

Appendix E: ERTF Detailed Recommendations

This appendix provides detailed memos that accompany the Task Force policy recommendations summarized in the Economic Recovery Task Force Report. The memos are intended to provide additional information for departments, policy makers, and community partners involved in implementation of the recommendations. The memos include detailed problem statements, goals and outcomes, implementation considerations, and equity analysis. Each memo can be accessed by clicking on the number and title in the linked table of contents below.

Table of Contents

1. Local Economic Stimulus

[1.1 Support the construction sector with public infrastructure investments and continued focus on major projects](#)

[1.2 Redesign building permit process and eliminate unnecessary permits not directly related to health and safety](#)

[1.3 Allow developers to defer paying impact fees to stimulate development](#)

[1.4 Make the Local Business Enterprise Program \(LBE\) more effective, equitable, and better suited to support the City's recovery](#)

[1.5 Promote reactivation and consider adaptive reuse of buildings for a vibrant San Francisco](#)

[1.6 Advocate for federal and state funding](#)

[1.7 Partner with the business and philanthropic communities to deliver a strong and equitable recovery](#)

[1.8 Create a child care system that meets the needs of families, educators, and the community](#)

2. Job Connections

[2.1 Centralize the City's workforce development programs](#)

[2.2 Provide culturally competent, accessible job training with career connections for marginalized and laid-off workers, particularly ACHE sector workers](#)

[2.3 Strengthen implementation of the First Source Hiring policy](#)

[2.4 Expand subsidized employment and hiring program – JobsNOW! and arts-specific](#)

3. Promote Safe Reopening

[3.1 Provide clear, concise communication in multiple languages to diverse business sectors on reopening and recovery from COVID-19](#)

[3.2 Remove barriers to obtaining PPE, testing, and tracing in low-income and communities of color](#)

[3.3 Ensure safe work environments for all workers, especially low-income workers](#)

[3.4 Support cleanliness, health, and safety in public spaces](#)

4. Preserve Operations and Lessen Regulatory Burdens

[4.1 Extend, improve, and support the Shared Spaces Program](#)

[4.2 Repurpose public outdoor space](#)

[4.3 Allow more flexible use of ground floor retail spaces](#)

[4.4 Rethink rules that restrict flexible/temporary arts, culture, hospitality and entertainment uses](#)

[4.5 Provide advisory services for commercial landlords and tenants and explore other strategies to avoid foreclosures and evictions, particularly for ACHE sector assets](#)

[4.6 Review employer mandates](#)

5. Pursue Economic Justice

[5.1 Invest in BIPOC and immigrant communities](#)

[5.2 Ensure low-income school children have access to educational programming](#)

[5.3 Reform fines and fees levied by San Francisco to reduce inequitable financial burdens on low-income people and communities of color](#)

[5.4 Provide high-quality computers to vulnerable populations](#)

[5.5 Bridge the digital divide with affordable connectivity and internet service](#)

[5.6 Build technology capacity of new users, small businesses, and nonprofits](#)

6. Invest in Housing

[6.1 Expand and stabilize affordable housing funding](#)

[6.2 Preserve and stabilize affordable multifamily rental housing and support small property owners](#)

[6.3 Support construction of small multifamily buildings](#)

[6.4 Streamline the housing entitlement process to incentivize affordable projects](#)

7. Meet the Basic Needs of the Vulnerable

7.1 Ensure adequate housing for family violence survivors and increase awareness of family violence issues during COVID-19

7.2 Ensure all San Franciscans have adequate access to healthy food

7.3 Expand mental health and substance use disorder services

7.4 Acquire hotels and other buildings to be converted into permanent supportive housing for people experiencing homelessness

7.5 Prevent renter evictions and displacement

8. Imagine and Build Stronger Neighborhoods

8.1 Plan collaboratively for San Francisco's resilient future and related investments

8.2 Catalyze neighborhood recovery through the arts

8.3 Identify new revenue sources and support grant applications for arts, culture, hospitality, and entertainment funding

8.4 Appoint more arts, culture, hospitality, and entertainment sector representatives to advisory groups and policy bodies

Glossary

1. Local Economic Stimulus

1.1 Support the construction sector with public infrastructure investments and continued focus on major projects

Problem Statement

Capital projects take years to plan and design, and interruptions to that pipeline can have long-term negative ripple effects. San Francisco has developed a strong capital planning practice for the City's public infrastructure, with an all-sources view, responsible fiscal constraints, and a robust general obligation bond program that has seen more than \$5 billion approved by San Francisco voters since 2008. The current slowdown in construction makes the present moment an attractive opportunity for countercyclical investment. Still, the uncertainty posed by the COVID-19 pandemic may make it more difficult to proceed as normal.

Although the City's development pipeline is still robust, private construction has slowed. As a result, City departments and local construction firms are reporting a sharp increase in the number of bids received. The Port recently received eight bids for a transportation project, the highest number of responses in five years. The stakes for job loss in this industry are especially high, as each \$1 million in construction spending translates to approximately 5.93 San Francisco jobs.

Program Overview

Proposed Solution, Goals, Intended Outcomes, and Beneficiaries

Infrastructure investment should be an important piece of the City's fiscal stimulus strategy for economic recovery. Not only is construction spending an efficient way to create jobs in San Francisco, but this boost to productivity has a multiplier effect on economic activity, creating more jobs in the future. At a national level, S&P Global estimates that if the U.S. invested \$2.1 trillion into public infrastructure spending over a 10-year horizon, the productivity boost from the infrastructure investment could add as much as \$5.7 trillion to the U.S. economy over the next decade. The same multiplier in San Francisco would translate to \$2.7 million in economic activity over ten years for every \$1 million in infrastructure investment.

San Francisco's last 10-Year Capital Plan planned for \$39 billion in investment over the period from 2020 to 2029. The City should continue to prioritize good stewardship of public assets as documented and recommended in the City's Capital Plan, which includes assets that deliver services for public safety, health and human services, recreation and culture, transportation, and general government, including IT infrastructure.

In the upcoming Capital Plan update, the City should promote a good state of repair for its buildings, right-of-way, public spaces, and other infrastructure assets with a variety of revenue sources, including but not limited to: general obligation bonds, General Fund debt, revenue bonds, and state and federal grants. The upcoming Capital Plan should also consider the extraordinary economic impacts of COVID-19 and plan for investments that will make a difference for San Francisco businesses, workers, and residents struggling through this crisis, such as investments to bridge the digital divide.

In addition, the City should continue to focus on its major developments, such as the Shipyard, Mission Rock, Pier 70, Treasure Island, and Central SoMa, as these projects bring with them thousands of jobs and support for local business.

Program Administrator(s) and Community Partners

The Capital Plan is delivered by City Administrator's Office of Resilience and Capital Planning (ORCP). ORCP works in coordination with the Controller's Office, Mayor's Office, and asset-owning City departments to inform project prioritization and finance strategies.

The Office of Racial Equity is assisting City departments with the development of Racial Equity Action Plans. These plans will integrate racial equity into the processes and policies of each department, including the community outreach process that informs each department's capital priorities.

Timeframe

The planning process began in late Summer of 2020 and will be presented to the Board of Supervisors for approval in the Spring of 2021. The Plan will recommend an infrastructure investment strategy for FY22-FY31.

Cost

No additional funds are needed. However, if additional funds are identified from federal, state, or public-private partnership sources, more investment could be made, further stimulating the local economy.

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers

Participating in public planning processes can be prohibitively time-consuming or otherwise inaccessible, especially for people with limited resources and accessibility challenges. As are all City departments, the Office of Resilience and Capital Planning is emphasizing racial equity in its recurring work such as the Capital Plan, requesting that all departments consider their capital pipelines with a racial equity lens, prioritize investment in projects that

mitigate historic racial inequities, and implement planning processes that amplify the voices of BIPOC community members.

Program Burdens

Historically, public infrastructure investment can be a catalyst of racial harm, forcing the diaspora of communities of color by encouraging gentrification, disruptive projects like the elevated highway systems built through BIPOC communities, lowering real estate value, and increasing environmental pollution.

Planning, including fiscal planning like the Capital Plan, should consider how public spaces can be improved to best serve the needs of the people that live, work, and visit the area.

Community Input and Partnership

The City’s capital projects and planning are heard in public meetings at Capital Planning Committee and at the Board of Supervisors Budget and Finance Committee, where members of the public are invited to offer comment on plans and projects as they are developed.

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	Yes
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	Yes
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	Yes
Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	Yes

If Yes, please briefly explain.

Long-term infrastructure planning and project implementation processes and policies that recognize racial harm and amplify BIPOC community voices will be a powerful tool in mitigating racial disparities and addressing the historic disinvestment in BIPOC

neighborhoods. Investing in infrastructure that improves transportation access, increases affordable housing, creates open space, and rebuilds community assets can meaningfully improve the living conditions of communities of color, and institutionalize their engagement in public decision-making processes.

Investing in job creation in the construction sector, and prioritizing contracts with BIPOC contractors, protects jobs, and invests in BIPOC communities.

Additional Context

Select the type of solution this is:	Please "X" for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	
New program or initiative	
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	X
Advocacy (supporting efforts bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	

Feasibility

Until the COVID-19 Pandemic, the growing Bay Area economy gave rise to historic levels of capital investment, allowing San Francisco to fund a record level of capital projects over the last 10 years. In the current economic downturn, continued investment in the City’s public infrastructure will require difficult tradeoffs and creative finance strategies.

This proposal does not require further federal or state legislation.

1.2 Redesign building permit process and eliminate unnecessary permits not directly related to health and safety

Problem Statement

The City's permitting process for construction is notoriously complex. Up to ten different departments can be involved in permitting, but no one department owns the entire customer experience. Lack of transparency around the permitting process has always been a challenge and navigating the process requires resources, time, and money. Novices to the system find the process confusing and overwhelming, whereas those who are experienced understand the sequencing and how to tap into technical expertise. For small businesses in particular, this may hinder economic recovery.

Task Force members are particularly concerned that the current permitting process, which has been impacted by COVID and the need to shut down in-person services, will have cascading impacts on small business and construction trades, increasing unemployment in sectors that employ many with good wages.

Existing Programs/Policies that Address this Problem

The creation of the Permit Center at 49 South Van Ness will consolidate 13 permitting locations into one and seek to integrate physical and digital resources. Task Force members support additional measures, as described below.

Program Overview

Proposed Solution, Goals, Intended Outcomes, and Beneficiaries

A suite of programmatic and regulatory changes is recommended to redesign the permitting process for the end user, increase transparency about the process, and remove requirements not directly related to health and safety.

The Task Force would like to see substantial changes in the process of permit procurement that result in at least 50% less time and cost and that stimulate more permit pulls. Specific recommendations include:

- Publish rates for all permit types as more transparency would stimulate movement towards expansions and construction starts.
- Implement a fee holiday, a temporary (perhaps one-year) reduction or elimination of permit fees designed to incentivize business owners, property owners, and developers to pull permits and undertake construction projects, thus creating jobs and stimulating economic growth. The particular types of permits which would see their fees reduced would need to be identified based on a thorough analysis of what

would be most impactful in inducing businesses and individuals to pull permits. Additionally, this analysis should take into account economic and racial equity and prioritize fee reductions for businesses and individuals most burdened by these fees and those who have the least resources. In undertaking this analysis in particular and the fee holiday in general, the City should include strong culturally sensitive outreach efforts to the immigrant and monolingual business communities to ensure that all perspectives are heard and that all have the opportunity to participate.

- Expand the [Open in SF Program](#) to offer the public a “concierge” service, managed by the City, to help the public through the complex process. This service could offer the public three choices: (1) Pull permits using the “self-service” option; (2) Use a private resource (publishing all names and services available); or (3) Use the City “concierge” service. The City could provide multi-lingual services, perhaps through partnerships with community-based organizations.
- Encourage as many permits to be pulled as possible. Make it easy. Make it affordable. Encourage growth and expansion as this will cascade out to local businesses and employers. To move this work forward, the overall permit process will need to be simplified for the customer, new technological systems will likely be necessary, permit departments will need more coordination and to maintain transparency and lines of clear communication for the public.

The goals of this effort are to keep San Francisco-based businesses in business, in San Francisco, and stimulate small business activity until the economy normalizes.

Beneficiaries of these improvements would include homeowners, small and large landlords, contractors of all sizes, businesses looking to reopen or expand with re-envisioned business ideas, small businesses anywhere in the supply chain for construction or business expansions – restaurants offering take out, small legal services providers, expeditors, hardware stores, cabinet makers, painters, etc. Sustaining the construction sector is important for economic stability, as the sector provides living wages to residents.

Program Administrator(s) and Community Partners

Multiple City agencies, including DBI, Fire, SFPUC, Public Works and Planning, would need to coordinate their permitting systems to create a process that is transparent and clear to residents.

Timeframe

This effort can start immediately, although coordination across departments could take many years especially due to the need for updated information technology and case

management systems across departments to facilitate better data sharing and workflow of permits from end to end.

Cost

Immediate cost will be from City staff overseeing redesign and implementation of the permitting process or costs to upgrade aging technology systems in the coming years. A concierge service would require an increase in staff, likely at the Department of Building Inspection or the Office of Economic and Workforce Development, to provide this service. The City could see long-term cost reductions from decreased bureaucracy. Property owners and business pulling permits could see long-term cost reductions. A fee holiday will have considerable costs which will be borne by the permitting departments in the form of decreased revenue. This will result in draw down of reserves or fund balance, backfill from another source, or in expenditure reductions. Given the difficulty of the latter two impacts, a fee holiday would make most sense for permits issued by departments that have considerable reserves or fund balance.

Program Equity Analysis

Program Burdens and Barriers

The existing permit system is a barrier to many small businesses and property owners because it is costly, time consuming, and difficult to navigate. Redesigning the system from the consumer perspective would decrease barriers.

Language access and the digital divide have also been a barrier for non-English speaking business owners and employees. Providing more accessible and non-English opportunities to use these services, including mobile services or satellite office where people can access permits in their own community, would increase participation and amplify success.

Where codes, practices, and regulations protect vulnerable populations, such as accessibility requirements, those benefits should be protected, even while seeking to make compliance easier.

Community Input and Partnership

In designing the new Permit Center, the City sought to understand not only the single-visit experience, but the end-to-end experience of getting a permit. Since early 2019, Digital Services has conducted in-depth interviews with applicants, interviews at 1660 Mission, and targeted online surveys. The team has also drawn on past research conducted by Gensler and the Controller's Office. Moving forward, the City should undertake more dialogue with neighborhood stakeholders and representatives of underserved communities

to explore ways to make the permit process even more accessible, equitable, and responsive to the needs of those communities.

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	No
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	No
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	Yes
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	Yes
Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	Yes

If Yes, please briefly explain.

By reducing barriers to entry and supporting diverse businesses.

Additional Context

Select the type of solution this is:	Please “X” for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	
New program or initiative	X
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	X
Advocacy (supporting efforts bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	

Feasibility

Implementation of this suite of recommendations will take significant time, will, and buy-in from stakeholders in the existing process. This effort will need to be led with strong change

management. The effort will also require coordination and likely implementation of upgraded technologies across many different permit departments with federated and outdated IT systems.

This proposal does not require further federal or state legislation.

1.3 Allow developers to defer paying impact fees to stimulate development

Problem Statement

Economic disruption caused by COVID-19 and related public health measures has stalled new real estate development. Market rents are falling, but construction and land costs have not fallen by a commensurate amount. Developers are having difficulty securing short- and long-term financing required to break ground on entitled projects. While these diminished rents are a temporary boon to renters of housing, office, and other types of space, the long-term stabilization of real estate costs in San Francisco will rely on continued production through all phases of the market cycle. Further, the development and construction industries are well poised to contribute to the recovery of San Francisco through job creation, stimulating the economy, and growing the tax base, if projects can move forward.

One of the major costs of development (and the cost that the City has the most control over) is impact fees. These are fees levied on developers that pay for capital costs associated with public services such as affordable housing, transportation, parks and open space, childcare, and other infrastructure. Currently impact fees must be paid to the City when a project receives its first building permit, before beginning construction. However, in the current climate, these fees will push some projects into unfeasibility. Without the deferral of impact fee payments, developers may not deliver projects in San Francisco, where the cost of construction is extraordinarily high.

Factors Affecting Communities of Color and/or Other Vulnerable Populations Differently

The unaffordability of San Francisco housing disproportionately affects communities of color and persons with disabilities, and it is especially important for them that the production of new affordable housing continues. Additionally, many of the high paying construction jobs created by real estate development projects would go to people of color and those without extensive education.

Existing Programs/Policies that Address this Problem

Building in San Francisco is expensive, and the City has shown that it can take steps to make it easier to build, such as last year's fee waiver for 100% affordable housing projects and Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs). From 2010 to 2013, the City had an impact fee deferral program much the same as proposed here.

Program Overview

Proposed Solution, Goals, Intended Outcomes, and Beneficiaries

This proposal would allow developers to defer paying impact fees until their project receives a temporary certificate of occupancy (TCO), which is after construction but before tenants are able to move in. Deferred fees would be subject to interest during the time they are deferred and would need to be paid back with interest at TCO. While the deferral period would vary significantly between different project types and sizes, a fair rule of thumb is that fees would be deferred for two years.

The specific benefit of this deferral is that it reduces development costs, thus making development financially feasible earlier in the economic recovery. It would reduce development costs in two ways. By allowing a developer to pay a significant cost two years later, their financial returns would be improved. Additionally, deferral would allow developers to avoid using high-interest construction debt to pay for the impact fees, thus reducing financing costs.

The rationale for the deferral and/or the entitlement extension is to try to stimulate development and thereby create housing, public benefits, jobs, and economic growth. Housing development has the benefit of increasing housing supply, thus stabilizing housing prices in the long-term. All development regardless of the type of space being built has the benefits of paying impact fees (even if deferred), creating construction jobs, stimulating the economy, and growing the City's tax base.

Timeframe

The fee deferral program would be in place for an initial three years, to be revisited at the end of that period. The program should be paired with regular study of the City's current development economics to ensure that (1) the deferral program is needed in order to induce developers to advance their projects, and (2) it is sufficient to significantly increase the chances that developers will advance their projects or accelerate development schedules.

Cost

The City would receive impact fee payments several years later than it would without the deferral. Even with deferred fees being paid with interest, the City misses out on access to the funds used for critical services such as affordable housing, transportation improvements, parks and open space, child care, etc. However, if applied in the right economic context, the deferral would allow projects to move forward years earlier than they would otherwise. In some cases, this may allow projects to proceed that would otherwise never be built. In that context, the ultimate impact fee revenue to the City may end up being greater than without the program.

Additionally, this policy could allow smaller property owners, developers, and contractors, with less access to capital and traditional financing, to do development projects that are likely smaller in scale. The fee deferral would bring greater equity to who can take on development projects by lowering the upfront costs and could result in the production of more small-scale, "missing middle" housing, less dependent on institutional investors.

Program Administrator(s) and Community Partners

The program would require local legislation and would be administered by the Planning Department. This proposal is based on a program the City implemented as a response to the Great Recession.

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers

Projects that would have the ability to defer fees have complied with zoning and other rules that are subject to significant community consultation and deliberation and have been approved by the Planning Commission. This proposed change would simply help these projects break ground and provide the associated public and economic benefits more quickly, reducing barriers.

Program Burdens

Because the deferral would push back the date the City receives impact fee revenue, it would delay the date the City will be able to use the funds to provide public benefits. Depending on the type of impact fee, the users of the projects funded by the fee may be disproportionately low income and people of color. This would especially be the case for two of the largest fees – those levied for affordable housing and transportation. However, if this is done in the right context, it would accelerate development schedules, thus bringing in more fee revenue more quickly. Additionally, if new funding sources, including state and federal sources, can be identified, those would mitigate the delay of impact fees facing the City.

Community Input and Partnership

All stakeholders should be consulted before the City implements a program like this. Successful consultation will need to be paired with education on development economics so communities understand not just the visible impacts, but the benefits created by development.

Community Assets

N/A

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	No
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	No
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	Yes
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	No
Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	Yes

If Yes, please briefly explain.

This deferral should be implemented if quantitative analysis of economic conditions proves that development is not financially feasible and that the fee deferral significantly improves feasibility. In that context, the proposal would result in an acceleration and increase in housing production, construction job creation, and growth of the tax base. Each of these effects can meaningfully improve the conditions of vulnerable populations in San Francisco. Additional housing production would stabilize housing prices, helping to stem the tide of displacement and outmigration from San Francisco, especially for rent-burdened low-income communities, which are more likely to include people of color. Additionally, the affordable housing that comes along with market rate housing through the inclusionary housing program would create more housing options for low income San Franciscans.

In order to make sure that these affordable units benefit vulnerable populations in San Francisco, the City can work with CBOs to help prepare local residents to participate in the affordable housing lotteries. Additional neighborhood preferences would also help direct the benefits that come along with development to vulnerable communities in the vicinity of the developments.

Creation of additional construction jobs would help the economic condition of working-class communities in San Francisco through more employment opportunities and wage growth. Growth in the tax base can fund additional social services, which support low-income workers and communities of color.

Additional Context

Select the type of solution this is:	Please "X" for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	
New program or initiative	
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	X (because we had this in 2010)
Advocacy (supporting efforts bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	

Feasibility

This is feasible. It takes one piece of legislation, very little implementation, and it has been done before, in 2010.

This proposal does not require further federal or state legislation.

1.4 Make the Local Business Enterprise Program (LBE) more effective, equitable, and better suited to support the City's recovery

Problem Statement

The Local Business Enterprise (LBE) program promotes the participation of certified small local businesses in the City contract process. It is designed to harness the City's significant spending power in support of small, local firms, many of which may be owned by women or people of color, so that they can compete with larger firms and/or firms taking advantage of cheaper places of business outside of San Francisco. Presently, there are over 1,400 firms certified in the LBE program, in over 270 unique certification categories. Total LBE contract value in FY 18/19 (latest year available at time of writing) was over \$3 billion.¹

The LBE program will likely be an essential part of San Francisco's economic recovery, but the need to balance the City's budget creates risk for these businesses, which are often based in and hire workers from communities adversely affected by COVID-19. In addition, current program rules and practices were not developed with the challenge posed by COVID-19 in mind and the resulting economic downturn.

For example, some LBEs have trouble maintaining their cashflow as they perform work for the City and incur costs well ahead of payment. A City contract is typically paid out as progress is made on completing the scope of work. As a result, businesses need to absorb the cost of meeting the scope of work and carry it until the City pays, which can take up to 60 days or longer after invoicing— or one week longer for subcontractors in lower tiers. For many small businesses this mismatch in timing often prevents them from participating in City projects. Businesses are faced with even more uncertainty under COVID and LBEs and prime contractors are even less willing or able to carry costs until they are reimbursed. This problem is more pronounced for minority and women-owned LBEs as these owners tend to lack access to traditional methods of debt financing (i.e. construction loans and/or lines of credit). Other challenges include:

- The prime not always paying the LBE subcontractor within the mandated timeline after receiving payment from the City
- Restrictive contract minimum threshold sizes that inhibit LBEs from participating at the Prime and/or 1st Tier subcontracting level
- Complex and potentially intimidating certification requirements
- A lack of opportunities for micro LBE set-aside projects
- Potential broader racial disparities in City contracting that state law prevents the City from addressing.

Finally, according to the Contract Monitoring Division's Community Outreach Report, LBEs are concerned that efforts are made unevenly across departments to meet LBE contracting goals, resulting in diminished LBE capture of City contract dollars.² For example, across the five Chapter-6 Contract Awarding Departments and Controller's Office, there were approximately 250 prime contracts let during FY19-20. Of that amount, only 83 firms (33%) were LBEs. In addition, there is uneven implementation of Micro-LBE Set-Aside Program requirements across departments and a lack of strategies for contracting work to smaller LBEs. LBEs showed an interest in extending certification to firms that are smaller than the lowest certification threshold, increasing access to contracts for smaller firms, and assisting in bringing new firms into the LBE program.³

Factors Affecting Communities of Color and/or Other Vulnerable Populations Differently

LBEs with either woman or ethnic minority ownership greater than or equal to 51% are designated as being a Woman Business Enterprise (WBE) or a Minority Business Enterprise (MBE) business in their certification letters. WBE and MBE designations are granted solely for the purpose of monitoring the availability and utilization rate of WBE and MBE businesses by the City and do not provide the certified firm with any additional discount or benefits. If the intent of the LBE program is to enable competitiveness of WBEs and MBEs, it would be important to pay attention to the equity implications of any changes delivered through this proposal.

Existing Programs/Policies that Address this Problem

Access to credit is a recognized barrier for participation in City contracts, and several initiatives address this issue. The San Francisco Community Investment Fund (SFCIF) has an existing Contractor Accelerated Payment Program (pilot). In addition, OEWD administers a number of City loan programs to support small businesses. The City has also maintained a Standby Letter of Credit in the past, a form that might align with this usage.

Program Overview

Proposed Solution, Goals, Intended Outcomes, and Beneficiaries

The City should consider changes to the LBE program to make it more effective, equitable, and suited to help support the City's recovery with a multi-pronged effort:

Expand the SFCIF Contractor Accelerated Payment Program (CAPP): The City could continue and expand the CAPP pilot program to provide funds to LBEs, so they can cover costs associated with the scope of work for City agreements until they are paid. Likely, the funds would be "rolled" until completion of the scope of work. Thereafter, the cash flow loan would be repaid through partial payments withheld from the City's scheduled progress

payments to the Prime or, if necessary, by withholding the full amount from the final progress payment of the agreement. There is also a need for more support and advocacy for small LBEs in the area of payment and in negotiating contracting with larger Prime contractors.⁴ The focus of the CAPP program is to assist firms primarily located in the City's most disadvantaged neighborhoods.

Adjust financial thresholds pertaining to LBEs: Micro LBEs are able to take advantage of City contracts that fall beneath the contract "threshold amount." In order to drive additional City purchasing to Micro LBEs, the current threshold amount of \$706,000 for construction and \$129,000 for professional services could be adjusted by the Board of Supervisors to allow departments to set aside a greater number of contracts under the threshold amounts. This change would allow these small firms to scale their San Francisco employee base, credit line, and bonding capacity.

Related, the City could raise the Maximum Economic Thresholds that govern which businesses are Micro and small LBEs. These thresholds are gross receipts limits, which a business must stay beneath to keep their LBE designation, and they are not tied to inflation. With a higher threshold, firms would be able to grow their business while still taking advantage of the contracting benefits of being an LBE.

Increase contracting opportunities for Micro and Small LBEs: The City should strive to increase contracting opportunities for Micro and Small LBEs to stimulate the economy through the multiplier effect of local spending and advance the City's equity goals. There are several strategies the City could pursue:

- Adopt "best value" procurement in more solicitations, which would allow the City to take into account if a contractor is willing to go above and beyond minimum requirements and demonstrate a commitment to the economic and social wellbeing of the community in which the project is located.
- Redouble each department's efforts to meet 50% Micro LBE Set-Aside contract procurement goals.
- Incorporate more Micro and Small LBE architecture firms into the developer teams during the entitlement phase or Notice of Funding Announcement ("NOFA") on City funded affordable housing projects or large development projects.
- Avoid the cancellation of any City contracts as a budget balancing measure that would significantly impact LBEs.
- Conduct additional outreach to LBEs on certification processes, contracting opportunities, and COVID-19 business support measures, including cost

reimbursement for safety measures on the job site. This outreach could be facilitated by local CBO's, merchant associations, and chambers of commerce and should seek to communicate opportunities to all eligible business owners, including those who do not speak English.

Disparity study: State Law does not currently allow for explicitly race-gender conscious procurement programs. However, should California Proposition 16 on the November 2020 ballot pass, it would repeal Proposition 209, and programs of this nature would be allowed. The City could fund a disparity study to ascertain what types of racial disparities exist in City contracting processes. Should this study find a disparity, it could serve as the basis for developing policies and programs to ensure that business owners of all backgrounds, especially those from vulnerable communities, are able to take advantage of opportunities to do business with the City.

Program Administrator(s) and Community Partners

These changes could be developed and administered by the Office of the City Administrator (Contracts Monitoring Division). The LBE Advisory Committee would be an important stakeholder for the proposed changes.

Timeframe

The CAPP component could be expanded with a scheduled report back in 12 months to validate efficacy. Some of the steps for increasing procurement opportunity could be delivered through direction to existing staff and begun quickly. The disparity study could be delivered in the current year. Adjusting financial thresholds would require changes to local legislation and take more time.

Cost

The CAPP component of this proposal would have minimal administrative costs. That effort would simply accelerate payment to LBEs and would not incur any additional cost unless a participating business defaulted on this loan. Other elements would require existing staff attention, and in the case of the financial thresholds legislative change, but not substantial additional costs unless consultants are needed.

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers

These potential program changes would require outreach to the LBE community to ensure all are aware of the program changes and can take advantage of the opportunities. All outreach should be linguistically and culturally responsive and intentionally aim to reach

WBE and MBE owners and entrepreneurs in communities of color—especially those firms located in our most disadvantaged neighborhoods (i.e. New Market Tax Credit Areas).

Program Burdens

Small business owners may need technical assistance to take advantage of the CAPP and this could take time and resources. Implementation should aim to make the uptake of improvements as hassle-free and easy-to-understand as possible.

Community Input and Partnership

Access to financial capital enables entrepreneurs and small business owners to start up their businesses, develop new products or ideas within their existing business, expand in scale or to a new location, or weather a period of depressed business by making up for shortfalls in operating capital. The business owners surveyed through a contractor development needs-assessment and business barriers survey indicated that increasing access to capital is a major component that the City could provide for increasing LBEs capacity and sustainability.

The Office of the City Administrator (Contracts Monitoring Division) should coordinate with TTX, OEWD, CMD, Risk Management, and the LBE Advisory Committee, as well as a diverse group of LBE owners to see how best to meet the demand for the proposed programs and policies.

Community Assets

Merchant associations, business improvement districts, community benefit districts, credit unions, Opportunity Fund, and the Mission Asset Fund are all community assets to build on.

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	Yes
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	No
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	Yes
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	No

Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	Yes
---	-----

If Yes, please briefly explain.

Implementing these policies and programs would be expected to expand access of LBE participants to City contracts.

The LBE Program expressly helps to eliminate barriers to winning contracts with the City at both the prime and subcontracting levels. This includes the use of LBE Prime bid discounts/subcontracting requirements as well as expansion of the contracting development program to include the implementation of the new Contractor Accelerated Payment Program (CAPP), which serves to bridge the credit/financing gap that LBEs—especially MBE and WBEs—are unable to cross.

Given the ability for CAPP to assist minority and women business owners from disadvantaged neighborhoods, these firms, in turn will hire residents from disadvantaged communities, thus help to improve the conditions of communities of color.

Additional Context

Select the type of solution this is:	Please “X” for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	X
New program or initiative	
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	X
Advocacy (supporting efforts bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	

Feasibility

Some pieces of this proposal would require legislation. Responding to the disparity study would require the passage of California Proposition 16 in order to allow racial considerations in contracting. Changing the LBE program would require amendments to the San Francisco Administrative Code Chapters 6, 14B, and 21.

1.5 Promote reactivation and consider adaptive reuse of buildings for a vibrant San Francisco

Problem Statement

The future of work is uncertain and close attention is needed to understand which changes are temporary and which may be more long-lasting. COVID-19 has caused a sudden and dramatic decrease in demand for office, hotel, and retail space. As firms direct their employees to work from home and the economy contracts, the City is expected to witness significant fluctuations in demand for large office buildings in the near future. To the extent any of these vacancies are not filled as the economy recovers, they could contribute to blight, further degrading the experience of our commercial districts and spurring further vacancies. Similarly, as tourism and convention travelers coming to San Francisco has significantly decreased, the demand for hotel rooms and retail space has plummeted.

At the same time, San Francisco continues to grapple with a severe shortage of housing, especially affordable housing and accessible housing, and the Production, Distribution, and Repair (PDR) space that can support blue collar jobs. Making changes to downtown uses could have lasting impacts on San Francisco's budget and economic potential, but if work patterns and office demands permanently change in the wake of the COVID-19 crisis, there could be an opportunity to make inroads into some of the city's most stubborn challenges.

Factors Affecting Communities of Color and/or Other Vulnerable Populations Differently

Communities of color tend to be lower income and have greater housing affordability challenges than the general population of San Francisco. Thus, these communities are more challenged by San Francisco's housing shortage and stand to gain more from the increased housing opportunities provided by converting hotel and office space into housing.

Additionally, the limited amount of PDR space in San Francisco has driven PDR businesses out of San Francisco to neighboring cities where this type of space is cheaper and more plentiful. Given that many of the blue collar jobs that PDR businesses support are held by people of color, the shortage of PDR space and the departure of PDR business results in disproportionate impacts to communities of color.

Existing Programs/Policies that Address this Problem

The ConnectSF scenario planning processes co-led by the SFMTA and Planning considered a future of work less dependent on in-person office presence. If the changes in office space demand appear to be lasting, the City could refer to those scenarios to identify opportunities for co-benefits and collaboration in transportation and other systems.

Program Overview

Proposed Solution, Goals, Intended Outcomes, and Beneficiaries

San Francisco should seek to preserve local businesses for both the jobs and revenue they deliver. If a COVID-19 vaccine or treatment is developed that allows for an economic recovery and resumption of the pre-COVID space needs in San Francisco, this proposal may be of limited value. However, if there is a lasting change in office and/or hotel demand in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic and if advisable for the overall health of the local economy, the City should consider incentivizing re-purposing of existing buildings.

Current zoning allows residential in all areas where office and retail exist, so the proposal would support and incentivize the conversion of office buildings and/or hotels and large retail to uses that promote equitable recovery, which could include affordable housing (or housing with high inclusionary levels), light manufacturing/place-based jobs to benefit BIPOC and immigrant communities, and other uses that face a shortage of space, such as cultural and community development programs. Any spaces adapted for housing have the potential to serve specific populations that may have different housing needs, such as artists.

The goals of the proposed conversions are to identify opportunities to produce more affordable housing and to create adequate space for good-paying blue collar PDR jobs for low-income San Franciscans, particularly BIPOC and immigrants, populations historically shut out the gains seen in recovery. The City should evaluate the feasibility of implementing local hire rules for the PDR jobs accommodated by space newly converted to PDR uses to maximize the benefit to San Francisco residents.

Before undertaking these steps, the City would need to assess whether the demand for hotel and office space will rebound as a COVID-19 vaccine is developed and the economy recovers. To the extent any of the changes in the economy are permanent and there does exist surplus space built for office, retail, or hotel uses, further analysis will be needed to identify the potential to produce housing or PDR space in existing buildings, applying currently available programs and tools (e.g., State Density Bonus Program, variances) and the need for new programs (e.g., Prop M refund). In addition, the City would need to assess the design feasibility (large office floorplates may not allow the light and air access required for residential units), market feasibility of conversion and potential public/private partnership models. The City may want to identify scenarios for long-term changes in office and hotel use and the potential impact of losing office job space.

It should be noted that conversion from a commercial use, especially hotel, to housing may result in a decrease in employment. In the case of hotels specifically, many of the positions are stable union jobs that are available to immigrants, people who speak English as a second

language, and people without extensive education. While these hotel conversions would likely occur in the event that demand for hotel space (and thus hotel employment) stays low, it is an important tradeoff that should be considered.

Program Administrator(s) and Community Partners

OEWD and Planning are best suited to lead this work. DBI would have purview over livability requirements for housing.

Timeframe

Permitting and construction to convert at a given site would take approximately three years, but the analysis about feasibility in the context of the City's overall budget and the sectors that support our economy would need to come first, allowing some time for the dynamics of the post-COVID economy to settle into a new long-term reality.

Cost

The studies associated with the economic feasibility analysis would likely require a consultant contract. Enabling the conversions would not have substantial costs, but public funds would likely be required to subsidize production of affordable housing and to incentivize PDR conversions.

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers

Any conversion from a commercial use, especially hotel, to housing might result in a decrease in revenue and employment that would need to be taken into account. In the case of hotels specifically, many of the positions are stable union jobs that are available to immigrants, people who speak English as a second language, and people without extensive education. While these conversions would likely occur in the event that demand for hotel space (and thus hotel employment) stays low, it is an important tradeoff that should be considered.

Most floor plates of larger office buildings are too big to meet light and air requirements for housing, which may incentivize conversions in smaller office buildings with smaller floor plates.

In buildings where the floor plates could accommodate residential uses, the City may need to provide additional incentives to convert Class A office space. Class B and Class C offices are generally considered more accessible and affordable for a greater variety of businesses, including nonprofits and BIPOC-owned businesses. Incentivizing the conversion of these types of office uses to residential may reduce the space available to these types of businesses and make it more challenging for them to remain in the City.

In certain Zoning Districts, office and hotel buildings also offer public benefits, such as POPOS and public art, that would need to be considered in any conversion.

Conversion to light manufacturing may need to be supported with other economic tools to ensure that vulnerable populations benefit, such as workforce development programs, business loans, or other business supports.

Development in San Francisco has been and will likely continue to be an expensive endeavor with mixed impacts on surrounding communities. Impacts on transit, traffic, schools, and other public amenities would need to be considered in an equity analysis. If these conversions came along with opportunities for collective ownership of the repurposed buildings, it could facilitate wealth creation and more broadly distribute the economic benefits of the conversion.

Community Input and Partnership

As of summer 2020, no budgetary analysis nor community input on adaptive reuse of office or hotel has been gathered. The feasibility analysis for the proposed policy changes should gather input from City budget staff and communities of color and/or other vulnerable populations to identify potential impacts.

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	Yes
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	N/A
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	No
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	Yes
Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	Yes

If Yes, please briefly explain.

By providing stable, affordable housing.

Additional Context

Select the type of solution this is:	Please "X" for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	X
New program or initiative	
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	
Advocacy (supporting efforts bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	

Feasibility

In the midst of the pandemic, it is difficult to know what immediate market reactions to the pandemic will become long-term trends. Vacancies in office may be short-term and tourism is expected to resume in coming years. Conversions can have significant impacts in the long-term. Such conversions would also not take effect for several years, so would not have an immediate impact on recovery. Feasibility of the effort for adaptive reuse will depend heavily on trends yet to emerge in the post-pandemic economy.

This proposal does not require further federal or state legislation.

1.6 Advocate for federal and state funding

Problem Statement

San Francisco will not be able to deliver on all the Task Force's recommendations on its own. The City needs support from the state and federal government, especially for larger investments and initiatives.

Program Overview

Proposed Solution, Goals, Intended Outcomes, and Beneficiaries

San Francisco should advocate at the state and federal level to support the recommendations of the Task Force in the following areas:

- **Rental assistance:** funding for renters or landlords to stave off an eviction crisis
- **Support for undocumented:** ensure undocumented immigrants benefit from state and federal programs
- **Health care for all:** health care should not be tied to employment considering huge loss in jobs during this pandemic and should include substance abuse treatment
- **Support for jailed and re-entering populations:** thoughtful transition planning for rehousing those that are reentering
- **Universal basic income:** provide dignity for all especially as the pandemic has decimated service industries and lower wage jobs
- **Internet for all:** funding to build a ubiquitous fiber-to-the-premises network to promote additional service competition to help ensure universal access to the Internet and help reach high-need groups
- **Food access:** continue and expand pandemic-linked benefits and waivers, and provide sufficient administrative funding

What Success Looks Like

Success for this proposal would look like significant state and federal investment in the priorities described above.

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers and Burdens

State and federal funding streams may have requirements, such as reporting, that present a burden for local agencies or nonprofit recipients.

Community Input and Partnership

Each of the advocacy areas above has many community partners that can amplify the City’s advocacy voice and support the impactful use of funds.

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	Yes
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	No
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	Yes
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	Yes
Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	Yes

If Yes, please briefly explain.

Additional resources to support the priorities above could help address racial disparities, advance full inclusion, and meaningfully improve the conditions of communities of color.

Additional Context

Select the type of solution this is:	Please “X” for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	
New program or initiative	
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	
Advocacy (supporting efforts bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	X

Feasibility

Advocacy will require ongoing time from staff and City leadership. The likelihood of success for federal funding may be dependent upon the results of the November 2020 election.

1.7 Partner with the business and philanthropic communities to deliver a strong and equitable recovery

Problem Statement

All of San Francisco's stakeholders will need to contribute in order for the city to recover from the current crisis in full. The City understands that a great many businesses – especially small businesses – are struggling to survive and support their workers. Numerous local interventions like waived fees, grants, paid leave, and technical assistance have been and will continue to be priorities for public support. However, the resources to stabilize every business and worker would amount to more than the City alone can deliver.

City leadership has already acknowledged the need for public private partnership to address the pandemic and established eligible uses related to COVID-19 priorities in its Give2SF charitable fund. Those uses include food security, access to housing, security for workers and small businesses, and youth programs. As of publication, \$28.8 million had been received, \$7.8 million directly to Give2SF and \$21.0 million through the San Francisco Foundation. Less than \$500,000 of funds received to date remained unallocated.

