

SAN FRANCISCO LOCAL HOMELESS COORDINATING BOARD  
Full Board- Minutes  
October 2, 2017

**Sam Dodge:** More and more over this last year when accomplishments are being achieved, I've been more in the role of absorbing and support which is wonderful that there is only so many seats in this work. There are excellent opportunities and the department is really out for consistency here and really getting it right. It made me think about the strategic brain work, there's tons of work to do, I'm not naive about that.

It's been an honor to serve with all of you in this struggle and to be honest as I have been working these last three years as people they're experiencing a really extreme addiction crisis in our community and it's not just in our community it's nationwide.

Jeff and I have been working together to make this transition as smooth as possible this last month and it's never going to be perfectly smooth but it's a wonderful opportunity.

I just thank all of you at the board for all you've done to really make this department happen and make progress possible in the city. Jeff for taking up this really, really hard work and taking it with such zeal. Carry and Emily, I mean I could really go to every single person and say thank you and I've appreciated this honor and I'm not going to be far. Call me if there is any way that I can help you in the future. Thank you so much.

**Jeff Kositsky:** Sam was really one of the architects creating the new department of homelessness and support of housing. He and I have been working together for many many years and I'm going to miss his friendship, I'm going to miss him as a tough partner in the department but he is not going to be too far away.

I just want to say, personally, Sam how much I respect you, how much I love and appreciate you and how much I'm going to miss you. But I know again you are just a phone call away. Thank you, Sam and I mean just again, a round of applause for Sam.

**Ralph Payton:** All right, the next item in our agenda is our standing item from HSH director who will be reporting out.

**Jeff Kositsky:** Thank you Ralph and the members of the Local Homelessness Coordinating Board. Today I'm going to have the opportunity to give the presentation on our strategic framework. It was an excellent job done by Charles Minor and many other people on the team. I just want to take the moment to acknowledge and thank Charles for the work that he did and everybody in HSH for getting the application out that will bring in over \$30 million of funding for addressing homelessness here in San Francisco. Charles, thank you very much.

**Jeff Kositsky:** All right. Great, while we're getting this ready. Some of you may have seen in the Chronicle today a story about the department's strategic framework, members of the Local Homeless Coordinating Board you should have received an advance copy last night. We wanted to make the first formal presentation over a strategic framework to the Local Homeless Coordinating Board and we didn't want to wait until November.

Very quickly the strategic framework, we started working on this last August with input from stakeholders before the department even started. A thousand interviews and focus groups were done with people experiencing homelessness that was the beginning of the core of the strategic framework.

Overall of the goal of the strategic framework is to achieve a significant and sustained reduction in homelessness in San Francisco.

We hope to reduce chronic homelessness among adults by 50% to end family homelessness. By the end, it doesn't mean no family will ever be homeless again but we'll not be able to help them quickly and help resolve their homelessness within 90 days.

We're working on a reduction in youth homelessness and we'll have a specific target when we finish up the planning process. We're engaging in with HUD through the new grant we received and we want to improve the cities response to street homelessness. Not only for people who are suffering on the streets. Need places to sleep and places to go the bathroom and take care of basic necessities.

The HUD budget has been cut by 80% since 1978 which is the beginning of the rise of modern-day homelessness and I don't believe that's a coincidence. We spend well over 150 billion dollars a year subsidizing home ownership through mortgage interest, tax reduction and capital gains exclusions. Less than 40 billion dollars a year subsidizing low-income housing. The state also invests relatively little in direct funding to address homelessness compared to other states.

That's absolutely not the case. There's a lot of people who experience this every year much more than the 7,500 that we've counted on any given night. It's important to note that in San Francisco, 58% of the homeless population sleeps on the streets. Which is relatively very high compared to other major cities around the US and that's despite the fact that our numbers have not gone up.

The problem has become much more visible in the city due to real estate developments in areas where there used to be homeless people. There are now offices and condominiums. The opioid epidemic and other factors that have led the problem to become more visible despite the fact that it has not gotten worse over the past eight or nine years in terms of relative to what we've seen in other cities.

