

Megan Owens: I'm here for the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing to update you on the adult coordinated entry assessment blitz which is the next big phase in our implementation of adult coordinated entry. So adult coordinated entry will be fully launched when we have launched all five key elements of coordinated entry. So the first is access. I'm here to talk to you about access today. The second is eligibility. I'm here to talk to you about eligibility today. We'll have more information about problem-solving coming soon. The fourth step is assessment. I'm here to talk about that today. And the fifth step is referral to housing, which is not going live, so we will not be covering that today.

We consider this the launch of the adult coordinated entry assessment blitz and on October 31st, our goal is to assess 2,000 adults experiencing homelessness. The intention of this assessment is to get sort of an apples to apples comparison of all of the adults who are experiencing homelessness in our community for the purpose of future prioritization.

We will, during this entire assessment blitz be targeting people who we believe are especially likely to be highly vulnerable to have long histories of homelessness and to have multiple barriers to hope to achieving their own housing. We thank UCSF for their partnership, for assessing people in their intensive case management program at Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital. And we're very eager to work with community partners who have no lists of highly vulnerable people who they believe are all homeless.

During this assessment blitz, we will be asking every adult experiencing homelessness 17 scored questions. These are questions like, "Are you living with mental illness, substance abuse, or HIV/AIDS? How frequently have you used emergency crisis services in the past year?" All of these questions are scored, and the reason that we want to assess 2,000 people before we start referring those to housing is we want to have an understanding of where the priority status score will fall in our community. So we'll be looking to get a sense of what the whole score is for all of the 2,000 people assessed, and then we'll be working with our access points to determine what score qualifies people for priority status. We'll then be going back to priority status people, who are assessed between August and October, and advising them that they're priority status. Perhaps more importantly, we'll be going back to folks who are assessed between August and October and advising them that they're not priority status, and working with folks who are assessed in the future. So there's no preference for date of assessment. Folks assessed today will get the exact same level of preference exclusively based on their score as those who are assessed on either October 31st or November 2nd.

Access points. I apologize to the members. When I came to you in June, I hoped to be able to announce our access points to you in July. Our contacting process took a little longer than we wanted, but we're here today with that announcement. Our access points are physical locations where adults experiencing homelessness are welcome to come and be accessed. One access point is at 123 10th street. One of the access points is at 2111 at Van Dyke's. Some of you refer to this building as Mother Brown's. And the most important thing to remember, especially during the assessment blitz, is the majority of access point staff are actually working on a mobile basis right now.

Starting today and ending October 31st, we'll be exclusively focusing on eligibility and assessment, so determining whether folks are San Francisco homeless adults, and then assessing those people starting in November households will be advised to in real time of their priority status and that's when we'll start to place folks in housing using our new methodology. It's exciting for us.

Ralph Payton: it looks like a lot of focus will understandably will of course be for prioritizing the adults, so what do we do with the non-prioritized adults?

Megan Owens: So one thing that we've been viewing for many years is excluding people from housing because of insufficient supply, and how people have been experiencing this in our previous response to homelessness is they would maybe apply for a care not cash benefits and find out they are not eligible. They would go to one of the 17 Shelter Plus Care access sites and prepare an application at one or more. What we believe that likely did is screen for people who are very well-connected and who are either very organized themselves or had very good advocates on their side. The intention of using a single community-wide prioritize process is to have a more apples to apples equitable approach to who gets permanent supportive housing and to make sure that permanent supportive housing is really targeted to the population that needs it, people who would not get housing without the assistance of an agency. We also know that there's insufficient permanent supportive housing for the population that's eligible. What we mostly found is, there's a lot more people who are long-term homeless then we have federally-funded housing for. Similarly, I imagine we're going to find the same thing with this process. We're going to find there's a significant number of chronically homeless people, and even though we are a community with a lot of permanent supportive housing compared to others, we don't have enough permanent supportive housing for everyone. What we're hoping is a higher level of transparency will really help those people. I think it's really troubling that we don't have enough permanent supportive housing for everyone. That's the big solution. It's also very troubling to have a lot of chronically homeless people running around chasing resources they're never going to get.

Ralph Payton: Will anyone be able to access the problem-solving service.

Megan Owens: Yes. And we look forward to launching our problem-solving service, so putting much more training out in the community so that's not just a word people are saying, it's a skill set people feel familiar with. And also putting out resources to be more flexible with things like security deposits, gas and grocery gift cards to help those families be more comfortable taking people in, on or before January 1st of next year.

Ralph Payton: So that'll include rental subsidies as well?

Megan Owens: Yes. We also do not have very much rental subsidies for homeless adults right now. Many of us have experienced working in the family system where there's a significant amount of rapid rehousing available. That's much less true in our adult system.

Del Seymour: In the past, HSA, HSH, the Department of Public Health have all done partnered housing placement that don't necessarily reflect the face of the people on the streets and in the tents.

Megan Owens: Yes, we are. We'll be happy to share through Charles with the board race and ethnicity tests that we've already done, the primary assessment. I think you'll be pleased to hear that the primary assessment prioritizes people appropriately, according to the real distribution by people in age of the chronic homeless population, which as you know is not the San Francisco population. Folks are much more likely to be African-American, and are much more likely to be male or transgender. And we saw that this primary assessment that we're adopting for the assessment blitz accurately reflects those folks. So those folks are highly prioritized in proportion to their real distribution in their community.

We're also quite eager to respond to feedback we've heard throughout our continual care priorities pilot process, which is that people are sick of being asked a lot of questions. One of the way that we were hoping to be farther along in that path is for the Department of Public Health to share information with us from a record-keeping system called CCMS. And that CCMS I believe stands for Coordinated Case Management System. The reason that we're not integrating CCMS data at this phase in the assessment blitz is two parts. First, there's some judiciary complications. Second, we're concerned that a myth perception that exists about CCMS that it skews "white" and "older" may be true. So we're very eager to have client-level data about CCMS records, to analyze them ourselves, and to analyze them with community participation about whether they're accurate and represent race in the most appropriate way for the population who's experiencing homelessness, and then use them if they do. But if we find that records skew "white" and "older," we already have that problem in some of our placements, and we're not looking to replicate it with coordinated entry.

Del Seymour: Yeah, and the other thing is, as we all know, the most vulnerable population of homeless people in the city are very transient right now, especially with the DPW moving people around like chess pieces. So you say that you're going to ask the people that you're assessing and tell them you're getting in touch with them and letting them know their status. That's maybe only 50% of the people. What about the other 50% that has no address or any way to be getting in contact?