Difficulty accessing capital and wealth inequality remain barriers to recovery, especially in communities of color. According to UC Berkeley research on Oakland businesses, federal Paycheck Protection Program (PPP) loans have been relatively effective in keeping businesses with just a few employees afloat, but for those with more workers they have been less effective. Many minority-owned businesses were unable to access the loans and have less direct connections to access institutional capital.¹

The City must remain vigilant in its attention to the public health response to minimize future economic contractions. Additionally, partnership and investment are especially needed to help San Francisco achieve its long-term resilience and sustainability goals. Known priority areas for future investment include climate resilience improvements such as building energy retrofits and electric vehicle charging, zero waste, more sustainable trips, and a more robust urban forest.

¹ <https://www.vox.com/the-goods/21453298/small-business-cornavirus-consumers-bars-restaurants-navy-pier>, accessed 9/30/20.

Program Overview

Proposed Solution, Goals, Intended Outcomes, and Beneficiaries

San Francisco should identify opportunities for public private partnerships that can help the local businesses, workers, and residents recover in the short-term and deliver economic strength and resilience in the long-term.

To mobilize philanthropic contributions to the highest local priorities, the Mayor's Office should work with the San Francisco Foundation, other major foundations, and donor-advised funds to build a campaign that would deliver resources to businesses most in danger of shuttering and workers and residents most in need as a result of the pandemic.

Capital will be an essential ingredient in helping existing businesses to survive and reviving the economy with the businesses of tomorrow. The City should convene local financial leaders and public office holders to explore financial products and strategies that can help stabilize struggling businesses and incentivize new business starts. Products for existing businesses should offer long-term affordable rates without debilitating balloon payments. Products to support new endeavors should make short-term entrepreneurial risk affordable to stimulate activity. Public financing and neighborhood financial empowerment centers should be considered alongside options put forward by the private sector.

San Francisco will strive to build back better from this crisis, to deliver a more equitable and resilient city. The Office of the City Administrator (Resilience and Capital Planning) and Controller's Office (Office of Public Finance) should explore opportunities to finance resilience improvements through public private partnerships, informed by the priorities published in the Hazards and Climate Resilience Plan, the 10-Year Capital Plan, and the Climate Action Plan. The Business Council on Climate Change (BC3) and the San Francisco Department of the Environment could be helpful partners in identifying promising opportunities.

What Success Looks Like

Success for this proposal would look like opportunities for engagement for the partners discussed, collaborative problem-solving across public and private sector lines, and a clear action plan and resulting products for each stakeholder set. Ultimately this work should generate many investments that help fuel San Francisco's recovery.

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers and Burdens

The effort of convening partners and pursuing solutions should not itself create barriers or impose burdens on vulnerable communities; however, it will be important to work in

partnership with those affected by structurally disadvantageous financial policies and wealth disparities.

With regard to capital specifically, communities of color historically have not had the same access to traditional financial institutions and competitive interest rates. Without an investment in redressing this historical disadvantage, it will remain relatively difficult for business owners from neighborhoods with less access to capital to survive and recover.

Community Input and Partnership

It is essential that the City engage with those who face the challenges of limited access to capital and wealth inequality to understand their nuances and the likely impact (positive and/or negative) of proposed solutions. The Human Rights Commission can help strategize about how to gather and use community input.

Community Assets

Local credit unions, community banks, large and small employers, and local philanthropic organizations would all be important partners.

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	Yes
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	No
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	Yes
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	Yes
Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	Yes

If Yes, please briefly explain.

Planning for equitable public infrastructure investments that center environmental justice presents an opportunity for the public to engage directly with government and inform the shape of San Francisco’s future.

Additional Context

Select the type of solution this is:	Please "X" for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	
New program or initiative	X
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	X
Advocacy (supporting efforts bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	X

Feasibility

Coordination will require ongoing time from staff and City leadership.

This proposal does not require further federal or state legislation.

1.8 Create a child care system that meets the needs of families, educators, and the community

Problem Statement

Affordable child care is an essential component of San Francisco's economy and labor market. As San Francisco gets back to work, businesses and their workers need child care more than ever, but those businesses are at risk of failure. A recent survey of child care centers and Family Child Care (FCC) homes, conducted by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), found that just 11% of providers could survive a closure of an indeterminate length of time without government support—and only 27% could survive a closure of a month.² In the long-term, estimates are that COVID-19 could result in a permanent loss of 4.5 million child care slots nationally.³

Without additional public investments in child care infrastructure, San Francisco could risk creating child care deserts, where there is insufficient child care capacity to meet the demand.⁴ Child care deserts are more likely in low income neighborhoods where families cannot afford the full cost of child care, in neighborhoods with significant immigrant populations and for families with infants, children with disabilities, and families who need nonstandard hours. San Francisco does not have a high rate of child care deserts compared to national averages, but they do exist in some low-income neighborhoods and may be exacerbated by COVID-19 related facility closures.

While schools in San Francisco closed for in-person learning due to COVID-19, child care centers and Family Child Care programs have been allowed to remain open. Social distancing requirements have restricted most programs to just a portion of the number of children they served before the pandemic, exacerbating a child care shortage that was present well before COVID-19. Child care providers have reduced their hours and/or days to allow additional time for cleaning. Child care providers also have to purchase additional cleaning supplies, PPE, thermometers, and modify existing spaces to comply with new regulations without additional revenue or resources. Many of these providers operated with minimal resources and low pay (despite high education) before COVID-19 and now face increasing costs and decreasing revenues as they try to stay open.

² https://www.naeyc.org/sites/default/files/globally-shared/downloads/PDFs/our-work/public-policy-advocacy/effects_of_coronavirus_on_child_care.final.pdf

³ <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/early-childhood/news/2020/04/24/483817/coronavirus-pandemic-lead-permanent-loss-nearly-4-5-million-child-care-slots/>

⁴ <https://spotlightonpoverty.org/spotlight-exclusives/mapping-child-care-deserts/>

Without additional public investments, tuition rates would have to increase significantly, or facilities may be forced to close. During the phased-in process of reopening San Francisco's economy, child care providers will need continued financial support as temporarily reduced enrollments and enhanced healthy and safety procedures will reduce operating capacity.

Currently, local, state and federal assistance falls short of serving all families who are eligible for child care subsidies, and many more families who are not eligible for subsidies are heavily burdened by the cost of child care. Child care expenses are even further out of reach for families with more than one child requiring care. According to the Economic Policy Institute's Family Budget Calculator, child care costs are one of the most significant expenses in a family's budget.⁵

Even though child care can cost more than college tuition, by the time tuition fees are applied to all the expenses it takes to run a program, very little is available for the educators themselves. As a result, educators end up subsidizing the true cost of high-quality services with their low wages.⁶ Early childhood educators and childcare providers are underpaid, and many are financially insecure, living close to or below the poverty line, which places their own families at risk. When the cost of providing child care is more than most families can afford, it results in an imbalance between supply and demand.⁷

Factors Affecting Communities of Color and/or Other Vulnerable Populations Differently

Without affordable child care, women will be the ones most likely to stay at home, hurting gender equality gains. It is particularly difficult for low-wage workers—who are more likely to be women and, specifically, Black or Latinx women—to afford child care.⁸ For a full-time, full-year minimum wage worker anywhere in California, child care costs as a share of income far exceed the recommended affordability standard of 7% of income. Studies have shown that in neighborhoods without adequate supply of affordable child care centers, women's labor participation rate are 3 percentage points lower than those neighborhoods with adequate supply. Immigrants, Latinx populations, families with infants and children with disabilities, and families needing nonstandard hours are more likely to experience insufficient child care availability.

Early childhood educators are almost exclusively women, 40% of whom are people of color. Compared to K-12 and postsecondary educators, early child educators are the most racially diverse sector of the teaching workforce. However, early childhood educators are among

⁵ <https://www.epi.org/resources/budget/>

⁶ Cooper 2019

⁷ <https://cscce.berkeley.edu/why-do-parents-pay-so-much-for-child-care-when-early-educators-earn-so-little/>

⁸ <https://cscce.berkeley.edu/racial-wage-gaps-in-early-education-employment/>

the lowest paid educators. In 2017, the median hourly wage in California was \$12.29 for childcare providers and \$16.19 for preschool teachers, compared with \$38.33 for kindergarten teachers. Child care providers often do not have health insurance or benefits that elementary school teachers enjoy. In California, early childhood educators are six times as likely as K-12 teachers to live in poverty, and 58% of childcare workers rely on some sort of public benefit, such as Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC), Medicaid, Food Stamps, and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF). Black early educators are 50% more likely to live in poverty than their white peers.⁹ These low wages are at odds with the skills and knowledge required for the job and undermine their ability to deliver high quality early childhood care and education.

Existing Programs/Policies that Address this Problem

There is no existing state or federal COVID-19 stimulus program that explicitly supports child care providers. The Paycheck Protection Program provided as part of the CARES Act stimulus funding passed by Congress in 2020 has been difficult for childcare providers to access and has run out. Small early care and education centers and FCCs have had particular challenges. Those that have received loans have often not received as much as they requested and have significant concerns about taking on additional debt or repaying loans because of decreased income.¹⁰ Child care employees may be eligible for Unemployment Insurance or Pandemic Unemployment Assistance, but they have reported difficulty accessing the funds.

The [CARES Act also](#) included \$3.5 billion in supplemental funding for the Child Care & Development Block Grant (CCDBG), which states are using to increase the number of families served through the child care subsidy system.¹¹ While this increase is already improving access to quality child care, a much larger investment is needed to fully fund high-quality child care.

Through Give2SF funding, OECE is providing an FCC Emergency Operating Grant for Early Learning Scholarship (ELS) qualified Family Child Care programs who have lost revenue due to COVID-19. Small FCC awardees will receive a one-time \$5,000 grant and Large FCC awardees will receive a one-time \$10,000 grant. OECE is also issuing an Emergency COVID-19 Closure Grant for ELS qualified FCC programs who close due to a family member (living at the FCC) or owner testing positive for COVID-19. Like the previous FCC grant, Small FCC awardees will receive a one-time \$5,000 grant and Large FCC awardees will receive a one-

⁹ Gould, Whitebook, Mokhiber, & Austin, 2019

¹⁰ https://www.naeyc.org/sites/default/files/globally-shared/downloads/PDFs/our-work/public-policy-advocacy/child_care_and_the_paycheck_protection_program.pdf

¹¹ <https://www.ffyf.org/issues/ccdbg/>

time \$10,000 grant. These programs are a crucial lifeline for those FCCs who qualify, but do not address the ongoing financial needs of child care providers as a result of the pandemic.

There is also no existing state or federal COVID-19 stimulus program that explicitly assists families to access child care. However, San Francisco's ELS provides financial assistance to pay for quality early care and education to eligible San Francisco families with children 0-5 years old. Families receiving the scholarship may need to pay a fee, which is determined by income and family size.

San Francisco's Preschool For All (PFA) Tuition Credit program helps provide universal access to preschool to all 4-year-olds in San Francisco. PFA is open to all families regardless of need or income. Families may receive a tuition credit of up to \$4,440 annually for reduced-cost or free half-day preschool (depending on the setting, Center or FCC) for up to 3.5 hours a day or as a tuition rebate to help reduce full-day preschool costs. Families pay the difference between full tuition cost and tuition credit they receive. Given the cost of childcare in San Francisco, the tuition credit covers approximately 25% of full-time preschool tuition for one child.

The Compensation and Retention Early Educator Stipend (CARES 2.0) was created in partnership with First 5 San Francisco to support early educators in San Francisco to recognize the value of early educators and acknowledge the economic challenges they face in one of the most expensive areas to live in the nation. OECE is set to distribute \$30 million between 2019-2021 to educators employed at City-funded licensed family child care and center-based programs in San Francisco. Stipends are approximately \$6,000 per year.

Program Overview

Proposed Solution, Goals, Intended Outcomes, and Beneficiaries

San Francisco should utilize future federal stimulus and/or CDBG funds to create a COVID-19 Child Care Relief Program to:

- Provide very flexible supplemental grant funds to daycare providers. The relief fund would build on the existing Emergency Operating and COVID-19 Closure Grants provided by the Office of Early Care & Education to provide flexible funds for pandemic-related reductions in revenue or increased costs. The funds could be used to support a range of expenses related to ongoing operations or reopening a facility, including payroll, rent, mortgage, utilities, insurance, restocking food, provide hazard pay and health benefits to employees, purchasing supplies and equipment (for cleaning/sanitation, PPE, thermometers, items to create social distance in play

spaces, new toys and materials that allow for rotation of items in play spaces, etc.). Funds could also be used to provide financial relief to families who cannot afford full tuition rates or who must keep children home from daycare temporarily.

- Provide low interest or forgivable loans to child care providers to increase capacity. Because rent is a significant fixed cost for childcare centers, the City could also assist with rent subsidies or providing new facilities for existing centers to expand their operations in City-owned buildings with more affordable rents. Some early care and education programs, especially those operating out of homes, may need additional space to allow them to bring in enough children, within currently allowed ratios, to bring in sufficient revenue.
- Increase the PFA program tuition credit amount and make it applicable for 3-year-olds to make childcare more affordable for low-income families.
- Expand the income eligibility for Early Learning Scholarship and the scope and amount of the CARES 2.0 stipend.
- Create a workforce training program to address the shortage of qualified childcare providers and early childhood educators.
- The City should also explore strategies to support a larger vision of seamlessly connecting low-income families to all public benefits for which they are eligible.

The Child Care Relief Program should provide realistic, clear, and consistent health and safety guidelines for operating child care and early education facilities (e.g. closure, social distancing, ratios) with training and assistance to child care providers to implement the guidance. The guidelines should reflect the realities of child development and behavior.¹²

The City's two Resource and Referral agencies, Children's Council of San Francisco and Wu Yee Children's Services, would also encourage businesses to provide child care solutions for employees, including stipends, on-site child care, and referral services.¹³ Businesses and philanthropic organizations would be encouraged to support public investment in our child care infrastructure while also advocating for universal public child care. Finally, state and federal advocacy is needed for public investment in child care infrastructure and universal public child care- our whole state's and country's economy depends on the viability of childcare programs.

¹² <https://cscce.berkeley.edu/recommendations-for-the-stabilization-and-survival-of-the-essential-early-care-and-education-sector/>

¹³ <https://www.childrenscouncil.org/why-child-care-matters/recovery/>

The goal of this program would be to adequately fund early childhood education and create a secure child care system that meets the financial, health, educational, and wellbeing needs of early childhood educators, children, and the community.

What Success Looks Like and Measures of Success

This program would be successful if every child care facility in San Francisco had the resources it needed to reopen safely, protect the health of workers, children and families, and remain financially solvent while paying their teachers a wage commensurate with their expertise and experience. All families would be able to easily access affordable, quality early childhood education and child care.

Program Administrator(s) and Community Partners

This effort would be led by OECE and First 5 San Francisco, DCYF, and OEWD.

Timeframe

This program should begin immediately and be ongoing but needs resources.

Cost

This is a costly, but urgently needed program. Future federal stimulus and/or CDBG funds may be used to fund this program, reducing the impact to the General Fund. However, there are many demands on federal funding, so this program will have to be prioritized. Because this is a nationwide crisis that significantly impacts the recovery of our nation's economy, there are growing calls to address this issue specifically as part of future federal relief packages, and San Francisco should advocate for that.

Business and philanthropic organizations may also contribute to this effort. Businesses especially have an interest in availability of child care so their workers can return to work. Donated PPE and cleaning supplies could also be directed to child care facilities to ease the burden of purchasing it themselves.

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers

This program is anticipated to be in high demand and will be needed by many families and providers, so the city must develop eligibility requirements that provide the greatest support to the most families and providers.

There may be barriers to accessing tuition subsidies for families who don't speak English well or don't have a computer or a bank account. It is especially important to ensure that undocumented immigrants and essential workers will be able to access these subsidies.

Child care providers and FCCs may be challenged to apply for additional assistance given the increased day-to-day demands of running child care facilities in the new pandemic environment. City staff and community partners may need to help walk clients through the process of applying for this program.

A lack of qualified childcare providers and early childhood educators and fair pay for their work is also a barrier to expanding services and San Francisco should consider creating a workforce training opportunity/pathway addressing this gap and providing a quality job at the same time.

Program Burdens

Families and child care centers may be burdened in accessing financial support. The program design should ensure that it reaches all targeted families and providers with minimal bureaucratic burden.

Community Input and Partnership

Community input to help better understanding specific needs of child care providers, impacts of increased demand, communities most impacted by lack of child care, and the impact of lack of child care on the city’s economic recovery. This information would help create a stronger, more targeted program and increase chances of securing funding. Business and philanthropic organizations should be included as partners to increase the number and amount of grants available.

Community Assets

Partnership with businesses and philanthropic organizations would increase the resources available for this program.

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	Yes
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	No
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	Yes
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	Yes

Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	Yes
---	-----

If Yes, please briefly explain.

Access to early childhood education and quality child care supports children’s development and prepares them for kindergarten, ensuring all children start their education on an equal footing. Parents, especially low income, who have child care are able to fully participate in the economic, social and cultural life of San Francisco and support their families.

Additional Context

	Please “X” for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	
New program or initiative	
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	X
Advocacy (supporting efforts that are bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	X

Feasibility

These programs already exist, but need additional funding to expand services.

Legislation is not needed to implement this program, but state and federal legislation that provides additional relief money specifically for childcare and early education programs would allow the City to provide more direct support to families and educators.

2. Job Connections

2.1 Centralize the City's workforce development programs

Problem Statement

The City of San Francisco administers 292 unique workforce development programs across 17 City departments, cumulatively serving over 26,000 participants. These programs target a range of participants and run the gamut from light touch services focused on developing resumes and interviewing skills to intensive skill development trainings to temporary placement in apprenticeships and paid work experiences. Chapter 30 of the Administrative Code established a Committee on Citywide Workforce Alignment (CCWA) in 2014, designating the OEWD as responsible for tracking information about these programs and chairing the Committee. From 2018 through 2019, the CCWA was co-chaired by OEWD and HRC and consisted of several departments with significant workforce development programming working to identify areas for coordination and alignment among programs. Chapter 30 and the CCWA sunset in 2019.

At this time, there is no single point of entry or information for a member of the public to identify what workforce services are available across all departments, or eligibility requirements for existing programs. In addition, apart from an annual Workforce Inventory of aggregate client data across departments, there is no program-level monitoring of outcomes for a majority of the City's 292 workforce development programs.

Challenges for the City's ability to advance impactful workforce development in this context include:

- Workforce services across different departments that are at times both overlapping and fragmented.
- A lack of a big picture citywide workforce development strategy as many departments do not have access to the data and models to inform effective workforce development programming, nor the infrastructure to track outcomes.
- A confusing and uncoordinated system for accessing workforce services. Interested participants can only access services through the department that administers a given program, and departments rarely refer candidates across programs. This siloing leads to significant gaps in information about what programming is available and inequities in access to relevant programming.

Factors Affecting Communities of Color and/or Other Vulnerable Populations Differently

The brunt of the impact from the current system's challenges is borne by vulnerable communities, particularly communities of color. They have the least exposure to strong career pathways, face the most systemic impediments to accessing quality job opportunities, and have the least access to the time, technology, networks, and resources necessary to navigate a confounding system. With few alternatives, these communities are likely to turn to non-traditional "gig-economy" work. This is a market that is often informal and unregulated, with few of the protections needed to ensure good pay, benefits, and opportunities for advancement.

A 2018 analysis of statewide workforce development programs found that although male and female participants went on to find a job at similar rates, males earned a higher median wage than females across programs.¹ The report also found that several race/ethnicity trends across programs. Black program participants had a median wage less than the program median in every year for every program. Latinx participants earned less than the program median in all but one program. Black program participants also went on to employment at a rate lower than the program average in all but one program.

The ramifications of COVID-19 on the economy and the nature of jobs and work will exacerbate the shortcomings of San Francisco's existing workforce development system. There will likely be a massive spike in demand for workforce services as an unprecedented number of individuals seek re-employment after wide-spread layoffs. These job-seekers will likely disproportionately represent workers who were not at all or were marginally attached to the workforce, as well as low-wage workers from the restaurant and hospitality industries. Evidence suggests that these job seekers will represent communities of color and other marginalized communities who face more turnover in their employment and are more represented in industries unable to offer remote work options and so were more likely to have lost employment during COVID.

These jobseekers will require clear and coherent ways to identify workforce programs that are available to them and will require more intensive workforce training programs offering rapid re-training in relevant industries. Workforce services themselves will need to rapidly pivot in order to understand and respond to the needs of a social distanced economy and impart services and trainings in a virtual format effectively.

Existing Programs/Policies that Address this Problem

On August 3, 2020 the Budget and Legislative Analyst's Office (BLA) released an audit of the City's Workforce Development System, including the CCWA. The report noted the value of the CCWA remarking: "Given the continued decentralization of the administration,

oversight, and funding for workforce development programs across the City, the value of ensuring ongoing, formalized coordination as provided through the CCWA seems clear.” It noted the CCWA’s success in collecting and analyzing data on workforce programming and client outcomes through an annual Citywide Workforce Services Inventory, making improvements to the Inventory, and providing an important mechanism for collaboration and data tracking. The BLA also noted the challenges in standardized and consistent data tracking across so many different departments and programs. Towards that challenge, the Report offered the following recommendations:

- The Board of Supervisors should adopt legislation reauthorizing the CCWA, under the leadership of OEWD. This reauthorization should include the expansion of the CCWA to include the Department of Public Health and the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, to join the existing membership of: representatives from the Mayor’s Office, the Board of Supervisors, the Human Services Agency, the Department of Children, Youth and their Families, the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, Human Rights Commission, Department of Human Resources, and the Department of Public Works. This reauthorization should be adopted without a sunset date.
- The Director of OEWD should work with the CCWA Data Working Group to expand the Annual Workforce Inventory to include program-level information and actual expenditures, as well as un-duplicated client counts, where possible.
- The Director of OEWD should present the estimated costs and a proposed implementation plan to enhance the Annual Workforce Inventory to the Board of Supervisors no later than January 31, 2021.
- The Director of OEWD should work with the CCWA Data Working Group to continue to identify opportunities to provide training and technical assistance to department staff completing the inventory template to ensure quality data collection.

Program Overview

Proposed Solution, Goals, Intended Outcomes, Beneficiaries

In order to respond to the needs of the current moment, the City should re-constitute the CCWA, co-chaired by OEWD and the Human Rights Commission, to establish a comprehensive workforce development strategy, centralize the coordination of workforce development programs and establish one point of information and entry for all of the City’s workforce development programs.

The following are priorities to address:

- Consider implementation of the BLA Audit’s recommendations for workforce alignment and data collection.
- Use Labor Market Information to understand what jobs are viable in SF post-COVID in order to ensure that workforce programs are preparing people for jobs that exist and offer meaningful pathways for financial security.
- Examine innovative infrastructure to protect and facilitate the gainful employment of jobseekers that engage in "irregular work" or non-traditional flexible hourly work, including novel ideas like a public marketplace for hour-by-hour work.
- Confer with industries to understand the skill requirements for jobs and develop programming that imparts these skills.
- Incorporate an assessment for jobseekers to understand what skills and experience they bring and how those qualifications transfer to jobs or workforce services that are appropriate for them based on their interests.
- Invest in workforce services that connect participants to career opportunities and upward mobility.
- Employ workforce development models that are proven to be effective and lead to a tangible outcome.
- Ensure that any interested jobseeker, particularly one with significant barriers to employment, is easily able to understand and access any workforce development program available to them.

Beneficiaries of this effort would include workforce clients, CBOs, and businesses. Workforce clients would be able to know which services are available, identify those that correspond to their needs and interests, and receive the appropriate level of support in order to facilitate their overall success. The robust network of CBOs that deliver workforce services would be able to increase their outreach and connection to a pool of participants best served by their programs and facilitate stronger inter-organizational awareness and connections to support their success. Businesses would benefit from more responsive programming imparting skills they need for their operations.

What Success Looks Like and Measures of Success

Success would look like more people aware of and accessing workforce services, more effective programs that progress participants along a trajectory towards their workforce goal, and improved placement into jobs with higher wages and/or explicit career pathways. More specific measures include:

- Development of public facing portal for all workforce development programs
- Standardized assessment that evaluates a jobseeker’s work readiness and/or workforce needs in order to connect to appropriate jobs or workforce services
- Adoption of City Workforce Development Strategy that is supported by labor market information and vetted by industry, labor, City departments and community representatives
- Alignment of City workforce programs to City Workforce Development Strategy
- Alignment with HRC’s racial equity strategies for economic equality, including community-informed program delivery
- Evidence of progression through workforce programs by participants with tangible skill increases and evidence of increasing work readiness
- Increased hiring outcomes
- Tangible wage progression by workforce participants
- Positive feedback and responses by job seekers about experience and outcomes in workforce services
- Outreach and engagement strategies that ensure the participation rates of vulnerable populations reflect their higher need
- Adherence to the City’s standards for design, including content, design of the interface, and accessibility standards for workforce services as evaluated by the Office of the City Administrator (Digital Services). Coordination with Digital Services would help to ensure an integrated approach that makes multiple City services accessible, including those that may not be directly about workforce but of high value to the same users.

Program Administrator

The reconstituted Committee on Citywide Workforce Alignment, Co-Chaired by OEWD and HRC

Community Partners

- Workforce CBOs
- Labor
- Worker Advocates
- Jobseekers

- Employers

Timeframe

Creating a comprehensive City Workforce Development Strategy, a portal or system for the public to access information, and a standardized assessment tool is envisioned as a one-year project. Support to City departments to align programming to the City's Workforce Strategy, maintain and update the tools and support an iterative evaluation and improvement process for workforce programming would be ongoing.

First year:

- Portal for City Workforce Development programs
- Economic analysis and stakeholder engagement to identify viable industries and new skill requirements in post-COVID economy (i.e. digital literacy)
- Creation of City Workforce Development Strategy
- Assessment tool for jobseekers work readiness and workforce services needs
- Guidelines for delivery of workforce services in virtual context

Second year:

- Assessment of where existing workforce programs fall within City's Workforce Development Strategy
- Gap analysis identifying redundancies and areas for additional programming
- Coordination of workforce programs to fully realize City Workforce Development Strategy
- Refinement of workforce programming based on outcome evaluation and community feedback

Cost

Year 1: \$675,000

- New position – \$200,000
- Workforce program portal – \$150,000 (minimum)
- Economic analysis contract – \$150,000
- Creation of an assessment tool – \$75,000
- Technical assistance for City departments/CBOs for effective virtual service delivery – \$100,000

Year 2: \$550,000

- Continued position – \$200,000
- Portal maintenance and updates (Digital Services) – \$50,000
- Evaluation and community stakeholder feedback contract – \$200,000
- Technical assistance to CBOs – \$100,000

Year 3: \$450,000

- Continued position – \$200,000
- Portal maintenance and updates – \$50,000
- Evaluation and community stakeholder feedback contract – \$100,000
- Technical assistance to CBOs – \$100,000

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers

Communities of color and vulnerable populations disproportionately participate in workforce services and disproportionately lack access to digital equipment and connectivity as well as support to navigate fragmented and inefficient program information. These communities also have the narrowest exposure to career options and the least support in mapping existing skills to viable career pathways.

Centralizing information about workforce services and creating an assessment tool directly addresses these barriers. Once information is consolidated into one intuitive system, that resource can be marketed directly to targeted communities as a “one-stop shop” for the City’s workforce development offerings. While these tools are envisioned to live online, it will be important for them to be compatible with mobile devices and to ensure that they are widely used by City departments, nonprofit organizations, and other entities that offer direct services to these communities so that a robust support and cross-referral network is activated around this resource.

In order for these tools to achieve their intended purpose, it will be critical that they are intuitive, streamlined, available in multiple languages, and culturally appropriate so all San Franciscans make use of them. Likewise, they must offer relevant and accurate information about workforce programming that responds to what the individual is looking for.

Program Burdens

There may be concern about the centralization of workforce strategy creating more administrative processes and bureaucracy, thereby limiting access to programming. It is

important to clarify that this proposal is not suggesting that the City eliminate existing entry points to its many workforce development programs, but rather offer these programs the tools to more easily meet the needs of potential participants. Programs would benefit from labor market information on viable jobs, a standardized assessment tool, and a centralized portal.

Community Input and Partnership

Through multiple stakeholder processes including community meetings across various departments in order to plan and get feedback for budget and RFPs, as well as through the Workforce Alignment Community Advisory Committee, the City has heard from workforce nonprofit organizations as well as participants in those services. That feedback has clearly expressed a need for a streamlined way to access the City's workforce programs, better information about job opportunities that are viable in San Francisco, and more explicit connections directly to meaningful employment outcomes. These points have been particularly emphasized as a need for non-English speaking communities and jobseekers that face specific barriers to employment such as individuals re-entering from incarceration and people experiencing homelessness.

The Office of Racial Equality, educational institutions, workforce development organizations, labor, employers, and coalitions that represent and advocate for workers or jobseekers, and jobseekers from targeted communities should be consulted in design and implementation.

Community Assets

OEWD can build on San Francisco's extremely robust network of nonprofit organizations established and trusted within their communities throughout the City, existing workforce development expertise, and evidence-based models in community and throughout City departments.

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	Yes
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	No
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	Yes
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	Yes
Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	Yes

If Yes, please briefly explain.

Developing a standardized assessment and one point of access to all programs will eliminate barriers to workforce services and lead to more widespread access to relevant workforce programs. Creating a Comprehensive Workforce Development Strategy that articulates growth industries and occupations in San Francisco and more explicitly maps workforce services to those pathways will lead to stronger outcomes for participants in workforce services, which are disproportionately communities of color. Stronger employment pathways for workforce participants will begin to reduce racial disparities in economic stability and allow San Franciscans to realize their full career potential and provide the basic underpinnings necessary for full inclusion.

Additional Context

Select the type of solution this is:	Please "X" for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	
New program or initiative	X
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	X
Advocacy (supporting efforts bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	

Feasibility

This plan builds upon existing City workforce development infrastructure (Committee on Citywide Workforce Alignment), making it relatively easier to implement in terms of expanding on existing efforts. However, coordinating and aligning strategy across many different departments can be challenging and time consuming. Also developing the digital resources described would require labor that is in high demand due to the pressure citywide to digitize processes.

This proposal does not require state or federal legislation.

2.2 Provide culturally competent, accessible job training with career connections for marginalized and laid-off workers, particularly ACHE sector workers

Problem Statement

Since San Francisco's March shelter-in-place order, the local workforce has decreased by over 100,000 workers. The arts, culture, hospitality, and entertainment sectors are expected to have a slower economic recovery than other sectors, leaving many workers without an opportunity to return to their job and/or industry in the near future. These sectors disproportionately employ women, people of color, and immigrants and these jobseekers will need to connect to opportunities in different industries that may require new skills that meet the demand of the current and future job market.

Factors Affecting Communities of Color and/or Other Vulnerable Populations Differently

Prior to COVID-19, communities of color, specifically Black and Latinx workers had a significantly higher unemployment rate than any other race/ethnicity throughout the City. As many as 49,000 undocumented immigrants live in San Francisco and face significant barriers to employment and income generation. Seniors and workers with disabilities experienced more barriers to employment and had fewer opportunities for employment than the average worker. Additionally, women comprised a larger share of low-wage jobs and higher rates of poverty, especially women of color. Youth, age 16 to 24, that are just entering the workforce with little prior work experience often have fewer opportunities for gainful employment. The aforementioned disparities of these vulnerable communities – Black, Latinx, immigrants, seniors, disabled, women, and youth – have only been exacerbated since the start of the pandemic. These workers are often the last in and first out at their places of work and experience discrimination in the hiring process.

Existing Programs/Policies that Address this Problem

OEWD's workforce system is designed to serve communities through culturally competent Job Centers. Job Centers are located throughout San Francisco to address the needs of specific jobseekers. They provide job search assistance, supportive services, 1:1 support, and soft skill development. Jobseekers who attend their community Job Center are connected to job opportunities through OEWD's jobs boards and hiring events. Moreover, they are connected to workforce training programs in the construction, healthcare, hospitality, and tech sectors. Currently OEWD is working to meet the needs of the changing workforce environment through union taught pre-apprenticeship programs and additional supportive services for individuals changing careers.

At the state level, the California Workforce Development Board invested in the High Roads Training Partnership (H RTP) Initiative to increase the California workforce system's ability to address equity, job quality, and sustainability, and to meet the need for in-demand skills. This initiative, originally a campaign, became a \$10 million demonstration project that modeled partnership strategies throughout the state. The Initiative is an industry-based and worker-focused program that focuses on building skills for California's High Road employers, businesses that compete based on their quality of product and service achieved through both innovation and investment in human capital. These training opportunities are pathway to employment with buy-in from employers, unions, and workers. Current H RTP industries include:

- Distributions and Logistics
- Janitorial
- Healthcare
- Hospitality
- Port Public Sector
- Public Transit
- Water

The H RTP currently exist throughout the state and has overarching definitions in guidelines that are not area specific. There are specific industries, employers, and unions that offer more or less opportunities depending on the area. Moreover, there are programs locally that are not in a single repository and are not all coordinated.

Many of the City's Workforce Development programs have long-standing partnerships with educational institutions, both K-12 and Higher Education. Currently OEWD's Workforce Development Division, DCYF youth workforce programming, and other City workforce programs partner with SFUSD in order to offer and inform supplemental career exposure, work-based learning opportunities, etc. as well as building pipelines to skill building programs for students to access industries such as Construction and Waste Water Treatment, IT and Technology, and others. Additionally, the City's Workforce programs partner closely with Adult Educational Institutions such as City College and SFSU to provide supported training and apprenticeship programs for industries such as Healthcare, Construction, and Technology as well as offering support and assistance to allow students to access and thrive in these educational institutions.

Program Overview

Proposed Solution, Goals, Intended Outcomes, and Beneficiaries

Existing sector training and job placement for both OEWD and H RTP may not fully address the needs of the workforce climate as it has dramatically shifted over the past six months and continues to shift.

To address the needs of the shifting workforce, the City should provide jobseekers, with priority to marginalized jobseekers, in-demand job training at scale that connects directly to good-paying sustainable career pathways with benefits. This can be achieved through:

- Creating a Citywide Workforce Development Strategy, as mentioned in proposal 2.1, that is responsive to the unique needs of the pandemic, and in partnership with community, employers, and unions. Similar to H RTP, this plan would address San Francisco's specific workforce and job market needs and outline how to align and coordinate departments, industries, and unions to work in conjunction to create career pathways and job opportunities for San Franciscans, with specific focus on the most vulnerable San Franciscans.
- Expanding pre-apprenticeship training programs in construction and non-construction sectors. Pre-apprenticeships train workers to be apprentices in in-demand industries – an earn while you learn model – that are usually union careers. City departments currently run pre-apprenticeship programs. For example, OCEIA's DreamSF Fellows Program is a one-year fellowship for college-enrolled undocumented immigrants that promotes professional development and helps people gain professional skills in partnership with 15 nonprofits that do immigrant support work. The City should create and expand programs that build on current successes.
- Shifting training programs to address skills needed for current, in-demand job opportunities. The City should conduct an industry analysis to identify industries that are hiring and those that are taking more time to recover from the COVID-19 crisis. The City's publicly funded training programs should align with industries that are hiring or in need of entrepreneurship to directly reflect a pipeline that gets trainees to work or start their own businesses, co-operatives, and social enterprises. Moreover, the City should reevaluate programming in industries that are not set to recover in the near future. The City should also take into account which industries and careers will help meet the needs of a thriving multiracial and multiclass city. For instance, the City could promote industries that help it reach its climate goals, such as building electrification and energy efficiency. Attention should also be given to the quality of the jobs (living wage, benefits, and worker protections).

- Offering more paid training opportunities. The City should offer and encourage more paid training programs where feasible. Paid trainings allow for greater participation, less burden for the student, and barrier removal for individuals who may not have been able to afford to participate without being paid.
- Strategically delivering accessible training, allowing for both in-class learning that is safe for students and teachers, as well as online learning. Currently, public health guidelines reflect that not all trainings/learning should be in person, and it is important that City trainings remain accessible whether held in-class or online, as appropriate. When trainings are done in-person they should abide by local health guidelines and take all necessary measures to advance public health and safety. When trainings are done online, attention should be paid to the digital needs and barriers of the potential participants.
- Building out more union partnerships for training programs to provide career pathways. There are training models, especially pre-apprenticeships, that have direct relationships with unions, such as the CityBuild pre-apprenticeship construction training program. More training programs should build off this model to allow more workers to have quality job opportunities. This would require cultivating union relationships and unions being a part of the training programs.
- Connecting all new training programs to direct career/entrepreneurship opportunities upon program graduation, prioritizing those marginalized in the job market. For training programs to meet one of their intended results of placing individuals in to careers, they need to foster direct relationships with employers. Employers should be able to interact with students and offer learning throughout the training. This connection would prepare students and promote job opportunities upon graduation.
- Targeting outreach and support services for vulnerable communities to improve participation and completion of programs. This effort could include marketing materials, family-friendly schedules, soft skills support and childcare assistance. Programs could also form peer support groups for women and other marginalized participants to give opportunities for building a network wherein participants assist each other and thereby increase success rates. Moreover, programs could feature worker's rights education to protect these vulnerable populations, as they are disproportionately impacted by labor law violations. The City should partner with trusted community-based organizations to conduct this work, as some vulnerable populations, especially undocumented immigrants, can lack trust with City agencies.
- Align workforce programs, SFUSD, and adult educational institutions so that participants can easily access meaningful learning opportunities, training,

credentialing, and certificate programs. Educational partners are a critical component to a successful and comprehensive workforce development strategy. Workforce development should be seamlessly integrated into SFUSD programming for those students who want to build skills in in-demand industries within San Francisco. Likewise, workforce development programs and adult educational institutions should align so that participants in workforce programs can easily and efficiently access meaningful training, credentialing, and certificate programs that allow them to build the skills necessary to access and advance in competitive professions. Specifically, workforce development and educational institutions should map connection points and develop strategies to create streamlined, modular programming that allow participants to benefit from a fully articulated pathway that offers short-term skill building and credentials while allowing participants a recognized foundation from which to build skills over time.

Specific goals for the aforementioned measures include—

- Deliver high-quality trainings that yield high placement rates for careers specific to the training received.
- Less “churn”/Fewer recurring workforce system participants in OEWD workforce trainings because of more successful placements.
- Program participants reflect the vulnerable populations most impacted by COVID-19, and the success rates for job placement are high for these populations.
- Community, union, and employer buy-in for industry specific trainings.

With these recommended measures, jobseekers would have access to trainings that would allow them to reskill and pivot industries or upskill to advance in their current industry. This would create more job opportunities for the jobseeker. Businesses would have access to a larger pool of trained workers that would be able to perform the skills necessary for their job opportunities. Finally, unions would be able to expand training programs to build out a more skilled workforce and support more workers.

Hand in hand with these efforts to support jobseekers, San Francisco should acknowledge and seek ways to support the needs of businesses so that they can hire. Those needs can be expected to evolve over time depending on the course the pandemic takes, and the City will need to work closely with small and large businesses, philanthropy, and financial partners to develop strategies to keep local job creators viable. These efforts could include tax incentives, direct investment, and/or other strategies to encourage job creation in San Francisco.

What Success Looks Like and Measures of Success

Success would be measured by:

- More in-demand workforce training/entrepreneurship programs
- Increase of employer and union partnerships for training programs
- Percentage of workforce training participants and placements that are job seekers from vulnerable populations
- Amount of paid and unpaid training opportunities
- Workforce training programs' graduation rate
- Indentured union members upon graduation from union-involved workforce training programs
- Job placement relevant to the job training received

Program Administrator(s)

This work would be spearheaded by OEWD in partnership with other City departments. There are over 250 workforce programs administered by 17 City departments, and this proposal would take coordination from all of them.

Community Partners

- Employers of in-demand industries
- Unions with in-demand workforce
- Community Based Organizations
- Jobseekers

Timeframe

These recommendations would take approximately one year to implement.

In the first six months:

- Begin to shift training programs to online platforms when appropriate
- Identify viable industries and new skill requirements in post-COVID job market
- Assess how current programs address current workforce needs
- Work with community, employers, and unions to draft overarching workforce plan similar to HRTP to address community workforce needs and job market needs

- Communicate to the California Workforce Board the needs addressed in workforce plan and how to shape workforce programs to address those needs
- Advocate for trainings to be paid trainings

In the second six months:

- Build out new workforce programs
- Create additional pre-apprenticeship workforce programs
- Build union and employer relationships for industries identified in workforce plan
- Adapt all workforce trainings to be sustainable in post-COVID environment

Cost

Proposal elements requiring no additional costs:

- Shifting training programs to address skills needed
- Building out more union partnerships for training programs
- Connecting all new training programs to direct career
- Creating an overarching pandemic workforce program initiative

Proposal elements requiring costs:

- Delivering accessible training
- Expansion of pre-apprenticeship training programs
- Offering more paid training opportunities

The cost for training programs differ by department and rely on the on the size, amount, duration, and type of training programs. This will all have to be taken in to account to give specific figure on how much this will cost per training program.

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers

Black participants make up 31% of all OEWD workforce development participants, followed by Asian/Pacific Islander and Latinx at 29% and 22% respectively and then white at 12%, with Indigenous people making up 1% of participants. Outcomes measured as placement of participants into employment tend to show equitable results across racial demographics with Asian/Pacific Islander and Black participants exceeding the overall placement rate of 50% (63% and 59% respectively), white participants matching the overall placement rate, and Latinx participants obtaining employment at a slightly reduced rate (45%).