In this graph shows that we spend \$239 million at the department of homelessness and supported housing. What it does show and what is really important is number one, the city has a strong commitment to this issue. About \$200 million of what we spend are general funding expenditures and it's also important to note that we have seen some good increases during the past year.

I think lastly, what's really important to note again where I ask you all to help us dispel some of these myths about the number of homeless people in this city. Also, how we spend the money. 66% for our budget, the majority of our budget almost 2/3 of it is going to house people who are living in more than 7,000 units of permanent supportive housing. We're not spending \$239 million just one addressing street homelessness which is what most folks see we're spending substantial amount of money on housing and services for people who were formerly homeless.

In fact, this is a quick summary of all the resources are available to the city right now. 1,500 eviction prevention slots, 800 home barring slots, 200 seats, and resources centers. Of course, you all know the hot team, we have 2,367 beds or units of temporary shelter and that includes transitional housing, shelters, and standard stabilization units. 7,400 units of permanent supportive housing and another 961 short and long terms rent subsidies.

Fifty new moving on initiatives subsidies which were have expanded. We have more permanent supportive housing per capita than any other city in the United States. We have a very good and we've made some good and important investments here. Clearly, though, we need to do more despite the fact that we have more permanent support of housing than any other city in the United States. It's also important to note that, we have approximately 25 shelter beds for every 100 homeless people.

Compared to a city like New York which has close to 95 shelter beds for every 100 homeless people. Part of that is due to the weather and state funding and state regulation.

It's something I would want to point to you all. Despite all of those investments. Despite the fact we've helped more than 25,000 people exit homelessness since 2004, that we have done. We have model programs that are used around the world.

The problem has been--This is not the problem of the non-profit providers and I don't want to in any way that that is the case. This is the cities responsibility and the city has managed to create a bunch of model programs, but not a model system. Under the system that existed previously, if you were somebody experiencing homelessness, you had to visit multiple organizations and answer the questions over and over again.

You were put on a waiting list and not giving clear information about what was going to happen next. There was no ability for the city to prioritize, say somebody who is the longest terms homeless and the sickest homeless person into housing had a systems level. Fifteen different databases no sharing of data between departments or between non-profits other than informal data sharing and it also catastrophize homeless people, by assuming everybody who is homeless today, needs permanent subsidized housing with services.

That's not necessarily the case. What we are our strategic framework essentially is all about is moving from a less than ideal system to a new homelessness response system.

There will get a single assessment into a single data system that will be shared by users across the system while protecting folk's privacy. Everybody who comes into the system is going to be offered what we're now calling problem-solving. We want to get you quickly off the streets. If we gave you a small rents, three months' worth of rents, because you lost a job, or you owe somebody money. If you took care of that problem, you can get back into housing. We want to work with everybody.

This holds a lot of promise. If we can place 300 people into this 'Moving on Program' that we call it. Get them rent subsidies. That's going to be 1,100 units that will become vacant next year. That's a very significant increase, and then combine that 300 with maybe five or 6000 more people who choose problem-solving, or diversion. Now we are talking about, we've just able to help 800 people more than we were able to help last year. That's more than 10% of the folks that we counted in accounts.

The other important piece is actually the way that we use these resources. That's being done with data modeling, and thinking through how do we best use our resources, what have we learned from the data, what can the data teach us, and also, where there's gaps in the system. We want to reduce street homelessness. We have more shelter beds. If we want to reduce homelessness among adults, we need more housing for homeless adults.

We need to know exactly how much we need, and make those investments based on policy decisions, not just based on what seems to be in the wind at that particular year. Just by way of example, when I started working on the new department. Sam, Dodge and others and I looked at the housing portfolio for single adults, and there was hardly any new housing in the portfolio for single adults. I don't know why. Doesn't matter why, really.