Megan Owens: So we're very proud of the outcomes of our continual care coordinated entry pilot. But one place that we never succeeded was in placing as many people who were homeless on the streets when they were identified as people who were homeless in shelters, navigation centers, and other settings when they were placed in housing. We hope that we're going to be making a lot of progress because of some ways that we've restructured as we've launched the full coordinated entry system. So one of those is the mobile teams. Our continual care coordinated entry pilot staff were incredibly flexible, and they went in the field a lot. They were also a tiny team. And so they were not able to meaningfully go out into the community, find people on the streets, and provide all services on the street. They sort of went out on the street whenever they were able for the folks that they were most nervous of losing

We'll be integrating with SF HOT using the same client-level record keeping system as them, the ONE system. SF HOT's quite a bit ahead of us. They've already created almost 2,000 records in the ONE system of new people they've found in the street in the last year.

So one of the metrics we're always looking at is what proportion of people who are housed as a result of the intervention came from the streets versus what proportion came from the shelter, just like we're looking to make sure that our seniors, African-American and black households, other populations we're concerned have been excluded in the past are accurately represented.

Brenda Jewett: I just have one question about the rapid rehousing vouchers. How do you parse out-- what percentages go to youth, adults, families? And are there an abundance of rapid rehousing vouchers in one area, and there aren't that many in another?

Megan Owens: The main reason that we have previously allocated vouchers to youth, adults, families, has frankly been leadership from the nonprofit community and from local funding partners. So nonprofits like Hamilton Families, Compass Family Services, and Catholic Charities have done a lot of work. They've set up partnerships with local foundations, and they've come to HSH and applied for those vouchers. Last year- HSH issued an RP that included rapid rehousing for adults and families. We did not receive any qualified applicants for adults. So we haven't seen a lot of push from the community for those resources.

Alan Guttirez is our new RRH Program manager and as I was working at a family nonprofit when rapid rehousing and agencies don't sort of magically detect how to do this. So, agencies who are interested in doing rapid rehousing for adults, we really encourage folks to work with the Alan.

Charles Pitts: I'm wondering about the families. What about the families and how will they be dealt with and processed with this new system? I'm wondering how you plan on getting those experiences from the other people who are in encampments, and how are you getting the information from the homeless now?

Ralph Payton: So, number one for families. We've been working on the coordinated entry for families for almost a year now. So, that was the first system sort of to roll out, so we can work out the kinks before rolling out the adult-coordinated entry system. We're still, of course, working on kinks on the family side.

Megan Owens: San Francisco has a long tradition of serving families experiencing homelessness and adults experiencing homelessness in fairly unique ways, and we've continued that in our first implementations in coordinated entry.

We have indeed been operating our family-coordinated entry access points for nearly a year. There are two family-coordinated entry access points. Families who present at the adult access points will be redirected. Similarly, adults who present at the family access points are already being redirected. We find a higher incidence of people showing up at the Bay View access point, looking for services without children in custody than we do at 995 Market. Some of us have speculated this may be because there are so few homeless services in the Bay View that folks are more curious there. We'll be continuing to look for that pattern. It'll be great for them to be fairly close to each other in both neighborhoods.

Yes. So, this is an important thing to reiterate, and thank you very much for the question. Everyone who has been assessed in the past, so folks who have had an SF hot case manager, folks who've been referred to the continual care coordinated entry pilot, folks who've been referred to all three. All of those folks will be asked to complete an assessment again. And again, that's because we're interested in this apples-to-apples comparison, using our community-wide agreed upon criteria. So, we'll be very curious about people's past history, mostly so that we can find them in the community, and continue to follow up with them. We do know it's a burden for people experiencing homelessness to have to keep asking these questions. Compass Services has let us know that Central City has moved to 37 Grove. We'll update our website immediately.

Ralph Payton: So the assessment, the 17 questions, how did we get to these 17 questions? Is it based on some other empirically validated assessment source, or did we make these up?

Megan Owens: Yes, so we'll share with the board as well our information sheet on the primary assessment. 17 questions come from sort of 4 main sources of community wisdom. The first is the three-year-long process that we hosted with local homeless coordinating board, where we held monthly meetings and saw community input. And then, of course, we've also heard the opposite feedback. Right, because this is a diverse community. We also worked with Focus Strategies, which are a national leader in developing these kinds of assessments. And they did some analysis for us and the community came together and reviewed their analysis. It won't surprise many of us in the room to hear that San Franciscans want a San Francisco-specific tool. And so that's how we move forward. And then the tool was tested after our various community members gave input. And that's where we got the results that the tool is adequate in terms of a reasonable distribution of African Americans, a reasonable distribution by age, etc. One thing we'll be doing during this assessment blitz that we didn't do in the original testing, is testing how the tool works specifically for the youth. So you all host a public meeting. Thank you very much. Experts on youth who are interested in giving input on coordinated entry for youth, which we're looking to implement later in the winter. And those folks have asked us just specifically to target youth during this assessment blitz, and also to intentionally include questions that we might otherwise miss with youth. So we've added two unscored questions to the assessment. One of which is about whether about folks who've traded sex for a place to stay. And one of which is about whether folks have been in foster care here in San Francisco. Feedback, partially from one of Sophia's colleagues was the loudest for that one. And so folks are also invited to come join in that conversation. The meeting is public. Folks meet on the 13th of the month, including the 13th month-- on the second Monday of the month, which is the 13th this month, here at City Hall. And that's a very robust discussion. We really thank our youth providers for sending really sophisticated folks. I also apologize, I think we're moving from City Hall to the public library, and Charles will keep us all informed.

Public Comment: Haley with SF Health Plan. I was wondering if the continuum care-coordinated entry pilot will then be finishing when we roll out the assessment blitz? And then the second question is just you already mentioned you're working on building some partnerships with community providers who might be reaching other folks, and wondering if that coordination is through ECS?

Megan Owens: The first question was will you be retiring the Continuum of Care coordinated entry pilot, the answer is yes since that's no longer how we'll plan to prioritize people. The actual website that folks have been going to make referrals will redirect to the HSH website explaining adult coordinated entry on or before September first of this year, and everyone who has been referred we will continue to have their records. Those folks will need to complete the primary assessment.

HSH is taking the lead on data sharing agreements we're quite eager to work with and have reached out to probably the wrong person at the San Francisco Healthplan so Haley if you could clean that up by reaching out to me directly that would be fantastic.

Del Seymour: So while are you out doing assessments and you're talking to people, not you but your department, are you telling people that you are the only source for permanent housing or are you telling them to apply in the other cities, or counties, or private, or what?

Megan Owens: When people are experiencing homelessness they're not sort of curious about who's developing what buildings. I think our assessment director is in the office so I think he'd be curious if you have feedback. But my general direction is always that people should always be advised and continue to pursue any housing that they're interested in. If folks are interested in living in another community they should apply for housing in that other community, and we want to make clear that they're no longer is a need to go to SFHomebaseCCC.org. I'm frequently astounded how savvy people experiencing homelessness are about our bureaucratic processes. It really makes clear that people care a great deal about housing and that our very complex systems people are very informed about. And so I'd imagine the advice would vary. What would your advice be Dale? It's day one so it's a chance to get in on the ground floor.

