity audits, eliminate racially biased curriculum, implement strategies to promptly address negative racial impacts, and establish frameworks for applying a racial equity lens to future policy and programming decisions.

1.5 Ensure that schools across San Francisco have adequate funding that prioritizes neighborhoods that have had a legacy of educational disinvestment.

1.6 Establish benchmarks and goals related to Black student retention at SFUSD and Department of Early Childhood.

⁴ <https://sf.gov/information/rent-stabilization-grant>



1.7 Offer financial compensation for families affected by the education harms that the SFUSD has perpetuated throughout the years on Black students.

Objective 2: Make meaningful financial investments in Students and Communities to Address Past Structural Harms

Actions

2.1 Expand eligibility to the equity incentives in the city's Kindergarten 2 College (K2C) program to prioritize Black SFUSD students at schools across the district to add funds monthly to students' accounts based on grades, evidence of student achievement and other benchmarks.

2.2 Offer scholarships for other educational options beyond SFUSD (boarding schools, private schools, parochial schools, etc.)

2.3 Fund tuition assistance for 2-4 year college institutions, trade school and other post-secondary school options.

2.4 Invest in pathways for Black SFUSD graduates who return to San Francisco to work at SFUSD. The city will provide funding to eligible returning professionals to offset the cost of housing, student loans, etc.

2.5 Eliminate student loan debt for Black people in San Francisco who went through SFUSD

Objective 3: Invest in educational infrastructure to ensure that all SFUSD students have equitable access to quality school buildings and resources.

Actions

3.1 Establish an Afrocentric K-12 school in San Francisco, similar to existing culturally specific schools in SFUSD. Study innovative public school models such as Cleveland, Ohio's iPromise School to implement best practices for urban education and pedagogy in a brand new K-12 school built intentionally for African-American student enrollment.

3.2 Equip all SFUSD students with technology that equips them to be competitive in the 21st century, including access to laptops and internet/wifi access supplemented for students.

3.3 Establish a satellite Historically Black College or University (HBCU) campus in San Francisco. Create an incentive package and facilitate relationships with the technology sector to attract an HBCU, with the intention of strengthening the pipeline into the technology industry.

CREATING BLACK-CENTERED EDUCATIONAL PATHWAYS

Objective 4: Introduce curriculum that elevates and promotes Black history and culture, and offers students a foundation of culturally competent skills.

Actions

4.1 Introduce a mandatory core Black History and Culture curriculum into all SFUSD grade levels, per the guidelines set forth by the [Fund Black History Resolution](#) adopted by the SFUSD in 2020.

4.2 Offer culturally-competent after school programs and weekend cultural enrichment opportunities.

4.3 Offer culturally-competent early childhood education programs for students ages 0-5 that prioritize fundamentals to prepare students for kindergarten.

4.4 Incorporate meditation, yoga and other mindfulness principles into the classroom and afterschool programs.

4.5 Teach and model healthy coping skills, anger management, navigating gender relations, empowerment and anti-bullying in schools.

4.6 Introduce a comprehensive nutrition curriculum that incorporates gardening and agriculture at all grade levels.

4.7 Commit to funding and hosting nonpartisan voter education events to supplement civic education curriculum with practical resources about voting and the electoral process.

Objective 5: Create pathways for African-American students to pursue both traditional and non-traditional educational opportunities.

Actions

5.1 Reinstate trade pathways and vocational opportunities into the SFUSD curriculum including culinary, woodshop, electrical engineering, automotive and other vocational programs.

5.2 Invest in the Arts Program, with an emphasis on culturally-based practices at schools densely populated with African American students. Collaborate with existing institutions such as the African American Arts and Cultural District to create relevant and meaningful arts curriculum.

5.3 Increase funding for existing programs that support college readiness and completion. Programs must have a proven track record and be monitored by a Reparations Oversight Committee.

5.4 Increase funding for existing programs that support 1:1 tutoring. Programs must have a proven track record and be monitored by a Reparations Oversight Committee.

5.5 Collaborate with local employers to create a secondary school curriculum that prepares students for careers and internships in emerging industries.

5.6 Provide scholarship funding for students to pursue supplemental educational opportunities inside and outside of San Francisco. Include a requirement for students to bring their talents back to San Francisco to prevent further regional brain drain.