We've modeled that if we can help a certain number of people, not become chronically homeless by to bring a number of our systems, or providing really fast assistance. Then we can do a certain number of housing placements. That's how we get to the 50% reduction. This is really important because remember I said, we help about 2,000 people a year exit homelessness through our housing, through homeward bound, through our rent subsidy programs.

However, in the peak count, we found that 3,000 people were newly homeless. That's 41% of the people reported they were homeless for less than a year. We need to know these things, and we need to figure out strategies. Obviously, prevention and the problem-solving I talked about is going to be really important because we can't build the housing fast enough. We have to figure out how to reduce the number of people who end up being homeless.

I already said all this. This is just key strategies that I spoke about. I've already spoken long enough, I'll jump ahead. Finally, I just want you all to understand that we are hoping that the strategic plan done last December. My apologies for taking so long, but the bottom line is, we've been too busy. We've been working on the strategic plan, and we've been busy doing work. A lot of work is underway, a lot of this work, that's in the strategic framework is already done, or underway.

I just want to point out and thank everybody at HSH, and our non-profit providers for what happened during our first month.

We also have engaged in standing, and improving the system. I spoke a lot about the need to make our work better, but we all know we need to make the pipe bigger as well, and we are working to do that. We've opened up four navigation centers, and there is another 150 temporary shelter beds. That's nav center stabilization units and a family center in the works. We've added last year 300 units of permanent supportive housing. There are 1,300 more PSH units that will be opening during the next five years.

We started the encampment resolution team, we'll be extend that and the HUD team. Next year we'll be opening up a new small resource center, and expanding hours of resource centers, people have a place to sit down and go to the bathroom, and just get some of the basic needs that we all have in our places, not on the streets. We have launched Moving on Initiative, and we have about 300 moving on subsidies available to us now which is really phenomenal.

We added over 600 new rapidly new housing and rent subsidies. Some of those came from the private sector, and I also just failed to mention that, in addition to the new funding that we have, we also have helped attract over \$130,000,000 in new investments from the private sector. Whether it's your tipping point, or the having home campaign from family homelessness, or to build two new and have centers with the help with your daily systems.

Outreach needs to be loving and persistent and when we can't meet somebody's needs, we need to find a different way to meet their needs. The nav centers is a beautiful example of that value really representing that some people don't do well in the shelter system. It doesn't work for them, we created something different and we're going to continue [coughs] to do that but it's rooted in compassion and the understanding that we need to meet people where they're at on the streets.

But we also need to listen to common sense, we need to listen to data, we need to understand the housing market that we're operating in. We need to understand that, for example, using a full housing market into the area is just essential given how expensive it is to rent housing here. We need to address the fact that it costs \$600,000 to build one studio apartment in a supportive housing site, currently.

We're not standing up here with a plan to end homelessness. I wish that we were. I mean, I've been doing this work for almost my entire career and I wish I could tell you that this is the plan to end homelessness. It's not. The plan for that involves continued advocacy at the state level and at the federal level but we can do a lot better than what we're doing.

With that, I just want to thank you all on behalf of everybody at HSH and just give a shout out to the really hard working staff at that department, as well as our non-profit partners, as well as people experiencing homelessness and other community members who have got engaged. You have all been part of this process and will continue to be part of the solutions and I'm happy to take any questions that you all have.

**Ralph Payton:** Thank you. Thank you for the comprehensive overview. There are some aspirational goals. I'm looking forward to seeing the full strategic plan. All they have had been weeks. Do we have any questions from the board members?

**Brenda Jewett:** I actually do. Could you just give me a brief overview of the Moving On Program and the Homeward Bound Program?

**Jeff Kositsky:** Yes. Homeward Bound is a program in which individuals who have a family member or a friend in another community who was willing to accept them back into their lives. Our staff will work with them to get them reconnected to those folks. Usually, what will happen is we'll call that family, we'll interview them to make sure that they're willing to accept that person back into their lives.

Moving On initiative is a program in which people who live in our permanent supported housing that have demonstrated that they no longer need the social services on site or have identified that they

don't think they need our services anymore and who have been able to pay their rents and follow the house rules, are applying for a Section 8 Voucher which we now call the Housing Choice Voucher.