In order for the City to promote equitable economic outcomes for its most vulnerable and marginalized populations, it would need to pursue a larger analysis of all workforce programs to determine if participation and outcomes mirror these findings (see Proposal 2.1). However, the preliminary findings indicated in the review of OEWD workforce programs, suggests that the focus of workforce programs should be in expanding and continuing to develop articulated career pathways into high-quality job opportunities for the participants and the CBOs delivering workforce services.

That said, a major barrier for vulnerable populations in participating in training to employment programs is a lack of income during the program. Additional paid training programs would help reduce the financial burden of re-skilling or up-skilling.

Additionally, there are unique barriers for women. Occupational segregation, bias, and the burden of caregiving often fall on women, contributing to the persistent gap in earnings, economic security, and retirement security for women of color. Moreover, women tend to be clustered in training programs for occupations that often have lower wages (such as hospitality), while men make up the majority of participants in construction and skilled trades training programs that offer higher earnings and more favorable employment prospects. In order to ensure women (especially women of color and trans women) are not left behind in the recovery, the City should make an intentional effort to increase women's participation and success in existing workforce programs in construction and skilled trades and technology.

Finally, undocumented immigrants do not have access to the same spectrum of supports and workforce opportunities as other populations and need supplementary local support. Pre-apprenticeship and fellowship programs offer a model of training and income generation for immigrants without status. Fellowships can last several months or a few years and are most commonly connected with educational attainment and professional development.

Community Input and Partnership

Throughout the process of creating this proposal there was feedback from community based organizations led by people of color, who discussed how to best serve the communities they serve and represent. Being intentional about serving vulnerable communities in the overarching pandemic workforce plan was raised as an important component of delivering equitable workforce development efforts. As this program is further developed, these CBOs would be consulted and engaged to ensure the program design addresses the barriers and burdens of vulnerable populations.

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	Yes
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	No
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	Yes
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	Yes
Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	Yes

If Yes, please briefly explain.

There are currently disparities amongst vulnerable communities in the job market. This proposal focuses on serving the most vulnerable, providing training, and having the training lead to direct job opportunities. This proposal aims to address barriers to program participation such as addressing financial needs and program accessibility. Offering paid training and online trainings addresses these barriers. This plan reflects the creation of creating career pathways to provide long lasting employment for individuals participating in workforce programs.

Additional Context

Select the type of solution this is:	Please “X” for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	
New program or initiative	X
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	X
Advocacy (supporting efforts bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	X

Feasibility

This plan would build upon existing City workforce development infrastructure, making it relatively easier to implement in terms of expanding on existing efforts. However, it is expected to be time-consuming given the scope of work detailed in the plan and the high number of stakeholders involved. Also, dramatic shifts in the local economy trailing the COVID-19 pandemic may make workforce development generally and job placements in particular more challenging than in the recent past.

This proposal does not require federal or state legislation.

2.3 Strengthen implementation of the First Source Hiring policy

Problem Statement

Since March, almost 200,000 San Franciscans have applied for Unemployment Insurance or Pandemic Unemployment Assistance. Preliminary data additionally shows that a significant number of people have moved out of area or otherwise left the labor force. While many businesses will re-open once the Stay-Safer-At-Home Order is lifted, economic predictions expect a long-lasting recession and slow return to full employment. The projected job market disadvantages jobseekers with less experience, especially those age 16-24 years old, and more barriers to employment as over-qualified individuals compete for and fill jobs that might otherwise be available to a broader range of candidates.

Factors Affecting Communities of Color and/or Other Vulnerable Populations Differently

According to analysis by the Economic Policy Institute, in the second quarter of 2020, African American workers had the highest unemployment rate in California, at 18.3%, following by Hispanic workers (at 18.1%), Asian workers (at 14.2%), and white workers (at 13.5%).¹ These numbers are likely low given they do not take into account those who are undocumented or self-employed operating out of their homes who can no longer operate, like private childcare. The post-COVID job market will exacerbate an already inequitable overall employment structure vulnerable to both implicit and explicit bias and overly reliant on educational credentials to assess a candidate's relevance for a job opportunity. The culmination of these factors has disadvantaged communities of color and youth who have less access to education, even when that same candidate may have equal or greater relevant experience. These barriers also keep workers with disabilities unemployed, as employers may avoid employees who might need accommodations and are perceived as more costly. Alternatively, young people, age 16 to 24, who have had little time to acquire work experience and thus have difficulty securing employment requiring previous experience, will face long-term disadvantages due to the lack of opportunities in the current job market.

Existing Programs/Policies that Address this Problem

In response to regional competition for San Francisco jobs even prior to COVID-19, the City enacted "First Source Hiring" and "Local Hire" legislation. Both of these ordinances require a preference be given to disadvantaged San Franciscans by any business that is benefitting from doing business with the City in different contexts. Local Hire is specific to construction projects that the City solicits while First Source largely focuses on leases, contracts for goods or services, and conditional use allowances extended to businesses within the City to operate outside of zoning requirements. Disadvantage persons are defined differently

under each ordinance, but similarly include low-income folks, targeting those experiencing or at high-risk of unemployment or reliance on public assistance, and those previously or currently involved with the criminal justice system. First Source explicitly includes individuals participating in vocational ESL programs, formerly homeless individuals or those experiencing homelessness, single parents, and those without a high school diploma or GED. Local Hire explicitly includes those involved with substance abuse programs, domestic violence survivors, people with disabilities, and veterans.

Despite overlapping target populations, the two ordinances have significant differences in their requirements, largely as a result of the different types of jobs legislated by each one and the associated systems for tracking information related to those jobs. For projects that have direct City investment, the City is able to implement mandatory hiring requirements that employers hire a pre-determined percentage of their workforce from San Francisco residents. Because Local Hire applies exclusively to construction projects (direct investment), the City is able to anticipate the hiring requirements and create responsive training programs in order to ensure that there is a pool of qualified candidates and leverage the certified payroll system that the construction industry uses to monitor compliance with requirements.

The general nature of the First Source Hiring Policy and its application to projects in which the employer is “deriving a benefit” but not receiving a direct investment from the City means there is a larger pool of employers obligated and a much broader range of positions sourced. This breadth results in difficulties requiring specific hiring targets and monitoring compliance through third-party systems. Rather, the City relies on “Good Faith” efforts to hire disadvantaged San Franciscans from the City’s workforce system and employer self-reporting. These aspects of First Source correspond with a lower rate of hiring workforce system participants and less transparent monitoring.

At the time of its implementation, the First Source Hiring Ordinance was groundbreaking in its intent to impose legislated hiring requirements on private sector actors to undercut the bias and systemic barriers that kept disadvantaged communities from gaining a foothold in the job market. Now, more than twenty years after its enactment, the City is gaining insight into what has worked and what has kept disadvantaged San Franciscans from access to job opportunities. For example, increasing access to entry-level job opportunities without a corresponding emphasis on retention or promotion leaves the promise of a foothold unrealized. Participation and buy-in from employers are not automatic. A consistent notification and accountability framework for City departments would help achieve greater compliance with the ordinance.

The Board of Supervisors Budget and Legislative Analyst has recently released a performance audit report on the City’s workforce programs, including First Source Hiring and Local Hire.

Program Overview

Proposed Solution, Goals, Intended Outcomes, and Beneficiaries

By addressing known challenges and applying the best practices and lessons learned through the implementation of this and other comparable policies, the City can better realize the initial intent of First Source and create more economic opportunity for disadvantaged San Franciscans.

The City should expand its First Source Hiring policy and its implementation of that policy in order to realize more tangible benefits for San Francisco jobseekers. This effort should:

- Ensure that job opportunities are made available to disadvantaged San Franciscans.
- Link graduates from training programs to relevant jobs in that field or industry.
- Borrow from the successes and learning lessons from the City’s Local Hire policy to more fully realize the potential outcomes from the First Source Hiring policy.

OEWD, the City’s First Source Hiring Administrator, has identified challenges to the implementation of this policy, made refinements to the administration of the policy, and generated ideas for strengthening and expanding this policy including:

- Ensuring consistent understanding of First Source Requirements by contracting agencies within the City and developing systems to automatically notify OEWD of employers obligated to First Source Hiring
- Creating consistent expectations about “good faith” efforts for complying with First Source obligations and clear consequences for lack of “good faith” efforts
- Ensuring expediency in administration of the program to eliminate hiring delays for businesses seeking to comply
- Expanding requirements to track retention and wage growth in addition to initial employment, including demographic data to ensure most vulnerable populations are being served equitably
- Developing incentives to increase participation and buy-in among employers
- Establishing systems for more consistent compliance tracking
- Linking training programs to First Source employment opportunities more directly

It will take a broader effort of internal and external stakeholders to review the policy and recommend improvements to its implementation for the City to attain the buy-in, coordination, and creativity necessary for meaningful change. By convening a working group of stakeholders to review this policy and its implementation, OEWD can generate a comprehensive strategy for improving the First Source Hiring Policy.

Vulnerable San Francisco-based jobseekers with limited education and subject to passive or active discrimination in the hiring process would be beneficiaries of this effort.

What Success Looks Like and Measures of Success

Success would look like increased employment opportunities for and hiring of disadvantaged San Franciscans. This could be measured by the number or percent of hires made from all of the City's Workforce programs, and tracking retention and wage progression over time of First Source hires.

Program Administrator(s) and Community Partners

OEWD would work with community members, businesses, and elected officials to strengthen First Source Hiring.

Community partners include current or potential First Source employers, workforce service providers for vulnerable communities, and worker advocate groups.

Timeframe

Recommended changes to policy and implementation practices could be ready in six months, with implementation to follow. The effort's schedule should allow sufficient time to engage community partners to vet and offer input into refining policies and implementation practices.

Cost

The initial cost would be existing staff time to assess policy and implementation for strengthening, convening stakeholders, and proposing recommendations. To pursue expanded implementation and compliance, there would likely be a need to hire additional First Source compliance staff.

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers

The First Source Hiring Policy is designed explicitly to reduce barriers to hiring for communities of color and other vulnerable population who face lack of access to and discrimination within the hiring process. Strengthening this program would help ensure that it meets its intent.

Program Burdens

The most significant burden for vulnerable communities is the risk of attaching stigma to First Source candidates by associating them with a hiring requirement and a program to create opportunity for “disadvantaged” job-seekers. It is worth noting that this is the same risk that is often referenced in arguments against Affirmative Action and has been debunked in that context. In order to ensure that this is not a risk within the context of First Source, it is critical to engage employers within the process for making recommendations, ensure that messaging about the program is very thoughtful, and track outcomes closely in order to monitor and adjust as necessary if unintended consequences are noted.

Community Input and Partnership

OEWD has been administering the First Source Hiring Program for over a decade and has solicited and received a great deal of feedback about the program from individuals, community-based organizations, and advocacy groups who identify themselves and/or represent communities of color and other vulnerable populations. This feedback has come from direct personal experiences with the program from jobseekers and CBOs, as well as feedback given during community meetings, partner meetings, and advocacy meetings. OEWD’s administration of the program has been responsive to date. However, formal participation of these stakeholders should be a part of implementing the recommendations described above.

The following stakeholders should be consulted in design and implementation to ensure success and equitable program outcomes:

- Current or potential First Source employers,
- Current or potential First Source candidates
- Workforce service providers (CBOs)
- City departments that generate a great deal of First Source obligations
- Worker advocate groups
- Stakeholders with direct experience participating in Local Hire

Community Assets

- A robust network of CBOs and City departments that comprise the City’s workforce system and offer a broad range of services and training that can be linked more directly to First Source employers
- A great deal of first-hand experience and lessons learned from similar programs that can offer direct insight into strategies for strengthening First Source Hiring.

- A strong and sophisticated advocacy community that has nuanced insight into specific barriers that need to be addressed in order for disadvantaged jobseekers to successfully connect to employment and the policies that have been successful in addressing these barriers.

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	Yes
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	Yes
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	Yes
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	Yes
Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	Yes

If Yes, please briefly explain.

Strengthening the City’s First Source Hiring would reduce racial disparities in access to jobs and reduce racial profiling and bias in hiring outcomes.

Additional Context

Select the type of solution this is:	Please “X” for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	
New program or initiative	
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	X
Advocacy (supporting efforts bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	

Feasibility

This proposal is feasible as it builds upon existing policy and associated programs already administered by the City. It proposes to strengthen that program using proven successes and learning lessons from other City policies and through a stakeholder-driven community engagement process. This proposal does not require further federal or state legislation.

2.4 Expand subsidized employment and hiring program – JobsNOW! and arts-specific

Problem Statement

COVID-19 has exacerbated the financial strain on many San Franciscans and unemployment has increased by nearly 500% since February 2020. This financial strain is set to continue as Additional Pandemic Compensation for unemployment insurance benefits ended on July 31. In addition, some industries are slow to return to work or still remain closed or at substantially reduced operations, and many workers are not connected to new job opportunities. The individuals who are most impacted by the pandemic – minority, senior, disabled, and low-income workers – are the same workers who held disproportionate unemployment rates prior to the COVID pandemic.

Factors Affecting Communities of Color and/or Other Vulnerable Populations Differently

Many minority-owned businesses were financially strained prior to COVID-19, and this has been exacerbated by the pandemic as revenues decreased significantly while expenses like commercial rent remain high. These businesses often lack access to capital from financial institutions. Employers in recovering/growing industries, especially small businesses, are incurring this financial strain while operating their business and trying to employ their workforce.

Existing Programs/Policies that Address this Problem

To address the Great Recession, the San Francisco Human Services Agency (HSA) launched the JobsNOW! subsidized employment program in 2009 as a Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program component in the American Recovery & Reinvestment Act stimulus. The program aimed to assist local businesses, reduce unemployment, and pump dollars into the economy. This program now continues with both TANF, state, and local funding. The program primarily serves individuals on CalWorks (TANF), General Assistance benefits, CalFresh (SNAP), public housing residents, foster youth and justice-involved. Among participants served from 2011 thru 2016, an analysis of EDD quarterly earnings data shows that 59% of these participants are still working three years after exiting subsidized employment. For clients placed from July to December 2018, 60.3% were employed six months after exit, at an average of \$7,822 for the quarter. The average participant earned \$3,864 six months prior to being placed through JobsNOW!, marking a 202% increase over their pre-JobsNOW! earnings.

At the federal level, in 1996, congress passed the Small Business Jobs Act which created the Work Opportunity Tax Credit (WOTC). The federal tax credit was temporary, has been

extended many times, and still exists today. The tax credit is a firm-level credit intended to help workers from disadvantage groups receive a job by incentivizing employers.

Program Overview

Proposed Solution, Goals, Intended Outcomes, and Beneficiaries

The City should expand the JobsNOW! subsidized employment program to prioritize:

- Providing more subsidized job opportunities. With the unemployment rate at 10.9% as of July 2020, the JobsNOW! program will need a supply of job opportunities to better reflect the needs of the workforce. HSA should expand the overall number of JobsNOW! participants placed in private-sector employment next Fiscal Year to 1,300 participants (up from 187 in Fiscal Year 2019), with a focus on serving the most disadvantaged San Franciscans. This program should continue to receive resources to support additional participants in subsequent years, as needed.
- Providing job opportunities to in-demand jobs with career pathways post-subsidized employment. Currently, JobsNow! offers the following tiers to private-sector employment, without prioritization on the number of placements in different tiers:

Tier	Hourly pay rate requirements	Employment hours requirements	Subsidy
Private-Sector Wage Subsidies			
Part-time jobs	\$16.07+	20-31 hours per week	\$625 per month for 6 months (\$3,750)
Full-time jobs, Tier I	\$16.50 - \$18.49	32+ hours per week	\$1000 per month for 6 months (\$6,000)
Full-time jobs, Tier II	\$18.50 - \$24.99	32+ hours per week	\$1500 per month for 6 months (\$9,000)
(NEW) Full-time jobs, Tier III	\$25+	32+ hours per week	50% of wages for 6 months
(NEW) On-the-job training positions Jobs at businesses with no revenue post-COVID, Jobs at new businesses, Jobs at businesses restarting after shutting-down	\$16.07+	Flexible	100% of wages for the first 3 months, 50% of wages for the 2 nd 3 months

HSA should focus on supporting jobs that offer a sustainable living wage with benefits for JobsNOW! program participants, and working with employers with a strong track record of respecting worker's rights. This would require emphasizing job placements that continue after the employer subsidy and jobs that have opportunities for upward mobility to build a career. The industries in which private-sector placement occurs should reflect in-demand industries that align with OEWD's sector training strategies based upon industry analysis. Moreover, where possible, the City should prioritize jobs that address community needs and public goods such as education, healthcare, housing, and community development.

- Providing online application, enrollment, and job opportunities. Given COVID-19 public health restrictions, each step of the subsidized employment process, before starting work, should be offered via phone, internet, and in-person when appropriate. All three are recommended because we recognize that public health and safety are a priority, and we recognize that many program participants' access to internet and technological skills vary. Providing phone, internet, and in-person access when needed allow for more equitable participation from workers.
- Lowering barriers for small businesses and jobseekers to participate. Jobseekers are often deterred from participating in programs when the application, enrollment, and hiring process consists of a lot of paperwork and/or time. The same applies for small businesses that do not have a large amount of staff to fill out items necessary for participation. Streamlining the application, enrollment, and hiring process for jobseekers and businesses would help. This may require focus on online systems/digital access to allow employers and jobseekers easy access.
- Extending outreach to unemployed people so they are more aware of job opportunities. JobsNOW! conducts extensive outreach to the tens of thousands of working age individuals who are on HSA's public assistance caseloads. There are many jobseekers who are newly unemployed, not on public assistance, in need during this time, and do not know the JobsNow! subsidized employment program exists.

A robust marketing plan should be undertaken to reach all vulnerable communities, including internet ads, ethnic and neighborhood media outlets, coordination with the San Francisco Workforce Hotline, EDD, City departments, and Community based organizations, and material reflecting changes made to the JobsNow! program. Moreover, outreach should be in multiple languages to expand the reach. Some immigrants fear applying for public assistance due to public charge restrictions. In order to reach vulnerable populations, HSA should to conduct outreach through

community based organizations that are trusted by this population. This would allow for more connectivity to other departments' program participants and access to new jobseekers that have not previously participated in City programs.

- Focusing on reaching communities that are the most vulnerable, especially those jobseekers with more than one marginalized identity. Currently it is a requirement that San Franciscans receive one of HSA's benefits in order to participate in the JobsNow! Program. In the current job market, many who have been laid off of work do not know they can receive benefits or do not receive benefits even if they are in dire financial need.

Workers should have access to the JobsNow! program as long as they meet the income threshold for benefits. If an individual is not receiving HSA benefits, they should not be excluded from the JobsNow! Program. Additionally, Job Centers across City neighborhoods and managed by various community based organizations should continue to conduct linguistically appropriate, culturally-informed outreach to marginalized communities.

- Creating local workforce employer tax credits and advocating for additional tax credits. Currently there are two local San Francisco tax credits for employers, the Clean Technology Payroll Tax Exclusion and the Film Production Incentive. There are no local tax incentives for employers to hire local target populations. There is currently a federal tax credit, the Work Opportunity Tax Credit (WOTC), that incentivizes hiring veteran, criminal justice involved, community residents, and SNAP benefit recipients. This program provides up to \$9,600 in tax credits for employers.

The City should explore the creation of local employer tax credits for hiring vulnerable workers. The WOTC program can be a useful model. San Francisco should also advocate for state and federal employer incentive tax credits that are specific to hiring local disadvantaged workers back in to the workforce.

- Consider the needs of ACHE sector workers. In addition to this JobsNOW! effort, OEWD, the Arts Commission, and the Office of the City Administrator (Grants for the Arts) should consider a employment program tailored for ACHE sector workers that stabilizes the creative economy, akin to the Creative Corps proposal submitted to the California Recovery Task Force. In San Francisco the program could focus on employing artists for public communication related to San Francisco's COVID-19 recovery (see Proposal 3.1 for details on an envisioned campaign and other potential creative work), and to help people connect and cope. This could include public health communication/marketing campaigns, public art projects, temporary activation

projects, Health Order education, and design and construction of outdoor dining spaces. The program should prioritize living-wage work, programming for BIPOC ACHE workers and communities, and connecting workers with projects/jobs in their neighborhoods.

The goals for the aforementioned measures are to:

- Remove program barriers for jobseekers and employers to participate.
- Have more program participants, jobseekers and employers, and reach more vulnerable workers.
- Deliver more high-quality jobs that offer sustainable employment for workers post-subsidized employment.
- Incentivize employers to hire more workers.

Beneficiaries would include vulnerable jobseekers -- especially those heavily impacted by COVID-19 or who may not have received access to employment without the JobsNOW! Program and employers, whose hiring costs would be cut and ability to hire and train staff would grow.

What Success Looks Like and Measures of Success

Success would be measured by:

- Number of high-quality subsidized jobs
- Number of employers assisted to reopen or sustain their businesses during the recession
- Percentage of jobs retained post-subsidized employment
- Percentage of jobs with a livable wage
- Number of jobseekers placed in employment
- Number of jobseekers from disadvantaged communities placed in employment
- Percentage of participants who reflect vulnerable populations
- Cost savings to employers to sustain their business

Program Administrator(s) and Community Partners

HSA currently administers the JobsNOW! subsidized employment program and will continue to administer the program. HSA is currently working to assemble their advisory board with the following program partners – OEWD Workforce Division, Office of Small

Business, California Employment Development Departments, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, merchant associations, and private employers.

OEWD would work towards creating employer incentive tax credits in partnership with other City departments. The advocacy of state and federal incentives would be spearheaded by OEWD and the Mayor's Office.

OEWD, the Arts Commission, and the Office of the City Administrator (Grants for the Arts) would explore a tailored employment program that stabilizes the creative economy. Health care organizations could be potential funding partners.

Timeframe

Program changes could begin immediately. The first step in this process would be for the various lead departments to outline goals/outcomes that will steer the program. This process has started to take place and can be further guided by this document.

Cost

To implement the expansion of JobsNOW!, HSA will need additional funding. The program costs per participant are \$9,000 - \$20,000 depending on the wages. Funding will also be needed to expand outreach, raise participant wages, implement remote application/enrollment process, and conduct additional employer engagement.

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers

Not all potential program participants are aware of JobsNOW! The proposal recommends expanding linguistically and culturally responsive outreach and engagement in partnership with State/City departments and organizations. This will allow for further reach beyond HSA program participants.

Accessibility of the program can be another barrier. Allowing participants, employers and jobseekers, to access the program via internet, phone, and in-person would create a program that meets employers and jobseekers where they are at, removing program barriers and additional paperwork.

Community Input and Partnership

Representatives from community-based organizations on the Economic Recovery Task Force provided feedback throughout the creation and development of this proposal. Their feedback is reflected in the proposal in multiple ways, including the calls to provide more high-quality opportunities (including being intentional about worker retention post-subsidy); to provide remote application, enrollment, and job opportunities to cut paperwork and

reduce sometimes overwhelming processes; and to lower barriers for small businesses/job seekers and focus on the most vulnerable with outreach and user-centered processes.

The following groups should be involved in this proposal’s implementation—

- HSA
- OEWD
- Local Chambers of Commerce
- Community based organizations
- Merchant Associations
- San Francisco Office of Small Business

Community Assets

This proposal should lean on feedback from CBOs, local Chambers of Commerce, and Merchant associations in addition to the City departments. This would allow for community and vulnerable populations centered programing that guides the desire outcomes and achieves the desired outcomes for this proposal.

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	Yes
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	Yes
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	Yes
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	Yes
Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	Yes

If Yes, please briefly explain.

Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic communities of color, specific black and brown communities, experienced a disproportionate unemployment rate. The unemployment rate for these communities has been exacerbated by the pandemic. The subsidized employment and employer workforce incentives meets these disparities head on by providing accessible job opportunities to communities that have traditionally been left behind. This proposal also looks to advance employment opportunities, through subsidies/incentives, for workers and employers who have been on the receiving end of discrimination. This proposal aims to break down barriers to programming by enhancing accessibility and awareness via marketing, removing that you have to be an HSA program participant while keeping financial requirements intact, and providing remote application, enrollment, and employment opportunities.

Additional Context

Select the type of solution this is:	Please "X" for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	
New program or initiative	X
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	X
Advocacy (supporting efforts bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	

Feasibility

The JobsNOW! program already exists, and this recommendation expands the program and uses an infrastructure that is currently in place. Expansion of the program and identified focus areas is reliant on additional program funding. Creation of local workforce tax incentives must be based on community, labor and business feedback, and analysis of the local economic impacts. Obtaining the data necessary to drive this local incentive may be burdensome.

This will not take additional legislation; however state and federal dollars can assist in expansion of the JobsNOW! program should there not be sufficient local funding. Tax incentives locally will not take need federal and state measures.

3. Promote Safe Reopening

3.1 Provide clear, concise communication in multiple languages to diverse business sectors on reopening and recovery from COVID-19

Problem Statement

Businesses and nonprofits, particularly small, neighborhood-based ones, need clear guidance and support from City government to navigate the COVID-19 crisis. Unclear communications and changing requirements disproportionately impact small businesses, which do not have the same in-house capacity as larger businesses to adapt business plans, apply for financial assistance, and tap business networks for support. Also, there are certain business sectors – particularly ones that are not as well-organized – disproportionately affected by health mandates, and lack of clear, concise communication further damages their long-term viability.

Though multiple City agencies have been in communication with various business sectors, there remains confusion about requirements and opportunities because of the shifting landscape, overly technical language, and multiple locations where documents live. Communities of color have been disproportionately impacted by COVID-19; especially in the Mission, Bayview, Tenderloin, Sunnysdale, Potrero, Chinatown, SOMA and Fillmore neighborhoods. Targeted outreach and communication to businesses in these neighborhoods is needed.

Many small businesses are not connected to strong networks and therefore get left behind in accessing City information. This is particularly true in neighborhoods that do not have Community Benefit Districts (CBDs), Business Investment Districts, or robust commercial corridor managers.

ERTF community research found “businesses are struggling navigating through all the different programs, grants and loans. And once receiving the service, they have issues navigating the rules behind some of these services, (i.e. PPP loans). Language barriers make it difficult for businesses to navigate all the grant and loan programs.”

According to the Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs (OCEIA) [Language Access Ordinance 2020 Report](#), around 20% of San Franciscans identify as Limited English Proficient (LEP). The report also states that, while departments are meeting the LAO (Language Access Ordinance) requirements, there is a trending decline in service provision for LEP (Limited English Proficiency) clients. Some factors of this decline can be attributed

to “poor in-language outreach, inconsistent data collection methodologies, lack of bilingual staff or growing fear of using City services due to anti-immigrant federal policies.”

The City’s Emergency Operations Center (EOC) has translated all vital information regarding COVID-19 in the required languages: Spanish, Chinese, and Filipino. They also added capacity for Vietnamese, Russian, and Arabic translations. While the EOC is doing its best to strategize and implement immigrant-focused outreach, these efforts are still not enough to cover all of the harder-to-reach LEP residents of San Francisco, particularly those without access to computers or other digital devices. It is clear that more robust, in-language outreach is needed.

According to a survey done by the SF Entertainment Commission in May 2020, 24% of respondents had not used City resources to receive guidance and/or financial assistance during the COVID-19 emergency, and yet the entertainment industry has been among the hardest hit.

Factors Affecting Communities of Color and/or Other Vulnerable Populations Differently

There are many commercial corridors that are not robustly organized or connected to networks that would help businesses access information. These corridors are in historically under-invested neighborhoods that are majority communities of color.

Research from CAST (Community Arts Stabilization Trust) found that for businesses to survive the pandemic, they must be able to adapt business practices and space use, rely on new business partnerships and models, and have technological capacity. Under-resourced neighborhoods were already undercapitalized before COVID, and therefore are disproportionately impacted. They need to have access to information, support, and resources. CAST also documented that organizations that serve the Black and Latinx communities are the most financially impacted by the pandemic and at risk of displacement. A lack of trust between vulnerable populations and City government is exacerbated by confusing and/or not regularly updated City government websites and general confusion about how to access to support and programs.

In addition, a survey of Filipinx businesses done by Kultivate Labs in April, found that 50% of food businesses had a 80-90% drop in revenue and 54% had laid off employees. In retail businesses, 70% had a 90% drop in revenue, with 43% laying off employees. And most importantly, 75% of Filipinx-owned small businesses will be insolvent in three months.

There is a digital divide that disproportionately affects communities of color, immigrants, small businesses owners, and limited and non-English speakers. About 1 in 8 residents still lack high-speed home Internet service. Additionally, basic digital literacy can be a challenge for the very populations we are trying to reach. As a result, a multi-channel, multi-lingual

approach will be core to this work. Significant outreach and marketing should be implemented, so that people and businesses who are traditionally left out are included from the beginning of the process.

Existing Programs/Policies that Address this Problem

Currently, there are multiple communication pathways including the Joint Information Center (JIC) at the Emergency Operations Center (EOC), SF Office of Small Business, OEWD (Invest in Neighborhoods’ “Opportunity Neighborhoods”), DPH, and MOHCD. OEWD has published a [one-stop website](#) with COVID-related information for businesses. The Office of the City Administrator (Civic Engagement & Immigrant Affairs) runs a Community Language Bank that can help City departments and community-based groups connect with their constituencies. The City’s Digital Services team has also established writing standards that reduce City communication to a fifth grade reading level. [These standards](#) ensure that our communication is easier to understand, search for online, but also translate into multiple languages. The City is also working to streamline information on its sf.gov website.

Program Overview

Proposed Solution, Goals, Intended Outcomes, and Beneficiaries

The City needs a concerted effort to provide clear, concise communication to diverse business and nonprofit sectors on the following topics:

- Health safety, i.e. how to keep employees and customers safe, required physical changes for health safety
- City services and programs, i.e. the use of outdoor space, eligibility for City services
- City financial support, i.e. grants, loans, business tax deferrals
- Connections to non-City government support, i.e. partnership opportunities
- Connections to State and Federal financial assistance programs
- Technical support to guide small businesses through recovery processes
- Updates on economic and pandemic outlook so that businesses can make projections

The City should pilot and test multiple multi-channel campaigns to evaluate efficacy. Standards should include that public communication be delivered in multiple languages, at a fifth grade reading level, and be concise, culturally specific, and contain specific information tailored for neighborhood business sector needs. This communication initiative should rely on robust outreach that relies on diverse modes of media including ethnic outlets, radio, digital advertising and local community-based organizations’ networks, particularly those

used by non-English speakers. In addition, the City should partner with private sector professionals who have connections and relationships in communities needing more outreach.

Digital communications should be consolidated for ease of access and clarify the benefits and program eligibility. Digital communications should integrate with existing channels, such as the 311 call center, email, social media, and text messaging. Additionally, these efforts should expand non-digital engagement including signage, flyers, and other media.

In addition, creative methods to bring in disconnected business owners, particularly those from historically vulnerable communities, are necessary. Supporting existing merchant associations to be more inclusive with their membership policies would help owners without brick and mortar storefronts participate. Also, because every business has its own culture and needs in its overall operation methods, it would be beneficial to have more one-on-one support.

The overall goal of this effort would be to reduce confusion and deliver up-to-date information to local stakeholders in a user-friendly, accessible, understandable way.

What Success Looks Like and Measures of Success

Success for this effort would mean that local and other resources are fully accessible to and easy to find for a diversity of businesses, particularly those owned/managed by people of color and limited and non-English speakers. Success would also be measured by the use and usefulness of the information, as quantified by number of visits and qualified by reading ease (5th grade reading level standard).

Stakeholder input via survey, constituent interviews and/or other feedback mechanism would be helpful to gauge that success and make improvements to our engagements on an ongoing basis.

Program Administrator(s) and Community Partners

This effort would be led by the COVID Command Center (CCC) and coordinated with OEWD, the Office of the City Administrator (Digital Services, Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs) and the various departments involved in business permitting, regulation, inspections, and grant-making, as well as community partners with language and cultural capacity.

Timeframe

This pro-active coordinated, multi-lingual communication strategy could begin immediately with the dedication of staff time and resources, and it should continue through the COVID-19 emergency.

Cost

Depends on scope for communications.

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers

“Covid-19 made it harder to outreach to our community. Many folks are not getting information.” CBO focus group participant, September 2020

The City has over 58 different departments. Each department, and sometimes even each program or division within departments, have their own websites, outreach, and communications staff. Due to the decentralized nature of our communications, it can be difficult to coordinate and ensure all information is aligned across City agencies. Additionally, each department often has limited resources to develop and share materials. Communities of color and/or other vulnerable populations are historically under-resourced and in the most need for information and support. If innovative and culturally appropriate outreach methods are not used, businesses with the greatest needs and the most vulnerability will not be able to access key information about economic recovery and health safety. City departments do not often have the staffing or resources to individually provide this level of outreach.

Program Burdens

A comprehensive communication campaign would support communities of color and/or other vulnerable populations and remove the burden of digging through confusing information to find resources.

Community Input and Partnership

Community-based groups with cultural and linguistic knowledge and relationships in the community should be consulted in design and implementation.

Community Assets

The City should build off of the knowledge and relationships of community-based groups, as well as the work of the EOC in implementing and disseminating culturally competent information through their neighborhood-based outreach.

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	Yes
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	Yes
Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	

If Yes, please briefly explain.

With strong in-language efforts, thoughtful outreach strategies, and deliberate engagement to understand pain points from small businesses and other vulnerable stakeholders, the envisioned work would increase the accessibility of information on how business should operate during COVID-19. It should also make finding resources and benefits easier for all.

Additional Context

Select the type of solution this is:	Please "X" for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	
New program or initiative	
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	X
Advocacy (supporting efforts bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	

Feasibility

This proposal is feasible. The difficulty is the cross-departmental coordination, staffing, application of City communication standards, and quick communication plan development.

This proposal does not require further federal or state legislation.

3.2 Remove barriers to obtaining PPE, testing, and tracing in low-income and communities of color

Problem Statement

Personal protective equipment (PPE) and cleaning supplies are critical for keeping essential and frontline workers safe from infection, but can be difficult for businesses to pay these additional costs at a time of steeply declining revenues. In addition, supply chain issues mean that small businesses may have trouble accessing PPE at a reasonable cost. Low-income families also have a difficult time affording these supplies to keep themselves safe.

Access to testing and tracing is critical to stopping the spread of COVID-19 and safely reopening the city. Testing that requires a doctor's note, e-mail address, appointment, or travel to another neighborhood reduces accessibility for vulnerable populations and creates additional risk for case spikes. Walk-up testing is especially in demand in the Bayview, Fillmore, and the Mission. People who have lost their jobs may have also lost their health insurance, making free testing even more important. There also may be fear and distrust associated with testing, as low wage workers most often don't have financial reserves to support them if they are sick and miss work. Accessible testing is especially critical for essential and frontline workers, who are more likely to contract the disease and spread it to their households or colleagues.

Factors Affecting Communities of Color and/or Other Vulnerable Populations Differently

Communities of color have historically faced burdens accessing health care and have lower rates of health insurance, access to health resources, and health information. They are more likely to be essential or frontline workers and therefore testing positive for COVID-19 at higher rates. Communities of color have mistrust of the medical establishment due to poor treatment, making testing or tracing more challenging. Also, undocumented immigrants may be fearful of government services for fear of deportation and therefore not participate in testing and tracing.

Existing Programs/Policies that Address this Problem

In August, San Francisco received over a million units of PPE from California's Small Business Advocate via California Office of Emergency Services. OEWD's Invest in Neighborhoods nonprofit partners will use an equity lens to distribute supplies, including prioritizing businesses located in Opportunity Neighborhoods and low-income small business with barriers to accessing PPE. The Mayor's budget also includes funding for PPE purchases for health and frontline workers through distribution by the Emergency Operations Center.

The City offers free testing for those unable to get a test through a healthcare provider at several sites in San Francisco, including Embarcadero, SOMA, City College, and several neighborhood sites. As of publishing, residents can get tested if they have one symptom and essential or frontline workers can get tested regardless of symptoms. The City has been meeting or exceeding its testing targets. However, anecdotally from ERTF members, there is a need for increased testing and outreach, particularly for vulnerable populations. In addition, there have been variations in the time to schedule a test and hear the results.

The City has a workforce of over 100 on its contact tracing team and staff is multilingual, including Spanish, Russian, Cantonese, and Mandarin. Contact tracing has not been meeting the City's target and as of early October is in level 2 (low alert) with 84% of contacts interviewed. Fear of wage loss, deportation or stigmatization are barriers to successful contact tracing.¹

Program Overview

Proposed Solution, Goals, Intended Outcomes, and Beneficiaries

This proposal seeks to address barriers to PPE, testing, and tracing in low-income communities and communities of color, in line with the City's equity priorities and California's recently released equity requirements for its tiered risk system. The COVID Command Center in partnership with DPH should also develop an overall strategy to reduce exposure and risk, including and especially for communities of color, to avoid a fragmented response.

The City's COVID Command Center should continue to provide free or low-cost PPE to low-income individuals, community based-organizations, nonprofits, and small businesses. The City should also continue to assist small, low-income, and minority businesses and nonprofits with obtaining free or subsidized PPE. Distribution could be coordinated with technical assistance regarding grants/loans/resources. Beneficiaries should include communities of color, marginalized communities, and persons living with access and functional needs.

One approach for reaching families and CBOs is to create an efficient distribution network for information, resources, and PPE through the DCYF Community Hubs that will bring together youth from across the City regularly at neighborhood sites. Because these Hubs will be staffed in collaboration between multiple CBO providers they could be an efficient way to distribute both to program participants and to CBO's. These sites could also be used as pick up locations for other CBO's that may not be on site but may be nearby. This effort could also be scaled to include other centralized sites operated by other City agencies or institutions. Distribution should prioritize families living in SROs and apartment buildings

who are at higher-risk. Another potential option is to partner with the SFPL and their books to go program.

Distribution to children, youth, and families could be in the form of COVID Care Packages that include cleaning supplies, screening equipment, masks and gloves as well as critical information and resources. The Care Packages could also include financial resources like grocery vouchers that can help families in need, possibly leveraging other funding sources. Distribution to CBO providers would focus on cleaning supplies, screening equipment and PPE as well as information as needed.

This approach involves creating a centralized procurement mechanism for cleaning supplies, PPE and screening equipment to bring down the cost of these resources through bulk purchasing and potentially mitigate the challenges that individual families and providers have in securing these supplies in a timely manner and at a reasonable cost.

Testing should be easily accessible for people who must leave their home to work. The City's COVID Command Center should continue to expand testing capacity, provide geographic equity, reduce wait times for appointments and results, and eliminate barriers (testing should be free, available upon walk-up, not require phone or email address, and available for asymptomatic people). The City should build on the Mission Latino Task Force testing site to provide testing at trusted community organizations and connection to the Right to Recover program. Recent testing at the 24th St. BART station is an example of a successful neighborhood testing location as they caught people going to work. In addition, the City should expand the essential worker ride home program to include transportation to testing sites, so that low-income people have easy and affordable transportation to testing. As vaccines and/or treatments become available, ensure delivery sites for those are similarly accessible and culturally responsible.

Timely testing appointments and results is critical for effective contact tracing. Contact tracing should be coordinated regionally to ensure high standards and that workers that commute across county lines are covered by contract tracers. The City's COVID Command Center should also regionally coordinate contact tracing to prevent spread of COVID-19. Residents throughout the Bay Area commute to and from work from different counties. Regional coordinate should build trust in the region's contact tracing structure and continue to provide resources and worker protection for contacts to safely isolate. The City should also prepare and pre-train contact tracing resources so the City can nimbly flex up this work if there is a surge in COVID-19 positive cases.

What Success Looks Like and Measures of Success

Success would look like meeting the [City's targets](#) for testing, tracing, and PPE. The testing goal is to test 1,800 San Franciscans per day. The contact tracing goal is to reach 90% of people to test positive. The PPE goal is to have at least a 30-day supply of essential PPE. Success would mean infection rates falling, particularly among low-wage workers and BIPOC communities, which have been disproportionately affected by COVID-19, and the City being able to move into subsequent reopening phases.

Program Administrator(s) and Community Partners

Testing and contact tracing is delivered by DPH. PPE is delivered through OEWD, HRC, DPH, the JIC Community Branch, and CERT for businesses and parks. Potential partners include faith-based organizations.

Timeframe

This project should start immediately as it builds on existing programs and run through the duration of the COVID-19 crisis.

Cost

There is a significant cost for the implementation of this effort; however, some of that cost would have been incurred regardless, and some may ultimately be reimbursable. The purchasing of cleaning supplies, screening equipment and PPE is a regular and potentially costly expense especially when procured by multiple grantees through multiple sources. Centralizing procurement to purchase these supplies in bulk could drive down cost and increase regular availability.

Additional costs for this effort would include staff time for procurement, storage, sorting, routing and delivery, as well as support required for partner CBOs.