5.7 Fund after school programs that include media literacy/analysis skills and cultural empowerment to counteract the harmful images of Black youth in mainstream media.

RECRUITING, RETAINING AND SUPPORTING AFRICAN-AMERICAN EDUCATORS

Objective 6: Invest in recruiting Black educators.

Actions

6.1 SFUSD should recruit Black teachers from HBCUs and throughout the community and region.

Objective 7: Develop incentives for retaining Black educators in the SFUSD.

Actions

7.1 Provide housing stipends for Black educators commensurate with market-rate housing needs.

7.2 Create a grant program to improve teacher preparation, recruitment, and ongoing professional development that fully incorporates culturally responsive pedagogy.

7.3 Provide funding for teacher pathway programs and continuing education opportunities.

7.4 Provide stipends for books, materials, etc Provide scholarships for San Francisco-based students attending public and private universities pursuing careers in education.

Objective 8: Building and sustaining a pipeline of Black educators.

Actions

8.1 Provide funding and other resources for new teachers to pursue tutors of their own choice for teaching certification tests.

8.2 Using the [Urban Ed Academy](#) model, expand the program to include Black women and build

professional pipelines to attract and retain Black woman educators

8.3 Compensate Black educators for the harm they experience teaching a white supremacy curriculum.

INTERRUPTING THE SCHOOL-TO-PRISON PIPELINE

Objective 9: Offer creative, community-informed options to support students who are most at risk of becoming involved in the criminal justice system.

Actions

9.1 Work in consultation with the District Attorney and Public Defender's offices to implement a cash incentive program (similar to [Richmond's Office of Neighborhood Safety gun violence intervention model](#)) that offers a stipend to those who are at risk of being justice-involved for achieving educational benchmarks like degree completion.

9.2 Introduce City College programs designed to provide access to degree programs while incarcerated and to ease the transition into educational pathways upon release.

9.3 Partner with the California State Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation and the San Francisco County jail to provide alternative pathways to college degrees while incarcerated through nontraditional instruction programs (i.e. mail-in packets, tablets, correspondence training programs, etc.)

Objective 10: Invest in holistic, comprehensive wraparound services for SFUSD youth and their families.

Actions

10.1 Supporting the SFDPH in creating a criteria for therapy within the school district to focus on trauma stemming from gun violence, war zones and Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD).

10.2 Offer rehabilitation and substance abuse counseling for youth that is easily accessible with culturally competent staff.

10.3 Offer tutoring, mentoring and counseling through nonprofit and community-based organizations that are already engaged in this work.

10.4 Increase access to in-school mental health resources and wellness practices including:

- a. Funding to introduce mindfulness practices to all schools densely populated with African American students.
- b. Additional full-time therapists at all schools densely populated with African American students.
- c. Free access to therapy.
- d. School-based expressive arts programs. Fund programs like Rafiki Coalition to do school based therapy.
- e. Provide therapy for Black SFUSD staff as well.

- f. Introduce services that introduce socioemotional learning and intelligence and counternarratives to harmful messages that youth often receive.

Objective 11: Implement educational pathways to degree programs for unhoused residents and Transitional Aged Youth (TAY).

Actions

11.1 Hire dedicated liaisons to visit Transitional Aged Youth (TAY) housing and other supportive housing sites across the city to provide guidance in pursuing education and advocate for unhoused people who want to pursue educational opportunities.

11.2 Develop a partnership with City College to ease transition into learning programs for unhoused residents and TAY.

Objective 12: Establish independent oversight of educational programs related to Reparations.

Actions

12.1 Introduce a Reparations Education Oversight Committee– a nonpartisan body formed by the city that includes legacy AARAC Members appointed to track the implementation and success of these programs that are uniquely serving the Black community.

HEALTH

Objective 1: Acknowledge the insult, assault and intergenerational harm caused by the City and County of San Francisco as it relates to the mental, physical and environmental health of Black San Franciscans.