Del Seymour: My advice would be this is the Bay Area housing 10 minutes away, 15 minutes in Oakland or Richmond is a very viable effort, and they should try everything that's in the basket because one other thing I hope that you are getting a place that you will be housed very soon because that's definitely not going to be the case. So I just want to make sure that you are making it clear that it's going to be still a lengthy process, just because we have this new department and these new tools don't mean we have any more housing.

Megan Owens: Yes it's ECS and their partners who are doing this work, and having worked with them quite a bit to plan this rollout I'm very sure they are committed to being very transparent with people and they're also very savvy about the fact that most folks are not going to be referred and that the process will take a long time.

Del Seymour: You know we got rental assistance through your department, we got rental assistance through Season of Sharing, in these ways some people could go out, find their own, move somewhere. Through Craig's List or whatever, whatever it takes.

Megan Owens: So we look forward, during the assessment list we've instructed ECS to give some information about some of our other programs like our deposit assistance if folks are curious. Also to dispel a rumor that I'd also like to ask this group to help dispel, we've heard from a couple of folks that

who believe Homeward Bound is only for people who are referred by the police and only for people who are referred by CAAP. They shouldn't repeat these because they are not true.

Jean Fields: So we are directly in the local competition phase of this. As we've been talking about the last couple of months, the actual NOFA is due on September 16th. The very, very final deadline. But right now, we're in that phase where projects are competing for the money. I'm going to throw a couple of numbers out there for you, just to remind people of what the money is all about. So it's a competition for approximately \$44 million. And then it's broken down in \$40.5 million, which is the amount of money it would take to renew all of our existing housing, HMIS, and Coordinated Entry projects in the community. This year, HUD is offering \$2.4 million in bonus funding. This is similar to it in the past years. And this funding supports housing, Permanent Supportive Housing serving chronically homeless people, or DedicatedPLUS, which is a form of chronic homeless housing, Rapid Re-housing, or Joint Transitional Housing-Rapid Rehousing projects. It also will fund coordinated entry programs. Also this year, there is \$1.2 million available in CoC planning funds.

So Friday was the deadline to turn them in. Good job, everyone. We got a lot of great applications. We've received 54 renewal applications. All were on time, except for one. So that's pretty good work. It was a tight turnaround, so we're really happy with that result. We had only one request to consolidate existing projects. As you recall, this was the first time that HUD said if you want to consolidate two of your similar projects, now is the time. And one project elected to do that. We had two applications for the DV bonus. One was through coordinated entry by HSH, and we had one applicant for a Transitional Housing-Rapid Rehousing project, which we're very excited about those new projects.

We had six applications for regular bonus. This is similar to last year. We had one Coordinated Entry expansion, no doubt to fund some of the work we've been talking about here today. One rapid re-housing and, four, permit-supported housing. And so the total amount requested for the new bonus was \$5.9 million. So obviously all of those projects aren't going to proceed into the competition.

So, as I said, there was about \$2.4 million available that the COC can recommend to HUD is funded. So during this review and rank process recall, we recruited a panel of non-conflicted panelists. They're knowledgeable in the community. We've had some new panelists I think this year but also some folks who have done it in past years. And they will review those renewal applications as well as the new ones.

Now renewal applications have already received preliminary ranking and preliminary scores. They received those I think on July 17th. And then part of their process is not only to submit their application but also to point to the panelists and say, "Look. We think you need to review our scores because they don't reflect the good work we're doing, or they don't reflect the nature of our program, or they don't reflect this one-time thing that happened that affected some of our scores." So those are very important parts of the process. And it allows our panelists to really target the interesting and kind of more important areas of the application rather than some of the things that are more pro forma. And the panelists will meet on September 15th and 16th. It's a two-day process. We get really good lunch for them though. Don't worry. And they will be going through all of those applications. So again just as a reminder this year the funding is divided into two tiers. And only those highest ranking projects are

going to be in Tier 1. And those will proceed pretty much safe. But unless there's some flaw in that application they'll be protected through the process. The other 6% of the renewal amount plus the bonus amount, those projects that are ranked in Tier 2, the lower scoring ones and the ones applying for bonus, they will compete in a national competition. So it's very important that we examine those projects and make sure we're putting the very best forward for our community. The DV bonus projects will be ranked locally. But they will be entering a separate national competition. So when we bring this list to you, the board, for approval, just keep in mind we'll go through it with you again as well. But that's really what you're looking for. Is this list going to be strong in both does it reflect our local values and also is it going to be a strong national competitive list

Ralph Payton: I have to say I'm particularly thrilled about the additional funding opportunities for DV. That's been a segment that's been underfunded in our community for a while now. Any questions for the board?

Charles Pitts: I'm looking for more information as to who and what programs are they funding.

Ralph Payton: We're still in the early stages of this process. So Charles was asking about exactly what programs where we're requesting funding and when will that information be revealed?

Charles Pitts: If not this question, then what have they funded last year?

Jean Fields: Most of the project funded are permanent supportive housing. Additionally, most of those products are permanent supportive housing that house primarily homeless individuals. And that is a requirement for any new permanent supportive housing that we find. We will be posting the list. I believe we post it after Rank and Review. So at that August 29th meeting, there also will be time for public comment so that the community can weigh in on that final list.

Mary Kate Bacalo: And I'm the director of Public Funding of Market Street Youth Services. I wanted to commend Homebase for running a really clean and great process every year. I also wanted to bring the board's attention to an issue concerning review and the scoring tool. HUD has increasingly over the past several years and everyone knows has moved into a focus towards permanent housing. As a community, we have designed to approve performance measures and targets that are-- they have adults in mind-- so specifically around permanent housing maintenance and in-county maintenance and basic things like that. Every year, Market Street advocates for Geary House, a traditional housing program in Richmond that's performed consistently well year to year.

We're almost at that 80% permanent housing exit target, for example. But our scoring tools are designed to take into account the developmentally appropriate needs with youth around income and permanent housing. And so it's come to my attention over the past couple of years - scoring tool that has helped out with to even the playing field for projects like Geary House. But Geary House is still slipping lower and lower in rankings each year just by performing well. And I believe that that's because we're the only youth provider in the community and because there's a implicit sort of bias against the youth population for most adults.

We would be very happy to partner with Homebase because we're the youth providers and consider how we can build more scoring mechanisms into the community processes. But I did want to share that with the board today.

Ralph Payton: I don't know, Jean, if you have any thoughts on that. How can we ensure that youth providers are still competitive?