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers

Mistrust of the government and the medical establishment poses a major barrier for testing and tracing efforts. Efforts need to ensure that testing is available for undocumented immigrants without fear of deportation. Also, people may be afraid or unwilling to get tested if they are afraid of losing their job and their income. The Right to Recover program needs to be expanded to be able to provide wage replacement for those that must quarantine. Contact tracing needs to be in-language and culturally appropriate. Undocumented people may feel vulnerable as identification questions put them in perceived danger.

Disruption of global supply chains for PPE and even testing supplies can pose a barrier to local programs. The City should also consider contingency plans, such as supporting local production and maintaining sufficient stockpiles of key supplies.

Community Input and Partnership

The ERTF has heard through the survey and community sessions that PPE and accessible testing remain high priorities. To adequately address the barriers, well-trusted CBOs need to help design program.

Community Assets

This proposal builds on the asset of the Community Hubs and OEWD Invest in Neighborhood’s community partners.

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	Yes
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	No
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	Yes
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	Yes
Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	Yes

If Yes, please briefly explain.

This proposal seeks to reduce racial disparities in access to health resources and better help vulnerable populations weather this health crisis.

Additional Context

Select the type of solution this is:	Please "X" for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	
New program or initiative	
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	X
Advocacy (supporting efforts bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	

Feasibility

The main feasibility challenge is that supply chains continue to be stressed even six months into the pandemic.

This proposal does not require further federal or state legislation.

3.3 Ensure safe work environments for all workers, especially low-income workers

Problem Statement

Keeping individuals and families healthy is essential to the city's resilience during our COVID-19 response and recovery. DPH noted that the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) describes the populations most vulnerable to COVID19 only along clinical parameters, or rather "people at higher risk for severe illness."^[10]

DPH identifies the following populations as higher risk for severe illness and death from COVID-19 due to structural disparities in health outcomes:²

- Black/African-American Community
- Latina/o/x Community
- Native Americans/Indigenous Community
- Pacific Islander Community
- Immigrants and undocumented people
- People with disabilities
- People experiencing homelessness

DPH identifies the following populations as higher risk because they experience conditions that facilitate the spread of infection of COVID-19:³

- People living in high-density situations
- People with high-risk economic/work conditions
- Essential workers who have extensive contact with the public (for example, food service workers)
- People without paid sick leave and/or health insurance
- Sex workers
- Low-income people who must go out in public for resources frequently

Factors Affecting Communities of Color and/or Other Vulnerable Populations Differently

Essential workers of color and their communities are especially vulnerable to COVID-19. A UCSF study conducted in the Mission District showed that 90% of the people who tested positive for COVID-19 were essential workers. Of those, 88.4% of those lived in households of three or more people, 95% were Latinx, and 53% reported experiencing no symptoms.⁴

Existing Programs/Policies that Address this Problem

Through the Workers and Families First Program, the City is providing \$10 million to reimburse businesses with employees located in San Francisco to provide an extra 5 days of paid sick time for those employees.

The Right to Recover fund guarantees two weeks of minimum wage replacement, or \$1,285, to any worker who lives in San Francisco who tests positive for COVID-19 and anticipates experiencing financial hardship. There is no application process and the City will not ask or record any citizenship or immigration questions.

Program Overview

Goals, Intended Outcomes, Proposed Solution, and Beneficiaries

San Francisco must prioritize protection and safety for people with structural barriers to healthy outcomes. Without a safe work environment for the higher-risk populations listed above, COVID-19 will continue to spread and prevent San Francisco from recovering.

No single effort alone will achieve the goal of zero infections amongst people who must work outside the home. The City must advance on multiple fronts at once. The Economic Recovery Task Force identified several possible investments that can support this effort:

- Educational Partnerships: Mobilize community ambassadors to deliver PPE and educate business owners, nonprofit leaders, and workers on PPE, safety protocols and potential space improvements, compliance, self-reporting, model sick leave policies, and what to do if you or your worker are exposed, feel symptoms, or test positive.
 - Expand on existing pilot with Calle24 and MEDA, also look to Korean Immigrant Workers Alliance (KIWA) Public Health Councils in Los Angeles.
 - DPH, OEWD, the Community Education and Outreach Team (CERT) managed by the Entertainment Commission, and/or OLSE could implement in partnership with CBOs.
 - Continue to provide education resources to sectors in later phases on re-opening
- Anonymous Reporting System: Develop a reporting system that allows workers to anonymously report unsafe or non-compliant work conditions that increases risk of COVID-19 transmission.
- Strong Site Safety Plans: As new COVID-response operations are set up, make sure the operators have strong site safety plans.

- The lead City department should provide sample site safety plans to CBO partners. Those site safety plans should include training for staff. DPH should approve the plans prior to the start of operations and provide technical assistance.
- Right to Recover: Continue to fund the Right to Recover Program, which guarantees two weeks of paid wages to anyone who tests positive and doesn't have alternative access to income or benefits during their recovery period.
- High-Risk Community Housing (HRCH) Program: HRCH provided temporary, free hotel accommodations to help keep workers, their families, and communities safe from exposure to COVID-19. Isolation housing for exposed low-income workers and communities of color must be culturally competent.
- Air filtration systems: Install or service safe air systems in the smallest and most needful spaces; low-or-no-interest loans for others; seek partnerships with firms that may be introducing new air circulation and cleaning technologies.

What Success Looks Like and Measures of Success

An interim measure of success could be that the infection rate of vulnerable populations matches that of non-vulnerable populations. Ultimately, the goal is to have zero infections in any community.

Program Administrator(s) and Community Partners

This effort would be led by DPH/CCC.

Timeframe

The timeframe of these efforts will be dictated by the length of the pandemic. Until exposures and cases are stopped amongst San Francisco's essential workers, the City will need to continue some or all of these efforts.

Cost

The cost of these efforts depends on how they are scaled and how many they can realistically serve.

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers

The content of this proposal is to overcome the barriers that have already resulted in the disproportionately high case rate in communities of color. Barriers to PPE access, testing

sites and appointments, language, familiarity, trust, fear of loss of income, and proximity all need to be overcome.

For the High-Risk Community Housing (HRCH) Program specifically, if reinstated, allow single parents and their children and couples to shelter together. Also, publish the application in Spanish, Chinese, Tagalog, and other languages.

In addition, the City must continue to identify, evaluate, and change policies that contribute to unsafe work environments for low-income workers.

Program Burdens

Without adequate funding, the expectation for partnership from CBOs could be burdensome. San Francisco should compensate community members for their time, translation skills, network outreach, and other resources not easily accessible to government workers.

Community Input and Partnership

The Latino Task Force on COVID-19 is already a partner in this work, and additional CBOs with language, cultural, and relationship competency are needed. The JIC Community Branch is working to improve its community outreach, and stronger culturally competent engagement should be a part of that ongoing improvement.

Community Assets

Members of the Task Force identified a list of potential community partners who can support implementation:

- Latino Task Force on COVID-19
- Young Community Developers
- Rafiki Coalition
- Third Street Youth Clinic
- SF New Deal

This is not a complete list. For implementation, City departments should pay attention to geography and demographics to ensure strong partnership and programming across the higher-risk populations described above.

Educational and other institutional partners could also be helpful: UCSF, SFSU, USF, City College, Kaiser, and vocational schools such as Mission Language and Vocational School.

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	Yes
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	No
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	Yes
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	No
Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	Yes

If Yes, please briefly explain.

Ensuring the health of essential workers of color and their communities is fundamental. This proposal is targeted to reduce the racial disparities in health.

Additional Context

Select the type of solution this is:	Please “X” for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	
New program or initiative	X
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	X
Advocacy (supporting efforts bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	

Feasibility

The engagement, planning, and guidance components of this proposal are feasible and build on existing efforts. The pieces that depend more heavily on funding – the Right to Recover and the hotel program – are feasible if funding is available.

This proposal does not require further federal or state legislation.

3.4 Support cleanliness, health, and safety in public spaces

Problem Statement

Unclean streets impact our residents, visitors and businesses, creating real and perceived concerns around safety, health and comfort. Prior to the pandemic, hospitality stakeholders reported that street cleanliness was a barrier to recruiting and retaining conventions and discouraged tourism.

ERTF members have expressed concern that poor street conditions could substantially impede San Francisco's economic recovery. First, residents, visitors and businesses may perceive unclean streets as increasing the likelihood of COVID-19 transmission; as a result, these conditions may discourage these stakeholders from seeking to visit, work, or shop in San Francisco. More immediately, given the benefits of conducting business outside in reducing the likelihood of COVID-19 transmission, the cleanliness of public spaces is important to creating a safe and inviting environment to support business activity like outdoor dining and shopping.

It is important to contextualize calls for cleaner and safer streets within the bigger picture of the underlying causes and needs of people experiencing homelessness and/or behavioral health challenges. Poor street conditions are directly related to these large and stubborn challenges that are overarching local government priorities. Strategies to support housing, mental health challenges, and substance use disorders are addressed in Recommendations 7.3 and 7.4. Investments in these areas must be made if San Francisco is to make successful and lasting progress improving street conditions.

Factors Affecting Communities of Color and/or Other Vulnerable Populations Differently

People who are unhoused are disproportionately people of color and other vulnerable populations including veterans and members of the disability community. Programs that are primarily focused on moving people, but without sufficient supplementary services in health, mental health, and housing, disproportionately harm people of color and the most vulnerable.

Existing Programs/Policies that Address this Problem

Existing cleaning services for litter pick up, power washing, graffiti-abatement, etc. are provided in various parts of the city by Public Works, a multitude of community benefit organizations (such as Urban Alchemy and Downtown Streets Team), Recology, community benefit districts (CBDs), merchant groups and individual businesses and residents. Businesses and residents are responsible for cleaning the sidewalk in front of their business

or home, but with many businesses closed temporarily or permanently due to COVID-19, efforts from this important partnership are reduced during the crisis.

Program Overview

Proposed Solution, Goals, Intended Outcomes, and Beneficiaries

For San Francisco's economy to recover successfully from the pandemic, residents and visitors alike must feel safe and comfortable returning to our neighborhoods and public spaces and enjoying what makes San Francisco so unique and special. Assuming investments in the underlying challenges of homelessness and behavioral health needs, service coordination would help improve street conditions to foster healthy local business activity.

Many public and private entities work to maintain street cleanliness, including Public Works teams, nonprofits, CBDs, residents and business owners, and they need to be better coordinated.

City stakeholders should develop benchmarks for success in achieving and maintaining street cleanliness, collect relevant data, and publish and regularly update this information. City stakeholders should develop a coordinated approach to data collection from public and private partners to help ensure streamlined and consistent reporting.

City stakeholders should work with business leadership to develop a collaborative program to encourage business owners to participate in street cleaning best practices like sweeping in front of their businesses and cleaning up graffiti on or in front of their businesses.

In addition, City stakeholders should explore more expansive partnerships and neighborhood-focused strategies to support cleanliness. For example, ERTF members have proposed a Tenderloin/Mid-Market public-private partnership to be led by CBDs and merchant associations. The City could also explore partnering with businesses to help achieve the common goal of improved street conditions.

Also, hiring neighborhood-specific ambassadors could help educate the public about health and safety measures and social distancing as well as being a general positive presence in our public spaces. This is also an opportunity to hire dislocated workers from industries like tourism and the art who have been hardest in the COVID 19 pandemic.

What Success Looks Like and Measures of Success

Success could be measured through existing departmental metrics on cleanliness, 311 data, surveys of public satisfaction, and metrics on economic activity in tourism and hospitality (e.g., conventions booked, hotel room stays).

Program Administrator(s) and Community Partners

This proposal would require partnership from Public Works, OEWD, CBD's, CBOs providing cleaning services, and merchant organizations in all neighborhoods.

Timeframe

The service coordination work could begin immediately, as funding resources allow. The work to adequately fund and solve the underlying issues of homelessness and behavioral health challenges is more long-term.

Cost

The service coordination effort would require existing staff time to develop benchmarks, collect data, publish findings, and pursue public-private partnerships. The costs associated with the investment in the underlying issues of homelessness and behavioral health challenges are outside the scope of this proposal but are critical to its success.

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers

Barriers to housing and behavioral health support services are outside the scope of this proposal but integral to the eventual success of street cleanliness and safety efforts.

CBOs providing these services may have concerns about continuity of their programming and/or funding.

Program Burdens

Communities may have concerns about pushing poor street conditions from one community to another. San Francisco will need to continue its efforts to respect its residents experiencing homelessness and seek to address their underlying needs for housing and behavioral health treatment.

Though not exactly a burden, in order for San Francisco's street conditions to improve, private businesses, organizations, and residents will need to be a part of the solution.

Community Input and Partnership

Public Works, OEWD, CBDs, CBOs providing cleaning services, and merchant organizations in diverse neighborhoods should be consulted in design and implementation.

Community Assets

For service alignment, there CBDs, CBOs, and merchant organizations providing cleaning and beautification services in San Francisco.

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	No
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	No
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	Yes
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	Yes
Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	Yes

If Yes, please briefly explain.

By improving street cleanliness residents and communities of color would benefit from improved conditions for their businesses and neighborhoods. If the marketing is successful these communities could also benefit from increased foot traffic and merchant activity.

Additional Context

Select the type of solution this is:	Please “X” for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	
New program or initiative	X
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	X
Advocacy (supporting efforts bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	

Feasibility

Development of benchmarks should not be difficult or risky. Data collection could be burdensome for some stakeholders, depending on existing data collection/tracking processes. Processing and analyzing could be burdensome depending on quality/consistency of submissions.

This proposal does not require further federal or state legislation, but resources at a state or federal scale are needed for the underlying issues of homelessness and behavioral health needs.

4. Preserve Operations and Lessen Regulatory Burdens

4.1 Extend, improve, and support the Shared Spaces Program

Problem Statement

COVID-19 and the public health measures implemented to slow its spread have dramatically impacted the operations of businesses that rely on customers visiting their physical location. As of September 2020, bars and restaurants are not allowed to operate indoors. Retail and some other types of businesses have been allowed to operate indoors, but public health measures for distancing have reduced indoor capacity. Various other business types have also been restricted from operating indoors or have customers who do not feel comfortable entering a storefront due to risk of contracting COVID-19. This limitation of normal business operations threatens the survival of businesses and jeopardizes the jobs, tax revenue, customers, and vibrant commercial corridors that rely on these businesses.

To facilitate access to outdoor space, in June 2020, the City created the Shared Spaces program. The first few months of Shared Spaces have been a success, with over 1,600 total permit applications approved covering all supervisorial districts. However, the program does have areas for improvement, including uneven and inequitable adoption across San Francisco's neighborhoods, bureaucratic hurdles that remain difficult to overcome, and not enough certainty in the future of the program for businesses to invest in high quality Shared Spaces.

Existing Programs/Policies that Address this Problem

Shared Spaces makes public outdoor space like the sidewalk, parking lane, traffic lane, and other parks and plazas available for neighboring businesses to utilize for safe, socially distanced operations. There are no fees associated with a Shared Spaces permit. The goals of the program are to promote public health, help struggling businesses survive, and contribute to a vibrant street life on our commercial corridors.

The Shared Spaces team has developed a multi-part, interdepartmental Sustainability Strategy. The Sustainability Strategy is organized around the following four objectives and five action areas. Some actions are being implemented, and others are still being analyzed:

	Increase Staff Capacity	Increase NGO Capacity	Streamline Procedure	Ease Regulations	Material Resources
Minimize barriers to widespread participation	x	x	x	x	x
Shorten overall Application-to-Installation timeline	x	x	x	x	x
Broad Compliance with Safety and Health Directives		x		x	x
Accurate and immediate tracking and reporting	x				

Pre-existing City programs such as the Café Tables and Chairs program, the Parklet program, and street closures through the Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation (ISCOTT) offered similar types of access to sidewalk and street space as Shared Spaces. The difference is that Shared Spaces has significantly more flexible program rules, offers greatly expedited service, and charges no fees.

In addition to the availability of outdoor space, the cleanliness of public spaces is important to creating a safe and inviting environment to support outdoor business activity. City agencies including Public Works, Public Health, the Fire Department, the Police Department, and the Homeless Outreach Team, along with Community Benefit Districts, community-based organizations, and merchant associations work together towards improved street conditions. Task force members have expressed significant concerns about the impact of street conditions on San Francisco’s future economic recovery, and Recommendations 3.4, 7.3, and 7.4 address this multifaceted challenge.

Program Overview

Proposed Solution, Goals, Intended Outcomes, and Beneficiaries

City departments have already taken steps to further eliminate administrative or regulatory burdens of the program and have significantly simplified the application process.

Improvements to the Shared Spaces program would make it more effective, equitable, and better poised to support the long-term economic recovery of the city. These improvements can broadly be sorted into three categories: Making the program more effective, making the program more equitable, and improving the street closure process.

Making the program more effective:

- Shared Spaces permits are currently set to expire on December 31, 2020. Instead, the program should be extended three years until December 31, 2023 to give businesses, artists, and communities an incentive to invest in high quality, visually appealing outdoor Shared Spaces, and give them certainty that the program will be a worthwhile investment.
- The City should continue to simplify the application process, especially where it involves the coordination of multiple departments or there is an emerging need not currently supported by the City's permitting functions, such as the need for easy access to outdoor heaters. Further, all program applicants should have access to high quality and individualized customer service assistance as they navigate the requirements of the program, with the goal of shepherding every applicant through the program as quickly and efficiently as possible.
- The City should reduce the administrative challenges and costs prohibitive to employing the use of platforms and wind barriers that help insure the viability of outside dining without compromising airflow and the safety of workers and diners.
- Where reasonable and safe, the City should delay construction, tree trimming, tree removal, and other public works projects that may otherwise inhibit a commercial corridor or business's participation in the Shared Spaces program.
- The Shared Spaces program should be modified to include businesses interested in hosting outdoor fitness classes in public park spaces, at no cost to the business.
- The Shared Spaces program should allow for more adaptive arts and entertainment uses within outdoor space to better support artists and musicians.
- The City should connect designers, architects, planners, artists, musicians, activists, and others who can support the design, construction, and operation of Shared

Spaces to businesses in need through sponsored design and art contests, listings on the Shared Spaces website, and showcases online and in print.

Making the program more equitable:

- The City should appropriate funds for small grants and loans specifically targeted to businesses from disadvantaged communities that want to participate in Shared Spaces but face financial barriers to doing so, such as the cost of furniture, ambassadors, or insurance. These businesses include those owned by Black, Latinx, and Asian-American people, and those located in underserved neighborhoods that have seen modest participation in Shared Spaces, such as the Excelsior, Bayview, and Visitacion Valley. These grants should be distributed through culturally competent local neighborhood organizations that can also provide technical assistance to participating businesses.
- The City should provide and deploy barriers and other traffic control fixtures rather than rely on applicants to procure and manage these devices.
- Shared Spaces should be as known, understood, and available to business owners who do not speak English as it is to those who do speak English. This would require promotion and outreach across all City neighborhoods, and in languages other than English, to ensure an equitable opportunity to participate in the program. Further, non-English speaking business owners interested in the Shared Spaces program should receive specialized assistance in navigating the program requirements and application.
- The City should partner with Cultural Districts and community-based organizations to identify specific implementation strategies that are tailored to the unique needs of each community, especially communities of color and other vulnerable communities.
- The City should establish a program for bulk purchases of PPE, including masks, for businesses participating in Shared Spaces, and grants and loans should be made available for more vulnerable small businesses.
- The City should encourage street closures and the use of parking spaces over the use of sidewalk space in order to keep the sidewalks safe and comfortable for pedestrians, including the elderly and those with disabilities. Further, The City should also offer training to businesses in best practices for accommodating patrons with disabilities and offer financial assistance for costs associated with increasing accessibility.

Improving the street closure process:

- Street closure applications should be evaluated outside of the traditional ISCOTT process and instead be evaluated by a team led by the Shared Spaces Program Manager. Street closures should be encouraged by City agencies through simplifying and reducing requirements and should be approved, without delay, once these requirements are met.
- Existing Shared Spaces staffing requirements for street closure entrances should be evaluated for long-term sustainability and reduced or eliminated wherever possible. That staffing should be supported through operating grants or other City assistance programs.
- Develop programs for unemployed ACHE workers to activate and support Shared Spaces including but not limited to the following:
 - Public health communication campaigns
 - Public art projects
 - Temporary activation projects
 - Health Order education and compliance monitoring of Shared Spaces in active neighborhood commercial corridors, especially those with street closures
 - Design and construction of outdoor dining spaces
- The City should support Shared Spaces street closures through providing or waiving insurance for street closures, providing tables and chairs for merchants' customers use within those street closures, providing required signage, providing metal barricades already owned by the City, and providing delineator cones and poles.
- The City should seek to accommodate businesses with location challenges that make outdoor operation difficult or impossible. Such challenges might include immovable street furniture in the business' immediate vicinity, or businesses being located on busier thoroughfares that cannot be closed to car traffic. The City can work to accommodate businesses with such challenges by helping negotiate space sharing with neighboring businesses and offering the use of public outdoor spaces that are not directly adjacent to the business but shared by neighborhood businesses.
- The City should implement an evaluation function to determine which street closures should be made permanent and what capital improvements and investments are needed to make these closures sustainable.

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers

There are existing barriers to participating in Shared Spaces that might arise from a lack of resources, language capacity, understanding of the program, technical knowledge, or challenges of location. The interventions described above are designed explicitly to lower or remove these barriers in order to achieve broad and equitable participation in the program. Additionally, mobile food businesses, including street vendors and food trucks, which may be more likely to be owned by people of color and people with fewer financial resources, have barriers to participating in the program in that they would need permission from a local business or resident to apply to use the street or sidewalk space in front of that building. Providing options for those mobile food businesses to have places to operate safely outside would contribute to broad and equitable participation in Shared Spaces.

Program Burdens

Given that these improvements are designed to make the program more accessible to businesses in disadvantaged communities, impacts to these communities should generally be positive. However, the existing program has not been without impacts, notably to wheelchair users, the elderly, blind and visually impaired people, and other disabled people who have trouble navigating and social distancing on sidewalks crowded with business activities. Additionally, street closures can be disruptive to neighbors (e.g. residential neighbors), so efforts to streamline that process may result in a burden.

Community Input and Partnership

Shared Spaces was developed with significant input from communities of color, including substantial engagement with community groups in the Mission. However, more outreach, dialogue, and collaboration are needed. Participation remains uneven around the city, with significantly more businesses participating in neighborhoods like the Marina and North Beach than in outer neighborhoods home to large communities of color. Given the detrimental impact that Shared Spaces has had on people with disabilities' ability to navigate safely through the city, any plans to make permanent or expand Shared Spaces should be vetted with people with disabilities, and especially with blind people.

Community Assets

Our diverse and entrepreneurial local businesses, neighborhood-based economic development agencies, community groups, and merchant associations should all play a significant role in making Shared Spaces as successful as it can be.

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	Yes
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	No
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	Yes
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	Yes
Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	Yes

If Yes, please briefly explain.

By providing opportunities for businesses to operate more safely during the health crisis.

Additional Context

Select the type of solution this is:	Please “X” for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	
New program or initiative	
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	X
Advocacy (supporting efforts bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	

Feasibility

The program is already operating successfully and these changes are feasible. Some are limited by available funds. Most are administrative and would not require legislation.

Though the program has successfully facilitated hundreds of operating sites throughout the city, it remains significantly under resourced in terms of meeting ongoing demand. The program continues to face extremely high volume without long-term dedicated staff resources to ensure sustainable operations in the short- and long-term. In addition to procedural and regulatory streamlining, the City must consider dedicating additional staff capacity to this program.

This proposal does not require further federal or state legislation.

4.2 Repurpose public outdoor space

Problem Statement

COVID-19 has shown the vulnerability of San Franciscans around food security, the need for local supply chains, and the need for job creation that supports small business and leads to career enhancement within low-income communities. Restrictions on indoor business have led to significant demand for outdoor space, underscoring the importance for the City to optimize the use of public outdoor space.

Program Overview

Proposed Solution, Goals, Intended Outcomes, and Beneficiaries

The City should reexamine how public outdoor space is used in San Francisco and facilitate use changes to better support the common recovery goals of equity, resilience, environmental sustainability, and economic strength. The Task Force identified three examples of use changes that would make progress towards these goals: Converting Gleneagles Golf course to an urban farm, establishing an eco-center underneath I-80, and interim uses for development sites that facilitate outdoor business.

Converting Gleneagles Golf Course to an urban farm: Gleneagles Golf Course is a nine-hole course situated within McLaren Park and adjacent to the Sunnydale community. Past data collection on golf course use shows very little, if any, use of the golf course by the Sunnydale and surrounding community. Conversion of the land to an urban farm could create a site that: supplies food to local restaurants and to vulnerable populations, trains residents on farming and food preservation techniques, provides outdoor activities for the entire community, and creates opportunity for business development and agricultural and landscaping skill building.

Currently the course uses on-site facilities for job training around landscape maintenance and the existing job training activities at Gleneagles are highly effective and beneficial to the local community. For this proposal to be successful, job training would need to be preserved and expanded to accommodate more trainees and teach a broader range of skills, including landscaping, but also gardening, farming, and other related skills.

This conversion could benefit the surrounding community of Sunnydale, trainees coming out of local high schools (such as Mission High School Urban Agriculture Program) and SF Community College, community-based organizations supplying food to vulnerable populations, local restaurants who want to buy local and support the community, the environment via carbon sequestration, local health from improved air quality due to

decreased transportation emissions from the movement of food, and improved nutrition from access to healthy, fresh food.

Should this effort prove successful, there is the potential to extend this idea of urban agriculture to other publicly owned outdoor spaces, such as the land in front of Laguna Honda Hospital.

Eco Park: The City could transform a four-acre plot under the freeway viaducts at 4th Street and Harrison Street into an “Eco-Park” with a building materials exchange site, job training programs, maker spaces, and accessible recreation.

In a multi-phased development process, REC would serve as the master tenant leasing space from CalTrans, utilizing discounted rent allowed via AB 857 (Ting), while the Department of the Environment, OEWD, and private sector partners would provide program and funding support.

A building materials exchange site would be the central element of the initial phase. It would serve to collect and redistribute high-quality surplus and salvaged items to restaurants and other business repositioning operations to shared-spaces, as well as to nonprofits, schools, housing/shelter initiatives, and others lacking access to these resources. These materials would be diverted from the landfill and provided at low or no cost to organizations that can utilize them. An onsite construction workforce development program, City Build, would also be able to make use of the material.

City agencies including Public Works and the Department of the Environment could create nursery facilities to spearhead an extensive greening of the surrounding SOMA neighborhood and the entire city. This project could include a recreational space for humans and dogs, as well as germinating native plants to green San Francisco, enhance pollinators, and boost carbon sequestration. The Next-Gen urban gardeners would be trained and deployed from here.

Additionally, this site could provide space to support the emerging citywide mobile California Redemption Value (CRV) Pilot, which trains San Francisco Conservation Core staff on driving, staffing, processing citywide materials from convenient mobile sites.

Interim Uses for Development Sites: Given the lengthy timeline needed for entitlement and permitting and the challenges that the current economy poses for development, there are sites in the city that will likely sit vacant waiting for construction to commence. Many of these sites are currently used for activities, like parking, that do not represent the highest and best use. As local businesses struggle to identify sufficient outdoor space to operate in a safe, socially distanced way, these development sites could be activated for interim use by local businesses. There are a broad range of possible activities that could take place on

these sites including arts and culture activities, food and beverage service, retail, outdoor fitness, and community gatherings, especially for vulnerable populations.

Each site would need to be evaluated for specific use based on attributes like size, improvements, proximity to existing businesses, and others. It would be critical to set expectations with the neighbors, businesses, and customers that these are interim uses. Still, even if these sites are only available for a year or less, outdoor space is too valuable a resource for economic recovery to leave lots underutilized.

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers

In developing new uses for public open space, communities with little access to open space or lack of open space need to be considered. Often these are vulnerable communities.

Program Burdens

As one of the most affordable golf courses in the City, Gleneagles is a significant asset to golfers who may not have the resources to play at private courses. A potential mitigation to this impact would be for the City to provide subsidies for green fees for low-income golfers at other public courses.

Community Input and Partnership

This proposal has not yet been discussed and vetted by asset-holding nor community stakeholders. That dialogue, particularly with communities of color, would be critical to making any of the specific site changes successful, especially for the proposed Gleneagles conversion. Given the proximity to Sunnydale and the importance of the existing workforce training program on site, any change should seek the approval of the neighboring community and labor partners.

Community Assets

Existing neighborhood and community groups, CACs, and merchants associations should be involved from the beginning as the City evaluates these conversions for community support, cost, feasibility, logistics, upkeep, impacts to the neighborhood, and other considerations.

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	Yes
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	No
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	Yes
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	No
Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	Yes

If Yes, please briefly explain.

Each site will have different equity impacts depending on the location of the site, the adjacent communities, the existing use, and the proposed use. These would each need to be explored before one could say that a particular site repurposing advanced racial or social equity. However, in the case of the proposals described above they are all designed to make space more accessible to all San Franciscans and to use space to better support goals of equity, resilience, environmental sustainability, and economic recovery.

Additional Context

Select the type of solution this is:	Please “X” for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	
New program or initiative	X
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	
Advocacy (supporting efforts bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	

Feasibility

This proposal is feasible if resources can be identified and stakeholders agree on best and highest use. Each site will have its own considerations. Sites owned by the state and federal government may require state and federal actions to be repurposed. Otherwise, this could be accomplished locally.

For the Conversion of Gleneagles and the Eco Park, a significant feasibility concern is adequate funds for capital and operating costs. Potential funding sources include: philanthropic investment, local revenue measures, US Dept. of Agriculture funds, San Francisco Carbon Fund, and Cap & Trade dollars for disadvantaged communities.

San Mateo and Alameda County Resource Conservation Districts could provide technical and financial assistance. University of California Cooperative Extension could provide technical assistance with site conversion, and educational programs such as Future Farmer of America and 4-H can advise.

4.3 Allow more flexible use of ground floor retail spaces

Problem Statement

In response to e-commerce and other factors, the retail landscape in American cities – San Francisco included – was changing dramatically before the COVID-19 pandemic. High rents in San Francisco’s desirable market coupled with restrictive zoning and permitting regulations made doing business costly and the process to change business operations onerous, resulting in rising vacancy rates in commercial corridors. The economic crisis brought on by COVID-19 has required many businesses to temporarily close for health reasons. As of August 25, 2020, only 46% of San Francisco storefront businesses open at the start of the pandemic remained open, according to a survey from the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce. It is clear a significant number of retail businesses will not survive the pandemic, as partial and complete closures to protect public health reduce their in-person customer base and the preexisting challenges of e-commerce competition and regulatory complexity persist. For many of these businesses, it is unclear if it will be possible to reopen given the financial burdens, loss of income and expected loss of business volume due to safety restrictions. In addition, many neighborhood businesses, even long-time institutions, have decided to close permanently.

Factors Affecting Communities of Color and/or Other Vulnerable Populations Differently

This economic crisis has disproportionately hit the small, neighborhood-based businesses that were already under-resourced and under-capitalized, particularly BIPOC-owned and serving businesses. Even where businesses are permitted to open to the public, there is a reduced customer base, especially in the Financial District and areas that have relied on tourists (like Fishermen’s Wharf). Even neighborhood-based businesses are suffering as customers stay home. A significant number of retail businesses will not survive the pandemic, especially in the nightlife, restaurants, bars, arts, entertainment, and hospitality industries, and many have already shuttered, leaving vacant ground-floor spaces throughout San Francisco’s commercial areas.

It’s also important to consider the commercial corridors that were already struggling with especially high vacancy rates before COVID-19, such as those in District 10, District 5, and other communities with large low-income communities of color. Retail vacancies can lead to more vacancies, less vibrant commercial corridors, increased homeless encampments, and perceptions of diminished safety to due fewer “eyes on the street.” The activation that ground-floor spaces generate is key to the financial life and culture of our commercial corridors.

Program Overview

Proposed Solution, Goals, Intended Outcomes, and Beneficiaries

Regulatory and programmatic changes are needed to create flexibility for filling ground floor retail spaces by allowing the broadest possible range of active uses, including things like maker spaces, arts, culture, and community development programs and uses.

The Planning Code regulates the allowable uses in commercial areas and should be changed via legislative process to achieve greater flexibility for ground floor retail space activation. Identifying changes to the Planning Code and developing a proposed Ordinance started in summer 2020.

Changes should support flexibility for businesses that operate as more than one land use, such as offering retail, food/drink, and on-site experiences (e.g., classes, workshops, etc.), and should expand opportunities for safe arts, culture, hospitality, and entertainment uses, given the pandemic's significant impacts on these important industries. The changes should encourage active uses and maintain window transparency to foster interesting and dynamic neighborhood corridors. Each community may have different perspectives on which uses should not be allowed or should be controlled or otherwise restricted. A robust outreach process should seek to inform policymakers as they balance between providing flexibility for business owners and more neighborhood control over retail uses. There may be uses that are not appropriate for a particular type of retail space, but absent a significant negative impact, the default should be that an active use of any kind is allowed in a retail space.

This proposal would benefit neighborhoods, business owners, and landlords by giving existing businesses the ability to pivot their operations and to give new businesses more opportunities to occupy vacant spaces.

What Success Looks Like and Measures of Success

Success could be measured by a number of metrics: lower vacancy rates, mix of uses in commercial corridors, and a quicker permitting period for businesses. Most important to monitor will be the success of those businesses that are suffering the most in this moment—the arts, culture, hospitality, and Entertainment sector and BIPOC owned and serving businesses. Identifying changes to the Planning Code and developing a proposed Ordinance started in summer 2020.

Timeframe

The Planning Department anticipates that changes can be effective by the end of the calendar year. These changes should be reevaluated in the next three to five years to

consider economic conditions, demand for retail space, and the success of the proposed changes.

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers

Given the dramatic changes in the ground floor real estate market under COVID-19, it is difficult to anticipate burdens. A loosening of regulations may incentivize landlords to increase rents if they think that incoming businesses can afford more. However, increasing vacancy rates may offset this risk and lead to lower rents.

A lack of information about changes to the Planning Code may be a barrier to participation. This can be ameliorated with coordination between the Planning Department and the City agencies that work directly with vulnerable communities, including OEWD and MOHCD, and the Office of Small Business.

Program Burdens

Even if zoning supported greater flexibility of use, under-resourced businesses (BIPOC-owned and serving) might not be able to take advantage of them. They might not have the capacity to pivot their businesses. Therefore, these businesses could fall further behind, in terms of potential business success and compared to their peer businesses in other neighborhoods. City support in the form of grants, loans, and technical support (such as a City staffer to serve as a coordinator) could address these barriers.

Community Input and Partnership

Community organizations, industry associations, and small business owners should be engaged throughout the process of developing the ordinance, prioritizing those businesses that have been most impacted (arts, culture, hospitality, and entertainment sectors) and those that were under-resourced even before COVID (BIPOC-owned and serving). Although the proposal seeks broadly to allow more flexibility of uses, community outreach will identify use restrictions that each neighborhood feels are appropriate to retain or implement.

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	Yes
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	N/A
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	Yes
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	No
Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	Yes

If Yes, please briefly explain.

By simplifying the existing complicated process of operating and/or opening businesses in commercial corridors.

Additional Context

Select the type of solution this is:	Please “X” for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	
New program or initiative	X
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	
Advocacy (supporting efforts bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	

Feasibility

These proposed changes are feasible, requiring staff time to develop and vet the specific changes to the Planning Code, engage stakeholders, and support the Ordinance through the legislative process.

This proposal does not require further federal or state legislation.

4.4 Rethink rules that restrict flexible/temporary arts, culture, hospitality and entertainment uses

Problem Statement

Temporary events and activations provide unique cultural experiences that attract patrons to support neighborhood businesses and offer important production and performance opportunities for the arts and culture workforce.

Even prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, there was an acknowledged need for greater flexibility to support temporary activities inside storefronts and in public spaces. Task Force members and others have reported challenges around permitting requirements, including lengthy wait times for conditional use authorizations, liquor licensing, and City-mandated costs imposed on indoor and outdoor temporary events.

These challenges can discourage event organizers and entrepreneurs from staging temporary activities that enrich neighborhoods, support cultural vitality, and meet evolving consumer demands, such as adding pop-up events, food and drink, and arts performances. The result is that business owners and entrepreneurs are obstructed from activating underutilized or vacant space.

Factors Affecting Communities of Color and/or Other Vulnerable Populations Differently

Temporary events and activations are critical components of place keeping for communities experiencing displacement and the threat of gentrification. Temporary activities enable community entrepreneurs to showcase their creative enterprises without needing a dedicated storefront or performance space. Temporary activities can also help existing businesses draw additional patrons and diversify revenue streams to help prevent their displacement, which is especially important for neighborhoods with less foot traffic and likely more vulnerable populations.

Existing Programs/Policies that Address this Problem

The Shared Spaces program, an interdepartmental effort developed to enable businesses to conduct more activity outside during the pandemic, is a useful model as it has dramatically reduced cost and process barriers for temporary outdoor activities connected to existing brick and mortar businesses. While health order limitations on permissible gatherings have prevented the program from being utilized for a broader range of arts and culture programming, stakeholders have expressed interest in seeing the program continue to be adapted moving forward.

Pursuant to an executive directive issued by the Mayor in 2019, an interdepartmental Special Events Steering Committee was convened. The Committee's report, which was

being finalized when the pandemic emerged, identified a number of recommendations to support additional interdepartmental coordination, process improvements, and support for special event organizers to navigate the permitting process.

The Planning Code currently authorizes a variety of Temporary Use Authorizations, including for “Pop-Up Retail,” which could enable storefronts to receive temporary planning approval to offer events, food and drink, or other retail uses. The usability of this TUA is limited due to the limits of health and entertainment permitting to enable flexible, short-term activity in vacant or underutilized storefronts.

In addition, there are examples of City partnerships with nonprofits, including Undiscovered SF, Livable City, Shared Spaces Mission/Castro/Valencia.

Program Overview

Proposed Solution, Goals, Intended Outcomes, and Beneficiaries

City staff should be directed to conduct a comprehensive review of existing permitting and regulatory barriers that impede temporary arts and culture activations in public and private space, including temporary use authorizations, amplified sound regulations, Police Code provisions, health permitting, zoning restrictions, liability insurance, and liquor licensing rules. This effort should result in recommendations for legislative action and administrative change. To do this effectively all permitting departments need to be involved in the review.

This review should build upon existing efforts, including pre-pandemic work like the Special Events Steering Committee, as well as emergency relief efforts like the Shared Spaces program, to identify short- and long-term measures to make temporary activity more feasible. Such a review should include proactive engagement with neighborhood-based stakeholders, including those from communities of color, to identify regulatory barriers and challenges that impact access to temporary activations (and should build upon and reference previously-gathered community engagement feedback as well).

This regulatory review, and its consideration of equity needs, would be best served by a concurrent effort to ready a broad spectrum of artists and entrepreneurs to activate temporary spaces. Such an effort to identify and amplify neighborhood-based actors and BIPOC-owned/BIPOC-serving businesses and organizations could be pursued as part of Proposal 8.2 (Catalyze neighborhood recovery through the arts), Proposal 5.1 (Invest in BIPOC and immigrant communities), and Proposal 5.6 (Build technology capacity of new users, small businesses, and nonprofits).

Reducing barriers to temporary activations would benefit a wide variety of arts, culture, hospitality and entertainment businesses and workers, including event organizers,

performance groups, individual artists, food and beverage makers, and others. Increased temporary activations would also benefit neighborhood commercial corridors and existing merchants.

In addition, a registry of existing City-owned public spaces and their respective jurisdictions would be helpful for neighborhoods, businesses and nonprofits as they plan activation and recovery programs.

What Success Looks Like and Measures of Success

Initial success would include the initiation and completion of the comprehensive review of permitting and regulatory barriers. Success in implementing reforms could be measured in the number of temporary activations undertaken citywide, as well as in qualitative study of City staff and event organizers' experiences within the process.

Program Administrator(s) and Community Partners

City staff, including OEWD, SFAC, and the Office of the City Administrator (Entertainment Commission), in partnership with the interdepartmental team coordinated through Shared Spaces, could facilitate this effort. Community partners could include Task Force members who produce temporary activations or represent impacted industry groups, neighborhood merchant associations, cultural districts and others.

Timeframe

Project duration: October 2020-June 2021

- Phase 1: Identify and triage barriers and potential strategies (October-November 2020)
- Phase 2: Implement near-term reforms and conduct further research on longer-term strategies (December 2020-January 2021)
- Phase 3: Stakeholder engagement, strategy refinement, legislative action and process reforms as needed (February 2021-June 2021)

Cost

- For the comprehensive review of existing barriers, the cost to the City would be the staff time to conduct this review.
- It is anticipated that this review will result in recommendations to reduce permitting processes and requirements, which could impact fees collected by City departments to administer those permits.

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers

As discussed above, the review of existing barriers must include proactive engagement with communities of color to understand existing challenges and ensure that any proposed strategies do not create or exacerbate barriers. This engagement could also help identify potential temporary activation projects led by communities of color that could benefit from thoughtful program development.

Moreover, given concerns that temporary activities may be particularly prone to pose barriers to people with disabilities, this effort should pay attention to ensuring that regulatory reform does not come at the expense of accessibility. To do so, this initiative must include engagement with representatives of disability organizations early in the program design process.