Actions

- 1.1 Issue an official apology from the City and County of San Francisco and the San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH) on the historic failure to adequately improve the social determinants of health for Black San Franciscans due to structural racism which has had lasting and generational impacts to the mental, physical and environmental wellbeing for Black residents.
- 1.2 Publically commit to the restoration for the ways that racism has caused insult to Black humanity and manifested in both visible and invisible trauma through the means of compensation, restoration and rehabilitation.
- 1.3 Investigate and hold health and wellness institutions liable for the racial trauma and harm they have inflicted on African American communities, and require them to be financially accountable and mandated to contribute to a San Francisco Reparations Fund.
- 1.4 Review, audit and improve city departments and policies responsible for community health and ensure public, philanthropic and city funding that is allocated toward Black health is appropriately and equitably spent

Objective 2: Address and reduce health disparities by investing in structural, long-term solutions to the social determinants to health.

Actions

- 2.1 Create an actionable Black Health Plan that builds on the existing Black/African American Focus Area in the SFDPH Strategic Plan to address disparities across areas of wellness focusing on illness prevention, culturally-appropriate treatment modalities and violence prevention.
- 2.2 Build and/or adequately resource neighborhood-based clinics in communities with high concentrations of African Americans.
- 2.3 Equip practitioners with mandatory training and engagement with culturally responsive approaches, hiring, practices and systems of care.
- 2.4 Create free educational pathways to recruit, train and retain Black health care professionals with stipends/student loan forgiveness and or affordable housing for Black physicians and Registered Nurses working in San Francisco's Black neighborhoods.
- 2.5 Provide funding to San Francisco public schools, African American churches and other community spaces to increase culturally-appropriate access to wellness, nutrition education, health screening and other health resources.

Objective 3: Create safer public spaces through improvements to the built environment.

Actions

3.1 Create, improve and allocate culturally specific Black spaces that rebuild and revitalize:

- Social relationships
- Social networks
- Infrastructure of social support

3.2 Revitalize San Francisco public housing sites to ensure safe, updated, liveable housing conditions for all residents.

3.3 Introduce land use controls to reduce the number of liquor stores, dispensaries, and fast food restaurants in Black communities and prioritize/incentivize access to fresh food and full service grocery stores.

Objective 4: Address persistent issues in environmental and community health.

4.1 Declare community violence as a public health crisis and fund resources for effective interventions.

4.2 Address health impacts specific to harm caused by radiological and toxic chemical contaminants from the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard operations upon the Bayview Hunters Point community residents across generations and over the decades since the opening of the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard by taking the following actions:

- a. Fund and sustain biomonitoring testing services for community residents (Hunters Point Biomonitoring Program) and maintain a community toxic registry.
- b. Fund and operate local health clinics to provide healthcare, nutrition, and mental health services for impacted residents showing above reference range levels of radiological and toxic chemical contaminants, correlated respiratory disease and cancers, and other health impacts as uncovered per toxic exposure science.
- c. Fund and maintain air monitoring services across SF neighborhoods (including Treasure Island) specifically addressing Environmental Justice Communities of pollution and environmental toxins assaulted communities as identified by CalEnviroScreen.
- d. Align environmental justice curriculum into our school programs and offer similar pedagogy for adult learning to advance awareness and advocacy.
- e. Align with culturally competent mental health redress as environmental injustices place undue stress upon our communities.

4.3 Align with CA State Bill 1000 and the SF General Plan [Environmental Justice Framework](#) policy development, and support findings and recommendations of the 2021-22 Civil Grand Jury Report [“Buried Problems and a Buried Process - The Hunters Point Naval Shipyard in a Time of Climate Change”](#) and the actions identified within the report, e.g. holding accountability for the ongoing remediation and 100% cleanup of the Hunter Point Naval Shipyard, and particularly actions as they relate to climate change, sea level and groundwater rise and risks imposed on the shoreline

communities, again identified as Environmental Justice (EJ) Communities by CalEnviroScreen.

Objective 5: Reduce the ongoing burden of stress disparately endured by Black San Franciscans.

Actions

5.1 Provide reparations direct payments to Black San Franciscans to alleviate the stress and anxiety caused by financial insecurity.

5.2 Provide free mental health, prenatal care, and rehabilitation treatment to all Black San Franciscans living below the poverty line, victims of violent crimes, previously incarcerated Black San Franciscans, high crime area residents and substance abuse users.

5.3 Provide free testing for residents near environmentally toxic environments and financial compensation for those testing positive for illness due to exposure.

POLICY

Objective 1: Address the historical and existing state policies that have disproportionately harmed San Francisco’s African-American communities.