Jean Fields: Mary Kate. Those are some great comments. We did add some bonus tools in the scoring tool for youth providers last year. But again, some of the outcomes that HUD prioritized is in the scoring tools aren't aligned with some of the outcomes that we look for in youth programs. That's very true.

Jean Fields: We will be having more youth providers in the COC, and we do think that it would be appropriate to redesign a scoring tool or look at the outcomes that we want to see from our youth programs.

Del Seymour: How are the numbers of youth homelessness compared to other cities in the nation, such as L.A. or Seattle? How do we-- do you know those figures? The comparative figures?

Mary Kate: I can't speak well enough to that, I can do some-- I can do some digging on that. I know that roughly 20% of San Francisco's homeless population is unaccompanied youth under 25 years of age.

Del Seymour: I want to see how that compares nationally because maybe we do need to do our San Francisco thing...

Mary Kate: San Francisco does have one of the highest rates of unsheltered youth. About 83% of youth are unsheltered, experiencing homelessness. And I think that-- so California has about a third of the nation's homeless youth, I want to say, a sixth of the nation's unsheltered youth, and I think those problems are concentrated in San Francisco, and also in L.A. That's partially because state-level funding streams support only four shelters across the state, so there's shelter in only four counties. And so San Francisco tends to be sort of a magnet city for young people. But in terms of the precise numbers of youth experiencing homelessness in L.A., I can't really speak to that right now.

Jean Fields: If I could suggest, it might be a great time to have Ali come and report not only on how the youth in comparison to other cities, but what some of the fantastic work that HSH and the youth providers are doing as part of the Youth Homeless Demonstration Project. They're doing amazing, national, groundbreaking work in that.

Charles Minor. We had had her scheduled for September, but there was a scheduling conflict when we moved the meeting to the 29th, so we're in contact with her about having her on the October agenda.

Emily Cohen: I'm Emily Cohen with the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing. Our director, Jeff Kositsky is out today and asked me to share the presentation from our department, and field questions that I can and refer other ones that I can't till next time. I am very excitedly; I hope you

noticed an improved quality of the data slides and an integration of the data into the presentation. I want to give a huge shout-out to our data and performance team.

And of course, want to thank the programs team and the providers for achieving the successes that we're able to report on with good data. So I will walk through some of this high level, and we can go into detail as needed.

This first slide shows an overall exits of homelessness from FY18, and you'll see here that we assisted over 21 hundred households exit from homeless during this year through both problem-solving and housing placements.

Family outcomes that 108 families were assessed through the access points in June, and 56 families were referred to housing. The Homeless outreach team, this is our outreach data that we wanted to present that 500-- that the homeless outreach team did 560 outreach attempts in June with 90% being considered successful outreach. Encampment resolution work continues to go strong. To date, we've resolved 36 encampments using the ERT model. We've engaged over 1300 residents through this process with 65.3% of those folks engaged during an encampment resolution.

So the heat map shows the areas of concentration of homeless outreach work. This is not ERT work. This is outreach workers, so you'll see where it's orange. Red to orange to yellow is a high-risk concentration of outreach with green being a lighter concentration.

Del Seymour: So this not encampment. This is services.

Emily Cohen: This is a heat map showing where the outreach workers are, throughout the month, making or doing outreach, making referrals and assessments.

Kelly Cutler: Can you describe what the differences between an outreach and a successful outreach engagement?

My understanding, a successful outreach engagement is a conversation that carries on with somebody. So somebody engages the hot] worker in a conversation about their interests and doesn't just says "Cool. Thanks," and moves on. We would consider that a successful engagement, and then from there, the hot worker will make referrals and then the linkage is on the successful referrals. So it sort of tiers down that way.

Moving on to the adult shelter system. What I think the takeaway here is in June we had 94% utilization in their occupancy rate throughout the shelter system. And you can see the different ways that we've broken down utilization, waiting list data, from our temporary shelter system. This is the adult shelter system. Navigation centers we've been able to include this time. Thank you for your consistent advocacy on that. You'll see that 13% of folks exiting navigation centers are going to permanent supportive housing. 32% are being connected with Homeward Bound. And you'll see that over the month, we served over 300 people throughout the navigation center system which is nearly 2500 people since we began navigation center model in 2015.

Del Seymour: Can you give us an up-to-date status of the navigation center outreach?

Emily Cohen: So 1515 South Van Ness closed in June and was replaced-- and Division Circle has opened. Division Circle's been up and running for several weeks now. We did the formal ribbon cutting on Friday, but they are fully operational and at capacity. So we currently have 1950 Mission is open and running, Civic Center Hotel, Central Waterfront, and Division Circle. 5th and Division navigation center and 125 Bay Shore are still on the pipeline coming mid-Summer-Fall.

Del Seymour: So Mission is housing when?

Emily Cohen: This early Fall. So we continue to add beds to the navigation center system despite the fact that we're taking some off. Because 1515 was 120 beds and I believe Division Circle's 128 beds.

Del Seymour: So 5th and Bryant? will have? because you're saying Division Circle will cover Mission, so how about 5th and Bryant? or will-- that will be additional, right?

Emily Cohen: 5th and Bryant will be opening around the same the 1915 Mission is closing.

Kelly Cutler: So when it comes-- at the top one here, it says, "Reunited with family and friends," so Homeward Bound? So with this, how long do people tend to be in the navigation center if they're going through Homeward Bound?

Emily Cohen: So folks tend to not stay if they come in with the intent of leaving through Homeward Bound. So they're referred in by Homeward Bound with the intention of exiting through Homeward Bound. They only tend to stay for a couple of days. We do have some folks, although it's a small number, who don't necessarily come in with the intent of leaving through Homeward Bound, but throughout their process at the navigation center make that choice.

Del Seymour: So if a client comes in and was referred through the navigation center solely to rest. How would they count them?

Emily Cohen: Yes. They are fully counted.

We enter everybody who enters the navigation center into the system in the same way, but we indicate where they're coming in from. So the 31% those folks come in with the intent of leaving with Homeward Bound and placed by the Homeward Bound team. So we're tracking where folks are coming in from.

Sophia Isom: So can you explain what's happening with denial of service? I see it was 19%, so what was happening with that?

Emily Cohen: I will have to get more information. I'm not fully prepared to respond to that. My suspicion given the rules that are in place that would result in those vowed service or mostly around violence. But I would want to check in with our data informant and see if we can get a fuller understanding before we put that back in the slide.

Kathy Triggari: So we only have 1950. And we don't have any denials of, "Well, I should have known." We use sanctions in timeouts-- so timeout being a couple of hours. And we really try to avoid a denial in service. I can't tell you off the top of my head how many denial services we've had in the last fiscal year. But I will say there are few and far between. And usually, it's based on violence. So it's a really, really serious situation.