Program Burdens

Feedback in the design of reform recommendations should be incorporated to avoid unintended consequences.

Community Input and Partnership

Several stakeholders from communities of color have identified these challenges as pain points to address in order to support more inclusive economic recovery.

Small business owners, arts and cultural event organizers, chambers of commerce representing communities of color, cultural districts, merchant associations should be consulted in design and implementation.

Community Assets

Many existing temporary activations, including a number of longstanding cultural fairs and festivals in neighborhoods across the city, are community assets that would benefit from this effort and could inform this work.

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	Yes
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	No
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	Yes
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	Yes
Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	Yes

If Yes, please briefly explain.

By reducing barriers and increasing opportunities for temporary activations, with a focus on barriers experienced by communities of color, this proposal will help increase civic engagement among communities of color and strengthen the ability of San Franciscans to incorporate arts and culture into their businesses and public spaces.

Additional Context

Select the type of solution this is:	Please “X” for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	
New program or initiative	X
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	X
Advocacy (supporting efforts bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	

Feasibility

Given staff expertise, the review of existing permitting and regulatory barriers is feasible. To the extent that a comprehensive review would require altering existing rules and processes around temporary activations, such a project could raise feasibility concerns around implementation.

This proposal does not require further federal or state legislation.

4.5 Provide advisory services for commercial landlords and tenants and explore other strategies to avoid foreclosures and evictions, particularly for ACHE sector assets

Problem Statement

Many small businesses have had to close to comply with the shelter-in-place orders. These closures have resulted in no or low revenues for these small businesses while many of their fixed costs have remained the same. The City's arts, culture, hospitality, and entertainment (ACHE) sectors have arguably faced the most severe impact due to the incompatibility of these industries' operations with current mandates that restrict both the operation of businesses indoors and large groups of people indoors. This feature also means that they will be among the final businesses to re-open as the pandemic recedes and restrictions are gradually lifted. Though the State has delivered a commercial evictions moratorium through March 2021, local attention is still needed to ensure that businesses can hang on once those protections expire. Meanwhile, the City should strive to help small and medium sized businesses with assistance that meets their needs in the short-term.

Through ERTF research and discussions, it has become clear that mortgages and rent are the most significant cost for many of these small businesses. While mortgage forbearance, eviction moratoriums, and rent deferrals are paused, these measures lead to large amounts of accumulated debt and may not prevent tenants from breaking leases or landlords from evicting tenants. There may be an opportunity for a neutral third party to assist banks and property owner, and landlords and tenants in amending the terms of mortgages or leases to avoid the costs and losses of foreclosing, breaking leases or evicting tenants.

Commercial corridors were already experiencing difficulties with keeping tenants prior to the pandemic. The City had instituted a commercial vacancy registry, fines, and voters had passed a vacancy tax to respond to the vacancies observed in many commercial corridors. Unless mitigated, COVID-19 will significantly increase commercial vacancy in San Francisco.

In addition, certain business activities were under significant cost pressures in the City, including manufacturing, distribution, repair, and ACHE sectors. Cost pressures on landlords may lead to evictions of these businesses that were already at risk of leaving the City.

Factors Affecting Communities of Color and/or Other Vulnerable Populations Differently

Due in part to historical wealth inequality and undercapitalization in communities of color, small business tenants in these communities may not be able to carry their costs for the length of the shelter-in-place. According to a survey conducted by the ERTF, 67% of

respondents who identify as Black and as business owners cited financial support for their business as their greatest need during the COVID-19 pandemic, almost 40% higher than their white counterparts. Moreover, a national survey conducted by the Stanford Latino Entrepreneurship in August 2020 found that one in four Latino-owned businesses will likely run out of cash by the end of the year. They also found that Latino-owned businesses were approved for PPP loans at half the rate of white-owned businesses (10% compared to 17%). Entrepreneurs without upfront capital or legal resources may be more likely to guarantee small business debt with personal assets such as a home, placing the entrepreneur and their families at risk if the debt becomes unmanageable. In addition, due to historical inequality, the terms of mortgages for vulnerable communities or communities of color may be more restrictive. Businesses and organizations run by those with limited English proficiency or educational barriers face barriers engaging with landlords who may be monolingual English speakers.

Landlords that manage their own properties may not have the resources to procure assistance in working out leases or may not have access to industry knowledge to understand that their lease expectations may diverge from the existing climate.

Existing Programs/Policies that Address this Problem

Alternative dispute resolution in the form of mediation or arbitration is common. The Bar Association of San Francisco provides a directory of mediators and appears to standardize agreements and practices. There are also a number of professional organizations for mediators and arbitrators. Legal Services for Entrepreneurs also works with OEWD to provide these services to small businesses. In addition, OEWD works with a number of small business lending programs.

There are also a handful of existing programs that could be useful models to help support local business in the arts and culture sectors especially: the Nonprofit Sustainability Program (administered in partnership with Community Vision), the Loan Preparation Program, and the Legacy Business Program. Additionally, there are similar private philanthropic efforts spearheaded by CAST, YBCA's Artist Power Center, Center for Cultural Innovation, and Intersection for the Arts.

Program Overview

Proposed Solution, Goals, Intended Outcomes, and Beneficiaries

To address the growing threats of eviction and displacement for commercial tenants and that of foreclosure for landlords, the City should provide advisory services from brokers or attorneys at no cost to the parties to negotiate solutions that avoid foreclosures, evictions, and/or permanent closures.

To reach the most urgent cases first, the application process for this initiative could give priority to clients with multiple risk factors, including but not limited to:

- Protracted COVID-19 business impacts;
- Length of shelter-in-place closure;
- Presence in an Opportunity Neighborhood, as designated by OEWD's Invest in Neighborhoods program;
- Operations led/delivered by people belonging to BIPOC communities; or
- Member of a hard-hit industry, such as the ACHE sectors.

Designing this prioritization would be an important early step of implementation.

Local government could also support struggling ACHE businesses and nonprofits with complementary efforts to help keep them afloat. Models to build off of include the Nonprofit Sustainability Program, the Loan Preparation Program, and the Legacy Business Program. The City could consider offering or advocating for property tax reductions for those landlords that agree to waive, postpone, or decrease the amount of rent owed by specific tenants. Offering reductions rather than complete exemptions would allow the City to minimize revenue losses and set the property tax reduction of a specific property based upon the extent to which that property's landlord agrees to decrease or waive rent payments.

The goal of this effort would be to avoid permanent closures of small businesses, particularly businesses owned by or serving communities of color or vulnerable populations, and within industries experiencing the most cost pressure under COVID-19.

Beneficiaries would include small business tenants in commercial corridors that are owned by or serve communities of color and vulnerable populations, as well as tenants within industries most impacted by COVID-19, such as the ACHE sectors. Further, landlords would benefit by avoiding the costly process of evicting tenants or losing rent over the long-term. Property owners would also benefit by avoiding foreclosure. And indirectly, neighborhood residents would benefit through the sustained presence of local businesses and avoided vacancies in commercial corridors.

What Success Looks Like and Measures of Success

Success would look like avoided commercial evictions and foreclosures, measured by the number of negotiations that are successful and/or businesses that are able to stay in place as a result of executed property tax reduction agreements.

Program Administrator(s) and Community Partners

This advisory services component of this effort would be administered by OEWD and the Office of Small Business in partnership with attorneys and brokers who serve the commercial real estate market, mediators and arbitrators. Potential community partners are the Bar Association of San Francisco, Building Owners Management Association, and community partners in small business lending programs. OEWD and TTX could advise about how best to approach tax reductions.

Timeframe

This project should start as soon as possible and plan to continue through 2021.

Cost

If pro bono advisory services are available, costs would be limited to City staff that organize the project, possibly part of an FTE in OEWD. However, given the needs across the City related to COVID-19, philanthropic funding for this effort may be difficult to secure. Historically, the City has paid for similar services, and pursuing enhancements to existing service agreements could be more expedient, if budget allocations were available.

The estimated funding need for the services is approximately \$530,000:

- A portion of an FTE to administer the program, seated in OEWD (\$80,909).
- Services cost from \$500-\$4500/business depending on the level of service provided; \$450,000 would support 100 high-touch supports for businesses.

The cost of property tax reductions in foregone collections would depend on the negotiations for each property.

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers

Language access and cultural competency of the advisors would be key barriers to accessing this program. Advisors would need to be able to demonstrate they understand the issues and concerns of the tenants, landlords, property owners, and banks to develop trust among the parties.

Focused recruiting of advisors who identify with or have experience working with communities of color or vulnerable populations would be key to overcoming these barriers. For instance, individuals with real estate expertise who work in nonprofits serving vulnerable communities may be good candidates to serve as advisors.

Effective outreach to communities of color and limited English proficient populations about this resource would help overcome access barriers and would require targeted resources. Extensive outreach should also be made to newer businesses to ensure they are aware of the resources available to them.

Program Burdens

This program has the risk of most easily reaching businesses with better access to resources and information, which are less likely to be owned by vulnerable populations. This could be mitigated by putting resources towards targeted, multi-lingual outreach and prioritizing economically vulnerable applicants in receiving available services (focusing on specific commercial corridors, partnering with specific CBOs to recruit applicants, and so on).

Community Input and Partnership

Merchant and trade associations, business improvement districts, community benefit districts, nonprofits, and OEWD should be consulted in design and implementation.

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	No
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	No
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	Yes
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	No
Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	Yes

If Yes, please briefly explain.

Providing advisory services and/or allowing for targeted property tax reductions with an equity lens would reduce barriers to accessing resources for the businesses and landlords

that participate in the program. The overall effort could reduce disruptions in communities, reduce vacancies, help support neighborhoods, and contribute a speedier recovery.

Additional Context

Select the type of solution this is:	Please "X" for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	
New program or initiative	X
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	X
Advocacy (supporting efforts bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	

Feasibility

This proposal builds on existing services that are available in the private sector. The City could pilot this program and scale up if it is successful. This proposal is feasible, but the demand is unknown.

This proposal does not require further federal or state legislation.

4.6 Review employer mandates

Problem Statement

San Francisco had a high cost of doing business before COVID-19, with many small businesses and nonprofits operating on slim margins. Since the pandemic, small businesses have come under significantly increased cost pressures due to reduced or no income during the shelter-in-place orders. These pressures include the growing cost of San Francisco employer mandates (expenses San Francisco requires businesses to incur, intended to benefit and protect workers). Employer mandates include the City's Health Care Security Ordinance, Paid Parental Leave, Minimum Wage, and Paid Sick Leave. Such items are crucial to the health, safety, and general welfare of the city's workforce, especially under COVID-19. However, there may be more efficient and effective methods for ensuring workers can access these benefits while minimizing the cost pressures on small businesses.

Small businesses have reported that employer mandates have significant impacts on their ability to hire and retain workers. Both the direct costs of meeting the mandate, and the administrative costs of ensuring compliance with City regulations cumulatively add financial stress for businesses. In addition to the cost pressures posed by the recent California wildfires, shelter-in-place, and COVID-19 imposed operational changes, San Francisco businesses face an extraordinary threat to their survival. At a time when San Francisco is facing the highest unemployment rate in recorded history, the City could work to ensure that the spirit of regulations continue to be met, while preventing those regulations from adding additional stress to local businesses and stifling job growth.

Factors Affecting Communities of Color and/or Other Vulnerable Populations Differently

The COVID-19 pandemic has disproportionately hurt minority-owned businesses, especially black-owned businesses, as reported by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. Nationally, active business owners fell by 22% from February to April, with black businesses experiencing the deepest decline at 41%. Hispanic and Asian business owners fell by 32% and 26%, respectively.¹ The report found that Black businesses often had less access to cash, weaker bank relationships, and large funding gaps ahead of the pandemic, and that these issues have been exacerbated by the health crisis.

Moreover, Latino-owned businesses are largely operating in industries that have taken a hard hit from the pandemic. According to a survey conducted by the Stanford Latino Entrepreneurship in August 2020, the accommodation and food services industry has the highest share of all businesses that report being negatively impacted by the pandemic in June 2020 (71%), and 13% of all Latino-owned employer businesses are located in this

sector. Conversely, only 15% of the businesses in the finance and insurance industry report a large negative impact, an industry that represents only 3% of all Latino-owned employer businesses. Additionally, one in four Latino-owned businesses reported not have sufficient cash to make it through the end of the year.

Allowing businesses to retain more of their cash could be beneficial to staving off some closures in the immediate term. Moreover, as detailed in the table below, there is already great racial disparities in business ownership in San Francisco. The pandemic will only further exacerbate these gaps without intervention.

San Francisco Business Owners by Race/Ethnicity

Category	# Firms	% of Classifiable Firms
White	74,019	65.8%
Asian	31,508	28.0%
Hispanic	10,600	9.4%
Black or African American	3,700	3.3%
American Indian and Alaska Native	934	0.8%

Source: 2012 US Census Survey of Business Owners

Includes businesses with one or more individuals as majority owner and reported race/ethnicity of ownership.

Existing Programs/Policies that Address this Problem

The Office of the City Administrator (Labor Standards and Enforcement) reports out data on the Health Care Security Ordinance, Minimum Wage, Paid Sick Leave, and Paid Parental Leave. Recent reports have shown that the Health Care Security Ordinance had nearly \$140 million unused dollars paid by businesses to the City rather than paying directly for health care. The City made a limited amount of these funds available to workers through one-time grants for COVID-19 expenses. However, if the program continues to collect funds that are not able to be expended on workers’ healthcare, these excess dollars may be better retained in the private sector to help businesses stay afloat, save jobs, and circulate in the local economy.

Program Overview

Proposed Solution, Goals, Intended Outcomes, and Beneficiaries

The City should review existing employer mandates to ensure they uphold local workforce protections and health care policy goals while being mindful of the cost implications to local

small businesses. As this is a legislative policy matter, the Board of Supervisors could direct a review of employer mandates to ensure they are meeting policy goals or recommend changes if there are areas for improvement, as well as ways seek ways to reduce the cost of compliance.

The effort would benefit small businesses and nonprofits with reduced costs and ultimately jobseekers if the reevaluation leads to changes that enable job creation.

What Success Looks Like and Measures of Success

Success would look like reduced costs to businesses and nonprofits while maintaining policy goals of worker coverage and protections.

Program Administrator(s) and Community Partners

The Board of Supervisors is responsible for changing employer mandates. The Office of the City Administrator (Labor Standards and Enforcement), the Budget and Legislative Analyst, and/or the Controller's Office could support the effort. Potential community partners include labor and small businesses.

Timeframe

A review of mandates, various revenue sources, and cost impact to small businesses would take approximately six months, ideally completed in time to develop policy recommendations for the next budget cycle.

Cost

Costs for the short-term effort would include staff/legislative analyst time and stakeholder engagement. If City reduces financial mandates and takes on a related financial burden, there could be lost revenue and/or additional costs, to be determined through the analysis and future policy decisions.

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers

Adequate education about any policy changes would be necessary to ensure businesses of all sizes understand program changes. Policy changes should be accompanied by linguistically and culturally responsive outreach and support services. This could be managed directly by the City or through partnerships with community-based organizations.

Program Burdens

If policy changes meet the original goals of these programs this should not have negative impacts on workers.

Small businesses often bear extra weight of ensuring compliance with City regulations due to their limited staffing capacity. They often have to contract out work or hire additional staff to meet these obligations. If a review of existing mandates were able to reduce the burden and cost of compliance by simplifying regulations, that would ease the burden on smaller businesses unable to distribute compliance work to existing staff.

Community Input and Partnership

The ERTF members who recommended this review were comprised of a diverse field of community leaders in the city. This included businesses owners from communities of color who expressed concern with the growing costs of ensuring compliance with employer mandates. They also expressed support for ensuring worker’s rights and access to quality healthcare, and they believed these items did not need to be in conflict with reviewing and potentially easing employer mandates.

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	No
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	No
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	Yes
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	No
Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	Yes

If Yes, please briefly explain.

Lowering barriers to starting and growing a small business is critical to advancing economic mobility in communities of color. According to University of Nevada, Las Vegas political scientist and recent Congressional Black Caucus Foundation senior research fellow, Tiffany Howard, “Black business ownership, more so than even education is a tangible pathway for African Americans to achieve economic parity and close the racial wealth gap.” The more expensive and difficult it is to succeed as an entrepreneur, the less inclusive our economy becomes as individuals without access to significant financial and legal resources are

excluded from wealth creation. Streamlining City mandates to reduce financial and legal barriers to starting and growing a business while maintaining the desired outcomes those mandates would support economic equity.

Additional Context

Select the type of solution this is:	Please “X” for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	
New program or initiative	X
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	
Advocacy (supporting efforts bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	

Feasibility

Feasibility depends on the scope of the proposals once mandates are reviewed. The review itself is feasible using existing staff or legislative analyst time.

This proposal does not require further federal or state legislation.

5. Pursue Economic Justice

5.1 Invest in BIPOC and immigrant communities

Problem Statement

Decades of housing and employment discrimination have created an intergenerational wealth gap between BIPOC and immigrant communities and their white peers. A history of mortgage market and housing discrimination means that Black people are significantly less likely to be homeowners than whites, which means they have had less access to the wealth generation and tax benefits that come with owning a home. Persistent labor market discrimination also force Black people into fewer and less advantageous employment opportunities than their white counterparts. In San Francisco, median household income for Black families is \$31,235, compared with \$116,102 for white families and \$67,282 for Latinx.¹⁴

San Francisco has seen the displacement and out-migration of its Black population, the only racial group that has consistently decreased in population in every census count since 1970. In addition, Black San Franciscans are 5% of population but make up 40% of those experiencing homelessness.¹⁵

Before COVID-19, the Black community was hardest hit by the Great Recession and foreclosure crisis, and the same looks to be true again in this crisis. BIPOC people are more likely than whites to be employed in industries decimated by job losses, including food service and hospitality. This year, Black unemployment is expected to peak at as much as 30%.¹⁶

Nationally, 11% of Black working age adults have disabilities, compared to 9% of white working age adults.¹⁷ In 2019, only 19.3% of disabled people were employed, compared with 66.2% of people without disabilities.

¹⁴ American Community Survey 2017 5-Year Estimates, Table S1903.
https://factfinder.census.gov/bkmk/table/1.0/en/ACS/17_5YR/S1903/0500000US06075
(Accessed 2019)

¹⁵ <https://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/article/San-Francisco-plans-to-redirect-120-million-from-15447811.php>

¹⁶ Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (June 2, 2020). *‘The Impact of the COVID19 Recession on Jobs and Incomes of Persons of Color’*. Retrieved from: https://www.cbpp.org/research/full-employment/the-impact-of-the-covid19-recession-on-the-jobs-and-incomes-of-persons-of#_ftn21

¹⁷ www.brookings.edu/blog/the-avenue/2018/05/15/disability-rates-among-working-age-adults-are-shaped-by-race-place-and-education

San Francisco is one of the largest ports for new immigrants to the larger Bay Area. Even with its long history of forced displacement of communities of color, the city remains a cultural hub for many immigrant individuals and families. Undocumented immigrants do not have access to the same spectrum of supports and workforce opportunities as other populations. As many as 49,000 undocumented immigrants live in San Francisco and face significant barriers to employment and income generation. There are reduced job prospects for workers in hard-hit sectors such as arts, culture, hospitality, and entertainment, especially for those with less education, immigrants, and gig-workers.

Factors Affecting Communities of Color and/or Other Vulnerable Populations Differently

BIPOC people are also more likely to work in jobs that cannot work from home, putting themselves and their families at risk of infection from COVID-19. For example, Black and Latinx workers are most overrepresented in child care and social services which are hard to transition to remote work.¹⁸

Another major factor affecting the Black community in San Francisco is policing. Black people have been subject to disproportionate arrests, use-of-force, and incarceration. Last year, roughly 45% of police use-of-force incidents in San Francisco involved a Black person, though not every incident involved a city resident.

The immigrant community is negatively impacted by the Trump administration's immigration policies. The fear of deportation makes immigrants reluctant to seek and accept services. Moreover, Asian and Latinx communities include many immigrants who have limited English Proficiency, which can pose as a barrier to access for many assistance programs.

Existing Programs/Policies that Address this Problem

While there are numerous programs that support BIPOC and immigrant populations, there is not an overarching systematic effort to reduce the wealth gap in San Francisco.

For the Fiscal Years 2021 and 2022 budget, San Francisco aimed to divert \$120 million from law enforcement budgets to investments in the Black community. That process is underway, led by HRC.

To date, Give2SF has distributed \$28,194,000 in donations. The City has identified four priority areas for the immediate use of the Give2SF funds: (1) food security; (2) access to housing; and (3) security for workers and small businesses. Funds are granted by HSA,

¹⁸ Center for Economic and Policy Research (CEPR) (April 2020). *'A Basic Demographic Profile of Workers in Frontline Industries'*. Retrieved from: <https://cepr.net/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/2020-04-Frontline-Workers.pdf>.

MOHCD, OECE, or OEWD to San Francisco based nonprofits. These City partners manage the below grant programs open to San Francisco residents regardless of immigration status:

Give 2SF Grant Programs

Priority Area	Description	Partners
Supportive Services for Immigrant Workers	Provide direct support to immigrants and undocumented children, families, and communities affected by COVID-19.	SF Labor Council, UndocuFund SF, Bay Area Community Resources, Community Youth Center
Supportive Services for Food Security	Provide direct relief to support immigrants and undocumented children, families, and communities affected by COVID-19.	Bay Area Community Resources, Community Youth Center
Housing Stabilization	Provide financial assistance of up to \$3,000 for rent, mortgage, utility, and other housing costs to eligible households per application period (with an assistance cap of \$10,000 per household). Households are eligible, regardless of immigration status, if they have experienced a substantial loss of income due to COVID-19 and cannot afford their housing costs. Applications are run through a prioritization tool that identifies households that are most at risk.	Catholic Charities of San Francisco, Eviction Defense Collaborative, La Raza Community Resource Center, Q Foundation, Young Community Developers

Program Overview

Proposed Solution, Goals, Intended Outcomes, and Beneficiaries

This program seeks to build on the City's announcement to divert \$120 million from law enforcement budgets over the next two years to the Black community. HRC has distilled a set of broad initiatives that reflect the Black community's preferences for how the money should be spent. The bulk of the funds — 60% — will be directed to mental health, wellness, and homelessness initiatives affecting the Black community. Another 35% will be used for education, youth development, and economic opportunities.

In addition to the \$120 million already committed, the Task Force would like to see investment targeted to the BIPOC and immigrant community in policy areas prioritized by the ERTF, including:

Childcare and early childhood education

- Expand tuition credits to make childcare affordable and accessible
- Invest in early education to end the cycle of poverty

Housing support to stay in San Francisco

- Rental support and eviction protection
- Permanent supportive housing
- Housing for transitional-age youth (TAY)

Mental health and behavioral health

- Drug and alcohol abuse treatment
- Supporting people in crisis, including youth, families and seniors
- Early intervention through CBOs

Workforce development

- Training for in-demand jobs that link to a career pathway
- Providing assistance for job search and application processes, which have gone completely online due to COVID.
- City can play a more active role in job creation, specifically in areas like infrastructure improvement.

Subsidized employment and other income support

- More subsidized job opportunities

- Explore universal basic income or other direct financial support
- Continue to direct donations to Give2SF and include more funding for vulnerable immigrants who are ineligible for or cannot access state or federal assistance
- Arts and culture work

Small business and entrepreneurship support

- Support accessing financial assistance programs, capital, avoiding eviction
- Support taking business online
- Support formation of worker cooperatives and other entrepreneurship opportunities
- Support commercial corridors in Black and immigrant neighborhoods

Addressing the digital divide

- Devices, affordable internet, and skills support (linguistically and culturally competent)

Financial services

- Bank accounts, credit products, and financial coaching
- Student and consumer debt relief

In addition to these efforts, San Francisco should continue to prioritize programs and initiatives that address wealth disparities in BIPOC and immigrant communities to foster an equitable recovery. All of these programs should feature linguistically appropriate outreach and support to ensure can apply and access the various forms of assistance suggested. The City should also continue to invest resources, including Give2SF and Immigrant Family Relief Funds, in undocumented populations and immigrant-owned businesses that don't qualify for federal and state aid and/or do not have work authorization. Although there are several financial relief programs available in San Francisco, many have closed applications due to limited funding available.

Programs should prioritize the needs of Black people and immigrants with disabilities and provide appropriate services and support towards employment.

What Success Looks Like and Measures of Success

Success would look like elimination of the racial wealth gap in San Francisco. Measures could include income comparisons of household income with other groups, outmigration rates of BIPOC populations, and percent of BIPOC-owned business closures compared to total closures.

Program Administrator(s) and Community Partners

The near-term funds reallocation is led by HRC, but all City departments have a role to play in delivering services for a more racially equitable city.

Timeframe

This effort can begin immediately with the current budget and should continue until the wealth gap has been eliminated.

Cost

- At the time of writing, the City has committed to at least \$120 million directly invested from the police department budget to the black community
- Many department budgets can be adjusted to serve the goals of this proposal.
- Additional philanthropic funds or revenues measures would help achieve the goals of this proposal

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers

Barriers include ongoing racism and discrimination, including access to housing, jobs, and financial resources. Anti-discrimination legislation and enforcement can help address these barriers. Data on university admissions, housing programs, hiring, contracts, and lending by race can also help bring to light bias and discrimination.

Program Burdens

This proposal aims to redress historical disinvestment on communities of color and/or other vulnerable populations.

Community Input and Partnership

After examining hundreds of public survey submissions and holding 13 community meetings, HRC has distilled a set of broad initiatives that reflect the Black community's preferences for how the money should be spent.

On June 8, 2020, the San Francisco Immigrant Rights Commission held a special hearing on the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic and hardships faced by San Francisco immigrant communities. The Commission heard from community members, service providers, and leaders, in addition to presentations from the Co-Chairs and members of the Economic Recovery Task Force, Give2SF, Family Relief Fund, and several smaller Bay Area and California relief funds for undocumented and vulnerable immigrants not eligible for other means of support.

Community Assets

This proposal should preserve and build on BIPOC-owned organizations and businesses, including in arts and culture, to ensure they are successful.

The proposal should also build on industries in San Francisco with growth potential to help ensure that people of BIPOC obtain jobs with upward mobility. The City should partner with universities and other educational institutions to ensure that people of color are positioned to enter into those fields.

The City should work in close partnership with CBOs to develop holistic strategies to lift up BIPOC communities, including strategies that are specific to each race/ethnicity and that work together.

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	Yes
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	Yes
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	Yes
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	Yes
Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	Yes

If Yes, please briefly explain.

Significant investment in the BIPOC and immigrant community would address the wealth disparity and improve the material condition of communities of color.

Additional Context

Select the type of solution this is:	Please "X" for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	X
New program or initiative	
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	X
Advocacy (supporting efforts bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	

Feasibility

This proposal is feasible and builds on existing efforts and assets.

This proposal does not require legislation, but would be more impactful with passage of Proposition 16 on the November 2020 ballot, which would repeal of Proposition 209, making it possible to consider race in hiring and contract decisions.

5.2 Ensure low-income school children have access to educational programming

Problem Statement

Due to COVID-19, SFUSD moved to distance learning in March and is starting the Fall 2020 school year distanced as well. Racial and socioeconomic achievement gaps will most likely widen [because of disparities](#) in access to computers, home internet connections, the loss of direct instruction from teachers, as well as the financial ability to supplement SFUSD learning plans. According to a nationwide survey from ParentsTogether, the lowest-income parents (making less than \$25,000 a year) were 10 times more likely than families making six figures and above to say their kids are doing little or no remote learning. The survey also found big gaps reported by families whose children are in special education. In San Francisco, SFUSD has an estimated 28,500 socioeconomically disadvantaged students. The formation of “pandemic pods” by private citizens could further exacerbate the disparity with lower-income children whose parents do not have resources to supplement.

When all of the impacts are taken into account, the average student could fall seven months behind academically, while Black and Latinx students could experience even greater learning losses, equivalent to 10 months for Black children and nine months for Latinx, according to [an analysis from McKinsey & Company](#). High school dropout rates could increase while younger children could miss out on foundational concepts in phonics and fractions that prepare them for a lifetime of learning and working.

Factors Affecting Communities of Color and/or Other Vulnerable Populations Differently

There have been persistent achievement disparities across income levels and between white students and students of Black and Latinx heritage. Unfortunately, the past decade has seen little progress in narrowing these disparities. The average Black or Latinx student remains roughly two years behind the average white one, and low-income students continue to be underrepresented among top performers. Institutional racism continues to harm Black and Brown students.

Existing Programs/Policies that Address this Problem

The Community Hubs program is a neighborhood-based strategy to support children, youth, and families during the school year. Community Hubs will provide support for students who are utilizing SFUSD’s Distance Learning Curriculum and will prioritize children and youth with the highest need, particularly low-income youth and those who are part of the City’s most vulnerable populations. Community Hubs provide support for SFUSD distance learning. They do not provide instruction. The effort is designed to help ensure

that kids are logging on and able to participate in distance learning with a device and a safe space to do it.

Community Hubs will serve up to 6,000 youth in grades K-6. They will be staffed primarily by DCYF CBO providers who are already required to be culturally responsive and, in some cases, have language capacity. Hub staff will mainly support the students as they engage so they will circulate and assist as needed. The diversity of students from multiple schools, teachers, and ages at a single Community Hub is a big challenge. That is why DCYF is ensuring a device for every student and will have enough bandwidth to allow for every kid to be on a separate online session at once.

Program Overview

Proposed Solution, Goals, Intended Outcomes, and Beneficiaries

This proposal is to seek resources to ensure the Community Hubs can mitigate learning loss for low-income students, students of color, and students with other challenges for distance learning at the desired level of service. Not all students in need will be able to join Community Hubs as they are limited by multiple factors, including health orders.

Parents, especially immigrant parents, and grandparents may also seek support to assist students with online learning, such as managing learning platforms and setting the right routine. These limitations require a multitude of sites beyond the CBO's locations. DCYF has secured close to 80 sites as of writing and still needs more. The City should continue to take steps to support SFUSD families in the success of distance learning, including breaking down barriers to the digital divide.

What Success Looks Like and Measures of Success

Success would look like the achievement gap not widening. It could be measured in reading and math levels by race and income, especially comparing pre- and post-COVID-19 disparities. Success could also be measured in terms of participation (numbers of students, ages, hours of participation) and how many of the children are from vulnerable populations.

Program Administrator(s) and Community Partners

This effort would be administered by DCYF, with support from CBOs, RPD, SFPL, SFDT, DPH, the CCC, and potentially with PUC and PW. The City should also explore partnerships with arts organizations to include high quality arts education and free digital content.

Timeframe

This effort will start immediately with the fall 2020 school year and should remain in place until in-person learning fully resumes.

Cost

Implementing Community Hubs costs DCYF \$70 million and RPD \$13 million. Partnerships with philanthropy will be critical to fully funding Community Hubs. At the time of writing, the greatest needs are sites and funding.

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers

It may be difficult to get the most vulnerable students to participate in Community Hubs, including undocumented immigrants, limited English speaking students, unsheltered students, those experiencing family violence, and others. DCYF is working closely with HOPE SF, MOHCD, HSA, and CBOs to identify students with the greatest needs and conduct direct in-person outreach. Reduced transit service may also make it challenging for enrolled students to attend. As such, DCYF is prioritizing placing youth in Community Hubs near where they live.

Another barrier is coordination between multiple agencies, including between City agencies and SFUSD, which is a separate jurisdiction. Coordination is critical for identifying high-needs kids near Community Hub sites and to deliver the program at a larger scale.

Appropriate support should be continued post-COVID to ensure the most vulnerable students get the support they need.

Program Burdens

Any in-person service increases the risk of COVID-19 infection. DCYF is addressing health and safety including ensuring all procedures are in place, procuring and distributing PPE, providing information on regulations and policies to parents, and potentially deploying surveillance testing in coordination with DPH.

Community Input and Partnership

Community input will be very valuable for honing the type of support that low-income and children and color need from the Community Hubs. Feedback from students, families, and teachers should be taken into account.

Community Assets

This proposal builds on the assets of public facilities, participating CBOs, and SFUSD teachers.

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	Yes
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	Yes
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	Yes
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	Yes
Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	Yes

If Yes, please briefly explain.

This proposal seeks to directly address racial disparities in distance learning.

Additional Context

Select the type of solution this is:	Please “X” for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	X
New program or initiative	
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	X
Advocacy (supporting efforts bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	

Feasibility

Delivering the Community Hubs is feasible as there is funding to get them up and running in fall 2020; however, achieving the desired level of service and reducing achievement disparities will be very challenging.

This proposal does not require further federal or state legislation.

5.3 Reform fines and fees levied by San Francisco to reduce inequitable financial burdens on low-income people and communities of color

Problem Statement

Over the past several years, awareness has increased in San Francisco that using fines and fees to discourage behaviors or cover costs can have an insidious unintended impact: to push people into poverty. People with lower incomes and people of color are usually hit the hardest. These financial penalties can make government a driver of inequality, not an equalizer of opportunity. When people cannot pay, what starts as a small problem can snowball into a much larger one as the fine or fee can grow through late fees, credit scores can take a hit, and driver's licenses can be suspended and vehicle registrations withheld, creating barriers for people to get jobs or housing.

Existing Programs/Policies that Address this Problem

[The Financial Justice Project](#) within the Office of the Treasurer and Tax Collector was launched in 2016 to assess and reform fines and fees that have a disproportionate adverse impact on low-income people and communities of color. The Project has two main goals: (1) to listen to community residents to identify pain points; and (2) to develop and implement solutions in partnership with government agencies and the courts that can make a difference in people's lives.

Over the past three and a half years, the Project has collaborated with departments and the courts to either eliminate or create ability to pay discounts for dozens of fees and fines, and also lifted tens of millions of dollars in debt off of thousands of San Francisco residents. All locally-controlled fees assessed from people exiting jail or the criminal justice system have been eliminated. Phone calls from county jail are now free. Discounted tow and boot fees are available for low-income San Franciscans. It is easier for lower-income people to pay off citations through payment plans, community service options, or receiving social services. A full list of Project accomplishments is [here](#).

The San Francisco Department of Child Support Services, in collaboration with the State Department of Child Support Services, leveraged a statewide debt forgiveness program using philanthropic dollars to pay down the debt parents owed to the government. Doing so ensured that all of the funds collected by child support can go directly to the custodial parent, usually the mother, and child. Funding was secured for the pilot from the Walter and Elise Haas Fund and Tipping Point Communities. As a result of the pilot, parents' child support payments increased 15-30%, their relationships with their child and co-parent improved, and their financial, housing, and employment opportunities improved.

The Financial Justice Project worked with the District Attorney’s Office and the Courts to create [the CONNECT program](#), which allows people who receive these citations to get them cleared if they receive 20 hours of social services support from community-based organizations. Many community groups have expressed that police are not the right entity to respond to these matters, nor are citations that right tool to address these incidents, and there is a larger discussion happening citywide to explore alternatives that meet the needs of these individuals and the community.

The above reforms have benefited communities of color, lower-income San Franciscans, at-risk youth, people struggling with homelessness, and people exiting the criminal justice system. Recently, ten other cities and counties received grants to be part of Cities and Counties for Fine and Fee Justice.

Factors Affecting Communities of Color and/or Other Vulnerable Populations Differently

Vulnerable populations and low-income residents are much more likely have a fine or fee lead to much larger impacts.

Program Overview

Though much progress has been made, there are still fine and fee reform priorities to deliver. The proposed reforms here have been raised by community groups and impacted individuals and range from process reforms to expansions of existing discounts to reforms to inequitable systems that have outsized impacts on lower income people and communities of color.

Process Reforms:

- **Conduct a biennial racial and economic equity review of all fines and fees.** The Financial Justice Project would like to permanently embed a racial and economic equity review of fines and fees into the City budget process to be conducted every two years. Through past pilots, all departments, as part of the budget process, have submitted information about fines and fees collected, including: considerations around ability to pay, whether there are late fees, the number of distinct individuals paying these fines and fees, and projected and actual revenue from collection. Continuing in this vein, analyzing this information can identify fines and fees that are “high pain” for individuals and have a disproportionate and adverse impact on low-income individuals and communities of color. From there the City can eliminate the fee or fine, create discounts for lower-income residents based on their ability to pay, or create nonmonetary ways for people to resolve their fine.

- **Ease the administrative burden for departments to offer fine and fee discounts to low-income San Franciscans through use of HSA’s income verification database.** Last year, the Financial Justice Project partnered with HSA to create an [income verification database](#) to make it easier and simpler for departments and the courts to discount fines and fees for people with lower incomes. SFMTA has now been using the tool for a year, and the SFPUC has begun using it as well. Expanding this tool for use by more departments would advance the goal of financial justice.
- **Expand eligibility for existing fine and fee discounts.** The SFMTA is in the process of expanding eligibility for its discounts to people who are receiving unemployment benefits. The Financial Justice Project has [worked with many departments](#) to expand eligibility to discounts and to pause on debt collection during the shelter-in-place order (and many were already advancing these reforms). The Financial Justice Project can continue to explore further possibilities such as: auto-enrolling people in discounts they are eligible for; fee waivers for low-income residents; and moving toward county-wide eligibility standards for fine and fee discounts.
- **Conduct an outreach campaign to ensure people know about fine and fee discounts that are available to them.** The Financial Justice Project has evidence that thousands of people are accessing and using the existing fine and fee discounts. While thousands are benefitting, there is still work to be done to reach more people who are eligible. Thousands of people may owe debt on fines and fees from before these reforms passed, and thousands more may not know these discounts are available. A citywide marketing campaign would raise awareness using low-cost methods: social media ad buys targeted toward low-income people of color in specific zip codes throughout San Francisco and training trusted community messengers and frontline staff at community organizations to make sure people know how to access and use these discounts.

Reform inequitable systems that have outsized detrimental impacts on lower income people and communities of color:

- **Reimagine our system of victim restitution to restore crime survivors and defendants in poverty.** Relying on defendants in poverty to make crime survivors in poverty whole does not work for anyone. Only an estimated 10% of victim restitution is ever paid in San Francisco. Victims of crime often never receive restitution or wait years to receive any of it. People who owe restitution, who are usually low-income, may be unemployed themselves, are often unable to pay restitution, and remain in debt for years even after completing other parts of their sentence. And for young people who owe restitution, but cannot pay, this debt hangs over them as they are

just starting off with their young adult lives and can create barriers to moving forward in their lives.

Both victims of crime and defendants need a more economically secure path following involvement with the criminal justice system to break cycles of revictimization and recidivism. The District Attorney's (DA) Office is leading this collaborative effort to develop recommendations for reform in San Francisco. Proposed reforms that have emerged are to: (1) develop a restorative rapid response fund in the DA's office to support crime survivors; (2) leverage the expansion of San Francisco DA's restorative justice programs to bring the principles of restorative justice into restitution and ensure a victim-centered approach; and (3) pilot a supported employment program for people who owe restitution and provide a funded matching contribution towards restitution.

- **Relieve the child support debt that low-income parents owe to the government.**

Parents who owe child support debt are charged 10% interest, have their driver's license suspended, and their credit score is damaged, creating formidable barriers to employment and to obtaining housing. The majority of parents who owe this debt in San Francisco are Black and Latino men who earn \$12,000 or less a year. This debt should be relieved. (The Financial Justice Project collaborated with Kamau Bell and Robert Reich to create a [three-minute explainer video](#) that describes a similar previous pilot program.)

In partnership with the Department of Child Support Services, this relief program could be piloted for families whose child support cases are closed and whose sole responsibility is to pay debt owed to the government. Every year, hundreds of thousands of California families do not receive their full child support payments because low-income families that receive public benefits only receive the first \$50 of their monthly child support payment. The rest is redirected to government to pay back the cost of public assistance, like Medi-Cal and CalWORKs. Punitive child support policies deprive low-income children of valuable resources, disproportionately harm children and families of color, and create conflict in families.

Transportation fines and fees:

- **Ensure that ability to pay is not a barrier to riding transit.** In San Francisco, over [50,000](#) fare evasion tickets are handed out each year. Community members who cannot afford to pay the Muni fare are receiving fare evasion tickets. Muni may be their only option to get to social service or medical appointments or work. The SFMTA should explore providing free Muni access to people living in deep poverty, below 100% of the federal poverty line (\$12,700 a year), which could help thousands

of San Franciscans—95,000 San Franciscans live below the poverty line. SFMTA is struggling budgetarily due to decreased ridership during COVID-19 and would require new funds.

- **Ensure that those who are vehicularly housed have access to services and opportunities for housing and that towing fees do not disproportionately affect low-income people.** The SFMTA should stop towing for debt collection for unpaid citations, which is a costly and inefficient tool for the City and devastates low-income families. A letter signed by 27 community organizations was recently sent to the SFMTA with this request. This reform would build on previous reforms made by the SFMTA, such as the low-income tow discount, which reduces the cost of the tow from \$550+ to \$230 for low-income people below 200% of the Federal Poverty Line. The SFMTA Board recently approved [deeper towing and booting discounts](#) for low-income people and people struggling with homelessness. The City has also recently opened vehicle triage centers to provide safe parking options for vehicularly housed people.

Towing cars to collect unpaid debt is the costliest option for both the City and the person. More than 50% of the cars towed for debt collection are not reclaimed, often resulting in the person losing not only their biggest asset, but often their home. Towing cars for unpaid citations also loses money for SFMTA. There are less onerous ways to collect the debt, such as tax intercepts, that do not result in a revenue loss for SFMTA like towing does. In addition, the SFMTA could develop a phone or texting system to warn people when their vehicles are about to be towed to prevent towing before it happens.

Other reforms:

- **Reduce or eliminate onerous permit fees for sidewalk vendors and micro-entrepreneurs.** These permit fees create barriers to low-income, often immigrant entrepreneurs. A new state law, SB 946, also calls into question whether several of the permit processes are relevant and affects SFPD's ability to enforce the permits. The following fees disproportionately impact low-income, immigrant, and monolingual populations:
 - San Francisco Arts Commission street artist permit fees cost \$821, in addition to registering as a business (\$83) and registering with the state (\$0). The fee is primarily paid for by monolingual, low-income, immigrant populations. As the fee has increased, the number of applicants has decreased from 400+ in 2011, to less than 200 in 2019. The Arts Commission

expects the number of applicants to keep decreasing and would like to waive upcoming quarterly payments on these fees.

- SFPD peddler permit fees range from \$75-\$1,200 and govern businesses as varied as pawn brokers to street peddlers. SFPD staff were not aware why there was such a range in pricing. Every person filling out a permit application must pay their permit fee (\$614 for a street peddler), go through a background check (\$76), fingerprint (\$101), attend a public hearing with SFPD, and register as a business with TTX (\$87). Last year, there were only 11 peddler permit applications. SFPD acknowledged there are likely many un-permitted peddlers, and the new state law inhibits any enforcement.

Reform Quality of Life citations that penalize people for their poverty.

- Quality of Life citations are given out by the SFPD for offenses like sleeping or camping where it is prohibited, blocking a sidewalk, loitering, or having an open container of alcohol. Most of the tickets start at \$200 and grow to nearly \$500 when people are unable to pay them on time. A [report](#) found that 90% of tickets go unpaid, not because people do not want to pay the fines, but because they are too poor to do so. These tickets often go to people experiencing homelessness, and community organizations and case workers have shared how the record of these citations created barriers to jobs and housing for people struggling with homelessness.

Pre-apply fine and fee discounts to San Franciscans who qualify.

- Using data sources available to the City, including the HSA's income verification database, the City agencies that administer these fines and fees can apply relevant discounts to those who qualify. No action on the part of discount recipients would be necessary to trigger these discounts. Automatically these discounts would solve long-standing issues regarding lack of public knowledge of such programs while eliminating barriers that traditional application and registration processes entail.

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers

One of the barriers for vulnerable populations is awareness of eligibility for discount programs. For this reason, the Financial Justice Project plans to conduct a citywide marketing campaign that relies on low-cost and effective marketing methods. A set of short videos would explain how to apply for various discounts, as well as develop training sessions for community groups who can support people to apply for discounts.

Conducting awareness campaigns is not enough. The Financial Justice Project works closely with community groups to ensure application processes are as straightforward and accessible as possible, collaboratively redesigning forms, applications, and promotional language. The Project also trains CBO staffs to help their constituents apply for discounts and navigate bureaucratic processes. All materials are in multiple languages and at an 8th grade reading level.

Program Burdens

There is often an administrative burden to applying for discounts and verifying eligibility, and The Financial Justice Project is aware of onerous application requirements that can prevent people from applying. For example, to address these concerns, the Project works with departments to accept benefits cards (i.e., Medi-Cal) as proof of eligibility. As long as someone can show their benefit card, something that 225,000 San Francisco residents can do, they do not need to fill out any additional paperwork. If people do not have their benefit cards, departments can be trained to utilize a cloud-based lookup tool created by HSA.

Community Input and Partnership

The reforms listed above were initially raised through engagement with community advocates and directly impacted individuals. Community groups and people impacted by fines and fees are important partners to develop and move forward reforms and have deep expertise on what reforms are most needed and would and would not work in the community. The Financial Justice Project works with community groups not only to identify fine and fee pain points, but also to develop and implement reforms, in partnership with other departments and the courts.

Community Assets

The Financial Justice Project has developed partnerships with legal service providers, grassroots coalitions, organizations comprised of and serving formerly incarcerated people and people struggling with homelessness, and local anti-poverty nonprofits. In implementing these reforms, The Financial Justice Project would work closely with departments and community groups to develop reforms, to discuss potential implementation plans and review draft promotional and application materials.

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	Yes
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	Yes
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	Yes
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	Yes
Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	Yes

If Yes, please briefly explain.

All of the proposals described have a focus on racial and economic justice. These proposals would benefit thousands of residents of color and low-income residents, lifting an economic burden that is often disproportionately experienced by vulnerable communities.

Additional Context

Select the type of solution this is:	Please “X” for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	X
New program or initiative	X
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	X
Advocacy (supporting efforts bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	

Feasibility

There is existing momentum behind all of these proposals. The Financial Justice Project has worked closely with other City departments to advance a number of reforms. Some proposed reforms require additional funding and/or have budgetary impacts.

The proposals put forward here do not require state or federal legislation.

5.4 Provide high-quality computers to vulnerable populations

Problem Statement

The COVID-19 crisis has made access to a computer and the internet more important than ever as in-person services have moved online. San Franciscans need a computer to access applications for benefits or other emergency resources, job opportunities, medical appointments, distance learning, and to prevent isolation for older adults. At the same time, shared computer labs that are normally a resource for people without a home computer, such as the Public Library, have not been unavailable for those services due to COVID-19.

Factors Affecting Communities of Color and/or Other Vulnerable Populations Differently

According to the 2019 Digital Equity Strategy Plan, the digital divide disproportionately impacts low-income residents, seniors, people with disabilities, and limited English proficient residents. Over 50% of low-income residents lack a home computer with internet access.

Existing Programs/Policies that Address this Problem

While SFUSD has loaned Chromebooks to students and the City has distributed a small number of refurbished computers through a nonprofit pilot program, the City has received requests for thousands more. Request for devices have come from DCYF for low-income City College students, First 5 educators, dozens of nonprofits who need devices for clients, and approximately 10 calls per day to the San Francisco Public Library.

Program Overview

Proposed Solution, Goals, Intended Outcomes, Proposed Solution, and Beneficiaries

San Francisco should enable the donation at scale of high-quality computers, tablets, smartphones or other related technology that local companies are no longer using to individuals in need, likely through community nonprofits. The exact platform is still to be designed, but it is envisioned that the City or nonprofit would develop a website to facilitate these donations.

Donated computers would need to primarily be new hardware. If hardware is used, it would need to meet certain standards, including being wiped clean of data and meeting specifications for hardware quality and operating system. Companies could go through their existing hardware recycling processes, but instead of re-selling the devices, they would be donated through this platform. Alternatively, it may be necessary to contract with an organization that can provide the data destruction and hardware refurbishment, as well as installing most commonly used applications by target audience, such as video conference and learning tools, and then distribute the devices.

Ideally companies would donate devices directly to community nonprofits through the platform. The benefits of such an approach include harnessing the existing relationships nonprofits have with clients that need computers. In addition, the nonprofit could connect individuals to digital support needed beyond the devices itself, such as referrals to remote tech support and support to access free or low cost internet. The donation to a nonprofit would also be tax deductible.

Beneficiaries would be defined to meet highest need and would likely include low-income San Franciscans, including job-seekers, City College Students, older adults, people with disabilities, immigrants and others.

What Success Looks Like and Measures of Success

Success would be measured by the number of high-quality computers distributed to members of a vulnerable population.

Program Administrator(s) and Community Partner

The effort would be coordinated by SFDT and MOHCD Office of Digital Equity, and administration could live in one of those agencies or with a nonprofit lead.

Timeframe

With committed partners and funding, the effort could start within 3 months.

Cost

- Setting up the platform: Existing staff time to oversee Code 4 SF volunteers, or contract with nonprofit
- Maintaining the platform and reporting: 0.5 FTE existing City staff
- Costs would be significantly higher if the City needs contract for data destruction, device refurbishment and distribution.

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers

A barrier to receiving a computer through this program could be that an individual would need to be connected to one of the participating nonprofits. To lower this barrier, City agencies that are in contact with low-income San Franciscans, such as HSA, OEWD, and SFPL, could promote the program to clients they know who need computers.

Other barriers to fully benefitting from this program include the lack of digital literacy skills in potential recipients (see Proposal 5.6) and access to the internet (see Proposal 5.5). A computer is not particularly useful without the knowledge of how to use it and internet

access. This program should consider pairing devices with skills training, distribution of wireless hotspots, and/or helping users enroll in lifeline internet service.

Program Burdens

The ongoing cost of internet access could be a burden for low-income individuals. The City should continue to find ways to bring low-cost and free broadband to vulnerable communities (see Proposal 5.5). Also, without standards for what constitutes a high-quality device, recipients could be burdened with outdated technology, frustrating rather than enabling them.

Community Input and Partnership

This recommendation is derived from the Digital Equity Strategic Plan, which was developed through engagement with communities of color, including focus groups and one-on-one conversations (in English and other languages) throughout the city at affordable housing sites, workforce centers, food pantries, community fairs, disability centers, schools, and community centers. Staff also met with leaders from City agencies, CBOs, Internet service providers (ISPs), and technology companies.

Additional consultation in service design should happen with potential donors, CBOs that would be distributing devices, and recipients of computers.

Community Assets

Participating nonprofits could help promote this program, set up peer-to-peer skills training, and help provide remote tech support (see Proposal 5.6).

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	Yes
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	No
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	Yes
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	Yes

Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	Yes
---	-----

If Yes, please briefly explain.

This proposal would reduce racial barriers to the digital divide. Access to a computer with internet would allow people to access online resources and services, including distance learning, job training and applications, benefits applications, medical appointments, and other services. Since so much engagement is moving online, having a computer and internet access is critical to inclusion and engagement.

Additional Context

Select the type of solution this is:	Please "X" for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	
New program or initiative	X
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	
Advocacy (supporting efforts bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	

Feasibility

One difficulty is identifying companies that are committed to donating devices at significant scale. The program could potentially be piloted with a couple committed companies before a larger roll out or explore other sources of donated computers, such as residents, government, or other organizations.

This proposal does not require further federal or state legislation.

5.5 Bridge the digital divide with affordable connectivity and internet service

Problem Statement

A June 2020 Greenlining study finds that “COVID-19 changed the digital divide from a problem into an emergency.” This mini-report explores what life is like for those who lack internet access. A summary of the findings: 1. Internet access is not a luxury. 2. Lack of access creates significant hurdles for everyday life. 3. Smartphone access is insufficient. 4. Internet plans designed for low-income families are inadequate. 5. Lack of access is a barrier to academic success.

According to the [2019 Digital Equity Strategy Plan](#), the digital divide disproportionately impacts low-income residents, seniors, people with disabilities, and residents with limited English proficiency. Over 50% of low-income residents lack a home computer with internet access. According to a survey conducted for the Digital Equity Strategic Plan, among respondents who do not use Internet at home or at all, or which lack high-speed home connections, about half said they would subscribe to a home broadband Internet service if offered at a price considered acceptable. Among these respondents, about half felt a monthly price above \$25 would be “too expensive to consider.”

With an unemployment rate of 12.7% in May 2020, San Francisco residents are struggling to pay for basic utilities during the COVID-19 crisis. This year, Black unemployment is expected to peak at as much as 30%.¹⁹ Support is needed to make sure that residents will continue to have access to the internet and mobile devices throughout the recession.

In order to ensure that the estimated 8,000 estimated SFUSD students without a home internet connection can continue to learn, the City needs the infrastructure available to quickly provide internet service in public housing and affordable housing locations. Also, seniors have been abruptly cut off from contact with friends, family, health care providers, exacerbating social isolation that demands better connectivity. Finally, as neighborhood health clinics have been closed or repurposed as temporary hospitals, DPH needs to rely on internet connectivity for telemedicine to treat its routine caseload and COVID-19 patients with minor symptoms at home. These connections are not possible in affordable housing units with no internet at the premise.

¹⁹ Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (June 2, 2020). *‘The Impact of the COVID19 Recession on Jobs and Incomes of Persons of Color’*. Retrieved from: <https://www.cbpp.org/research/full-employment/the-impact-of-the-covid19-recession-on-the-jobs-and-incomes-of-persons-of-color> ftn21

Factors Affecting Communities of Color and/or Other Vulnerable Populations Differently

The digital divide disproportionately affects residents of color and immigrants. Whereas 92% of white households have high-speed home internet connectivity, only 75% of Black households and 78% of Latinx households do. Of households where the primary language spoken at home is English, 91% have high speed connectivity, but only 71% of other households do.²⁰

For many vulnerable communities, especially isolated seniors, mobile devices are the only access to internet and for social contact. According to the City's 2018 Digital Equity Survey, most residents (88%) have smartphones with data plans, compared to only 60% of seniors and 68% of low-income residents. Without a steady source of income, the ability to maintain service will drop.

Existing Programs/Policies that Address this Problem

For the past three years, SFDT has received Capital Budget funding to install broadband internet connectivity to public housing and collaborated with MonkeyBrains, a local internet service provider. From 2017 to 2019, connectivity was installed in 1,600 units, connecting approximately 6,400 residents. During FY2020, internet service was extended to 2,132 units and serves approximately 8,258 residents.

When the COVID-19 emergency started, SFDT's focus shifted to support student distance learning and telehealth needs, and in four weeks extended internet connectivity to 525 students and five shelter sites with 545 beds total.

The California LifeLine Program is a state initiative that provides discounted home phone and cell phone services to eligible households, and it is helping to keep households connected with mobile devices. LifeLine provides discounted phones to vulnerable populations with voice, text, and usually a limited amount of data (<5GB). In response to the recession, the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) has already suspended renewal requirements to the Lifeline program ensuring some continuity of service, but additional support is needed to ensure all households have telephony access. Also, LifeLine offers a combined \$25/household/month subsidy for phone and Internet access, but it has had low uptake due to a number of problems. Notably, ISPs and mobile carriers currently do not have to participate in the program, leading to service quality and availability issues.

20

https://sfmohcd.org/sites/default/files/SF_Digital_Equity_Strategic_Plan_2019.pdf page 21

Program Overview

Proposed Solution, Goals, Intended Outcomes, and Beneficiaries

The City's vision for digital inclusion is full and equitable access to digital technology and its benefits so all San Francisco residents and communities can thrive, regardless of demographics. To deliver on that vision would require a multi-pronged effort:

- SFDT should continue working with MOHCD to extend fiber to very low, low, and moderate income households at public housing and affordable housing locations.
- Public Works and SFDT should consider ways to lower the cost of fiber installation and facilitate the installation of conduits and encourage fiber installation at competitive rates to bring affordable connectivity to low-income households regardless of where they live in San Francisco. More funding is needed to make sure all right-of-way projects install conduit. In addition, the permit process should be streamlined.
- HSH should expand existing efforts to deliver high-speed internet service at SROs.
- SFDT should explore partnerships with the private sector, especially local providers, to build out affordable internet options for more low-income and vulnerable communities. Efforts like the partnership with Monkey Brains to provide broadband to former public housing sites could be expanded and supported throughout San Francisco as funding and capacity allows. Related, the City could partner with companies to explore the use of emerging wireless technologies to overcome traditional hurdles of network buildout while continuing to prioritize connectivity for the most vulnerable first.
- The City should advocate before the CPUC to strengthen the LifeLine program and expand affordable internet service, including extending the LifeLine fee waivers so that they reach more residents for whom cost is a barrier to access. The City's advocacy should include affordability and speed standards, expansion of eligibility for existing discount programs provided by ISPs, and improvement of the registration process.

What Success Looks Like and Measures of Success

Success would acknowledge the urgency of this need and include annual funding at a level to support the maximum level of connections SFDT can reasonably be expected to deliver. SFDT has estimated a \$10.5 million annual budget for four years for this effort.

Success would be measured by the number of affordable housing units connected and could include statistics on the number of SFUSD students, elderly persons, and persons

with disabilities connected, as well as racially and geographically disaggregated data to show equitable implementation. Ultimately the goal would be for all public and affordable housing units to have affordable high-speed internet available. That connectivity and level of service would need to be monitored as part of ongoing service delivery to ensure adequate access, as discussed in the [Digital Equity Strategic Plan](#).

Program Administrator(s) and Community Partners

Various, including SFDT's Fiber to the Premise team.

Timeframe

Ongoing – continues an existing effort.

Cost

Up to \$10.5 million annually until all public housing and affordable housing units are connected.

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers

Barriers for vulnerable populations to the connectivity itself would be minimal as no action from residents would be required. In order to make use of the connectivity once in place, however, barriers include the need for a device and fluency with that device (see Recommendations 5.4 and 5.6).

Program design should also consider how to reach young people who need digital connectivity, but are reliant upon their parents for access to a device and internet service.

Program Burdens

Installation teams should make every effort to avoid disrupting residents at inopportune times to avoid unnecessary burdens.

Community Input and Partnership

This recommendation is derived from the [Digital Equity Strategic Plan](#), which was developed through engagement with vulnerable populations, including focus groups and one-on-one conversations (in English and other languages) throughout the city at affordable housing sites, workforce centers, food pantries, community fairs, disability centers, schools, and community centers. This process also involved meeting with leaders from City agencies, CBOs, ISPs, and technology companies.

SFDT handles the technical aspects of this program, but for equitable outcomes, partnership with MOHCD and Digital Equity Strategic Plan stakeholders is important. Also,

program staff should be sure to conduct outreach to residents in language and in a culturally responsive manner.

Community Assets

For the connectivity itself, N/A, but it needs to be woven into greater digital skills and equity outreach in order to be effective, per the Digital Equity Strategic Plan.

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	Yes
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	Yes
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	Yes
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	Yes
Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	Yes

If Yes, please briefly explain.

This proposal would reduce the digital divide, which disproportionately affects residents of color and immigrant households as described above. Access to internet connectivity would allow people to access online resources and services, including distance learning, job training and applications, benefits applications, medical appointments, and other services. Since so much engagement is moving online, having a computer and internet access is critical to inclusion and achieving full potential.

Additional Context

Select the type of solution this is:	Please “X” for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	
New program or initiative	

Expansion or continuation of existing effort	X
Advocacy (supporting efforts bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	

Feasibility

This program has high feasibility for the internet connectivity component especially as it is a scalable existing effort. The internet service piece is more complicated and will require City leadership to mobilize resources and staff time behind the effort.

This proposal does not require further federal or state legislation. Improving the LifeLine Program would require engagement with the CPUC.

5.6 Build technology capacity of new users, small businesses, and nonprofits

Problem Statement

The COVID-19 pandemic has changed the way we live, do business, learn, and provide support for those in need to a more digital norm. Many of our most vulnerable residents need basic digital literacy skills and require additional support to participate in these new digital-first exchanges. These residents need support to go online and get the services they need, as do small businesses and nonprofits. Converting to online operations is needed for sustained business operation in this moment, and many organizations need support to make this transition, particularly in the arts, culture, hospitality, and entertainment sectors. The lack of technology expertise, resources, and technology education is especially an issue for minority and limited-English business owners. In addition, cybersecurity is a particular concern for smaller organizations. The risk of online fraud or other crime has only increased since COVID-19.

Factors Affecting Communities of Color and/or Other Vulnerable Populations Differently

According to the 2019 [Digital Equity Strategic Plan](#), internet users who are low-income, speak a primary language other than English at home, are senior, or have a disability are less likely to have basic digital literacy.

Minority-owned businesses and nonprofits may have less access to capital due to discrimination in financial institutions and markets. This may limit their ability to invest in digital resources for their business.

Existing Programs/Policies that Address this Problem

Although some CBOs already provide remote tech support, they primarily serve their own clients. In addition, Community Tech Network has launched Home Connect to bring internet and devices into the homes of seniors, but the organization has limited service capacity.

Prior to the pandemic, the Public Library had TechMobile, a fully equipped computer lab on wheels that offered digital literacy classes. Since COVID-19, the library has offered limited “tech time” appointments with library staff. Librarian capacity is limited as many are serving as DSWs in the City’s COVID-19 response.

The City’s Invest in Neighborhoods program provides a number of small business assistance services by partnering with local nonprofits and consultants to deliver needed services to entrepreneurs and small business owners.

Program Overview

Mentorship, user testing, training, and technical assistance are all needed to help unfamiliar technology users, nonprofits, and small businesses transition to a digital-first environment. MOHCD's Office of Digital Equity should administer an effort for the City to partner with digital literacy nonprofit(s) to provide culturally competent and community responsive technology assistance to these audiences. Especially for older adults, people with disabilities, and residents with limited English proficiency, individual support and guidance is needed. The support provided should help residents with a range of key digital skills, including basic computer and Internet usage, online safety and privacy, work-related skills, how to use accessibility features, and the ability to use important digital services. Agencies and CBOs that serve vulnerable populations should be made aware of the program, so they may refer their clients.

OEWD should also explore expanding its small business assistance services and partnering with local companies or nonprofits to deliver services and technical assistance to help businesses and nonprofits transition to a digital environment. Services could include consulting to create online marketing and business/program strategies. Basic concepts of technology accessibility should be introduced. This program should prioritize minority-owned businesses and organizations, including businesses located in more vulnerable neighborhoods (e.g., Bayview, Chinatown, Tenderloin), and the arts, culture, hospitality, and entertainment sectors. Programs should be culturally competent and customized for different types of businesses.

What Success Looks Like and Measures of Success

Success could be measured by the percent increase in basic digital literacy rate among the target population (low-income residents, BIPOC residents, people with disabilities, limited English proficient, older adults, small businesses, and nonprofits). Success could also be measured by the number of residents, small businesses, and nonprofits participating in trainings from the target populations and their self-reported sufficiency using technology after the training. As this program becomes more defined, additional metrics should be developed to ensure that target populations are being served.

Program Administrator(s) and Community Partners

This effort would likely be delivered by a digital literacy nonprofit in partnership with CBOs that have strong connections with residents in need who would refer them to this service. Referrals could also come from HSA, OEWD job training programs, and SFPL. The contract could be administered by MOHCD Office of Digital Equity.

Timeframe

This effort could be started within three months of funding and could last as long as funding is available.

Cost

The Home Connect program currently reaches 14 people per week or 675 annually with an annual budget of approximately \$285,000. This program can expect to have similar costs and can be scaled to the funding available.

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers

According to the 2019 Digital Equity Strategic Plan, there are significant barriers to gaining digital skills, including:

- Unreliable or difficult access: the inability to practice and reinforce the skills learned.
- Learning curve: The feeling that technology is just too complicated to learn.
- Language: Immigrants find it too hard to learn to use technology without knowing English.
- Time and competing priorities: Many said they struggle to find the time to take a class.

The program should have tech support available in multiple languages, and the program provider should have a high level of cultural competency and be responsive to needs in a wide range of vulnerable communities. Outreach and referrals should be conducted by CBOs, HSA, OEWD, and SFPL so that vulnerable populations are aware of the service.

For a program targeted to business owners and executive directors, it will be especially important to make the services available at times that are convenient for busy schedules. Follow-up training and mentorship should be available to reinforce the skills gained.

Barriers may also include sufficient resources for the software or hardware needed. The City should provide grants and low interest loans to help small businesses and organizations purchase necessary equipment for touchless ordering or equipment for virtual programming

People with disabilities also face barriers using technology and accessing remote tech support. The program should be able to support people with disabilities with assistive technologies.

Program Burdens

This program could have a burden on these communities if they are expected to learn how to do web design rather than helping them access free or subsidized web development services.

Community Input

This recommendation is derived from the Digital Equity Strategic Plan, which was developed through engagement with communities of color, including focus groups and one-on-one conversations (in English and other languages) throughout the city at affordable housing sites, workforce centers, food pantries, community fairs, disability centers, schools, and community centers. More community outreach should be conducted to better understand the specific challenges and support needed in the COVID-19 context.

On the City's side, agencies with related program design experience (SFPL, MOHCD Community Development Division, for example) can provide insight on program design and implementation. For the program to be successful and fulfill its equity goals, it would need to create specific outreach and engagement strategies for the various target audiences—small businesses, nonprofits, low-income residents, people with disabilities, people with limited English proficiency, and older adults.

Community Assets

This program can build on the Invest in Neighborhoods Program (IIN), which leverage partnerships between City agencies and nonprofits to enhance and strengthen neighborhood commercial corridors around San Francisco. IIN small business and neighborhood services strengthen small businesses, improve physical conditions, increase quality of life, and build community capacity.

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	Yes
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	No
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	Yes
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	Yes

Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	Yes
---	-----

If Yes, please briefly explain.

Internet access is foundational to being a full member of today’s society and economy. Providing remote support will help vulnerable communities gain the access they need.

Supporting nonprofits and small businesses to become digital-first in their mentality and services is essential to be a full participant in the COVID economy. All organizations must adjust to the reality of social distancing and remote connection with our communities. This proposal will help support nonprofits and small businesses overcome their barriers and find sustainable paths forward.

Additional Context

Select the type of solution this is:	Please “X” for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	
New program or initiative	
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	X
Advocacy (supporting efforts bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	

Feasibility

Implementation of a remote technology program would require partnering with a number of CBOs that have strong connections with residents in need. City support would be needed to provide the basic equipment and infrastructure to provide the services, and potentially administrative support to maintain the service and support partner organization. Additional staffing would be needed to provide the tech support to residents as well. There are many additional details to be addressed through implementation to ensure this program successfully addresses racial disparities in digital literacy.

No additional legislation is required.

6. Invest in Housing

6.1 Expand and stabilize affordable housing funding

Problem Statement

San Francisco historically has not had sufficient funding to meet affordable housing needs including production of new affordable housing, preservation of existing housing, sufficient supply of affordable and accessible housing, or assistance and services for cost burdened, vulnerable renters or those experiencing homelessness. COVID-19 is placing new pressures on low-income renters across the country, especially those experiencing loss of work and income, and increasing housing instability. As a result, there will likely be an expanded need for investment to stabilize renters, preserve housing, and continue production of new affordable housing.

Like most cities, San Francisco is facing a drop in revenue, making federal aid for housing all the more essential in the short run recovery from the COVID-19 crisis. The City can also leverage special state and federal housing funds available at this time such as Project Homekey. The City will need to maintain and grow affordable housing funding, including local funding, with an emphasis on implementing permanent, stable funding sources to sustain progress on affordability and stability for residents.

Factors Affecting Communities of Color and/or Other Vulnerable Populations Differently

People of color and people with lower incomes are particularly impacted by housing affordability issues, with higher rates of cost burden, overcrowding, and housing insecurity.²¹ People experiencing homelessness are disproportionately people of color, in particular Black people.²² In addition, many workers of color, including Latinx and African Americans, have been disproportionately impacted by job loss during the crisis and have been at elevated risk of COVID-19 exposure through work in essential jobs and crowded living conditions. Further, people with disabilities and undocumented immigrants face unique challenges in securing safe, affordable, accessible housing. Because of these existing disparities, investment in affordable housing and services will directly aid San

²¹ See the discussion of housing, income, and race and ethnicity in the Planning Department's Housing Needs and Trends Report https://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/Housing-Needs-and-Trends-Report-2018.pdf

²² See San Francisco Homeless Count and Survey Comprehensive Report for 2019 https://hsh.sfgov.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/2019HIRDReport_SanFrancisco_FinalDraft-1.pdf

Francisco's vulnerable populations and help prevent an increase in displacement as a result of the crisis.

Existing Programs/Policies that Address this Problem

In the fiscal year ending June 2020, the City's local affordable housing funding rose to an all-time high of \$500 million, leveraging hundreds of millions more in federal and state funding and private capital, and reaching the estimated funding necessary to meet the City's affordable housing production and preservation targets.²³ These funds, however, are primarily time-limited sources that may not be renewed in the future (such as voter-approved affordable housing bonds or allocations of ERAF funds) or are tied to economic cycles (job-housing linkage and inclusionary housing linkage fees).

San Francisco can work to implement more consistent funding for affordable housing and work with other cities and state and national leaders to win increased investment in affordable housing at the regional, state, and federal levels. Securing additional, consistent funding sources will ensure that San Francisco can meet its housing needs now and in the future.

Program Overview

Proposed Solution, Goals, Intended Outcomes, and Beneficiaries

San Francisco's affordable housing funding agenda will need to focus in the short-term on winning a federal recovery aid package to fund affordable housing production and preservation as well as rent relief and foreclosure prevention. A new version of the federal Neighborhood Stabilization Program could help San Francisco preserve and stabilize rental housing in lower income communities of color.

Moving forward, a more robust federal focus on housing policy and investment would be of great help to jurisdictions including San Francisco. Key federal programs would include rent assistance, expansion of Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC) and tax exempt bonds, funding for homelessness services and supportive housing, and funding for capital investment, preservation, and housing services such as HOME Investment Partnerships Program (Home), Community Development Block Grants (CDBG), Emergency Solutions Grants Program (ESG), the 202 and 811 programs, and supportive housing for elderly and disabled people.

²³ See the discussion of affordable housing funding in the Planning Department's Housing Affordability Strategies report https://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/Housing_Affordability_Strategies_Report.pdf

Local policymakers can identify additional ways to consistently fund affordable housing—both rental and ownership--through taxes, fees, or other sources. The City can also support regional funding measures to be implemented by the new Bay Area Housing Finance Agency (BAHFA) and support continued state investment in affordable housing and homelessness services. An estimated \$500 million is needed annually to meet current affordable housing production and preservation goals while hundreds of millions more is needed for homelessness services, supportive housing, and renter assistance and services.

Lower-income San Franciscans, who are disproportionately people of color and people with disabilities, would benefit from sustained and increased investment in affordable housing and services. This funding would help to protect and stabilize communities at risk of displacement and housing insecurity. People currently experiencing homelessness would also be helped by increased housing investment. The construction sector, including workers and contractors, would also be supported by this investment as would nonprofits developing affordable housing and providing services to low-income residents.

What Success Looks Like and Measures of Success

Success would be measured through various people and housing metrics including:

- Targets for production and preservation of affordable housing, including accessible affordable housing, are met
- The number of people experiencing homelessness is reduced and the amount of supportive housing and shelter capacity are increased
- The majority of renter households in need of emergency rent assistance and services receive those services
- Foreclosures among small property owners do not increase and owners can access services
- Construction employment is retained at higher levels than the past recession

Program Administrator(s) and Community Partners

MOHCD and HSH would be the primary agencies to administer increased funding that would mostly flow to nonprofit developers and service providers in communities throughout San Francisco.

Timeframe

The policy work to win and sustain affordable housing funding would be ongoing. Local funding measures and the federal aid package would be the focus in the short-term. In 2021

and 2022, the City's focus could shift to implementing additional local funding sources as well as winning additional aid at the regional, state, and federal levels.

Cost

Cost to the City's General Fund would depend on the structure of a new funding source. Currently, certain housing programs are funded from the General Fund, including the Local Operating Subsidy Program (LOSP), as well as Street Outreach Services (SOS) and Plus Housing. The process of designing and implementing additional, permanent funding for affordable housing and services could seek to add revenue specifically for these investments as opposed to using existing General Fund, which would create a budget shortfall elsewhere.

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers

Investment in affordable housing and services needs to be accompanied by resident outreach and education to ensure that people of color and other vulnerable groups are beneficiaries of the investments. In addition, organizations employing and serving communities of color would need to be providers of housing and services. Specifically, funding to support getting vulnerable populations eligible to participate in the City's affordable housing lotteries, will help achieve more equitable distribution of the scarce affordable units.

Additional burdens exist that make it more difficult for certain populations to take advantage of City-sponsored affordable housing. These populations can include homeless people, those whose incomes are below even the affordable rents set for new affordable housing developments, those who lack access to the internet for access to the DAHLIA housing portal, those who do not speak fluent English, and undocumented people.

Program Burdens

There are few burdens of additional funding for affordable housing and services other than the need to generate revenue. The revenue source would need to be designed to be as progressive as possible to avoid increased taxes or fees for lower income people of color. Rules for the Small Sites program, one of the programs that could utilize new funding, can restrict which buildings are able to be acquired and preserved. City rules should be reevaluated and optimized to ensure funding can be deployed as efficiently and broadly as possible.

Community Input and Partnership

Recent housing planning and policy efforts including the Consolidated Plan and Housing Affordability Strategies received extensive public feedback and demonstrated widespread community need for affordable housing and services.

Leading nonprofit affordable housing developers working in San Francisco and CBOs serving communities of color and people with disabilities should be among the leading voices in designing programs to improve equity.

Community Assets

San Francisco's robust group of nonprofit affordable housing developers and community-based housing service providers are key assets, along with the significant presence of local philanthropy and local community development finance institutions. Growing recognition among business leaders that more must be done to address housing affordability to support San Francisco's workforce and reduce homelessness can also be an asset as the City looks for additional funding resources and approaches.

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	Yes
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	Yes
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	Yes
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	Yes
Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	Yes

If Yes, please briefly explain.

Lack of quality, affordable housing and resulting housing instability have been two of the biggest challenges for the welfare of vulnerable communities, particularly communities of color. Ensuring more robust and consistent investment in affordable housing and services

will support and stabilize vulnerable populations in San Francisco, and ensure they are best positioned to participate in civic life and take advantage of opportunities the city offers.

Additional Context

Select the type of solution this is:	Please "X" for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	X
New program or initiative	X
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	X
Advocacy (supporting efforts bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	X

Feasibility

San Francisco has been funding affordable housing through various means for decades. Voter support for increased affordable housing funding has been demonstrated repeatedly over the last eight years since the passage of Proposition C in 2012 that created a Housing Trust Fund. The approval of two affordable housing bonds (in 2015 and 2019) and the approval of a gross receipts tax for affordable housing in 2018 indicate widespread support for housing funding. With that said, voter approval is necessary for new funding, and passage of a dedicated revenue measure typically requires a 2/3 majority of voters when placed on the ballot by elected officials. Winning new local funding for affordable housing will likely require political strategy, broad support, and effective communication with voters. Pursuing regional, state, and federal funds will also require political alliances and strategy to achieve.

This proposal involves pursuing passage of a federal recovery package including affordable housing and neighborhood stabilization funds following the election in November 2020. Additional future legislation will also likely be needed to win additional state and federal funding.

6.2 Preserve and stabilize affordable multifamily rental housing and support small property owners

Problem Statement

As COVID-19 has disrupted the economy, many tenants have been unable to pay rent due to loss of work, and some property owners have experienced a drop in revenue as rent has not been paid or tenants have moved out of their apartments. Temporary moratoriums on evictions have shielded tenants in the short-term, and some owners with property debt may have received debt restructuring and/or short-term relief from debt payments. As moratoriums on evictions end, more tenants could face eviction for nonpayment of rent, and if debt forbearance ends, owners of multifamily rental properties could face foreclosure or increased financial pressure to sell to investors.

A majority of renters in San Francisco are shielded from significant rent increases by rent control and are protected from arbitrary evictions by just cause eviction regulations. Eviction for nonpayment, however, is an allowed cause for eviction. Because many tenants covered by rent control pay rent below market rate, there can be a financial incentive for property owners and investors to evict or offer buyouts to long-time tenants in rent-controlled units. The extraordinary economic instability of the current crisis for both renters and property owners could create a wave of property sales and evictions that could result in the displacement of thousands of low- and moderate-income tenants.

Factors Affecting Communities of Color and/or Other Vulnerable Populations Differently

People of color are more likely to be renters and may be particularly impacted by evictions for nonpayment of rent. In addition, wealth gaps between people of color and white households mean that renters of color are less likely to have savings to draw on when unemployed. Without efforts to stabilize renters (see Proposal 7.5) and the housing they live in, San Francisco could see a loss to its communities of color. Additionally, many low-income people and people of color already struggle to afford safe housing in San Francisco and have been forced into crowded congregate living situations that increase the likelihood of exposure to COVID-19.

Existing Programs/Policies that Address this Problem

Since 2014, San Francisco has been steadily investing local funding in the [Small Sites Program](#) to purchase multifamily rental properties, typically with 5-25 units, occupied by low- and moderate-income renters. The properties are purchased by nonprofit developers with funding from MOHCD and preserved for the long-term as affordable rental housing. These nonprofits often work with community members and vulnerable tenants to identify

at-risk properties. Larger rent-controlled properties have also been purchased and preserved.

During the last recession beginning in 2008, the federal government provided funding to local governments for the [Neighborhood Stabilization Program \(NSP\)](#), which focused on the purchase of foreclosed or abandoned homes. A new version of this program could focus on preserving and stabilizing multifamily rental housing.

Program Overview

Proposed Solution, Goals, Intended Outcomes, and Beneficiaries

Expanded investment in preservation acquisitions and stabilization loans for multifamily rental housing can help to prevent a wave of eviction, displacement, and speculative property sales in vulnerable communities. These efforts would have two main components:

1. Expand nonprofit acquisition of multifamily, rent-controlled properties, particularly those of small to medium size (5-25 units) or larger, including SRO properties, that are occupied by lower income renters and preservation as permanently affordable housing.
2. Provide forgivable loans to small property owners of rent controlled properties in exchange for rent forgiveness, focusing on owners of properties with 5 or fewer units who are facing loss of rent revenue and facing foreclosure or other financial challenges.

The goal of these investments is to retain affordability in San Francisco's multifamily rental housing and prevent widespread eviction and displacement of lower income renters, particularly people of color and other vulnerable residents.

San Francisco would use available local, state, and federal funds for these preservation purchases and stabilization loans in coordination with an effort to win additional affordable housing funding (see Proposal 6.1) and support vulnerable renters (see Proposal 7.5). The City would be able to take advantage of the Community Opportunity to Purchase Act (COPA) to acquire rent-controlled properties placed on the market. Through these preservation purchases, San Francisco would bring a larger segment of rent-controlled housing into permanent nonprofit ownership. Long-term affordability and targeted investments would prevent large increases in evictions in neighborhoods with concentrations of renters of color.

The goal would be to purchase 30% of rent-controlled properties going through foreclosure, short sale, or otherwise being put up for sale during the crisis and recovery period. This effort would be complemented by increased tenant protections, as described

in Recommendation 7.3, that would lead to increased stability of tenants, especially those in existing rent controlled buildings. This effort would also benefit from strategies designed to support community-level stabilization, not just building-level stabilization, which preserves access to services, proximity to loved ones, and broader social benefits.

Program Administrator(s) and Community Partners

To implement this effort, MOHCD would partner with nonprofit affordable housing organizations, San Francisco Housing Accelerator Fund (SFHAF), and potentially additional funders and philanthropic organizations to acquire and preserve rent controlled housing. For example, funds deployed for preservation purchases through the SFHAF could be used to acquire buildings more opportunistically, and the City could provide funding over time to repay the original loan.

The City could also partner with nonprofit organizations and/or financial institutions to administer forgivable loans to small property owners in exchange for an agreement to provide rent relief to tenants that are behind on rent. The effort would be ongoing but would be most intense while unemployment is elevated and eviction risk and financial risk to property owners are higher, likely approximately two years.

Cost

Funding needed for these programs can be estimated based on preservation costs associated with the Small Sites Program, which as of 2019, showed average per-unit development costs of \$497,000 and average city subsidy of \$339,000.²⁴ It is likely that these per-unit costs could be lower in an environment where multifamily rents drop lower than their market peak in 2015.

As part of the Affordability Strategies project, Planning worked with MOHCD to identify a preservation target of approximately 400 rent controlled units per year based on the annual average loss of units to Owner Move In and Ellis Act evictions (acquiring 30% of properties foreclosed or put up for short sale could be higher or lower number of units). Assuming per-unit public subsidy of approximately \$300,000, preservation acquisition costs annually would be \$120 million per year or \$240 million over two years. Scaling these investments up in the short run by 50% and also providing stabilization loans to small property owners could require funding closer to \$200 million per year or \$400 million over two years.

²⁴ See Housing Affordability Strategies white paper on Affordable Housing Funding, Production, and Preservation https://default.sfplanning.org/plans-and-programs/housing/affordability-strategy/HAS_Affordable%20Housing%20White%20Paper_Final.pdf

Funding for preservation purchases would come from available affordable housing funding from federal, state, and local sources (see Proposal 6.1), where stipulations related to that funding allow uses for preservation activities. There would be no impact on the City's General Fund.

Investments from philanthropy and private sectors could help the City accomplish additional preservation activities and act more rapidly to preserve housing, for example through the SFHAF. Any locally controlled affordable housing funds that are redirected to this use would reduce funding available for other affordable housing uses, such as production of new affordable housing, down payment assistance, etc.

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers

Limited capacity at the nonprofit housing development organizations that would likely purchase, rehabilitate, and operate these apartment buildings is one barrier to affordability. While many of these organizations have particular neighborhood or community focuses, they do not exist in all neighborhoods and communities. Without an entity to receive public or philanthropic funding and buy the at-risk building, the program benefits cannot flow to the vulnerable tenants.

Small Sites program rules and funding constraints can result in stabilized buildings that have rents that, which below market rate, are too high to serve the lowest income community members. Efforts to generate more funding or otherwise allow the program to house lower income individuals and families will help the program be as accessible and impactful as possible.