Actions

1.1 Generate local political support to repeal Proposition 209⁵, which, through eliminating government funded affirmative action programs, has been attributed to significant decreases in African-American participation across higher education⁶, public employment⁷, government procurement⁸, etc.

Rationale: Proposition 209 has created a dynamic that prevents legislators from crafting policy that directly addresses issues that specifically affect certain racial groups.

1.2 In alignment with the [AB 3121 Interim Report](#), repeal Article 34⁹ of the California Constitution.

Rationale: Article 34 is a state constitutional provision that requires cities to get voter approval before building housing with public funds. It has been attributed to slowing down efforts to integrate suburbs across the state. California is the only state whose constitution explicitly prevents public housing.

1.3 Address potential remedies to Proposition 13, which has frozen commercial and residential property tax assessments

Rationale: Though framed as an incentive to California property owners, the loss of tax revenue spurred by Proposition 13 has contributed significantly to the growing racial wealth gap and the housing shortage across the state– both of which disproportionately affect African-American communities.¹⁰

1.4 Audit War on Drugs-era policies (e.g. the “One strike rule”) that prevented African-American San Franciscans from accessing public housing and other housing-related subsidies

5. Full Text of Prop 209: <https://vigarchive.sos.ca.gov/1996/general/pamphlet/209text.htm>

6. https://www.ucop.edu/institutional-research-academic-planning/_files/uc-affirmative-action.pdf

7. <https://www.law.berkeley.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Proposition-209-and-Public-Employment-Workforce-Diversity.pdf>

8. <https://equaljusticesociety.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/ejs-impact-prop-209-mwbes.pdf>

9. [Why it's been so hard to kill Article 34, California's 'racist' barrier to affordable housing](#)

10. [Unjust Legacy: How Proposition 13 Has Contributed to Intergenerational, Economic, and Racial Inequities in Schools and Communities](#)

Objective 2: Enforce existing local policies that are ostensibly designed to address historical harms.

Actions

2.1 Use the City's existing [Slavery Disclosure Ordinance \(Section 12Y of the Administrative Code\)](#) to hold private companies who have economically benefited from chattel slavery financially accountable for their harmful legacy by mandating contributions to the Special Fund established by the ordinance.

Rationale: Though the City requires annual disclosures from companies who participated in the slave trade, contributions to the Special Fund are currently voluntary. A mandatory contribution, proportional to the company's size and revenue, could be used to offset the costs of implementing a comprehensive African American Reparations effort.

2.2 Enforce all existing and future [Development Agreements](#) and Community Benefits Agreements that developers have proposed as a condition of project approval.

Rationale: Development/Community Benefits Agreements often make lofty promises to neighborhoods to address stakeholder concerns and impacts during the approval process, but are rarely fully realized after development is completed. These commitments need to be enforced by city agencies to mitigate the negative impacts that new development can impose on the community, and developers should face fines and other penalties if they are not upheld.

The Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII) will be conducting an audit of all agreements made since 1948 to determine if they have been upheld. The results of this study should be made public, and the private actors who run afoul of it should be held accountable for their unfulfilled promises to communities.

2.3 Create better systems and communication channels to ensure that Certificate of Preference holders are prioritized in housing and made aware of all options available to them through OCII and other relevant city agencies.

Objective 3: Work with the full African American Reparations Advisory Committee to develop a suite of prioritized, actionable policy recommendations to advocate for immediately.

Objective 4: Create a nonpartisan body and/or a new City agency to ensure the successful implementation of Reparations policy recommendations after this body sunsets in June 2023.

4.1 Introduce a 'Reparations Tax' to partially offset additional costs necessary to fund this infrastructure

Recommendations At a Glance

[SFAARAC Recommendations - At a Glance](#)

ADDENDUM

A History of Broken Promises: Past City Commissions and Reports on San Francisco's Black Communities Highlight Systemic Issues But Inspire Little Government Action

Multiple reports have been created over the past decades to examine the socio economic wellbeing of San Francisco's Black communities. These reports each provide policy recommendations that offer a number of pathways to better outcomes across a range of indicators . These studies that have been released since 1993 have been met with varying degrees of success, but often received lackluster political attention and funding. Because of this, the racial disparities that were documented through quantitative data and qualitative experiences continue to negatively impact the livelihood of thousands of San Francisco residents.