Ralph Payton: So another step that's a little concerning is being able to find a choice. Almost 30%. I just wonder-- how many individuals go to the navigation centers to get help and if you get shelter. But again, it's a concerning step because the point of the navigation centers was to create an environment but was extremely welcoming. And so I'm wondering why 30% of the exits are just in clients not finding that marketed solutions?

Emily Cohen: I think we can delve more into this. I think my suspicion-- and again, this is based on my perspective on acting with navigations with our guests and navigation providers is that we're really making a concerted effort to serve in navigation centers folks that are not being served in the traditional shelter systems. So this may be a hot air service need or a population that is a little bit more reluctant to staying in shelters. This is, again, a speculation. Additionally, I would be very curious to see what this is compared to other programs. This may be high. This may be low. We don't actually know what this means without looking at what it might be in another setting.

Ralph Payton: And I'm wondering also how many of those audience were part of encampment removals. And so they can apply for that short-term removal, run into a navigation center, and then decide, "Well, it's better for me to find shelter elsewhere--" so just a lot of turn around."

Sophia Isom: Are you guys tracking-- like, where I hear you saying reunified with family and friends. So that's what-- approximately 31%. Do you know how long they're staying with family and friends that they reunify with or are you find that they're coming back through?

Emily Cohen: We find that folks do not come back through largely. And we've began over the last year a program called Within Homeward Bound that's making follow-up calls to the host family and to the client. And I don't have the data in front of me around the stability rates. But they're rather high in terms of folks either staying with the family and friend or staying housed within the community that are able to locate to, very few folks are coming back through the homelessness system.

Ralph Payton: So it'd be interesting for us to note this is something that we've talked about for years now. Recidivism throughout our system, it'd be interesting for us to start collecting numbers on that and some information around it.

Kelly Cutler: So one other question I have is for Homeward Bound, are they able to get another ticket if they used it once? I know it used to be that they only get it once so, I are people coming back and asking for another ticket out of town?

Emily Cohen: It's not necessarily coming back to Homeward Bound. It's coming back to the homelessness system. But my understanding is that a policy is in place.

Kelly Cutler: Looking at where the data has Homeward Bound within the navigation center data, that's a pretty big chunk. And so if we take that out of the larger picture and look at the number of clients that exit by choice, denial of services, it just seems like they would be able to get a better read of the data. And also if it's that large, what are possible issues with the actual model? If it's not working for such a large percentage of people that we might need to look at the model to see what can be more effective and meet people's needs.

Del Seymour: I don't know what the numbers are after the people that are there just waiting on the bus. I always think they should be included in all these figures because it throws everything out. Because they're not being housed. They're just waiting on the bus. And even some people go to navigation and waiting on the bus six hours.

Emily Cohen: We want to enter everybody who enters the navigation center system. We want to be sure that we're capturing that information. It's a small number of beds but because of how quickly they turn over, they do serve a very large number of people relative to the other outcomes.

Del Seymour: If they only there for six hours, they should not be included in this because it throws everything out. It gives an impression that we actually house a lot more people in the Navigation Center than we really have. And there are people there-- because I was over there the other day. All they're there for is a few hours waiting on the next Greyhound.

Emily Cohen: So I would push back a little bit in that we need to be tracking our housing placements as a system. And it should matter less where the person laid their head the night before if it's a shelter or navigation center on the street. Our goal is to get people housed and so we are tracking the Homeward Bound data separately as well. So we're not saying that the navigation center caused this housing placement. But what we need to look at is what is our homeless response system doing? And how many people are we reuniting with a safe place to live? And so certainly wanting to capture that night. If we're looking just at navigation centers, we can absolutely look at this without that data. But it is an important output of our homelessness response system to include that data and to continue to be looking at it system-wide.

Brenda Jewett: I was just going to say I think data is very important but if we could tease it out so that we could really see what percentage of people are experiencing navigation center is a more.

Del Seymour: So the other day, I was over there. We had one young man that was there in the navigation center just to take a shower so he wouldn't be so colorful on the bus. But you count him as a tenant of the navigation. He was just there to take a shower. And it's a wonderful included in your data that he did show up, right, and he was served by the navigation center, but then he also shows up on all these other as a client of the navigation center, but I don't think he was.

Valerie Caplan: So basically everyone who comes through the navigation center would be entered into the database, and they would be counted as a potential client, just to make sure that we're getting a complete picture of everyone. They wouldn't necessarily have to stay overnight, but I do think this is capturing the work that the navigation center is doing, and having someone come in just to take a

shower, it is an important service that they're receiving before they get on the bus. We can definitely parse out the data within this model so that-- and provide it without the clients. I do think it's also important to complete the center picture, to get a sense of this

Del Seymour: I just want to see how, that these are people-- these people only came here for a shower. And that's cool, that's what we wanted-- we talked about at the beginning, that that's a service we really wanted to do, to make it, you know-- so I'm good.

Problem Solving. Let's move on. So this is largely Homeward Bound, although not exclusively, as we've started to conduct Problem Solving at access points, and you can see here, then those are the flexible grants that we've been offering.

You'll see that 879 households were helped with Problem Solving, and this is actually 103% of our goal for the fiscal year.

Housing placement, this is obviously the thing that we are striving for and working towards every day, and you'll see that in this fiscal year, we housed just over 1300 households in both rapid rehousing and permanent supported housing, and that is 97.9% of our fiscal year goal.

Housing ladder, 146 households were placed out of permanent supported housing and into affordable housing for moving on in the program. This is in the housing choice voucher "Housing in the Community," and this represents 92.4% of our goal for the year. The Thousand Percent Projects folks - people - are likely quite familiar with the school. Mayor Lee charged us with bringing in 1000 additional people off the street, and charged our department to really ramp up efforts in order to do that. So you'll see here that we are 60% of the way towards that goal, and feel confident that we will get there this fall.

Program highlights: just wanted to highlight a few things that we are continuing to move forward on. 1316 Mission is a new affordable housing site that has PSH for families. 626 Mission Bay also began the lease up. This is another PSH site.

These are our strategic framework goals. Nothing new, you've seen these each month. Move through them, over quickly. So we did include some updates here that are specific to achieving these goals, some of our strategic planning progress.

So one is the launch of Problem Solving, with the homeless response system and this is really helping at the access points working with families for now and soon all folks experiencing homelessness to have the problem-solving conversation before they begin engaging in the homeless response system.

We've also implemented HomStat, which is a formal process for evaluating our data internally to make real-time decisions about where we're meeting our goals, where we're not meeting our goals, how we need to tweak things, and using this data to really direct our conversations. This has been evolved from day one of the department and we're very excited that we now have the data in place to begin this process and, as Megan mentioned previously, the coordinated entry assessment points, which launches today.

