

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

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

Dear Board Of Supervisors

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

stakeholders

Sincerely,
Dennis Lu

Mission SF

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

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

Dear Board Of Supervisors,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,
Nurit Baruch
District 2

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

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

Dear Board Of Supervisors,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,
Lea McGeever
District 6

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

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

Dear Board of Supervisors,

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

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

Sincerely,
Patricia Koren, District 8 resident

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

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

Dear everyone,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours,

Jordan (she/her)