Within [*The Unfinished Agenda: The Economic Status of African Americans in San Francisco*](#), the Committee on African American Parity (CAAP) of the Human Rights Commission of San Francisco created a report that analyzes the economic well being of the Black San Franciscans through the collection of quantitative data and personal narratives. This study intended to take a detailed look at "the comparative social, economic, health, and educational status of African Americans in San Francisco." To create a thorough and comprehensive investigation, the CAAP focused their research on the following eight issue areas:

1. Employment and Entrepreneurship
2. Education
3. Criminal Justice
4. Housing
5. Health Services
6. Media Relations
7. Political Empowerment
8. African American families

In its methodology, the CAAP used data from the US Census between 1960 and 1990. The committee also utilized special studies of minority owned businesses developed by the US Department of Commerce, Association of Bay Area Government (ABAG) data, CAAP research papers on housing issues, reports on the state of race relations issued by the San Francisco Conference of Religion, Race, and Social Concerns of the Catholic Diocese in 1968, local and national newspapers, magazine articles, information from the Joint Center for Political And Economic Studies, annual reports from the National Urban League on the state of Black America, and data from SF Department of City Planning; the SF Redevelopment Agency; the Human Rights Commission; the California Department of Social Services, the SF Police Department, the SF Fire Department. In addition, multiple interviews were conducted with African American leaders and historical figures in the Black community to understand the human impact of programs and initiatives in the San Francisco

community.

The committee faced difficulty in obtaining some data, experienced delays in receiving data, and at times questioned whether data from the same sources like the US census were comparable. Because terminology and definitions changed over time, the group attempted to identify data gaps and use the information to the best of their ability.

From this pool of information, the CAAP made a series of observations:

1. The African American population has decreased in size. The number of AA in San Francisco reached a Peak of 88,343, or 13.4%, of the city's population in 1970. Since that time the African-American community has declined absolutely and proportionately Dash so that by 1990 there were 76,343 African-American residents, or 10.9% of the overall population.
2. The African-American population is getting older and there are fewer children under 18 years of age.
3. The African-American population which used to be the second largest ethnic group in San Francisco after whites, or are now the fourth largest group. Asians comprise the second largest group and Latinos the third.
4. The shift in San Francisco economy from manufacturing to services displaced African-American workers beginning soon after the end of World War II and continuing to the present.
5. The income of African-Americans compared to that of white San Franciscans has declined since 1970 from a high of 60.1% to 45.1% in 1990.
6. The income of African-Americans compared to that of other non-white ethnic groups in the city indicates that Asian Americans have higher per capita in household income than African-Americans and Latinos have slightly lower per capita incomes but higher household incomes than African-Americans.
7. African Americans suffer higher rates of poverty and unemployment and have higher levels of dependency.
8. African Americans are greatly underrepresented in many job titles in the private sector.
9. African-Americans have benefited from the consent decrees addressing the hiring and promotional policies of the fire department and police department even though they have not fully met the goals.
10. Many African Americans have been pushed out of the city by a combination of governmental programs like urban renewal and the high cost of housing. At one point rental costs which had been reasonable until 1979 or 1980 escalated until they reached almost 90% of the per capita income of African-Americans in 1985.
11. Traditionally Black communities —like Bayview Hunters Point – are becoming more integrated as a result of the net outmigration of African-Americans, greater desegregation in the housing market for African-Americans, and increase competition for housing in those communities.
12. The African-American community is become increasingly bifurcated as working class moderate income blacks are migrating out of San Francisco leaving behind one group of

higher income more educated African-Americans who are dispersed throughout the city and another group of lower income more dependent and less economically competitive African-Americans who are concentrated in public housing and other federally subsidized housing.

13. The average level of education of African-Americans is increasing. The percentage of African American residents of San Francisco reporting that they had completed four more years of college was twice as large in 1990 as in 1980.
14. The urban renewal program in the Western Addition destroyed the economic base of black on small businesses in that part of the city.
15. The number and size of Black owned businesses in San Francisco continued to decrease between 1982 to 1987.
16. San Francisco's public agencies are not meeting the minority business enterprise and women's business enterprise contracting goals established by the Human Rights Commission. A study commissioned by the city, subsequent to *Richard v. Croson*, indicates that the extent of undercontracting is indicative of discrimination in a number of instances.