That voucher will allow them to move somewhere into the private market where they'll pay 30% of their income to rent and then the housing authority will make up the difference through the Housing Choice Voucher Program. That again will help us make those units that they moved out of available for other people who are currently living on the streets. There's a good story about it in the Chronicle if you want to Google that. Thank you for those questions.

**Ralph Payton:** Any other questions in the board? I guess my final question or comment would be I know we've talked about employment before and how that's a necessary component for maintaining self-sufficiency. I would love to hear in future about how agencies are working with some of the cities workforce development program. Wages that can support the cost of living in the area.

**Jeff Kositsky:** Yes, which is a big challenge for folks. Our focus is really on trying to solve a problem that we have the resources to solve. We do talk in strategic framework about the importance of connection to employment. We continue to work with the Mayor's Office as well as HSA on getting our folks connected to employment programs.

I want to say one of the things we've been doing is piloting working with downtown streets which provides flexible entry-level employment opportunities for folks and they've been doing it with community benefits and districts and what not. It's been really powerful for folks. They're actually the folks that we're employing are doing street cleaning in the national district.

I do agree with you and again it's about matching and recognizing it's not the right path for everybody. When it is we need to make sure, it's really front and center as part of the problem-solving strategies, I would say. We should probably be talking to everybody about employment. Before we start talking to them about permanent supportive housing.

**Ralph Payton:** Jeff I want to thank you and the department. A great roadmap for what lies ahead for the department in San Francisco. At this point, we'll open it up for public comment. Remember that each person has two minutes for a comment. We're just submitting it to this agenda item.

**Carey:** Good morning, I'm Carey and I sit for this whole community services. I'll use my two minutes to say that we are huge supporters of coordinated entry system for housing and we've been modeling that. The folks who had been housed have been homeless for over a decade and with that comes a lot of drama and distrust and low expectations and fears and so a system that is strong engagement of potential applicants and then applications support experts for the systems navigation help.

Strong advocates when people along the way in the system say no initially and then partners in transitioning from homelessness to housing is all very important. Through the small part, the small pilot coordinated entries system, 560 folks have been housed since 2014. We agreed with the department that we need to have a system that now extends to all of our housing and folks are still working on specifically what's that's going to look like.

For the single adults system allocating housing per community priorities. We need to ensure the system is easily accessible by homeless residents irrespective of where they're living in our system. With comes transparency, the clarity, getting rid of favoritism, the bias. The equity that we're looking for in our system.

**Ralph Payton:** Excellent. Thank you Carey. Do we have any other public comments? In the absence of any more comments, we move on to the next agenda item. We have a presentation from the University of California in San Francisco. Julia McQueen and Dorie Apollonio,

**Dorie Appolonio:** Hi, thank you so much for having me. My name is Dorie Apollonio and I'm a professor at University of California in San Francisco. I wanted to talk to you about SFCAN and resources we might be able to offer and work with other community programs.

SFCAN is a collaborative effort from the UCSF Helen Diller Family Comprehensive Cancer Center. It was launched last year with support from Mayor Lee as an effort to engage health care system, government and community groups to reduce cancer in San Francisco.

Our emphasis is tobacco-related disease because it's the single most important contributor to cancer particularly in vulnerable populations. SFCAN's goal is to dramatically reduce rates of lung cancer and other tobacco-related diseases.

Smoking cessation is a huge public health success in the United States generally. What it means is that a lot of resources have gone historically to populations that are already advantaged.

The LGBT community, the African-American community, you can see all those are much higher than the statewide smoking prevalence in California which is at 11 or 12 % right now. However, 75% of people experiencing homelessness are current smokers. As compared to all of the gathered populations it completely overwhelms it. At the same time, in every study that's been done the desire to quit in this populations is exactly the same as it is for everyone else.