I want to give a quick a budget and finance update. This here is a high-level overview of the rebalancing plan that was passed in the mayor's budget. This includes funding for programs that would have been funded by Prop. D had it passed and this was how they were able to ensure that those programs continue to go forward, so that including state money and general funding increase.

Policy updates. Last week the mayor signed the budget and this includes \$272 million in homeless service resources through our department. On the state level, SB918, the Homeless Youth Act, will be in Assembly Appropriations Committee on the 8th, so Wednesday, and that is expected to move forward. Assembly Member Chiu Homeless Integrated Data Collection Bill will be heard in the Senate Appropriation Committee today. That is something we've been largely supportive. And Assembly Member Chiu Streamlining Supportive Housing Bill is in Senate Appropriations this week and is expected to pass.

Del Seymour: Does your department have someone in Sacramento standing up for that?

Emily Cohen: So I do the primary state legislative work for the department in partnership with the city's lobbyist at the capital.

And we've been very vocal about our support of those bills. Community relations. This is a list of the July community meetings that our department was engaged in, and one thing I wanted to highlight for you guys going forward-- and this hasn't been announced yet because it's still in planning phases, but on August 16th Matthew Dougherty and Katie Miller from the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness will be in town and we're working to plan a community forum for them to present the federal strategic framework, which is newly released, to the San Francisco community. Folks might remember last year Matthew and Katie were here collecting input from a variety of stakeholders, including the city department, people experiencing homelessness, people with former experience of homelessness, and providers, and all of that input went into the development of the new federal strategic plan.

So they will be here later in August to present that back to the community. As soon as a room, I will let Charles know and he will make it known to the community when that will be, but likely the afternoon of August 16th.

Departmental updates. Building the department has obviously been a big part of the work and isn't essentially needed in order to deploy the resources we have and execute the great programs that we have. So we made some pretty significant hiring this year. This is obvious from the whole fiscal year including internal promotions. And then the new budget also including some increase in staff providence of shipments stopping to better along with our strategy. I'm going to turn it over to Charles who will do the CV update.

Ralph Payton: Just a reminder from something we just talked about a little bit earlier in our meeting. That our September meeting will be cancelled and then we will have our September meeting in August on the 29th. Reminder that will be a room change, actually. So, it will be 416. I believe that's down the hallway here. I'll send a reminder out to everyone.

Charles Minor: I'll double check with the room. One of the things that we'll cover in that meeting and I want to invite people today is for Shelter Grievance Advisory Committee nomination. As many of you are aware, the Shelter Grievance Advisory Committee reports to the LHCB. And one of the duties that the LHCB has is to assist with nominations for that board, and they currently have four seats available. Right now, they have at large, a family, a single adult as well as a youth and so, we're sending out invitations to the community for people to apply. The guidelines are on the website as well as handout.

Yeah, it was a scheduling issue. Yeah. The fact that we were operating outside of our normal first Monday, becomes a bit more difficult to get our room.

Del Seymour: Okay, excellent. Thank you so much, Charles. Emily, again, thank you for that presentation that you did for maybe. Do we have any other comments or questions for the board?

Del Seymour: Yeah, we're going to talk about it. Yes. You can put it wherever you want it. I mean, a lot of people are here to talk about encampments. They have courses around here, so it should be doing it right now, this time or?

Emily Cohen: I mean, if you have a specific question for the department, about a departmental action or policy, I'm happy to try to field that. If we want I would encourage you to do it under the next agenda item.

Charles Pitts: I think you need to keep in mind that the navigation centers are not regulated. Who, from the city and county of San Francisco he's monitoring the contracts and who is monitoring the contracts regarding the standards of care section. It seems like no one is monitoring the standards of care. You wonder why people are leaving. The government stopped following the administrative code regarding the amount of patient centers. Now the other thing, too, is if you add up some of the numbers, people responded so small. My experience staying at the navigation center, they didn't protect me from violence. I mean, I had a staff worker come flailing her arms at me. So the homeless have no protections regarding violence. They let someone in who wasn't even supposed to be in this navigation center. I mean, it's a horrible experience staying at the navigation center. You get some food or something, but come and go when you feel like it, but I mean, shelter shock is a very clear parallel as to what's happening in the navigation center.

Ralph Payton: Thank you, Charles. That actually brings out some questions we had earlier I think this year and the past year around when the standards of care and the shelter grievance policy will apply to the navigation centers. Jeff had given us some indication that the grievance policy I think it was had officially been applied to the navigation centers some time earlier this year. Are the standards of care also applicable to the navigation centers as well?

Emily Cohen: Yes. So, unfortunately, I'm not sure of the answer to that, which is why I was looking at ECS to see if they knew the answer to that question. My understanding is that the shelter monitoring community and our department are working together to ensure that navigation centers are monitored. I just don't have an update on the progress of that implementation. If one of my colleagues in the

audience does, we can get that for you, otherwise, I can follow up. But I know it's in process and may already be implemented. Unfortunately, I didn't come prepared to answer that question.

Ralph Payton: So if we could have this question for our next meeting answered, I think that would be fantastic. So again, we're wondering if the standards of care apply to shelters and navigation centers and if not, what's the timeline for that and the same for the shelter grievance process?

Del Seymour: In the meantime, let me just say, Charles, you and I had a conversation on the street the other day and I'm really sorry that you're having the experience that you had in the navigation centers. I would personally would like to see the same standards of care shared in all of our facilities. But it's almost like when you say those people don't care, man, I mean, that's a slap in the face for the people that work over there. Slap in a face for us here. We're citizens. We're citizens just like you. I care about those centers and everyone that've met in the navigation and the shelters, they really care about people, man, because they ain't making a whole bunch of money in there. By city standards, they don't make anything working in those shelters. So they have a big heart. So I'm sorry that's happened to you. Okay, all right.

Ralph Payton: So I agree they care, but I think we should still have some accountability processes in place verify that they care,

Public Comment: I really appreciated Emily's presentation and the work the data team did to put that together. Some just minor comments on the presentation was just the size of the fonts, the boldness of the fonts, the choice of colors, especially when looking at the types of exits, was all-- I only got to use the slides.

It's very challenging. I also really appreciated several members of the boards very strong feeling that homeward bound exits could be displayed really separately from the other exits that they're all important ways of addressing homelessness, but when really trying to understand the effectiveness of the navigation center relative to other shelters relative to other programs that homeward bound being separated out seemed good. And then also I have a question about one of the early slides. It was something about the shelter waiting list and just showing how the number was a little above 1,000, but then there was next to that there was something about available beds being about 30 and new entries on to the waitlist being about 30 and I just didn't understand how those three numbers related to each other or what they meant to each other.