Based on these observations, the committee created 12 goals and 5 policy initiatives to guide the development of the Black community over the next decade. The goals are as follows:

1. To halt, and/or, reverse the decline in the size of the African American population in San Francisco.
2. To increase per capita and/or household income in the African American community.
3. To raise the income of African American individuals and families with the lowest incomes above the poverty level
4. To create jobs and job opportunities that fit the full range of skills within the African American community from entry level to those requiring technical skills and professional training
5. To increase the employability and employment of African American males.
6. To increase the number and economic viability of African American entrepreneurs and businesses.
7. To increase the level of "human capital" in the African American community.
8. To increase access to capital for entrepreneurs.
9. To provide access to "protected" or "captive" markets for goods and services provided by African Americans.
10. To preserve and/or increase the level of capital and wealth in the African American community.
11. To increase community cohesion and strengthen identity.
12. To increase the community's political power and influence on public policy.

Based on these goals, the following policy initiatives were created:

1. A commitment to setting racial equity goals and establishing benchmarks to ensure that goals are being met.
2. Use placemaking as a principle to establish and invest in an African American Cultural

District in the city.

3. Establish an African American development foundation and fund it through tax revenue; seek matching funds from banks and local corporations.
4. Promote alternatives to incarceration and oppose construction of additional jails and prisons.
5. Establish vocational programs in jails and in conjunction with programs offering alternatives to incarcerations.

In addition to these initiatives, the CAAP created recommendations for employment and training and housing:

1. Employment and Training Recommendations

- a. Negotiate training and hiring goals and subcontracting goals in conjunction with nonprofit and for-profit developments in the city (UCSF, Mission Bay, SFO, Navy Yard, Presidio, Port, etc)
- b. Aggressive recruitment and increased affirmative action hiring in targeted areas of municipal employment – especially in executive levels of municipal agencies
- c. Seek improvements in the scope and effectiveness of vocational training programs in public schools and link training to job placement
- d. Establish training programs for African American entrepreneurs

1. Housing Recommendations

- a. Negotiate a commitment to increased lending to African American homebuyers and entrepreneurs on the part of banks and other lending institutions
- b. Preserve and enhance African American equity in real estate through purchase of rights of first refusal and/or reverse annuity mortgages with African American homeowners.
- c. Analyze benefits and liabilities of public housing privatization and/or tenant management programs
- d. Encourage development of affordable housing with land write downs and sweat equity participation

This report heavily focused on quantitative data, compared to a more human-centered narrative approach. While this strategy is effective to diagnose existing problems within the community, it fails to engage with culturally relevant solutions that are in line with community values. Though some community insight was gained through conversations with Black leaders of San Francisco, the perspective of residents most proximally affected by the phenomena studied by the CAAP was largely absent.

In addition, this report saw limited action because of a lack of support from political leadership, funding sources, and enforcement agencies. As a result, the status quo remained largely unchanged. This directly affected the quantity of Black residents that had the ability to remain in the city, and the quality of life for Black residents that stayed.

In 2009, another report was conducted to examine and provide recourse for the continual displacement of African Americans from San Francisco, known as the [*Report of the San Francisco Mayor's Task Force on African-American Out-Migration*](#). Mayor Gavin Newsom along with Supervisor Sophie Maxwell created a special committee in order to find solutions for Black out-migration and preserve city diversity. The report was intended to be used by city departments, community based organizations, and advisory groups to improve the quality of life for African Americans in San Francisco. Mayor Newsom cited that “hundreds of disparity reports have been created in the past”, and that this task force would be different in identifying viable solutions to reverse the three-decade trend of Black displacement. With a focus on housing, education, jobs and economic development, public safety and quality life, and art and cultural life, the committee created its recommendations for action.

In the data collection process, task force members worked with a San Francisco State University research team and the San Francisco Community Development and Redevelopment agencies to examine and analyze trends. In addition, the team interviewed African Americans who both left and remained in San Francisco. Lastly, the task force identified trends and policy strategies in cities that saw increases in the Black population while the Black demographic in San Francisco declined.