Vulnerable populations are equally eager to stop. Resources haven't been devoted to this population. We found that there are certain problems that need to be addressed. First of all, smoking may be perceived as important. Eventually, it will kill you. It is not urgent. Getting housing is urgent, smoking is in the health consequences of smoking are something that appear in your in your life long after the need for housing is addressed in those cases.

The interventions that we have been trying to pilot as researchers in vulnerable populations are largely new and untested. We don't really know what works. Until very recently, all of that money has gone to groups that are already able to quit and have a lot of advantages in their court. Recently, funding agencies have realized that this is a problem.

What it means is that tobacco really is a disease it's a burden on existing vulnerable populations. There are two new resources coming out the California Tobacco-related Disease Research Program has new an increase funding through the 2017, \$2 per pack of tobacco tax. It's specifically requested proposals to address tobacco cessations in vulnerable populations using community partnerships.

The national cancer institute had also specific proposals for this issues addressing populations that are considered vulnerable. Meaning, people in addictions treatment, people experiencing homelessness, people who are very low income. We can here specifically to talk to you about whether or not you'll be interested as community partners in helping people experiencing homelessness quit smoking.

We had expertise in developing grants. We have some expertise with research and interventions that have been done in these populations. Specifically, resources that have been developed from the past have some success under certain populations are paid for educators. For individuals who are experiencing homelessness, this is an opportunity we hope for individuals to have some additional income that they wouldn't otherwise have and at the same time, that they're improving their health and potentially, in some cases spending a lot less money on tobacco itself.

Both of the group of the board here and to the larger population in the room, if you're interested in this kind of program or with working with us, we'd be very interested in talking to you. Please feel free to contact us through our website at [sfcancer.org](http://sfcancer.org), or email us at [infosfcancer.org](mailto:infosfcancer.org), or just talk to me or Julia who's here today or any of us after this presentation. Thank you so much.

**Ralph Payton:** Dorie, thank you so much for an enlightening presentation. Are there any questions or comments from the board?

**Brenda Jewett:** How did this particular project come about? Seems like there are a lot of opportunities for more organic involvement throughout the system and so what was the impetus for this?

**Dorie:** The Helen Diller Comprehensive Cancer Center is a multiple cancer center funded by the National Institutes of Health in the US. The NIH is required as all national comprehensive cancer centers to do some kind of outreach to the community, that's just something that UCSF along with a number of other institutions has not been involved in the past. We're aware of that and trying to fix it and we were specifically tasked with trying to reach out to the more vulnerable populations in the San Francisco Bay Area..

**James Loyce:** With all the health experience, is smoking the most important or easiest to work within?

**Dorie:** There's a difference between importance and urgency, as I mentioned. We would probably say it's one of the most important, if not the most important, since it's still the leading preventable cause of death in the US overall and certainly the higher the smoking rate in the population, the more severe the problem. But it is a long-term problem, they'll experience the health risks in 20 years. There are other outreach programs that we're not involved with directly, working with liver cancer, breast cancer, colorectal cancer. It's the same kind of issue though, though they are important and not urgent.

**James Loyce:** Can you tell me about a little bit about, specifically, what the interventions of model populations are that are new and untested?

**Dorie:** Some of the financial incentives -- We've been trying to get funding for a while especially in situations like primary and supportive housing or people in substance abuse treatment, where you essentially just take someone to go and have a consultation of smoking cessation, meeting with a physician for example. The incentive is for particular actions that are untested. Some things that are new but not completely untested are our paid peer educators and some systems where you breathe into a carbon monoxide detector and if it's below the rate of exposure, then they just give you a payment for that.

**Ralph Payton:** Thank you Dorie. We'll open it up for public comment now around this agenda item. All right, we do not have public comment. We'll move on to the next agenda item. We have Josh Jacobs from HSH.

**Josh Jacobs:** Thank you. My name is Josh Jacobs. I'll try to multitask with this presentation at the same time as I talk to you guys. We have been able to get a lot of really good feedback from the community around some questions that we have with just in additional data fields in the ONE system. I'm just trying to pull this up.