Program Burdens

There is an opportunity cost to investing affordable housing funding in preservation purchases as opposed to other stabilization activities such as rent assistance that might help more people in the short run. For those not in a purchased property, rent assistance could be a way to help them avoid eviction. With sufficient funding this tension may not be an issue. Additionally, some tenants in buildings that are acquired through Small Sites can have their rents raised (though not to "rent burdened" levels) as the buildings are released by rent control.

Community Input and Partnership

The impetus for the program comes from leading organizations working in some of San Francisco's communities of color, including Mission Economic Development Agency

(MEDA) and Chinatown Community Development Center (CCDC), who have been leaders in the implementation of Small Sites.

The City will need to continue to work with community-based service providers, tenant advocates, and housing organizations in areas with significant concentrations of lower-income people of color to design and implement the preservation and stabilization programs.

Community Assets

The robust CBOs, nonprofit affordable housing developers, unique nonprofit lenders such as the SFHAF, and MOHCD’s own experience with Small Sites and other preservation lending constitute an important set of assets to build on for this effort.

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	Yes
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	No
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	Yes
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	Yes
Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	Yes

If Yes, please briefly explain.

Preservation of rent-controlled housing serving primarily lower-income renters of color can be a stabilizing investment in communities to keep people housed and lock in affordability for the future of the community. By providing this long-term affordability, these purchases can prevent immediate displacement, reduce housing cost burdens, and stabilize vulnerable populations. Forgivable loans to small property owners in exchange for rent relief can be part of a strategy to keep lower-income renters housed and keep properties with longtime owners, preventing displacement and stabilizing communities.

Additional Context

Select the type of solution this is:	Please "X" for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	
New program or initiative	
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	X
Advocacy (supporting efforts bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	

Feasibility

Preservation purchases and stabilization loans have been done and can be scaled based on available funding.

This proposal does not require state or federal legislation, but it would greatly benefit from state or federal funding that might be made available through legislation.

6.3 Support construction of small multifamily buildings

Problem Statement

High construction costs, limited land, and a long and uncertain entitlement process all make it difficult to produce sufficient housing in San Francisco. While many strategies can help address this problem, a key part of stabilizing housing costs in the long-term is increasing housing supply through consistent production of market rate and affordable housing. Specifically, the City's goals call for the construction of 5,000 new units of housing each year with at least one-third being affordable, a target that has rarely been achieved.

Current zoning does not allow multifamily housing in most of the city's residential areas. Nearly 60% of San Francisco's residential land is limited to just one or two units (RH-1 and RH-2 zoning), especially in the western and southern parts of the city. Modern zoning can be more restrictive than what was allowed historically; thousands of San Franciscans live in multifamily buildings throughout the city's residential neighborhoods that could not be built today because they contain more units than are now allowed. Though smaller multifamily buildings of 4-10 units provide about 20% of the city's housing, they are rarely built today in part because of zoning restrictions. Low-density zoning is often referred to as "exclusionary zoning" because single family homes, especially in expensive place like San Francisco, are not affordable to lower-income people. Restricting multifamily buildings can reduce the opportunity for lower-income people to live in low-density neighborhoods.

During the current economic conditions, larger projects may be idled by lack of available investment, however, smaller projects with alternative financing sources might be able to continue to produce housing and employ contractors and construction workers if small multifamily projects were more widely allowed and encouraged.

Factors Affecting Communities of Color and/or Other Vulnerable Populations Differently

Today most housing development occurs in a few neighborhoods on the eastern side of city where larger, multifamily housing is widely allowed, including the Financial District, SoMa, Mission Bay, Bayview, Hunters Point, the Tenderloin, and the Mission. Nearly 75% of all housing produced in the city from 2005 to 2018, including more than 75% of all affordable housing, was built in these six neighborhoods. A majority of these areas have historically had greater concentrations of lower income renters and people of color, raising concerns that impacts associated with new construction are only felt in these communities. At the same time, prohibition on multifamily housing in most of the west and south sides of the city mean that little new housing, including affordable housing, is added in these areas that have

some of the city's best public infrastructure including large parks and high-performing schools.

Existing Programs/Policies that Address this Problem

Most housing today is built in larger projects with over 50 units, on larger sites, built by larger companies (often national and multinational), typically funded by large banks and institutional investors. For example, over 56% of San Francisco's entitled projects are in multi-acre, multi-phase projects such as Candlestick, Treasure Island, Park Merced, Mission Rock, and Pier 70, which will be built over many years.

New small multifamily projects make up a small percentage of projects built today, in part due to zoning restrictions that reduce opportunities to build new housing among smaller developers, contractors, and property owners.

Program Overview

Proposed Solution, Goals, Intended Outcomes, and Beneficiaries

This proposal is intended to support the construction of more small multifamily buildings where they are currently restricted today, reduce exclusionary zoning, and expand housing opportunities and construction jobs. Small multifamily buildings, sometimes called "missing middle" housing, are often considered more naturally affordable than larger buildings and have a scale that can complement existing housing in residential neighborhoods. Potential changes to zoning and process could include:

- Allow at least four units to be built on parcels currently occupied by a single family home or vacant
- Allow at least four units and up to ten units on corner parcels currently occupied by a single family home or vacant. Consider allowing additional units for more affordable housing types including educator, 100% affordable, and group housing
- Consider focusing changes in low-density areas near to high-quality transit, jobs, and services. For example, Geary Boulevard in the Richmond District has frequent 38 bus service and could support additional density
- For projects with at least four new units, remove conditional use authorization requirements for demolition of existing single family homes, but clarify and strengthen relocation assistance, right of return, and unit replacement in line with local priorities and state laws such as SB 330

What Success Looks Like and Measures of Success

Allowing more small multifamily buildings in low density areas would provide additional housing opportunities for both renters and owners in these resource-rich neighborhoods as measured by units constructed. A larger share of new housing produced in small multifamily buildings overall in the city than occurs today would be an indicator of success.

Construction jobs retained in San Francisco in the wake of the proposed changes would be another potential way to show success.

Program Administrator(s) and Community Partners

The Planning Department would work with policymakers and the public to implement zoning changes to allow more small multifamily housing. Potential partners in developing these policy changes include CBOs in neighborhoods around the city, small property owners, residential builders, and labor and construction trades.

Timeframe

Developing these policy changes could take months to years. Planning has already been engaging residents in neighborhoods on the west and south sides of the city in conversations about housing and could build on those conversations to implement zoning changes along with policymakers.

Cost

Other than staff time to develop potential zoning changes with the public and policymakers and to process potential development applications, there would be little cost to the City from this policy.

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers

These zoning changes could open up new opportunities for small property owners and small contractors who may be more likely to be people of color. However, the opportunity to rent or buy the new housing units facilitated by these zoning changes may be limited for marginalized communities due to well documented, longstanding, historical income, wealth, and employment disparities. The fallout of the current public health pandemic and economic downturn only serves to exacerbate these trends. Planning and policymakers would work with members of the community to design the program to facilitate participation and opportunity for a wide range of San Franciscans. To the extent that the City can use value capture techniques to provide additional public benefits, including affordable housing, without jeopardizing financial feasibility of these new projects, that would be a productive avenue to explore to lower the burden discussed above. Financial

feasibility should be evaluated by independent economic analysis that considers real costs, rents, and market rate return thresholds.

Program Burdens

Potential impacts of these policy changes on vulnerable people would be limited to people renting single family homes that might be displaced if the home is redeveloped. However, it should be noted that the vast majority of single family homes are not subject to rent control under the state’s Costa-Hawkins law, so tenants in single family homes already have few protections against rent increases and are subject to owner move-in if a home is sold or the property owner wishes to reoccupy the home. Impacts of new development could be reduced by providing clearer and strengthened rules on relocation assistance, unit replacement, and right of return.

Community Input and Partnership

Planning has engaged in a range of neighborhood and housing planning conversations with diverse San Francisco populations and the ability to add housing in more areas of the city often comes up. With that said, additional conversations would be needed to successfully implement this proposal. Planning would need to engage with neighborhood and community-based organizations including tenants groups, small property owners, residential builders, and construction and other labor groups in design and implementation.

Community Assets

San Francisco has a community of smaller local builders with experience in small residential development who could help to develop and implement this policy proposal.

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	Yes
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	N/A
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	Yes
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	Yes

Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	Yes
---	-----

If Yes, please briefly explain.

Allowing small multifamily housing in more of the city where housing is currently restricted to 1-2 units would open up new housing opportunities and end a history of exclusionary housing and increasing social integration and access throughout the city. This policy change would also open up more opportunities for smaller contractors, developers, and property owners to build housing, increasing employment and investment opportunities for a wider range of people.

Additional Context

Select the type of solution this is:	Please "X" for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	
New program or initiative	X
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	
Advocacy (supporting efforts bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	

Feasibility

Zoning changes to allow more small multifamily can be time-consuming to implement primarily because they depend on political processes with lengthy community engagement. Environmental review related to CEQA can also involve time-consuming analysis of zoning changes; however, state legislation currently under consideration could reduce the need for this analysis. Ultimately the time and barriers involved in zoning changes would depend largely on political support among policymakers and different interest groups in San Francisco, but they are not insurmountable.

This proposal does not require further federal or state legislation.

6.4 Streamline the housing entitlement process to incentivize affordable projects

Problem Statement

Stabilizing housing costs in the long-term will require increasing housing supply through consistent production of market rate and affordable housing. Advancing housing construction to increase housing affordability is one of San Francisco's top priorities, as shown through recent Executive Directives for departments to work collaboratively towards faster approvals for housing development projects (2017) and to accelerate the creation of accessory dwelling units (ADUs) and clear the backlog of pending applications (2018), as well as the \$600 million 2019 Affordable Housing general obligation bond.

San Francisco's high construction costs, limited land, and restrictive zoning across much of the city are partly to blame for the slower-than-desired housing production, but another cause is the City's time-consuming, difficult, and uncertain entitlement process. Entitlement refers to receiving permission from the City to construct a building. In San Francisco, nearly all entitlements are discretionary, meaning they could be denied or be subject to conditions by the Planning Commission even when they comply with zoning and need no special waiver or accommodation. As a result, entitlement can be a lengthy process with uncertain outcomes for developers.

The time and risk involved in entitlement force housing developers to demand higher returns on investment, rendering certain projects financially infeasible and reducing the number of projects that are built, especially in economically challenging times such as the current period.

Factors Affecting Communities of Color and/or Other Vulnerable Populations Differently

Vulnerable populations have greater housing affordability challenges than the general population of San Francisco. Thus, these communities stand to gain more from the stabilized housing prices that would result from increased housing production. Further, given that a larger proportion of vulnerable populations are low-income, these communities would benefit from the increased production of permanently affordable housing that would be delivered alongside the market rate housing. Not unique to communities of color, but perhaps relatively more impactful for them, streamlined housing entitlements would reduce the means to slow or stop housing projects.

Existing Programs/Policies that Address this Problem

There are existing programs and efforts to accelerate and ease housing entitlement, including SB35 and the State Density Bonus, which have already helped streamline about

2,000 units in 100% affordable projects, as well as HOMESF, and the 2017 Mayor's Executive Directive on Housing. None of these efforts goes as far as the proposed streamlining described in this proposal.

Program Overview

Proposed Solution, Goals, Intended Outcomes, and Beneficiaries

This proposal would change the entitlement process to incentivize projects that are more likely to be affordable to low- and moderate-income households, especially ones that would deliver a substantial number of new units. These changes could take a number of forms and focus on a few types of projects:

- San Francisco could adopt administrative review for qualifying projects that adhere to the zoning code, removing discretionary approvals and reducing uncertainty in the entitlement process. The City could also go to voters with an option to provide “as of right” ministerial approval for qualifying projects that adhere to the zoning code. Both options could substantially simplify and shorten San Francisco’s entitlement process.
- San Francisco could make these entitlement changes for projects that are 100% affordable, for projects that exceed inclusionary housing requirements by 15%, or for projects that provide some other important unmet housing need such as increased accessible units. It could also apply to HOMESF projects, which already require higher affordability in exchange for providing a density bonus to projects. The City could also consider expanding where HOMESF can be used to more zoning districts and within certain Supervisorial districts where the program has been restricted.
- The City could adopt entitlement changes to support small multifamily projects of 4-10 units, which are often built by small local developers and have smaller profit margins and less access to large investors than bigger developments. Small multifamily buildings are sometimes seen as more “naturally affordable” than larger, high rise development, are common in many San Francisco neighborhoods, and could provide a path to add housing during a period when larger projects may be stalled.
- Currently, demolition of an existing housing unit as part of a new development requires a conditional use authorization, adding extensive procedure for these projects regardless of whether the existing unit is affordable or not. San Francisco could refocus demolition restrictions more specifically on multifamily rental housing with regulatory restrictions, such as rent control, while making it easier to transform

a single family home site as multifamily housing with four or more units when the existing home does not serve lower income renters. The City could add on unit replacement, relocation, and affordability requirements related to demolition found in SB 330.

What Success Looks Like and Measures of Success

Faster approval and less uncertainty resulting from this proposal should result in increased housing production by incentivizing developers to build more projects and by increasing the chances that projects are able to proceed while market conditions allow.

Increased production would increase housing supply, thus stabilizing housing prices, create construction jobs, stimulate the economy, and grow the tax base. Additionally, because this benefit would be available to projects with higher affordability or small multifamily projects, it would likely result in more housing production with greater affordability than would otherwise occur.

Because this proposal would reduce the amount of review and deliberation into each individual project, it requires the City to continue to undertake robust community engagement efforts as they consider planning and zoning code changes and other rules and standards. If the rules that an “as of right” project adheres to were developed with the voice of the community in mind, the need for an extended entitlement process is diminished.

Program Administrator(s) and Community Partners

Planning would be the lead department implementing the streamlined entitlement process. Community partners that could advise on implementation would include housing advocacy organizations, affordable housing developers, market rate developers, and neighborhood groups.

Timeframe

As it would require a Charter amendment, this measure would need to be adopted by the voters. The earliest it could appear on the ballot is in 2022.

Cost

This would cost no money to implement and would likely reduce staffing costs due to diminished review workload.

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers

Due to restrictive zoning in much of the City, certain communities (largely on the east side) would have many more code compliant projects that are able to take advantage of

administrative or “as of right” entitlements. Ensuring that there is enough education and outreach to small developers, particularly nonprofits and people of color, to communicate the changes and associated benefits would help circumvent would-be barriers of confusion and complexity.

Program Burdens

Because the residential districts that are prevalent on the south and west sides of San Francisco limit multifamily housing, certain communities (largely on the east side) would have many more code compliant projects that are able to take advantage of administrative or “as of right” entitlements. If this proposal was to be paired with a change to those zoning rules to allow multifamily housing to be built in more districts, the burdens and benefits of new development would be spread more equitably across the City.

This proposal would reduce the ability of communities (including communities of color) to slow or stop housing projects. Because only fully code compliant projects would qualify for administrative or “as of right” approvals, this change can be mitigated by ensuring that there is robust community input into community planning and zoning code changes and other rules and standards. In this way, a code compliant project could be said to reflect the preferences and priorities of the community as represented by the code.

Community Input and Partnership

Area plans that establish zoning rules are subject to significant community engagement and deliberation. This should continue. Affordable housing developers, housing advocacy organizations, and neighborhood groups should be consulted in the implementation of the entitlement streamlining.

Community Assets

CBOs could focus on promoting awareness of rule changes and qualifying existing low-income residents to be eligible to participate in the lotteries for new affordable units delivered through this streamlined entitlement process.

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	Yes
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	No
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	Yes
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	No
Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	Yes

If Yes, please briefly explain.

By removing a level of discretionary review from fully code compliant housing projects, this effort would accelerate and increase housing production, hopefully stabilizing prices and reducing gentrification and displacement in San Francisco. Additionally, housing production would create constructions jobs, stimulate the economy, and grow the City’s tax base.

Further, this proposal would incentivize projects to increase by 15% the portion of the housing units that will be affordable to low- and moderate-income families, thus increasing the amount of affordable housing – providing a direct benefit to low-income San Franciscans, many of whom are vulnerable populations.

Additional Context

Select the type of solution this is:	Please “X” for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	
New program or initiative	
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	X
Advocacy (supporting efforts bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	

Feasibility

This proposal is feasible. It would require a charter amendment and a ballot measure, but once passed, it would eliminate work from the review process.

This proposal does not require federal or state legislation.

7. Meet the Basic Needs of the Vulnerable

7.1 Ensure adequate housing for family violence survivors and increase awareness of family violence issues during COVID-19

Problem Statement

Multiple factors have increased the likelihood of family violence in San Francisco during COVID-19, including: increased social isolation, the possibility of additional time spent in abusive home situations, decreased ability for connection with teachers and providers who may have been able to help intervene, and general stress and trauma associated with the pandemic itself.

Factors Affecting Communities of Color and/or Other Vulnerable Populations Differently

Data has shown that COVID-19 and economic hardship have disproportionately impacted communities of color, especially Black and Latinx communities, which may cause additional stress in families. In addition, people with disabilities are more at risk of abuse. Additionally, a recent Family Violence Council's report found that reported family violence (child abuse, domestic violence, and elder abuse) continues to disproportionately impact Black and Latinx communities in San Francisco.²⁵

Existing Programs/Policies that Address this Problem

This effort leverages several existing providers, programs and efforts, including:

- DPH Mental & Behavioral Health Services for children and youth
- DCYF grantees
- DCYF Community Hubs
- Department on the Status of Women's (DOSW) Gender Based Violence Intervention and Prevention Program grantees
- The City could also explore how to leverage SFUSD High School Wellness Centers

²⁵

https://sfgov.org/dosw/sites/default/files/Family%20Violence%20in%20San%20Francisco%20FY2018-FY2019%20_0.pdf

Program Overview

Proposed Solution, Goals, Intended Outcomes, and Beneficiaries

With less space in shelters to do social distancing, the City should ensure there is enough housing available for family violence survivors, including potentially the use of COVID-19 hotel rooms or other types of emergency housing options, such as vouchers. Placements should include other supports such as mental health and legal support.

The City should also increase awareness of family violence issues during COVID-19 among providers. For example, DCYF should ensure nonprofit providers at Community Hubs are trained to be aware of signs of family violence and can help connect children, youth, and their families experiencing issues to resources. Training should be culturally competent and take into account implicit biases.

What Success Looks Like and Measures of Success

Success would be determined by measuring the amount of housing placements and uptake of services for families in crisis and where they occurred.

Program Administrator(s) and Community Partners

Working with HSA, DOSW administers funding to the city's domestic violence emergency shelter and transitional housing programs. Community partners would include DOSW grantees and domestic violence service providers who could refer family violence survivors to this program.

Community Hubs are administered by DCYF.

Timeframe

This effort could start immediately and run through the duration of the COVID-19 crisis with additional funding.

Cost

This effort would leverage existing funding streams. DCYF grantees are funded through San Francisco's Children & Youth Fund. Gender Based Violence Program grantees are administered through DOSW and funded by the City's General Fund. Additional resources may be needed for safe housing for survivors if existing vouchers and rooms are prioritized for other populations.

Due to the high levels of coordination and the need to leverage the work of departments that are heavily engaged in their own COVID-19 response efforts, there could be a need for additional City staff to help support this effort and the cost of training Community Hub staff to act as early interveners.

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers

There are many barriers for this effort that must be addressed. First, accessing people in need of these services will be a challenge. While some youth may be connected to school and CBO providers, others may be disconnected from all service providers. Additional outreach is needed to reach these families. Resources could potentially be advertised through radio ads, flyers, and at COVID-19 testing sites.

Mistrust of government services exists in some communities due to disproportionate surveillance and social service intervention in poor and BIPOC families. Using existing providers who have presence in the community and are able to develop good relationships with youth and families while providing non-clinical services, such as those in Community Hubs, could be a way to mitigate this issue.

Program Burdens

There is documentation of the structural racism of social services. A 2017 study found that 53% of Black children will experience a Child Protective Services investigation.²⁶ These types of interventions can have a disproportionate impact on BIPOC children and families. A program that is driven by grantees rooted in BIPOC communities can help overcome this potential burden.

Community Input and Partnership

While elements of this proposal take into account previous community engagement designed to capture the needs of the community, these efforts are outdated and may not capture the depth of need that has occurred as a result of COVID-19.

The design of this effort should consult with system partners and CBO providers to ensure that ideas match the realities of implementation. Engaging with select grantees who are rooted in the Black, Latinx, Pacific Islander, and low-income Asian communities can help to develop culturally competent approaches that are effective. Domestic violence service providers with longstanding relationships in vulnerable populations—communities of color, LGBTQI, and immigrant communities—may also provide a channel for connecting with target populations.

²⁶ <https://ajph.aphapublications.org/doi/abs/10.2105/AJPH.2016.303545>

Community Assets

This program builds on the assets of DCYF grantees, Community Hubs, and DOSW grantees, including their longstanding relationships in vulnerable populations.

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	Yes
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	Yes
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	Yes
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	Yes
Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	Yes

If Yes, please briefly explain.

This proposal helps families of color experiencing violence access housing placements/vouchers, mental health, and legal supports, which would meaningfully improve their condition.

Additional Context

Select the type of solution this is:	Please "X" for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	
New program or initiative	
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	X
Advocacy (supporting efforts bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	

Feasibility

This effort is feasible with adequate resources as it builds on existing programs and resources.

This proposal does not require further federal or state legislation.

7.2 Ensure all San Franciscans have adequate access to healthy food

Problem Statement

Hunger was a crisis before the COVID-19 and the pandemic has generated increased food insecurity in San Francisco. Job losses have left individuals and families without resources to buy enough food. SNAP/CalFresh²⁷ applications increased by 118% in the 8 weeks following the March shelter-in-place order (compared to the 8 weeks prior). School closures have meant that children that are normally receiving meals at school are needing to be fed at home. Over 29,000 children in San Francisco receive free or reduced-price meals at school (about half of all public school students).

In addition, older adults and medically vulnerable people may need to self-isolate, making accessing food safely a challenge. Decreased options for public transit also makes getting groceries for seniors and disabled people more challenging. Grocery delivery services cost extra and may not be an option for low-income households.

Congregate meal sites throughout the city have closed due to health orders requiring those most vulnerable to shelter-in-place. Providers have had the challenge of changing their service from congregate to home delivery. At the same time, restaurants face reduced demand and service restrictions while trying to stay afloat.

Factors Affecting Communities of Color and/or Other Vulnerable Populations Differently

Research emphasizes that pandemics aggravate poverty and have differential impacts based on race, ethnicity, and language. HSA conducted a recent survey of public benefit recipients on the impact of the pandemic; this survey received over 10,000 responses. Survey results suggest that Black people, persons with limited English, and seniors are more vulnerable. Over a third of Black respondents reported that food was their most immediate need, and 40% said they expected food to be an ongoing need.

According to a study by UC San Francisco, the number of primary Spanish-speaking Latinx families in the San Francisco Bay Area who cannot afford to eat balanced meals and go to bed hungry has more than doubled since the pandemic.²⁸ Unemployment is closely related to food insecurity and Latinx adults may have been the most impacted by shutdowns in the hotel industry, food services, health care and manufacturing sectors.

²⁷ SNAP is the federal name and CalFresh is the state name for the program formerly called Food Stamps.

²⁸ <https://www.ucsf.edu/news/2020/10/418781/shutdowns-mean-more-go-hungry-among-spanish-speaking-latinx-households-bay-area>

Existing Programs/Policies that Address this Problem

The City has initiated several programs to respond to growing food insecurity. Existing programs include Pandemic EBT, HSA's Food Access Initiative for people who need to self-isolate, Give2SF Food Security efforts, Pantry @ Home, Meals in Place SF, the Congregate Meal Program, the SRO Meal Program, a dedicated [food resource website](#), Pop Up Pantry, Great Plates Delivered, and free meals for children and youth during SFUSD school closures.

Programs that serve the unhoused include CalFresh, Pandemic EBT, Meals in Place SF, Congregate Meal Program, Give2SF, and Pop Up Pantry, and SFUSD meals for children and youth.

Program Overview

Proposed Solution, Goals, Intended Outcomes, and Beneficiaries

The City should continue to fund programs that ensure vulnerable populations, including children, older adults, and medically vulnerable people do not experience hunger or have to make the choice between groceries and other basic necessities. In a time of growing need, that would likely mean an expansion of existing efforts, especially for older adults and adults with disabilities. The City should also maximize enrollment in existing resources with advocacy work, technological innovations, outreach, and systems improvements.

Support expansion of existing programs for older adults and adults with disabilities

- The current programs in place for older adults and adults with disabilities have been modified and adapted to meet their needs during the COVID-19 pandemic. These include changing congregate meal settings to take-out or delivery models, and partnering with local restaurants to offer a diverse range of meals. These programs should continue and potentially be expanded with additional funding to reach a greater number of consumers, particularly in the Black and Latinx communities.
- The City should expand the Essential Trip Card program to ensure older adults and people with disabilities have affordable transportation for grocery shopping and other essential trips. Outreach should also be increased to ensure older adults are aware of food programs.

Support programs that serve San Franciscans that do not qualify for federally-funded programs

- The City should identify and fund programs that can efficiently support food security for San Franciscans who do not qualify for federally-funded food assistance programs because of their income, immigration status, or other reasons.

Maximize enrollment in SNAP/CalFresh

- SNAP/CalFresh is the single largest and most impactful program in the fight against food insecurity. The program currently serves 85,000 San Franciscans (a 25% increase since the start of 2020). CalFresh families in San Francisco receive a total of around \$9 million each month to purchase food, which also has a multiplier effect in the local economy. San Francisco should support efforts to expand the reach and maximize the efficiency of the local CalFresh program in the wake of the pandemic. Below are some strategies to achieve this goal:
 - **Advocacy Work:** San Francisco should continue to advocate at the federal and state level for additional benefits, waivers and increased administrative funding. Additional benefits at the federal level have included SNAP emergency allotments and Pandemic EBT for school-age children. Federal waivers were temporarily granted for semi-annual reports, annual recertifications and phone interviews associated with applications and recertifications, but have since expired. Waivers to support remote procedures and to suspend work requirements as a condition of receiving benefits are still in place. San Francisco should also continue to advocate for the roll-back of recent administrative rules that make receipt of SNAP by non-citizens subject to public charge. At the state level, the budget for CalFresh administration was augmented somewhat to support increased eligibility work due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and some policy and practice requirements were simplified. San Francisco should continue to advocate for more flexibility and funding for CalFresh at the state level.
 - **Technological Innovations:** The COVID-19 pandemic has made it vital to minimize face-to-face SNAP/CalFresh transactions, but many customers are accustomed to applying in person and using drop-in lobby service counters. This is especially true of persons with limited English and/or from communities of color in San Francisco's southern neighborhoods. In response, HSA would like use technology to ensure clients can successfully access and retain benefits using remote online/phone channels. For example, HSA would like to use community organizations to help clients access and use an existing app, add a chat function to its website to provide immediate and informed assistance, test expanded use of text messaging, and increase the productivity of telecommuting staff. HSA recently submitted a federal grant application to fund many of these activities, although local funds could be used to augment these efforts or fund them outright if San Francisco is not awarded the federal grant in September 2020.

- **Support Equitable Outreach Efforts:** CalFresh has traditionally had a lower take-up rate compared to Medi-Cal health coverage. There is a greater perceived stigma attached to “food stamps,” and immigrants fear the impact of the “public charge” test related to obtaining and keeping lawful permanent residency. Given the current economic crisis, the City may want to consider a new CalFresh media campaign targeted to underserved communities.
- **Systems Improvements:** The City should also explore strategies to support a larger vision of seamlessly connecting San Franciscans to all public benefits for which they are eligible, especially programs that enhance food security. For example, San Francisco could work to expand information sharing between CalFresh, WIC (administered by DPH) and the School Nutrition Programs (administered by SFUSD) to promote “automatic” or streamlined eligibility across programs. Also, locally-authorized programs targeted to low-income individuals could eliminate stand-alone eligibility requirements and application processes in favor of categorical eligibility for all public aid recipients (information could be provided by HSA). Alternate application procedures would likely still be needed for non-aided low-income individuals to ensure that non-citizens are not excluded from local benefits.
- **Partner with the private sector:** CalFresh benefits are widely accepted at both local and large chain grocery stores and other food retailers, including some restaurants. To promote food security and increase the purchasing power of CalFresh benefits, the City could seek public-private partnership with major local retailers (e.g., Safeway, Amazon/Whole Foods, Foods Co, etc.) to ask them to offer a flat percentage discount and/or to waive delivery fees on all EBT purchases.

The State of California has implemented the Great Plates Program to route assistance funds for meals support to local businesses to help meet multiple needs simultaneously. At the time of writing, that program is set to expire on October 9, 2020. If it is not extended, the City should consider ways to support a similar effort, potentially through endorsement of existing grassroots channels.

What Success Looks Like and Measures of Success

Success could be measured in number of meals provided and location, with attention to the demographics of people served.

For the systems change component, success would be a new and streamlined way of connecting eligible San Franciscans with their benefits. Where applicable, adherence to the

City's standards for digital design, including content, interface design, and accessibility standards would be another metric.

Program Administrator(s) and Community Partner

This effort would be administered by HSA.

Timeframe

This project could start immediately as it builds on existing programs and should be in place through the duration of the COVID-19 crisis and until the economy has recovered such that hunger is reduced. The systems change component would take time, likely two or three years from funding.

Cost

The Department of Aging and Adult Services (part of HSA) currently funds nutrition programs annually for older adults and adults with disabilities at \$18.3M from the General Fund, \$3.8M from federal funding, and \$200K from state funding.

HSA's federal SNAP/CalFresh technology improvement grant application requested \$489,763 over 3 years. Campaigns comparable to the one envisioned for maximizing enrollment and combatting the stigma associated with food stamps have cost approximately \$500,000. The envisioned systems change project would likely cost several million dollars and require a consultant contract.

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers

Barriers include reluctance to accept services, including fear/mistrust of government programs from some populations, and the risks associated with public charge for the undocumented community. An additional barrier is the cultural appropriateness of food offered by feeding partners. Bringing in additional diverse partners citywide could help address this barrier. Lastly, existing infrastructure is not supportive of integrated social service referrals.

Program Burdens

The federal government recently added CalFresh to the list of public benefits programs that may be considered under the "public charge" test, which is used by federal immigration officials to decide who can obtain and retain lawful permanent residency (also known as a "green card"). Public charge does not apply to applications to become a naturalized U.S. citizen, or impact most immigrants on CalFresh. Additionally, there are multiple ongoing court challenges to the public charge immigration rules, and a recent injunction temporarily

blocked public charge amid the COVID-19 Pandemic. However, confusion and false rumors related to public charge are believed to have a chilling effect on immigrants seeking CalFresh assistance.

Community Input and Partnership

HSA conducted a recent survey of public benefit recipients on the impact of the pandemic; this survey received over 10,000 responses. Consistent with the research literature, the survey results suggest that African Americans, persons with limited English, and seniors are more vulnerable than others.

City agencies, CBOs, consumer advocates, and local restaurants can potentially work together to design and implement programs that could effectively ensure food access and equitable outcomes. The creation of a citywide food justice committee with a representative from each district detailing the impacts felt in community could help.

Community Assets

The San Francisco CalFresh Outreach Coalition is comprised of local and state nonprofits and administrators with a shared vision of increasing CalFresh access and participation rates in San Francisco through community education, outreach, advocacy, and innovative collaborations. The meetings are co-chaired by HSA and the SF-Marin Food Bank. Partners share outreach strategies and create best practices, discuss ways to shift negative perceptions of CalFresh within marginalized communities, learn about new local and State program policies, and collaborate to pilot innovative tools and practices meant to decrease client barriers to applying for and receiving benefits.

An additional asset is the Latino Task Force in the Mission. The City could learn from their success to replicate their model in other high-need neighborhoods.

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	No
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	No
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	Yes

Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	No
Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	Yes

If Yes, please briefly explain.

Without maintaining or expanding programs and benefits that combat food insecurity, the City would be creating even more barriers to ensuring that vulnerable San Franciscans have adequate access to food. Food is among the most basic needs for human survival, and ensuring access to a reliable source of nutrition meaningful improves the conditions of communities of color, which have been disproportionately impacted by the pandemic and are more likely to rank food as their most immediate need.

Additional Context

	Please “X” for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	
New program or initiative	
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	X
Advocacy (supporting efforts that are bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	X

Feasibility

This is highly feasible because it expands on existing programs.

Local meals and food security initiatives would not require new legislation. Continuation or expansion of food security programs controlled or funded at the federal or state level could require legislation or approval at those higher levels of government. If AB 826 is signed by the Governor, it would provide \$600 in food assistance to qualified adults, including undocumented Californians.

7.3 Expand mental health and substance use disorder services

Problem Statement

As a result of both the COVID-19 pandemic and the measures put in place to slow the spread of the virus, mental and behavioral health stressors have increased, especially for youth and people experiencing homelessness. These stressors include increased social isolation, financial strain, the possibility of additional time spent in abusive home situations, decreased ability for connection with providers who may have been able to help intervene, and general stress and trauma associated with the pandemic itself. During April, the first full month of the shelter-in-place order, San Francisco saw a nearly 50% drop in their number of child abuse calls when compared to the same month last year as children did not have contact with teachers, counselors, and other care providers.²⁹ Seniors and other medically vulnerable people may also be at greater risk for mental health issues due to isolation during shelter-in-place. ERTF members repeatedly emphasized the need to provide additional resources to address these mental health and wellness issues.

As the City rises to meet these emerging mental health challenges, the City must also recommit to the significant and persistent mental health and substance abuse challenges for people experiencing homelessness that existed even before COVID-19. According to the 2019 Point in Time Count, 42% of those experiencing homelessness self-reported alcoholic and drug use, 39% reported emotional or psychiatric conditions, and 37% reported post-traumatic stress. While no count has been conducted to confirm, COVID-19 has led to an increase in homelessness in San Francisco due to limited shelter capacity to allow for social distancing, the inability to stay with family or friends due to social distancing, and the economic crisis. As public health guidance calls for social distancing and more business is conducted on the street and public spaces, there is a renewed need to ensure a safe environment on the street on in public spaces and provide critical services to those in need. For strategies related to improving cleanliness of spaces, neighborhoods, residents and businesses, see Recommendation 3.4. For strategies related to housing people experiencing homelessness, see Recommendation 7.4.

Though there are numerous agencies and organizations providing field-based services in San Francisco, there is a need for services on the street which far outpace existing resources. These services are essential for reaching people who are not ready to enter residential treatment or engage with the system in traditional ways. Field-based services are an opportunity to provide care for these individuals in a way that meets their needs and

²⁹ <https://www.nbcbayarea.com/investigations/child-abuse-reports-plummeted-during-pandemic-and-thats-not-a-good-thing/2298653/>

preferences and may open a door to connecting them with additional services. People who are experiencing homelessness and behavioral health issues need services and coordination from numerous departments and through multiple levels of care, including a place to sleep. The complex array of services needed and the associated transitions of care require a high level of coordination and cooperation, and services need to be available to clients when they are ready to receive them.

Factors Affecting Communities of Color and/or Other Vulnerable Populations Differently

People of color also experience high rates of mental health conditions, substance use, and traumatic stress, and they experience worse behavioral health outcomes than white populations. Among the population of people experiencing homelessness in San Francisco who have a behavioral health condition, Black individuals are the most vulnerable.

Existing Programs/Policies that Address this Problem

DPH Behavioral Health Services (BHS) provides services to more than 30,000 San Francisco residents each year, at a budgeted cost of \$370 million. The system of care includes DPH, multiple hospitals, and community-based organizations, and encompasses more than 300 different programs. In addition to DPH, numerous community programs, departments, and agencies serve people experiencing homelessness who have behavioral health needs in San Francisco, including the Police Department, the Adult Probation Department, collaborative courts, intensive case management services, and cross-agency collaborations. Street-based services are offered through City departments and agencies, including the SF Homeless Outreach Team, DPH street medicine, and EMS-6, a partnership between the San Francisco Fire Department and DPH that dispatches emergency and public health experts to respond to 911 calls for non-emergency medical, social and psychological needs.

For youth and families, existing providers, programs and efforts, include:

- SFUSD High School Wellness Centers
- DPH Mental & Behavioral Health Services for children and youth
- DPH Transitional Age Youth (TAY) System of Care
- DCYF grantees
- DCYF Community Hubs

For older adults, DAS-funded community programs conducted wellness checks on older adults and adults with disabilities via phone to survey how clients were doing during this

health crisis. Information collected from the wellness checks are analyzed and used to inform the department of gaps in services and where targeted outreach is needed.

Program Overview

Goals, Intended Outcomes, Proposed Solution, and Beneficiaries

For children and youth, leveraging, connecting, and expanding existing efforts would help ensure that that behavioral and mental health supports are available both virtually and where programming is occurring. The first layer of supports prioritizes community outreach and training for teachers and youth providers:

- Ensure Community Hub CBOs have access to a directory of mental and behavioral health providers and distribute to teachers and CBO staff. In the directory, elevate providers with specific types of cultural competence as well as clinicians of color.
- Increase capacity for CBOs and teachers by training them to identify mental and behavioral health issues, especially those related to trauma. This support would leverage a partnership currently underway between DCYF, the Walter & Elise Haas Fund, DPH, and SFUSD.
- Increase the amount of CBO-implemented wellness checks, as well as prevention activities, and provide a common framework to ensure consistency across providers. Create a regular forum for CBO staff to come together to reflect on common themes and determine potential solutions.
- Expand the 24/7 Mobile Response Team currently in place within behavioral health so it can expand to support the school district.
- Increase coordination between youth providers and behavioral health services by identifying jointly funded DPH and DCYF grantees and ensuring their distribution across the Community Hub Initiative

The second layer of supports focuses on connecting resources with children, youth, and their families experiencing mental health issues as a result of COVID:

- Leverage existing behavioral health providers, especially those jointly funded by DCYF and DPH, to offer services at Community Hub sites.
- Expand capacity at High School Wellness centers to be available to students both in person and virtually.
- Expand TAY System of Care mobile intervention work and intentionally connect to Community Hubs and DCYF CBOs serving older youth.

- Continue to solidify the connection with existing DPH behavioral health resources and ensure smooth handoffs with minimal hoops for youth and families to jump through.

For older adults and adults with disabilities, DAS should continue and expand well checks to provide information on resources and services to those in need. A larger partnership with other City agencies such as DPH, MOHCD, or HSH may provide a wider reach to the vulnerable population of San Francisco.

For people experiencing homelessness, a systematic and aligned public health approach is needed to provide access to treatment for mental illness and substance use disorders. This would include investment in a Behavioral Health Access Center that centralizes access to the City's system of behavioral health services, improvement of residential treatment and residential stepdown beds, improvement of respite and detox facilities, and improvement of community health facilities that provide full-service health care, including behavioral health services. Street-based mental health and substance use disorder services could offer a low-barrier, adaptive form of treatment that not only provides a much-needed service but acts as a doorway to the system for people who are disconnected. Additional safe spaces are needed that offer the opportunity to build trust with clients and offer them a safe place to be.

Additional resources are needed for the treatment of methamphetamine, opioid use, chronic alcoholism, and crack cocaine. Methamphetamine is one of the most frequently identified unaddressed issues in the behavioral health system. Chronic alcoholism is another significant challenge faced by the system of care for people experiencing homelessness in San Francisco. Increased availability of evidence-based approaches, including dedicated accessible low barrier residential treatment facilities, clean and sober housing, and new models of medical detox could reduce premature mortality among people experiencing homelessness. The City should make sure info about free/low-cost substance use treatment and mental health support is widely available.

What Success Looks Like and Measures of Success

Success would be determined by measuring the amount of meaningful connection to behavioral and mental health services for people experiencing homelessness, children, youth, and TAY. Provider-client privilege limits the ability for this effort to be judged on the individual progress that people have made when connected to these services.

For people experiencing homelessness with mental health and substance use disorders, success would be measured by their ability to easily access the treatment resources they need, as well as permanent housing solutions.

Program Administrator(s) and Community Partners

This effort would require significant work and contribution of existing resources by DPH, HSH, DCYF, SFUSD, and DAS. As the primary provider of behavioral and mental health services, DPH would be poised to connect this effort to the many clinics, funded providers and other efforts already in place. As a large funder of CBO based youth development services, DCYF could provide a pathway to connect meaningfully with young people both to determine their needs and make warm handoffs to services. Because SFUSD plays such a large role in the lives of young people they could provide access to their most disconnected youth or help the effort target young people already engaged in behavioral or mental health services. Significant coordination would be required for this effort to be successful.

Timeframe

These efforts should begin as soon as resources are available.

Cost

The effort focused on children, youth, and their families would significantly leverage existing funding streams. DCYF grantees are funded through San Francisco's Children & Youth Fund. SFUSD is supported through a combination of state and City Funding. Due to the high levels of coordination and the need to leverage the work of departments that are heavily engaged in their own COVID-19 response efforts, there could be a need for additional City staff to help support this effort.

An estimated \$400,000 is needed to expand the 24/7 Mobile Response Team to support youth in crisis or at-risk for out-of-home placement. With this additional funding, this resource could expand to support the SFUSD system so they can provide direct links/referrals to this 24/7 mobile service.