From the collection of qualitative and quantitative data, the task force members distilled six key findings from the period of 1990 to 2005:

1. There was a disproportionate decline in the number of African American families compared to non African American families.
2. As the number of middle and upper-middle income household decreased since 1990, the percentage of very low-income households increased from over one half of African American households in 1990 to over two-thirds in 2005.
3. In 2000, one quarter of African Americans lived in poverty , more than twice the number of non African Americans
4. The unemployment rate among African Americans in the labor force from 1990 to 2005 was consistently over twice that of non African Americans.
5. From 1997 to 2002, African American owned businesses declined by nearly one quarter and African American business receipts fell by 60.7% although the number of people employed by African American businesses increased.
6. The proportion of homeowners among African Americans increased slightly since 1990, perhaps due to a greater rate of out-migration among renters than among homeowners. This would be consistent with other findings that highlighted housing as a primary reason for moving among African-Americans in California.

These findings highlight the fact that homeownership is fundamental. African American out-migration is precipitated by lack of housing stability. Guaranteeing pathways and investment in ownership is key to stemming the loss of African American population in San Francisco.

Based on the key findings, the task force created policy recommendations to help stem the outflow

of Black San Franciscans and entice more of the Black community to make a home within the city. These policies are categorized across five focus areas: housing, education, jobs and economic development, culture and social life, and public safety and quality of life.

Housing

1. Expand Homeownership opportunities for existing and potential African American residents
2. Stabilize and improve conditions in San Francisco's public housing
3. Promote public policies that support retention and attraction strategies
4. Preserve and improve existing housing stock and produce new affordable housing

Education

1. Strengthen infrastructure to improve Pre-K through college achievement
2. Establish direct and effective linkages to community colleges & universities
3. Continue to support and expand programs for youth engagement

Jobs & Economic Development

1. Implement strategies that increase employment opportunities for African American residents
2. Promote business development opportunities for African American owned businesses
3. Strengthen economic development activities focused on historically African American communities

Cultural & Social Life

1. Increase support to institutions that highlight African-American art and culture
2. Increase profile of African Americans in San Francisco's tourism industry
3. Increase support to efforts that focus on creating a sense of place for African Americans within the city

Public Safety & Quality of Life

1. Maintain funding and political support for violence prevention and stabilization programs
2. Expand support for victims of violence
3. Actively monitor and facilitate better relationships between communities, the Police Departments, and the Criminal Justice System
4. Develop community supports for the re-entry population to actively lower the recidivism rate

Though the plan had the political support of the current mayor and members of the Board of Supervisors, it still failed to retain Black Black San Francisco residents. The trend of outmigration continued from 2000 to 2010 to 2020, from 7.8% to 6.1% to 5.7%. In this study as well, the Black residents of the city played no significant role in the process to determine what recommendations should be made.

The next report was issued in August of 2020, during a summer of civil unrest triggered by the murder of George Floyd. Millions of people across the world took to the streets to protest against the injustice of police brutality and systemic racism towards African Americans. To address the structural inequity that exists within San Francisco, Mayor London Breed and Supervisor Shammon

Walton announced that a portion of the budget from the San Francisco Police Department would be reallocated to support the African American community, a program now known as the Dream Keeper Initiative (DKI).

This initiative was announced at a time of reckoning where the nation was deeply fractured over its racial divide. In 2020, as the world endured the crisis of the COVID-19 pandemic, members of the Black community continued to endure harassment, abuse, and violence at the hands of police. The demand for justice and accountability after the deaths of Breonna Taylor, George Floyd, Ahmaud Arbery, Elijah McClain, and more victims sparked outrage, protests, and policy conversations to end the perpetual discrimination. The Dream Keeper Initiative was designed to repair the negative impact of racially disparate policies in San Francisco through the promotion of community-led change.

Housed and facilitated by the Human Rights Commission, the DKI began with community members sharing their ideas through virtual meetings and email commentary on what should receive focus and funding in this reinvestment process. The [Investment of Funds to Support the Black Community in San Francisco](#) provides details regarding the existing research on the wellbeing of African Americans in San Francisco, a description of the outreach and engagement effort, a comprehensive list of community recommendations, critical themes and missing elements, a commitment to invest, and a recommended timeline.

A major change in this brief compared to past reports is the inclusion of explicit funding and timeline. With these elements, the intention and action ability of this draft heavily outweighs the plans proposed in prior studies. Recommendations were paired with an actual dollar amount, shifting the conversation from possibility to feasibility. Unlike previous reports that sought to highlight wellbeing disparity for Black San Franciscans, this initiative goes further to disperse funding and financial support to organizations and programs recommended through community input. Combining the qualitative data of the lived experiences of the community with quantitative data from past reports on the Black San Francisco population, the HRC informs its recommendations.