Ralph Payton: Emily, do you have any clarification around the three numbers - the 1,000 waitlist?

Emily Cohen: So the waitlist is the 311 90-day bed waiting list that the 311 system manages. In terms of the beds available, my understanding is these are the beds that 311 can make available to folks coming off of the waiting list that month. So this is not folks not showing up. That's occupancy. But these are how many beds are the reservation expires and they're able to be rereleased by 311. And then the new waiting list request is simply the calls that the waiting list takes each month to be added to the waiting list by folks asking to be added.

Lessy Benedith: I'm the program director of the Division Circle Navigation Center. And I do want to inform you that we are observing the shelter grievance process at this facility and we are also following the standards of care. That was something that was implemented through the Department of HSH. Unfortunately, we have been without a contract manager, but I am informed that we will soon have one. But at least for the division's circle I want to reassure you that we are following both processes.

Ralph Payton: Excellent. Was this a voluntary compliance or was it mandated by the state?

Lessy Benedith: No, it was through the department. This is was during the time that Brian Quinn was still around.

Ralph Payton: Oh, beautiful. What's the timeline?

Lessy Benedith: Early in the year. Yes.

Del Seymour: I've got one just quick question the assistant asked me the other day. She couldn't be here today, so maybe you can answer some of them for your staff. This person's been at the shelter for seven months and she's worried. How does she get collected to go to the next step. Who makes that decision? Because according to her, a lot of people who have been there less than her have moved up on the housing ladder. So how is that decision made?

Megan Owens: It sounds like from the way that you're describing the situation, you might be describing the current Care Not Cash HAT placement process, and this person or, in general, community members should expect that the Care Not Cash placement process will not change until at least November. So folks who are already working with the housing access team, colloquially known as the HAT team, should proceed.

Ralph Payton: Board member announcements and scheduling future meetings. I know one thing that we had talked about, and Delta submitted it to you during our previous conversation. I know there's been a lot of discussion. There's been a lot of meetings, and I know we've had previous discussions over the last months with DPW as well as HSH and even the police department. I know that, Charles, one thing that we do want to do is invite Commander Lazar to join us at the August 29th meeting so we can discuss in more detail exactly how the police are overseeing this process. Again, we've heard from HSH and DPW that there's been no change in policy even though we've seen that change in practice. And we'd like a more robust conversation with the manager about how this change in practices occurred without a change in policy. So I'd like that to be an agenda item.

Charles Minor: And are some specific questions that I could draft that I could send to him between now and then so that we can have a more kind of formalized discussion?

Ralph Payton: Sure. I mean, my question is why is there an observable change in practice even though there's been no change in policy

Kelly Cutler: I have a lot of questions. One of the things is regarding the data. There's so many things when it comes to data and with transparency. Also with the policy. With like the agenda and what's

going on there with the actual policy and to be able to see the policy. I had to miss the last meeting here, but I listened to it and read the minutes. And there were a number of things that really concerned me. When Sam Dodge, who's with DPW presented. One is that the head of the policy, department of HSOC is commander. When we're responding to homelessness, and the lead person is law enforcement, it's concerning and really also doesn't make sense, but. And so, for example, some concerns were given notification.

You'd mentioned that they had been given notices why the Hot team, by the encampment resolution team specifically. And so at that point, they should be off limits. And because it's kind of a waiting room. Because they're waiting until they can actually get connected in to resources that are available. And that this is-- at this very same time, the sweeps from DPW ramped. To be straight up, they were undermining the homeless department and the work that they were trying to do. And it was extremely disturbing. Calling supervisor Jane Kim it was in her district. Calling everyone to try and get them to stop, okay. And so, this is where there's a lot of concern about what's going on there. And with this policy, and it's so-- the lack of transparency along this whole process has been stunning to me. I'm also on the SFPD homeless advisory board, and there's been no transparency there either.

There's huge concerns there. And we have seen a massive increase in the sweeps that are taking place. It seems like with the coordinated entry and getting that's going to be such a huge challenge. Because they're getting hit literally everyday by sweeps. They can't find people to help them. And also another concerning thing is with the documentation. We're seeing the city workers that are documenting it going back to this command center to HSOC. So there's a lot of policy questions I'm having. Also when it comes to HIPA with a lot of different concerns there. We have some folks from GLIDE that are here. Where it's a known thing when service providers are providing meals and services that you're not going to target folks. They're going there to get help. And there was an incident last week that they can speak more about. It's just very concerning and so. So yes.

Del Seymour: So, same thing, I think. You all present us policy here, but the practice on the street is nothing like the policy. It doesn't look anything like it. And in fact, just as far as being practical, we made terrorism. That's where our people go and ask for help.

Emily Cohen: I think we HSOC, the Health Issues Operation Center, which is the collaborative of the three, four organizations talk.

Sophia Isom: It just seems like there's a big disconnect happening. And it seems like this keeps happening over and over and over--

Kelly Cutler: Another thing also that came up as I was conferencing with someone from Oakland, and Oakland actually posts a week or two in advance online of resolutions or sweeps. And so it's more transparent. Now, it's like we've been asking and asking for schedules of things. And we're not getting that. We're asking for data about who's been connected more than just having an interaction with someone who's an outreach worker. They are seeing us at PD and DPW. A lot. But they're not necessarily seeing workers because there's a limited capacity for what the city's doing and what is being clearly organized across the city. So, I have massive concerns.

Del Seymour: And the mayor's been out three times walking the streets in the encampment neighborhoods. I walked with her twice. And I've invited her, and I've asked the department, you guys, and I know you've been several times. So stay on there, because I would like for her to listen to what our people out here-- we're all citizens out here. But listen to what we really-- the passion that we have for this. Because this is being operated like a military maneuver

But we don't need to be dealing with our homeless neighbors as an enemy. Or in a military way at all. Some days it seems like-- and I'm out here every day man.

Kelly Cutler: It'd be really nice for the board to be able to go to HSOC. To get a tour-- to become more informed and find out what's going on. Because we're talking about this entity. I have been there, but just more.

Del Seymour: We'll have to continue to invite the mayor to this. The last time we had the mayor was almost two years ago, I guess and he came up and sit with us.

Public Comment:

Good afternoon. My name is Janet I'm glad you brought this agenda item to the table doesn't think we need to have a bigger and broader discussion about this. I mean, This is a major topic. I've noticed on our outreaches in front of Glide that the authoritarian response to the homeless population - our most vulnerable population - is becoming increasingly aggressive. And it's a great concern to us, especially when we like we-- hearing what Dell said, we think of that area in front of Glide as a sanctuary and a safe haven for some of the most vulnerable people in the city. And when GBW rolls out with a copy of SUVs, the police department SUVs with bullhorns would aggressively threaten to hose those people down if they don't move on, confiscate their property, nudge them with their feet, tell them that they could be arrested. And then, we might run their warrants. This is insanely aggressive and really uncalled for. That's a safe haven for people, right? I witnessed this myself from my office. One of my interns is working with us from the University of Washington, came to my office that same day early in the day before this happened to ask me why DPW was confiscating the locker of a senior citizen and throwing it into the DPW truck accompanied by police. So this is the response some of us miss in our own little population-- is getting increasingly aggressive. And for those of us at Glide, it's an increasing concern because the police have been very authoritarian. And while we don't want to use inflammatory language and we realize that the climate is sensitive and volatile, we also feel very passionate about speaking out when we witness these things down there.

Hi. My name is Courtney Pearson. I'm here from the San Francisco AIDS Foundation and just wanted to reiterate the concerns of our colleagues from Glide. We operate an affirmative action center that does syringe access services and also Hepatitis C treatment, daily vulnerable clients on 6th Street. And we're witnessing similar tactics against people congregating, or sitting, or taking a break. And I'm very concerned about people being afraid to access our services and the impact that has on people's health. So I wanted to reiterate and would love to hear more response from SMDP about why they're taking this kind of response and where their orders are coming from. And then also, one comment on navigation centers-- I just want to continue to bring up the issue around farm reduction and people being able to

bring in drug-using equipment into centers. And that's been a big barrier for a lot of our clients who-- then, we have a concern about people discarding emails and safely because they can't bring emails into centers. So it feels like there could be some solutions. And I know some centers are different on that.

Public Comment: It's in with the Coalition of Homelessness. I totally agree with the board that we need to bring the mayor in to discuss these issues. Hopefully, she'll agree to come. I've noticed a lot of in community outreach that a lot of people have been saying DPW has been aggressive, just cutting their property, including slashing tents, is the recurring thing that I've heard on the streets. And I think DPW needs to answer for doing something as aggressive as slashing people's property and discarding walkers. So if we can bring DPW in, on these meetings, I feel like that would be productive.

Thank you. So we have DPW in the guise of Sam Dodge but I think that was a good point, inviting the director in, we've had the fortune of having Jeff here answer from the director level some of the issues. So in terms, if we can put an invite out to the DPW director.

Charles Pitts: Well, I think my problem is everyone's talking but what do you want to do with this, talking doesn't get anything done. I'm trying to implement some, type of, legislation or some policies that would be enforced. When I say they don't care, I, on average I just see a, we're going to help you get better by being mean and by arm twisting. That's what I see. I can't even go to the drop-in center anymore because I mean, what's the psychological profile of these people that work at these places? I mean, the homeless that's got the issues, yeah, but the staff, they're supposed to be decent and stuff, and make you think that-- I mean there's no hiring standards. You look at your contract; there's no hiring standards. I mean, you look at your contracts, we have hillbilly protections for our shelter system. We have complete near ineffective protections when it comes to the shelters. We are at the complete disposal of whoever they decide to hire. When we meet, I say here, when do you do something? Talking is antiquated. Is this oral? I mean you ask me, have I seeked housing? I can't; I'm still in the city because they keep abusing me. How do I get to a place where I don't have to defend my humanity?

Del Seymour: So let me just say one thing that you mentioned. Thank God this is a city that does hire felons, We come out as one of the most unique cities in the United States, that band the box, so thank God that they do hire felons.

Rebecca Belvin: I'm in the Policy Resource Center. And I am standing up here on a more personal level, not representing my agency, regarding the sweeps. More specifically, it's not, I don't know if you would do the qualified sweep, but I get off at Powell Street Bart Station every day, and obviously encounter people who are homeless. And one of the things that is failing, to me, is that on polishing days for Powell Street Station. Instead of doing that, they honk to wake up people who are homeless, which is a little bit ridiculous, I think, especially because they could just as easily get up and gently wake those people up. And I know this isn't on the scale of the sweeps, definitely not, and I'm not trying to compare them at all. I just think that something as simple as that could really bring a lot of humanity. I think, worse, so I just wanted to make sure that was on your radar.

Scott Nelson: and I just have a comment about DPW. If you guys have a future hearing in which DPW officials are here, something that should be brought to their attention is that they're not following their own policy, in particular, procedure 16.05.08, which governs how they remove and store properties collected.

They have two types of sweeps. One's called a pre-planned special cleaning event in which they know they're going to do a sweep, and they're supposed to give 72 hours' notice to everyone around there. And then they have the routine clean operation sweep, which is perhaps what happened at glide, but during all of those, they're supposed to post a notice or give a notice to the person whose property was taken, or if they don't know that person, they're supposed to post it in the area. And I've yet to see them actually do that. They're also supposed to bag and tag the items, which they then take to the yard. I seen them put them on the truck. I was at Merlin Street when they did an encampment sweep about a month ago, and they collected at least six items. However, they didn't put any notices anywhere. They didn't give notices to anyone. So someone returning to the area would have no idea where their stuff went to. And as part of their policy, it's required; they're also supposed bag and tag. Each month has a different color and tag, and I asked the supervisor what color they're using that month. And he said, "We don't do that. We just throw them on the truck."

Public Comment I am currently at one of the navigation centers, and I've currently been homeless on and off in San Francisco since I came from Delaware eight years ago when I was pregnant with my son and my daughter was three months old.

I'm Kia. I'm with the Coalition on Homelessness, as well. I just want to echo about looking into the policy and not even just reading the policy for SPD, DPW on the sweeps is really crucial because, on my outreach, I haven't encountered one person who says that they've received their items back from DPW. I haven't encountered one person who said that they saw their things bagged and tagged. I also, in the past couple weeks, have gotten multiple reports of people getting threatened jail time if they don't hand over their belongings and a lot of reports of people seeing their personal items being put into personal vehicles and their valuables being separated out by DPW workers or SPD officers. So I think that looking in how their policy is being implemented or even if there's loopholes in their policy for what happens with these belongings, I don't know, but I have not gotten one report of somebody having a positive experience with these sweeps so far.

Del Seymour: First of all, I want to thank all the staff from HSH for being here, Leslie and all the other folks. Thanks for coming here and thank you for all the good work that you do. Continue to listen to us in here. Listen to these citizens. I mean, everybody can't be lying. If we want to call ourselves a Sanctuary City, we need to know how to build a sanctuary for the people on the streets first because we're not giving a sanctuary. We need to stay on have the honorable mayor, London Breed, to come here. So I want her to listen to what I heard this morning. And I don't know if she-- in those forms, I don't know if her handlers are isolating her from a move like this. I think maybe they are because she needs to be here to listen to her citizens. We'll see you again August 29th instead of September. Thank you for coming.