**Josh Jacobs:** There's two topics I want to talk about today. One of them is the sexual orientation and gender identity questions. The other topic is where people are experiencing homelessness in San Francisco or in other communities?

**Josh Jacobs:** I have the slides, if guys want to look at it on paper, we just won't do it. If that's okay?

**Ralph Payton:** Sure. Let's start, Josh Jacobs.

**Josh Jacobs:** In 2016, the board passed some coordinates with a collection of sexual orientation and gender identity questions. They asked it from multiple departments it was also the Department of Public Health, HSA, Department of Aging and Adult Services, American Housing and Community Development, and also the Department of Children, Youth, and their Families.

As the departments got these recommendations from the Department of Public Health, they saw that there was maybe some need for some tweaks to ask these questions. And so all the departments requested from Department of Public Health an opportunity to review these questions, get some community feedback from their partners and then report the recommendations for how to ask these questions appropriately. We went to the same process, we did this on LHCBC coordinated entry, wants its own committee meetings.

We came forward with what we currently ask and the ones that-- what DPH recommended and then we came up with our own recommendations based on the community feedback. That's what you'll see in these slides.

The first slide here and the third slide is the DPH recommendation, which is, "How do you describe sexual orientation and gender identity?"

The options that the group suggested that we include would also include asexual. It would separate out gay and lesbian to be their own categories. It would list them in alphabetical order.

**Ralph Payton:** I think it'd be more time appropriate if we went through all the questions.

**Josh Jacobs:** Sounds good. For the next question, we're looking at a client's gender. The DPH recommendation is to ask what is the gender, to pick the one that best describes your current gender identity. It lists male, female, trans-male, trans-female, gender queer, or gender non-binary. Also, allows for a line for specification. The recommendations of the ONE system group were to include both boy and man in this, also, female, or girl, or woman instead of female/male. Also, including gender queer or gender non-binary.

Then, the third question that we're asking is, "What is your sex at birth?" The group felt that this was a little bit too restrictive and also, wanted to include intersex or non-binary then, also, non-listed. This was to accommodate some legislation that allows you to change, actually, what's on a person's birth certificate. Would also include what was this one person's date of birth.

These are the recommendations from the group. We were hoping that we would be able to have you guys both adopt these recommendations to move forward, to give to the Department of Public Health as they look at all the different ways all these departments are going to be asking these questions.

**Ralph Payton:** Opening it up for any questions or comments from the board.

**Brenda Jewett:** I have a question. How's the data being employed?

**Josh Jacobs:** We're going to be putting this into the ONE system so that when we are collecting information about all the clients put in ONE, all that information will be used. We'll be able to analyze it and look at the information from all of our clients across our system.

**James Loyce:** Under what set of circumstances would data not be collected? I understand refuse, I understand the notion of client doesn't know, but they do not reflect it when the data is not collected?

**Josh Jacobs:** That's likely to be a situation where they weren't able to go through a whole interview of questions, so they were only able to get through a certain number. It could be that the business relationship hadn't been built up yet, so there wasn't maybe-- or our outreach teams, someone hasn't had a lot of contact with a client, so they're trying to wage that so they can build that relationship before they ask the whole battery of questions.

**Josh Jacobs:** Yes, we can absolutely include some type of definition over the top to ONE system.

**Ralph Payton:** Do you want a motion now for these two recommendations?

**Josh Jacobs:** Yes. We'd love a motion to recommend that we move forward with these three questions for the Department of Public Health as they consider giving recommendation to all of the interagencies that are working on this.

**Ralph Payton:** To deliver a motion? All in favor?

**All:** Aye.

**Ralph Payton:** Any opposed? Any abstain? Great. Those recommendations are approved. Thank you, guys.



**Josh Jacobs:** The second data field that we're interested in collecting would be people's geographic experiences of homelessness, so looking at where people became homeless.

We want to be very clear that these are just for research purposes only, we're not going to use this in any way towards our prioritization towards health. We're just asking, where were you living at the time you most recently became homeless and then we'd list out a number of Bay Area communities.