Between June 23rd and July 16th of 2020, the commission used social media, email comments, community sessions, and surveys to collect the input of over 600 participants. From the feedback received, over 400 recommendations were recorded and spread across 16 themes, with an emphasis on the intersectional nature of the Black community.

In order to ensure that funding was supported and held accountable for the Dream Keeper Initiative, the Human Rights Commission established tools to use in the allocation process, and used community input to reaffirm and edit their utilization. These suggestions ranged from defining intended results and how the DKI funding should be allocated to fulfill goals, to using data sheets to house logistics for government expenditures, to creating a citizen jury to make sure that organizations that receive funding are actually supporting the Black community. Since the program officially launched in 2021, it has supported over 90 organizations, and has provided over \$60 million

in funding to Black led and Black serving organizations.

There is a direct shift from prior initiatives that sought to provide redress for the Black community and the Dream Keeper initiative. One of the factors that made the Dream Keeper process possible was the mobilization of Black leadership within the San Francisco government. Mayor London Breed, Supervisor Shammon Walton, and Human Rights Commission Director Sheryl Davis all played significant roles in moving this program through the bureaucratic process. In tandem with the political support and state of race relations within America during the summer of 2020, the community played a direct role in demanding policy change and overseeing the process to build out what this program would look like. A common theme expressed within the community recommendation period was a feeling of distrust in public administration; residents and community-based organizations voiced their frustration that the City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) underfunds Black organizations, undervalues the contributions of Black programs, and creates policy that is out of touch with the needs of the community.

The Dream Keeper Initiative created a new standard for support in communities of color, and had ripple effects across the City. Other city leaders saw the work being done through the DKI program, and were encouraged to establish ongoing funds for marginalized communities. Since the DKI was announced in 2020, millions of dollars have been set aside from the city's general fund to support infrastructure and anti-hate prevention programs within the Asian, Latinx and Indigenous communities. The Dream Keeper Initiative demonstrates that operating from an abundance mindset to redress harms does not necessitate competition across communities. Advancing a reparations plan would uplift multiple demographics through a process that catalogs historical harms, stimulates the economy, and facilitates generational wealth among underserved populations.

This process is an active shift from the model of centralized power making decisions with limited community oversight. Black residents were able to contribute meaningfully to the conversation and determine how the Dream Keeper Initiative would run. The direct lines of communication between the CCSF and the community in turn established a foundation of trust, and increased the overall support and effectiveness of the program. Black-led and Black-serving institutions were prioritized in the funding process. DKI is a promising blueprint for how we can build a more comprehensive and equitable system of reparations in the future.





SAN FRANCISCO AARAC

CONTACT

AFRICAN AMERICAN REPARATIONS
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SAN FRANCISCO HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

25 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA
94102

415-252-2500

www.sfreparations.org
reparations@sfgov.org



Introduction Form

(by a Member of the Board of Supervisors or the Mayor)



I hereby submit the following item for introduction (select only one):

- 1. For reference to Committee (Ordinance, Resolution, Motion or Charter Amendment)
- 2. Request for next printed agenda (For Adoption Without Committee Reference)
(Routine, non-controversial and/or commendatory matters only)
- 3. Request for Hearing on a subject matter at Committee
- 4. Request for Letter beginning with "Supervisor inquires..."
- 5. City Attorney Request
- 6. Call File No. from Committee.
- 7. Budget and Legislative Analyst Request (attached written Motion)
- 8. Substitute Legislation File No.
- 9. Reactivate File No.
- 10. Topic submitted for Mayoral Appearance before the Board on

The proposed legislation should be forwarded to the following (please check all appropriate boxes):

- Small Business Commission Youth Commission Ethics Commission
- Planning Commission Building Inspection Commission Human Resources Department

General Plan Referral sent to the Planning Department (proposed legislation subject to Charter 4.105 & Admin 2A.53):

- Yes No

(Note: For Imperative Agenda items (a Resolution not on the printed agenda), use the Imperative Agenda Form.)

Sponsor(s):

Subject:

Long Title or text listed:

Signature of Sponsoring Supervisor: