

From: [Board of Supervisors \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Aides](#)
Cc: [BOS-Operations](#); [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#); [Calvillo, Angela \(BOS\)](#); [De Asis, Edward \(BOS\)](#); [Entezari, Mehran \(BOS\)](#); [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#); [Ng, Wilson \(BOS\)](#); [Somera, Alisa \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Subject: Opposition to FILE NO. 250466 Resolution Supporting AB 255 (Haney)...
Date: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 12:36:48 PM

Hello,

Please see below communication regarding **File No. 250466:**

Resolution supporting California State Assembly Bill No. 255, introduced by Assembly Member Matt Haney, The Supportive-Recovery Residence Program, to enable state investment and establish a certification process for such programs.

Regards,

John Bullock
Office of the Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 554-5184
BOS@sfgov.org | www.sfbos.org

Disclosures: *Personal information that is provided in communications to the Board of Supervisors is subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act and the San Francisco Sunshine Ordinance. Personal information provided will not be redacted. Members of the public are not required to provide personal identifying information when they communicate with the Board of Supervisors and its committees. All written or oral communications that members of the public submit to the Clerk's Office regarding pending legislation or hearings will be made available to all members of the public for inspection and copying. The Clerk's Office does not redact any information from these submissions. This means that personal information—including names, phone numbers, addresses and similar information that a member of the public elects to submit to the Board and its committees—may appear on the Board of Supervisors website or in other public documents that members of the public may inspect or copy.*

From: Christopher Mika <mika.christopher@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 6, 2025 9:31 AM
To: Board of Supervisors (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Cc: Chan, Connie (BOS) <connie.chan@sfgov.org>; Sherrill, Stephen (BOS) <stephen.sherrill@sfgov.org>; Sauter, Danny (BOS) <Danny.Sauter@sfgov.org>; Engardio, Joel (BOS) <joel.engardio@sfgov.org>; Mahmood, Bilal (BOS) <bilal.mahmood@sfgov.org>; Dorsey, Matt (BOS) <matt.dorsey@sfgov.org>; Melgar, Myrna (BOS) <Myrna.Melgar@sfgov.org>; Mandelman, Rafael (BOS) <rafael.mandelman@sfgov.org>; Fielder, Jackie (BOS) <Jackie.Fielder@sfgov.org>; Walton,

Shamann (BOS) <shamann.walton@sfgov.org>; Chen, Chyanne (BOS) <chyanne.chen@sfgov.org>; Calvillo, Angela (BOS) <angela.calvillo@sfgov.org>; Gee, Natalie (BOS) <natalie.gee@sfgov.org>

Subject: Subject: Opposition to FILE NO. 250466 Resolution Supporting AB 255 (Haney)...

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

Dear Supervisors,,

I'm writing to urge you to vote no on Supervisor Dorsey's resolution supporting Assembly Bill 255 (Haney) regarding the establishment of a state-supported Supportive-Recovery Residence (SRR) program.

While I understand that AB 255 has been amended in response to public feedback, significant and unresolved concerns remain. Major national and statewide housing organizations—including the Corporation for Supportive Housing, Housing California, and the National Alliance to End Homelessness—have raised objections to the bill as written, particularly in its alignment with the Housing First model.

Specifically:

- 1.
- 2.
3. **Eviction**
4. **Loophole via "Automatic" Language:**
5. The bill currently
6. states that relapse is "not an automatic cause for eviction." This language is a major step backward from earlier language that stated relapse is "not a cause for eviction." The addition of "automatic" appears to intentionally create a loophole through which
7. tenants could still be evicted for relapse—an ordinary part of recovery. This contradicts both the spirit and practice of Housing First, which decouples housing access from clinical compliance.
- 8.
- 9.
- 10.
- 11.
- 12.
13. **Lack**

14. **of Evidence for Solving Homelessness:**

15. While abstinence-based

16. recovery housing can serve individuals in recovery, there is no evidence that SRRs are an effective intervention for ending homelessness. In fact, research suggests the opposite. Redirecting as much as 25% of homelessness funds to a model that has not demonstrated

17. efficacy in reducing long-term homelessness risks undermining more effective, evidence-based housing approaches.

18.

19.

20.

21.

22.

23. **Need**

24. **for Stronger Safeguards and Data Collection:**

25. If SRRs are

26. to be state-funded, then at minimum the bill should mandate robust data collection. This includes:

27.

-
-
- Tracking evictions
- and the housing outcomes that follow (e.g., whether individuals are rehoused or rendered homeless).
-
-
-
- Vacancy rates, to
- assess true demand.
-
-
-
- Engagement with people
- who have lived experience of homelessness and substance use.
-
-
-

28.

29.

30. **Equity**

31. **and Choice:**

32. True recovery

33. must be rooted in voluntary participation. There must be safeguards to ensure that SRRs are not used to coercively shift people out of Housing First placements or to justify eviction due to relapse or behavior that would be tolerated in other housing settings.

34.

Redirecting public housing dollars to treatment programs violates the core purpose of these funds. These dollars are meant to provide housing, not to fund treatment models that have no demonstrated effectiveness at ending homelessness. AB 255, as written, risks entrenching exclusionary practices and reframing supportive housing as a privilege contingent on compliance rather than a right.

This resolution may be non-binding, but it plays a critical rhetorical role. Supervisor Dorsey is laying the groundwork for a political narrative that misrepresents and undermines Permanent Supportive Housing by portraying it as unsafe or unaccountable. In reality, PSH is simply housing—just like any other apartment in San Francisco—with proven outcomes in reducing homelessness. In San Francisco, the push toward abstinence-based alternatives is being driven by the Salvation Army, a Christian nationalist organization whose ideological agenda is incompatible with harm reduction and housing-first principles. This resolution seeks to redirect public resources away from permanent housing and into the coffers of a religious provider—despite no evidence that their programs improve housing outcomes. The goal is not to support an alternative model; it is to discredit and defund the one that works. This narrative must be actively contested, and this resolution should be rejected.

Please vote no on Supervisor Dorsey's Resolution Supporting Assembly Bill 255 (Haney), titled "The Supportive-Recovery Residence Program," when it comes before the Board.

Sincerely,

Christopher Mika
District 5