We had a little bit of a discussion about including some other ones. We also thought it could be useful just to keep this to the PIT information. Also, I can take comments about this and we can bring it back to the committee, as well. That's useful.

Then, the fourth question would be why did you primarily move to San Francisco. The only comment that we received on this besides the categories listed for the PIT count was doing to list out instead of to access veterans for VA services. We would change that to access veteran services. The group felt pretty confident in these questions from the PIT count. We just wanted to hear your comments on this. If you guys had any recommendations or that could help with those comments, we'd love to take them now. Also, you can just reach out to me there.

**Ralph Payton:** Any questions from the board?

**James Loyce:** Quick question. Number one of the last four questions, where were you living at the time you most recently became homeless? We have out of state there. I know it doesn't happen frequently but there are times when 'out of country' is an appropriate response. Is that something you guys have contemplated?

**Josh Jacobs:** Yes, we talked about that. We felt that we didn't want to highlight anyone who wouldn't be a citizen. We thought it was probably best not to include that as a category.

**Ralph Payton:** If the board doesn't have any more questions, then we can open it up for comment. Anybody have a public comment to make?

**Julia D'antonio:** Hello. I'm Julia D'Antonio. I'm a shelter client advocate for the homeless. Worked at the Coalition on Homelessness. I just wanted to ask have we thought about adding what district you became homeless in the first time you became homeless? Because I would like to see that data. Specifically, be around maybe your first instance of homelessness because I know it's broad. I guess being a youth that was homeless, I'm drawn a lot to that question because maybe make it specific if you were to add it. I would like to see that data of where in San Francisco people are becoming homeless.

**Josh Jacobs:** Yes, that's a good point.

**Jennifer Friedenbach:** Hi, Jennifer Friedenbach, Coalition on Homelessness. For us, we were originally supposed to be on the agenda. We got pulled off by HSH because the launching of ONE system to have recommendations around coordinated entry coming. I just wanted to point that out because I know it was brought up last time, in case you're wondering. We're supposed to be coming to the next month's Local Homeless Program Youth board meeting and presenting those.

The second thing is that in general, these kind of questions tend to feed into a very prejudicial attitude around homelessness in general and around this misnomer that every locality thinks they're a magnet for homeless people. Just as a premise, we don't think we should be asking questions unless they're useful for moving people towards housing. Is it a question that's pertinent or not to the housing placement, to the preferences, to that kind of stuff, just to be asking questions. That's what the homeless account is for and that's done every couple of years but we really don't want to burden people with all of this heavy intrusion into their lives as it leads to access services. That's one piece.

The other piece if we are going to be asking these kinds of questions, the thing that I did not see reflected was that we have a large number of people who in general homeless people are not coming to San Francisco. It's San Franciscans that are becoming homeless but there is an exception to that rule that's not really reflected and that's members of the LGBT community, a lot of young people who

were pushed out of their communities or pushed out of their homes due to homophobia. That particular piece is prevalent enough that if we are going ask these kinds of questions that it should be reflected.

There is the one piece in there that says pushed out of community but it's not really specific. I feel like that's what really important nuance if we are going to be asking these kinds of questions, we should be getting the full story. Thank you so much.

**Ralph Payton:** Thank you Jenny. Do we have any other public comments? All right, Josh Jacobs, can you come on back? There were three points that were made here in the public comments. The first was requesting information on districts in San Francisco. Is that something that you guys considered?

**Josh Jacobs:** It wasn't something we considered and I think one of the things that we did consider was asking too many questions. The group is a little bit nervous about making their questions go over three or four, but it's still in the paper for that. I think adding a district. I don't think that's incredibly burdensome. Then again it would refer to the board would get a recommendation of where to go forward with that.

**Ralph Payton:** I feel almost that that would be almost up of information. I know there's a lot of talk among the supervisors of where the homeless population congregate and who should have more services. It'd be interesting to find out where homelessness originates in San Francisco and there are some resources or services that need to be allocated up for that. Any comments?

I don't know if there's just next to the San Francisco option in question number one, if there can be, I don't know, left a blank or a pull down for district or something. I don't know if it can just be added to that. Obviously, so we don't have to add another question there.

**Josh Jacobs:** That's a great idea.

**Ralph Payton:** The second point that came out of the public comment was the usefulness of these questions. I definitely understand getting the data for research, how would this research be used and it what way would it benefit not only the population we're trying to serve but also the city in helping us formulate new responses.

**Josh Jacobs:** We've definitely heard multiple communities voice their concerns about becoming a magnet for people experiencing homelessness because of their services, pulling in people who are experiencing homelessness. That's one reason why we want to do this research because we actually don't think that's true. We think majority of our clients are San Francisco residents and we want to be able to have the numbers to back that up.

**Ralph Payton:** All in favor?

**All:** Aye.

**Ralph Payton:** Any opposed? Any abstain?

All right, Josh Jacobs. The recommendations are approved.

**Josh Jacobs:** Thank you. I just wanted to real quick-- we have a hard sheet of all of our committee meetings. You guys feel free to take extra copies

**Ralph Payton:** Great. Thank you so much.

**Josh Jacobs:** Thank you.

**Ralph Payton:** Now we'll open it up to general public comment. A reminder two minutes per person and it's for any issue whether on the agenda or not on the agenda.

**Nancy Cross:** My name is Nancy Cross and I'm going to-- I got here quite late because of the long wait for the bus and other things. I'm somewhat a resident of Next Door Shelter and a person exited from Sanctuary Shelter. I was exited from Sanctuary Shelter on a sudden charge that I had assaulted a staff member. This is completely fictitious and it came two days after the site director had imported it seemed two people in police uniforms to say that I had to leave with them and in their patrol car unless I signed a paper to agree to a court appearance. There was no charge.

**Ralph Payton:** Your time is up for public comment today.

**Nancy:** No, I have been mistreated and I want a fair hearing and I'd like Mr. Kositsky to have a copy of the paper that his subordinates that maybe to refuse to get to his attention

**Ralph Payton:** All right, thank you.

**Nancy:** And I'd like to have an appointment to talk about this.

**Jeff Kositsky:** I'll talk to you after the meeting, how about that?

**Nancy:** Thank you very much.

**Jeff:** Yes, absolutely.

**Ralph Payton:** Great. Thank you Nancy. Do we have any other public comment?

**Kelley:** The Coalition wants to suggest that the Local Homelessness Support Coordinating Board were used to be receiving reports from HSH regarding encampment resolutions, so there should be an account of what's going on and year to date, how many encampment resolutions or ERTs have taken place, who got placed 30 days later, 60 days later and also accounting for who is discharged back to the street. There should just be reports of that on an ongoing basis. An example is like 15 people placed on the navigation center, five people placed in treatment, five in homeward bound, and then following up after that so we know exactly what's going on.

Also, we're hearing a lot more now with re-encampment prevention team and wondering what is the policy procedure. What encampment prevention efforts are taking place, what resources have been provided?

**Ralph Payton:** Kelley, thank you. Just an FYI, recently the chairs of LHCB met with I believe should be an HSH and having a report-- distributing a report format that can be framed out on a monthly basis, including the encampment information is worth coming to, so thank you.

**Monica O'Neal:** Hello. Good afternoon from the San Francisco Unified School District. Just an update, we have made an arrangement and an agreement with all of our school social workers and nurses to release their information and contact information, so that we have a partnership with our community partners, so that we can now give you information to the social workers and advocates in our community partners, so that there's not going to be a lag time. Which is the first time in a couple of years that's going to be happening. So that if there is a crisis for families and clients, we can get that information back and forth to our school sites, which is a big boost for us.

**Ralph Payton:** And we have to thank you for making this information available to us. Quick question for you, how can community partners get access to this contact information?

**Monica:** We have a website which is up and running.

**Ralph Payton:** Yes, that will be good. Thanks so much. Do we have any other public comment? All right, then let's adjourn the October 2nd meeting. Thank you all for coming today.