Expanding mental health and substance use disorder services to meet the level of need for people experiencing homelessness in San Francisco is by comparison a massive effort. The upcoming Health and Recovery general obligation bond would provide a source for capital investment in facilities delivering those services. Expansion of service beyond current levels however would require increased resources.

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers

People may not be ready to receive mental health or behavioral health support. The services need to be available and accessible when people are ready and in need. Low barrier entry services that help people get their foot in the door and build trust can help make a bridge to additional services. In addition, services need to be culturally relevant.

Accessing young people in need of these services will be a challenge. While some youth may be connected to schools and CBO providers, others may be disconnected from all youth serving systems. Additional efforts and outreach would need to occur to reach these youth. In addition, stigma related to mental health services exists for some communities. This stigma requires creative ways to engage clients that seem less threatening. Using existing providers who have presence in the community and are able to develop good relationships while providing non-clinical services, such as those in Community Hubs, could be a way to mitigate this issue.

Existing older adult wellness checks are limited to those already connected to DAS in some way. A larger partnership with other city agencies such as DPH, MOHCD, or HSH may provide a wider reach if wellness checks are implemented as a citywide effort.

Program Burdens

Data has shown that COVID-19 has disproportionately impacted communities of color, especially Black and Latinx communities. In addition, stigma associated with mental health services could prevent communities of color from connecting with mental health providers. So, while there may be additional trauma associated with the impacts of COVID-19 and increased behavioral health needs, there may be less willingness to access those services. To address these issues there is a need for creative thinking about how to engage clients in non-threatening and non-clinical ways first to build the trust needed to facilitate deeper engagement.

There are racial disparities among school aged children who are tracked due to mental health and behavioral issues. Teacher training can be especially important in this regard as trauma can manifest as behavioral issues. There is a need for a shift in how teachers are trained as the first line staff that are making assessments of behavior.

Community Input and Partnership

While elements of this proposal take into account previous community engagement designed to capture the needs of the community, these efforts are outdated and may not capture the depth of need that has occurred as a result of COVID-19.

The design of this effort should consult with system partners and CBO providers to ensure that ideas match the realities of implementation. Engaging with select grantees who are rooted in the Black, Latinx, Pacific Islander and low-income Asian communities can help to develop culturally competent approaches that are effective. These providers may also provide a channel for accessing the target populations.

Community Assets

This proposal will build on DCYF’s largest community asset, CBO grantees. Additionally, the effort could leverage existing City efforts related to mental and behavioral health.

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	No
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	No
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	Yes
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	No
Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	Yes

If Yes, please briefly explain.

This proposal, if successfully implemented would increase access to behavioral health support for people experiencing homelessness, children, youth, TAY, older adults, and communities of color.

Additional Context

	Please “X” for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	
New program or initiative	
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	X
Advocacy (supporting efforts that are bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	X

Feasibility

This effort is feasible because it primarily utilizes existing systems and providers in an attempt to expand and enhance services. However, the effort would not be without challenges because it does require significant coordination across multiple partners, including those who are heavily occupied with COVID-19 response efforts. In order to mitigate these challenges, the effort will need to rely on willingness, clarity of purpose and approach, trust building among partners, and regular levels of communication.

This proposal does not require further federal or state legislation.

7.4 Acquire hotels and other buildings to be converted into permanent supportive housing for people experiencing homelessness

Problem Statement

The homelessness crisis has long impacted San Francisco, and the COVID-19 pandemic has only exacerbated the problem. There is a well-documented lack of sufficient affordable housing in San Francisco. Though San Francisco leads the nation in the provision of Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH), demand always outpaces supply for supportive and affordable housing. There are more than 3,000 chronically homeless individuals on a given night, and only 80–100 units of supportive housing become available each month since the turnover rates are low once applicants are housed.

Due to COVID-19 and in order to follow public health guidelines, the City has had to limit its shelter capacity to allow for social distancing, and more people have become homeless due to the inability to stay in informal living situations (with friends or family) because of the need to shelter-in-place. These factors, coupled with the economic crisis, has led to an assumed increase in homelessness in San Francisco (although no count has been conducted to confirm).

People experiencing homelessness are uniquely vulnerable to COVID-19 due to congregate living, high rates of co-occurring health disorders, and the impacts of poverty. Additionally, this population has limited access to shelter/housing, sanitation facilities, and services needed to protect themselves from the spread of COVID-19 and the ongoing health crisis of homelessness.

Factors Affecting Communities of Color and/or Other Vulnerable Populations Differently

Black San Franciscans are disproportionately represented in the population experiencing homelessness. Black residents make up less than 6% of the total population, yet make up 37% of the homeless population. This disparity is the result of structural racism and historic discrimination that have restricted access to higher-earning jobs, community supports, and homeownership.³⁰

LGBTQI individuals are also disproportionately represented in the population experiencing homelessness in San Francisco. Data suggest that these individuals are more likely to be experiencing homelessness for the first time and are less likely to have behavioral health conditions; however, being LGBTQI and experiencing homelessness comes with unique

³⁰ Behavioral Health and Homelessness in San Francisco: Needs and Opportunities; http://chi.tippingpoint.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/JSI_SF-BH-and-Homelessness_2019.pdf

challenges. For example, LBGTQI individuals may feel unsafe in traditional shelters that separate residents by the gender assigned to them at birth and some may have experienced trauma related to rejection from their families and communities.³¹

An estimated 30% of the homeless population have disabilities and 30% have medical conditions. Many of these need housing that is accessible and there is an acute lack of accessible units.

Existing Programs/Policies that Address this Problem

The City's response to COVID-19 includes establishing the COVID-19 Alternative Housing System to provide emergency, temporary housing and shelter options for the City's most vulnerable populations, a vast majority of which are for people experiencing homelessness. The City is using private hotel rooms, as well as a variety of other types of facilities, to establish these safe spaces for residents to isolate, quarantine, or shelter-in-place.

PSH links affordable housing with voluntary supportive services to help people experiencing homelessness lead more stable lives. Services utilize a client-centered, harm reduction approach to engage tenants and address health, mental health, substance use, connect to benefits, employment or vocational services, and other community engagement that promotes the health and well-being of the individual and community. Services include assessment of client needs and strengths, case management, benefits advocacy and assistance, referrals and coordination of services, coordination with property management, and community building and/or peer support activities to promote housing stability. A significant proportion of PSH units must be accessible.

Program Overview

Proposed Solution, Goals, Intended Outcomes, and Beneficiaries

While not unique to San Francisco, there is a need to address the persistent shortage of shelter, rental assistance, and affordable and supportive housing available to homeless, at-risk, and extremely low-income households in our community. To address the existing homelessness crisis and in order to help ensure that people currently sheltered in shelter-in-place hotels do not return to unsheltered homelessness, a significant increase in resources is needed to acquire new buildings to convert to PSH and lease new units. This could be facilitated through awards from the state's Homekey Grant Program and/or dispensation of one-time capital funds from sources such as the recently unlocked

³¹ Behavioral Health and Homelessness in San Francisco: Needs and Opportunities; http://chi.tippingpoint.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/JSI_SF-BH-and-Homelessness_2019.pdf

Proposition C, Our City, Our Home measure and the November 2020 Health and Recovery General Obligation Bond, should it pass.

In response to the potential increase in homelessness and displacement, increased funding is also needed for existing homelessness prevention, rental assistance, and outreach programs. While it is still unclear what the impact of COVID-19 and the economic situation will mean for homelessness, some national data indicates that California could see an increase in homelessness of 20%. Therefore, a 20% increase in targeted homelessness prevention resources and short-term rental assistance, including for homeless youth and families, is needed to help ensure that people who are losing income and jobs related to COVID-19 do not fall into homelessness (see Recommendation 7.4).

Since having a disability and/or medical condition increases the risk of homelessness, services must be targeted to support the disability-related needs of people at risk and outreach must be targeted to people with disabilities and medical conditions.

What Success Looks Like and Measures of Success

Success would look like no one returning to unsheltered homeless from a shelter-in-place placement. This would be measured by the percent of people in shelter-in-place placements remaining housed.

Program Administrator(s) and Community Partners

PSH is administered by the HSH. Rental assistance is administered by MOHCD.

Timeframe

This effort is already underway as funding for the Homekey Grant funds must be expended by December 30, 2020.

Cost

The State is making some resources available to acquire hotels and other buildings that can be converted into PSH such as the Homekey Grant Program and the City will also need to make significant investments in order to purchase buildings at a scale needed to make an impact on the overall homelessness crisis.

Recently, the Courts unlocked funds approved by San Francisco voters through Proposition C (2018), which will provide approximately \$300 million annually for a subset of homeless services. Capital expenses for PSH are also an eligible use for the 2019 Affordable Housing Bond. One of the measures anticipated for the November 2020 ballot could greatly support these efforts: the Health and Recovery General Obligation Bond, which would provide one-time capital funds for acquisition or improvement of homeless service sites.

Philanthropic partners are also hard at work raising additional funds to support this effort.

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers

Black and LGBTQI people disproportionately experience homelessness in San Francisco and across the country as homelessness is the result of centuries of racist housing and social policies. Today, this disproportionality continues due to barriers within our housing and service systems, including discrimination in rental housing. People with disabilities face intractable barriers to receiving equitable and effective services. A system with too many silos is often not well enough coordinated to respond to their complex needs. Language access can also be a barrier to services for Limited English Proficient residents and undocumented residents may face barriers to accessing resources.

Barriers can, in part, be removed by minimizing opportunities for bias and by assessing people based on their needs and vulnerabilities for housing placement, rather than basing housing access on the ability of the homeless person or staff to navigate the system. San Francisco is able to begin to reverse these barriers through the implementation of the Coordinated Entry process for housing placement, which uses a standardized and consistent method for prioritizing people with the most barriers to housing stability for the deepest housing interventions. Also, it is important to ensure that services are available in-language.

Program Burdens

People experiencing homelessness often have needed to seek assistance from multiple providers separately. The Coordinated Entry process described above reduces that burden and streamlines access to resources.

To avoid placing burdens on existing tenants, the City should adopt a do-no-harm approach to acquisition of new residential buildings with existing tenants.

Community Input and Partnership

As part of the advanced planning process related to homelessness, the City hosted three community input sessions on solutions. These sessions were open to people with lived experiences of homelessness, homeless service providers, and the public. Additionally, the City hosts monthly public meetings on solutions to homelessness, which are an additional opportunity for community input. More community engagement, specifically for homeless people of color and homeless people with disabilities and medical conditions should be conducted to gather input on program design, building/service locations, and services.

Community Assets

The community input sessions described above provide an opportunity for City staff to learn about opportunities to partner with existing organizations and leaders in the community.

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	Yes
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	No
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	Yes
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	Yes
Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	Yes

If Yes, please briefly explain.

Increasing the PSH available to our most vulnerable homeless residents will help address racial disparities within the homeless population, eliminate barriers to housing resources, advance civic engagement, and improve conditions of homeless communities of color in San Francisco.

Increasing housing resources and using the Coordinated Entry system to facilitate access and placement will reduce disparities and minimize barriers by ensuring that the most vulnerable people experiencing homelessness (most often people of color) are able to access this valuable resource. Additionally, this process eliminates individual bias in the placement process.

Stable housing is the first step toward recovery for people with long experiences of homelessness. This recovery is often focused on physical and mental health, but it is also the backbone for civic engagement. As people stabilize in housing, their ability to advocate

for themselves and their community increases as does their participation in social and civic activities.

Improving access to housing resources meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color who are significantly impacted by homelessness in our community by providing more opportunities to move off the streets and into housing.

Additional Context

Select the type of solution this is:	Please "X" for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	
New program or initiative	
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	X
Advocacy (supporting efforts bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	X

Feasibility

The City knows how to implement these programs, but this is a big task because of the resources needed to achieve significant scale.

Passage of the Recovery Bond on the November 2020 ballot would help make site acquisition at scale more feasible. The recently unlocked Prop C dollars will also help as an ongoing source. More resources still will be needed and we need to advocate for these resources in future federal and state economic recovery bills. Homelessness is ultimately a regional, state and federal issue as people can move easily around the United States. The City should continue to advocate at all levels for increased funding for homelessness.

7.5 Prevent renter evictions and displacement

Problem Statement

Housing Precarity Before the Pandemic and Now

Nearly two-thirds (65%) of all San Francisco households are tenants, a much higher percentage than the Bay Area overall (45%). Before the pandemic, nearly one-fifth (19.4%) of the City's more than 225,000 tenant households were low-income households paying more than half of their income toward rent.³² Seventy-seven percent of these low-income households had extremely low incomes, earning 30% and below the area median income (AMI), and about half had at least one adult in the work force.

In an August 2017 report to Congress, the U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development (HUD) found that during the Great Recession, the U.S. experienced a 43.5% increase in tenants with “worst case housing needs” or very low- and extremely low-income households who pay more than half of their income toward rent, live in severely inadequate housing, or both. Some economists expect the current economic downturn to be as severe or more severe than the last economic collapse.

Looming Eviction and Homelessness Problems

In a UCLA report authored by Gary Blasi published May 28, 2020 titled, “UD Day: Impending Evictions and Homelessness in Los Angeles,” the author projects a surge in evictions and homelessness that will follow the lifting of emergency orders. Blasi argues that without appropriate tenant protections and eviction prevention programs, communities will see two large-scale “waves” of evictions and homelessness when the emergency orders are lifted: the first made up of unemployed tenant households without replacement income (e.g., unemployment benefits), and the second, larger wave made up of unemployed tenant households unable to make ends meet when their unemployment benefits end.

The author quantified only the first wave. Using the study's methodology, the estimate for San Francisco suggests that as many as 38,000 tenant households could face eviction during the first wave. According to this study's methodology, between one-tenth and one-third of these households, or 3,500-11,800, may experience homelessness. The median of this range, 7,650, serves as an estimate of the most vulnerable households for which to target assistance.

In 2019, 2,638 eviction lawsuits were filed in San Francisco's housing court. Prior to the pandemic, during the most significant expansion of the City's eviction defense system, the

³² Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data derived from 2012-2016 American Community Survey (ACS) data from the U.S. Census Bureau,

MOHCD-funded program Tenant Right to Counsel, was serving only two-thirds of tenant households facing eviction. To confront an eviction problem of this scale will require extensive investment in proven eviction prevention strategies.

Factors Affecting Communities of Color and/or Other Vulnerable Populations Differently

San Franciscans most at risk of eviction and displacement are low-income communities of color. Low-income communities of color disproportionately have severe housing problems that include overcrowding, substandard housing, and severe rent burdens.

The legal aid, tenant advocate, and social service organizations of San Francisco who have pioneered this anti-displacement work are often long-time City partners, committed to further centering the work on the needs of Black, Latinx, and other communities disproportionately impacted by systemic racism and other forms of oppression. The pandemic presents an opportunity for the City to scale strategies to combat displacement exacerbated by the crisis, and for this anti-displacement coalition to build bridges across movements and align efforts that aim to lift up Black, Latinx, and other vulnerable populations, including older adults, people with disabilities, and LGBTQI people.

Existing Programs/Policies that Address this Problem

Emergency Tenant Protections and the Eviction Process

On March 13, Mayor Breed issued an executive order, effective through September 30, 2020, that imposed a residential eviction moratorium on all evictions except those related to violence, threats of violence, or health and safety. The moratorium also extends the due date to January 31, 2021 for missed rents that were normally due between March 13 and July 31, 2020, if the rents were missed due to COVID-19 financial impact. It prohibits landlords from imposing late fees and interest.

Rents have not been cancelled; tenants are still obligated to pay these missed rent payments. It is important to note that August and subsequent rents are currently due on-time, as the executive order does not cover missed rents after July 31. If a tenant misses these rent payments, their landlord will have a just cause to evict them. A landlord is not precluded from serving their tenants with an unlawful detainer complaint (eviction lawsuit or UD), even when the tenant is protected by the executive order. Rather, the tenant will have an affirmative defense if they get their day in court.

Additionally, on June 26, 2020, the City enacted an ordinance that effectively converts missed rents (March 13 – July 31 only) into consumer debt so that the tenant’s housing will not be at stake. A landlord can still take their tenants to civil court to collect this debt, but they cannot use the unlawful detainer (UD) process to collect the outstanding debt and

recover possession of the rental unit. In UD cases, not only is a tenant's housing at stake, but the UD process is a summary court procedure, which can move as quickly as five weeks from beginning to end. A typical civil lawsuit takes a year or more.

In addition to the City's residential eviction moratorium, the Judicial Council of California, the policymaking body for California's court system, suspended eviction proceedings indefinitely by executive order. The order will sunset 90 days after the Governor lifts the state of emergency or when the Judicial Council amends or repeals it. Since the Governor likely will not lift the state of emergency in the foreseeable future, local experts speculate the Judicial Council will likely amend or repeal before the Governor lifts the state of emergency. If and when the Judicial Council amends or repeals the order, local experts hope it will give at least two months notice. When the Judicial Council announced the possibility of repealing the order in early June, they had set the repeal date to August 3. They have since backed down and are being sued by the real estate and landlord industry.

When a tenant is served with a UD, they have five calendar days to file a response at court; otherwise, they default and must move out. An estimated 22% of UDs result in default. Even when a tenant manages to file a timely response, the legal system is difficult to navigate self-represented and case outcomes are generally poor.

Existing Eviction Prevention Services

San Francisco's community-based eviction prevention strategy is designed to combat displacement through:

- Tenant Right to Counsel: Providing high-quality legal representation to tenants facing eviction that results in tenants staying in their home (intensive intervention)
- Tenant Counseling, Education, and Outreach: Educating tenants on their rights and responsibilities before and during the eviction notice stage so that these cases do not end up in high-stakes court, and tenants know how to avail themselves of help when they need it, including SRO residents (prevention and early intervention)
- Tenant-Landlord Mediation (Conflict Intervention Service [CIS] Program): Intervening early in tenant-landlord disputes so that these cases also do not end up in court when the stakes are so high, and so that the tenant-landlord relationship is repaired, leading to more sustainable tenancies (prevention and early intervention)
- Housing Stabilization Program: Rental assistance as a flexible and decisive intervention that resolves most cases at any stage: before an eviction notice, during the eviction notice, and during an eviction proceeding

Program Overview

Proposed Solution, Goals, Intended Outcomes, and Beneficiaries

This recommendation includes four programs with the following goals:

- Increase the number of households informed of tenants' rights and eviction prevention services
- Increase the number of tenants receiving eviction counseling before or during the notice stage
- Increase the number of pre-eviction tenant-landlord mediation
- Increase the number of mediation resolutions that result in tenant household staying in their home
- Reduce the number of unlawful detainer complaints filed at the court
- Increase the number of households that stay in their home after being served an unlawful detainer complaint
- Reduce the rate of default judgments
- Increase the number of households receiving rental assistance

Tenant Right to Counsel (TRC) (Program 1 of 4)

A first of its kind in the U.S., San Francisco voters passed the “No Eviction Without Representation Act of 2018,” then-known as Proposition F, on June 5, 2018. This local law went into effect on July 11, 2019. It established a policy that all residential tenants facing eviction have a right to legal representation known as a tenant right to counsel. The ballot initiative that led to the enactment of the local law did not create a revenue source to fund TRC. However, through the City’s budget process, the Mayor and Board of Supervisors have significantly increased funding for TRC since its passage.

Legal representation is currently provided by a network of nine City-funded legal services organizations with a combined 47 attorneys supported by social workers and paralegals and is subject to availability. During the first six months of implementation (July 1-December 31, 2019), TRC provided the mandated full-scope legal representation to approximately two-thirds of all tenant households who availed themselves of assistance. The remaining one-third received limited legal services, including *pro per* assistance with completing the prescribed court form that must be filed at the court within five calendar days of being served with the unlawful detainer complaint (eviction lawsuit or UD). This enables the tenant to have their day in court and limited-scope representation during the mandatory pre-trial settlement conference.

Prior to the suspension of evictions, TRC was providing full-scope legal representation to an unprecedented number of tenants facing eviction. Program performance data and several studies show that full-scope legal representation gets far better results than limited legal services. In San Francisco, approximately 67% of clients receiving full-scope representation stayed in their homes, as compared to 38% of clients receiving limited legal services.

In the most recent implementation report of the Tenant Right to Counsel, MOHCD found that Black and Latinx San Franciscans were overrepresented in evictions. Despite Black and Latinx people representing 5.6% and 15.2%, respectively, of the City's population overall, they each represented 22.2% of all eviction cases. According to the implementation report, 18% of TRC clients were Black and 23% of TRC clients were Latinx. Fortunately, TRC success rates were highest for Black clients with 80% resulting in these households staying in their home.

Key to ensuring continued focus on Black and Latinx clients will be crafting a tool that targets assistance to those who are most vulnerable (e.g., formerly homeless, those in subsidized housing, extremely low-income individuals, families with children, workers in the informal economy [a proxy for undocumented], etc.). Black and Latinx households are overrepresented in vulnerability factors that could be weighted most heavily. In addition to client characteristics, targeting should also consider case characteristics to ensure that the client is matched to the appropriate intervention (e.g., full-scope representation, limited-scope representation, pro per assistance, rental assistance, etc.).

Full-scope legal representation is the gold standard of tenant advocacy. TRC attorneys are housing litigators and well-positioned to leverage rental assistance in negotiating “pay and stay” agreements (payment plans) that may include partial rent forgiveness. These attorneys also represent tenants in civil court when landlords take their tenants to court for debt collection when a UD is not an option.

Average cost per case: \$4,500

FY19-20 budget: \$9.6 million (General Fund)

FY19-20 MOHCD grantees: Tenderloin Housing Clinic, Open Door Legal, Legal Assistance to the Elderly, Justice & Diversity Center of the Bar Association of San Francisco, Eviction Defense Collaborative, Bay Area Legal Aid, Asian Pacific Islander Legal Outreach (APILO), Asian Americans Advancing Justice – Asian Law Caucus, AIDS Legal Referral Panel (ALRP)

Unmet need based on the estimated 7,650 most vulnerable households for which to target this assistance: \$24,800,000 to serve an additional 5,500 households. However, this program cannot be ramped up at this scale, as there are not sufficient tenant attorneys in

San Francisco. Prior to the pandemic, TRC's funding gap was approximately \$4 million per year during a time that evictions were at their lowest point in at least nine years. **If it were to be scaled 50% or an additional \$5 million, San Francisco's eviction defense system would be appropriately scaled for its baseline need and would target those most at risk.**

Tenant Counseling, Education & Outreach (Program 2 of 4)

A network of City-funded tenant counseling organizations with deep ties to the communities they serve, including Bayview, Chinatown, Mission, Excelsior, SoMa, Tenderloin, and the City's Westside. These tenant counselors and organizers educate tenants on their rights; counsel tenants on tenant-landlord issues, such as habitability, rent increases, Rent Board petitions/hearings; and advise tenants before and during the eviction notice stage. These services are especially vital in the context of subsidized housing (San Francisco Housing Authority, HOPE SF, RAD, permanent supportive housing, etc.), which makes up nine percent of the City's housing stock. These services are critical in helping tenants navigate the local eviction moratorium and collaborating with DPH and the EOC in helping SRO residents navigate a multitude of challenges during the pandemic. Such challenges include landlord harassment, the unlawful practice of moving residents to different units to avoid establishing tenancy, unlawfully evicting residents when seeking treatment/isolation, amongst other issues. When the City's overall COVID-19 case count increased by 306%, it increased by 1,888% in SROs during that same time.

Tenant counselors and organizers will be vital partners in any rent relief program aimed at SRO residents, particularly when dealing with SRO owner/operator bad actors. Tenant counseling organizations also work closely with TRC on referring cases needing legal representation and receiving referrals from legal service organizations for tenants in the notice or earlier stages. For more complex cases that involve multiple units in a building, tenant counseling organizations will collaborate with legal services organizations to ensure particularly vulnerable tenants receive the assistance they need. Tenant counseling organizations are also the eyes, ears, and brain of the tenants' rights movement and work closely with local and state leaders on expanding and strengthening tenant protections.

Average cost per case: \$1,000

FY19-20 budget: \$2 million (General Fund)

FY19-20 MOHCD grantees: Tenderloin Housing Clinic, Housing Rights Committee of San Francisco, Causa Justa::Just Cause, Chinatown Community Development Center South of Market Community Action Network (SOMCAN), Lower Polk Community Benefit District,

Unmet need based on half the estimated 34,700 households experiencing housing precarity for which to target this assistance (the other half to be served through tenant-

landlord mediation): \$15,350,000 to serve an additional 15,350 households. However, this program cannot be ramped up at this scale, as there are not enough tenant counselors in San Francisco. **If it were to be scaled 150% or an additional \$3 million, San Francisco's tenant counseling, outreach, and education would be appropriately scaled for its baseline need and would target those most at risk.**

Conflict Intervention Service (CIS) Program (Tenant-Landlord Mediation) (Program 3 of 4)

MOHCD partnered with the Bar Association of San Francisco starting in 2016 to provide a continuum of mediation services, including social services support to assist tenants, master tenants, small landlords and housing providers with conflict resolution services for an array of housing issues. CIS deploys a rapid response model, using a diverse panel of attorney and non-attorney mediators with deep knowledge of behavioral health conditions, property management and tenant relations, and cultural humility.

Average cost per case: \$1,200

FY19-20 budget: \$900,000 (General Fund)

FY19-20 MOHCD grantee: Bar Association of San Francisco

Unmet need based on half the estimated 34,700 households experiencing housing precarity for which to target this assistance (the other half to be served through tenant counseling, education, and outreach): \$19,900,000 to serve an additional 16,600 households. However, this program cannot be ramped up at this scale, as there are not enough housing mediators in San Francisco. **If it were to be scaled 150% or an additional \$1.4 million, San Francisco's tenant-landlord mediation would be appropriately scaled for its baseline need and would target those most at risk.**

Housing Stabilization Program (Rental Assistance) (Program 4 of 4)

Even before the pandemic, nonpayment of rent was the leading cause of eviction in any community. MOHCD has partnered with five CBOs with experience providing rental assistance and with deep ties to the communities they serve to launch the Housing Stabilization Program of the Give2SF COVID-19 Response & Recovery Fund. These program operators include: Young Community Developers, Q Foundation, La Raza Community Resource Center, Eviction Defense Collaborative, and Catholic Charities of San Francisco.

Q Foundation has been instrumental in helping MOHCD build a robust web-based platform that includes a user-friendly online application and a program operator portal to process applications. The highlight of the platform is the Equity Visualization & Optimization (EVO)

tool that enables MOHCD to evaluate applications according to certain vulnerability factors, rather than simply first come, first served.

In addition to this system-generated prioritization process, MOHCD and its program operators rely on their deep ties to the communities they serve to identify those vulnerable households that the EVO tool may have missed. For example, Young Community Developers in collaboration with Rafiki Coalition, Collective Impact, and other CBOs are implementing a targeted prioritization strategy that ensures low-income residents of historically Black neighborhoods who have been severely financially impacted by COVID-19 are not displaced from their homes. Similarly, La Raza Community Resource Center in collaboration with Latinx immigrant- and indigenous-serving CBOs outreach to and engage undocumented, mixed-status, and other vulnerable populations.

Unlike traditional rental assistance programs, this COVID-19 program is low-barrier and available to households who may have informal housing arrangements and may not appear on the lease, which is another major risk factor.

The Give2SF Housing Stabilization Program was launched May 4 and has received nearly 6,000 applications requesting more than \$23 million in housing assistance. Program operators are currently working with approximately 1,000 households to provide each with up to \$10,000 over the life of the program. Each of these households will receive two months of housing assistance initially, which may include rent, utilities, and, for particularly vulnerable households, assistance for basic needs, such as food and diapers. To monitor successful deployment of assistance, program operators will check in on these households after two months to ensure that their housing has been stabilized or provide more assistance if necessary. The Housing Stabilization Program is leveraging the local residential eviction moratorium by providing landlords with pre-payment of rents not covered by the moratorium to maximize the time the household is stably housed. For example, for tenants that have been financially impacted by COVID-19, April, May, June, and July missed rents are not due until January 31, 2021, which is why the Housing Stabilization Program will provide these households with rental assistance for August and later months to protect tenants from eviction for those months not covered by the moratorium. The hope and expectation is that these households will have landed on their feet by the time these missed rents are due January 31, 2021.

According to the latest EVO report:

- 69.4% are Latinx, 8.8% White, 7.8% Black, 7.5% Asian, 3.1% indigenous, 1.9% Middle Eastern/North African, and .6% Pacific Islander
- 92% are extremely low-income, 7% very low-income, and 1% low-income

- 69.5% are straight, 17% LGBTQI, and 13.5% declined to answer
- 31.6% worked in the leisure/hospitality industry, 19.5% in the informal economy, 13.1% in services industry
- 57.4% are families with minor children, 16.8% seniors, 14.9% adults with disabilities, and 11% fleeing domestic violence

Currently, tenants and landlords are reaching four months or more of missed rent payments. Rental assistance is relief for both tenants and landlords. Since the City's enforcement of tenant protections is primarily passive, (e.g., petition-based Rent Board proceedings, affirmative legal defenses at housing court), financial incentives, such as rental assistance, serve as a lever for landlord compliance with tenant protections.

Funding committed: \$9.3 million (\$6.3 million from private donations and \$3 million from federal CDBG-CV first allocation)

Anticipated average amount of assistance per household: \$6,000

Anticipated number of households served: 1,200

MOHCD grantees: Young Community Developers, Q Foundation, La Raza Community Resource Center, Eviction Defense Collaborative, Catholic Charities of San Francisco

Unmet need based on the estimated 7,650 most vulnerable households for which to target this assistance: \$50,000,000 to serve an additional 6,450 households

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers

The barriers vary by program. In terms of tenants in housing court, 22% of tenants served with an eviction do not respond to the lawsuit and consequently lose to their landlords by default. We know nothing about this 22%, but tenant outreach and education is key to decreasing this default rate.

Providers of tenant counseling, education, and outreach that serve SRO residents (primarily BIPOC) indicate that access to residents is a major barrier. SRO owners/operators do not always want residents of their buildings to know and assert their rights. Generally, a best practice among providers is to be embedded in Black and Latinx communities. For example, key providers are onsite at HOPE SF, RAD, and other communities. Not only do they deliver services onsite, their staff have specialized expertise (e.g., tenant attorneys and counselors with expertise in HUD rules & regulations).

An additional barrier is a lack of tenant lawyers across the sector. The City is working with law schools to create interest and demonstrate career demand. The City is also considering

having nonprofits subcontract with private practice tenant attorneys, but that is not particularly cost-effective and there still may not be enough to meet the need. Finally, another idea is pro bono, which was a prominent part of the eviction defense system before Tenant Right to Counsel. These pro bono attorneys come from private practice and larger firms, but are not typically able to provide full-scope representation. Instead, they tend to help with settlement negotiations (limited-scope).

Program Burdens

These eviction prevention services are designed to combat displacement, particularly of communities of color. The targeting strategies of these services will be developed with consultation from communities most disproportionately impacted by displacement.

Community Input and Partnership

Community engagement is an ongoing commitment of MOHCD and its service providers. MOHCD convenes eviction prevention stakeholders every month to learn from each other and exchange ideas, improve service coordination, co-create strategies, and collaborate. These stakeholders have deep ties to the communities they serve and are advocates for their respective communities and the larger tenant movement.

Community Assets

Service provision is only one aspect of anti-displacement work. There is also community building, leadership development, advocacy, and self-empowerment skills building. Service providers are committed to engaging community leaders and CBOs not yet connected to these services and the larger tenant movement. This will involve building trust and demonstrating commitment to these communities by getting results for people they serve.

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	Yes
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	Yes
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	Yes
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	No

Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	Yes
---	-----

If Yes, please briefly explain.

For San Francisco’s communities of color, displacement is one of the biggest threats to their prosperity.

Additional Context

Select the type of solution this is:	Please “X” for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	
New program or initiative	
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	X
Advocacy (supporting efforts bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	

Feasibility

The City’s eviction prevention services strategy is a national model that can be scaled up to meet the immense need. Given the magnitude of the problem, MOHCD and its TRC partners in close consultation with key community stakeholders will need to develop a prioritization process that maximizes coverage and serves the most vulnerable. The more upstream prevention and early intervention strategies, such as tenant counseling, education and outreach, and tenant-landlord mediation are necessary pieces to the larger puzzle and provide targeted immediate assistance to many vulnerable households with the aim of avoiding eviction altogether.

The scope of this proposal is limited to eviction prevention services. While not within the scope of this proposal, reforming state legislation (Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act), which currently preempts communities from expanding and strengthening their rent control policies, would provide greater tenant protections. For example, the status quo of vacancy decontrol incentivizes landlords and real estate speculators to push out, lawfully and otherwise, long-term (often elderly) tenants in rent-controlled units to reset the rent to

market rate. At the time of writing, legislation has been introduced at the Board of Supervisors barring landlords from executing a no-fault eviction until March 2021, regardless of how the tenant has been affected by the pandemic.

Also, rent cancellation would solve many of the problems outlined in this proposal. However, the price tag is too big for state and local governments, which must balance their budgets. Federal funds offer the only source for large-scale rent cancellation.

8. Imagine and Build Stronger Neighborhoods

8.1 Plan collaboratively for San Francisco's resilient future and related investments

Problem Statement

COVID-19 has spotlighted the need for a strong, clear vision for San Francisco's future. With accelerating global warming, more extreme weather events because of climate change, and the ongoing risk of a major seismic event, the need for multi-hazard resilience investments in San Francisco is clear. The City regularly delivers a Five-Year Financial Plan to layout planned investment strategies across public sources. In addition to this financial planning document, various City departments have developed or will soon complete planning documents that point to a more resilient San Francisco. These include the 10-Year Capital Plan, SFMTA's 20-Year Capital Plan, ConnectSF, updates to the Community Safety and Housing elements of the General Plan, the Hazards and Climate Resilience Plan, the Waterfront Plan, the Climate Action Plan, the Digital Equity Strategy, neighborhood Area Plans, and others. Transformative projects like the Embarcadero Seawall Program, the Muni F-train loop, largescale affordable housing near transit, and citywide seismic and climate risk mitigation programs will help San Francisco build resilience to the city's most pressing hazards. It will require concerted effort to bring these plans together and use them to fuel expedient, coordinated investment in a resilient future San Francisco.

Program Overview

Proposed Solution, Goals, Intended Outcomes, and Beneficiaries

The Mayor's Budget Office should update the Five-Year Financial Plan to reflect planned investments considering the COVID-19 crisis. Further, the City Administrator's ORCP should work with the City's asset-owning departments, the Department of the Environment, the MOHCD, and Planning to articulate a program of public investment that can deliver priority resilience enhancement projects. The City's Capital Plan can hold the fiscal planning information for capital and should reflect how San Francisco has incorporated resilience planning into its anticipated infrastructure investments for the next 10 years.

What Success Looks Like and Measures of Success

Successful coordination will result in a fiscal plan for climate resilient public infrastructure. For example, it would highlight planned investments that encourage walking, biking, and

using widely accessible public transit. It would document the planned increase in the supply of affordable housing throughout the city. Coastline and shoreline investments that protect people, communities, and businesses from sea level rise and other flood hazards would show how San Francisco plans to protect existing assets into the future.

Program Administrator(s) and Community Partners

The effort would be delivered through the City Administrator's ORCP as part of the 10-Year Capital Plan, with collaboration and support from departments to provide information on planned efforts.

Timeframe & Cost

The Capital Plan is updated every other year; no additional costs are required.

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers and Burdens

The City's many planning efforts require time and participation from individuals and communities, and not all are able to participate. Community engagement efforts should be designed to hear and amplify BIPOC input.

Community Input and Partnership

City departments strive to gather community input to inform planning efforts. For example, the 2020 Climate Action Plan (CAP) update process will put equity, racial justice, resilience, and a just economy at the center of climate action solutions. The effort will engage work and partnerships between City agencies, community members, local businesses, and technical experts.

Community Assets

The community engagement of each planning effort varies as do the partners, but neighborhood organizations, merchants associations, and local groups and residents are invited to participate and offer public comment along the way.

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	Yes
Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	

If Yes, please briefly explain.

Planning for equitable public infrastructure investments that center environmental justice presents an opportunity for the public to engage directly with government and inform the shape of San Francisco’s future.

Additional Context

Select the type of solution this is:	Please “X” for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	
New program or initiative	
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	X
Advocacy (supporting efforts bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	

Feasibility

Coordination will require ongoing time from staff and department leadership.

This proposal does not require further federal or state legislation.

8.2 Catalyze neighborhood recovery through the arts

Problem Statement

COVID-19 exacerbates challenges for neighborhood commercial corridors and community organizations, which faced financial instability even before the pandemic due to the high cost of real estate, big box retailers, and e-commerce. Throughout the City, restaurants, museums, hotels, night clubs and retail stores are shuttered and neighborhood commercial corridors are seeing reduced activity. Employees of these establishments have been laid off. The path to reinvigorate these spaces is not yet known in full, but there is an opportunity to find creative solutions that center community needs.

Factors Affecting Communities of Color and/or Other Vulnerable Populations Differently

The COVID-19 pandemic has disproportionately hurt minority-owned businesses, especially black-owned businesses, as reported by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. Nationally, active business owners fell by 22% from February to April, with Black business owners experiencing the deepest decline at 41%. Hispanic and Asian business owners fell by 32% and 26%, respectively.¹ The report found that Black businesses often had less access to cash, weaker bank relationships, and large funding gaps ahead of the pandemic, and that these issues have been exacerbated by the health crisis. These disadvantages appear in communities of color as business closures and vacancies, as well as the loss of neighborhood jobs. In addition, industries that have taken the hardest hit during the pandemic, like construction and accommodation and food services, have large numbers of BIPOC employees, who have been laid off or furloughed. Neighborhoods disproportionately affected are the Mission, Bayview, Tenderloin, Sunnyside, Potrero, Chinatown, SOMA, and Fillmore.

Existing Programs/Policies that Address this Problem

OEWD's Invest in Neighborhoods program is a model for outreach and coordination with commercial businesses and community organizations. MOHCD's Cultural Districts are a good model for neighborhood engagement. In addition, the SF Arts Commission has its Arts Impact Endowment Fund which prioritizes arts education, affordable arts and culture space, core support for arts organizations, and support for individual artists.

Program Overview

Proposed Solution, Goals, Intended Outcomes, and Beneficiaries

For commercial districts to re-open and become active destinations for residents and tourists, the City should support inclusive neighborhood-based economic activation plans

and initiatives that draw upon the strengths of San Francisco's arts, culture, hospitality, and entertainment (ACHE) sectors. The ACHE sectors can help build public trust and cohesion – across language and culture barriers, activate vacant properties, develop and implement beautification projects and bring joy to our neighborhoods.

This proposal is to hire ACHE sector workers through contracts, grant awards, or temporary positions to help develop campaigns and events specific to each neighborhood, to reinvigorate community spaces and support community resilience. These economic activation plans need to be inclusive, culturally and linguistically appropriate, and should draw upon unique neighborhood assets. The planning efforts would include engagement with local merchants' associations, CBDs, CBOs, SFUSD, and neighborhood residents, to build economic vibrancy through creative channels. Neighborhood initiatives might include art classes, live entertainment during street closures, murals over boarded up windows, civic pride and clean streets encouragement, and socially-distanced outdoor events. Plans would be responsive to the current health and economic issues and inclusive of the most vulnerable community members. In addition, plans should incorporate strategies for surmounting space limitations, such as narrow sidewalks or a lack of outdoor space.

A component of this work could be an outreach campaign, in partnership with tourism, business and arts organizations, to bolster civic pride by highlighting San Francisco's diverse neighborhoods, commercial corridors, and cultural assets, promoting foot traffic from residents and tourists. This campaign could serve as a call to action and reactivation, encouraging local businesses and residents to partner in keeping the City clean and engaged. Moreover, highlighting the City's unique cultural assets will attract residents and tourists. The campaign could also highlight San Francisco's strong and early response to COVID-19, its novel uses of our outdoor spaces (i.e. social bubbles in the park), and the thorough cleaning protocols of local hotels. Though initially targeting residents and tourists within driving range, the campaign could expand in reach when health conditions allow.

This proposal offers a way to directly engage the private sector in San Francisco's recovery. The City could collaborate with SF Travel, CalTravel, and Visit California to employ artists to create inspirational images and messages that communicate San Francisco's neighborhood resiliency, vibrancy, and core values.

Beneficiaries would depend on which neighborhoods were supported by the recommended planning efforts. Resources and assistance should be prioritized to support historically marginalized neighborhoods that have not benefitted from past economic growth and those hardest hit by reduced tourism. These investments and attention to BIPOC communities could strengthen these neighborhoods to become stronger than pre-COVID conditions. With ACHE sector contributions and an equity lens for implementation, the

proposed neighborhood recovery plans and initiatives could support BIPOC and low-income artists who live and/or work in each neighborhood, local venues and businesses, and community organizations.

What Success Looks Like and Measures of Success

Success could be measured by:

- Number of ACHE sector workers employed by City contracts and grants geared toward these efforts
- Number of neighborhoods working with City agencies to develop specific neighborhood-based plans, and the proportion of low-income and BIPOC neighborhoods served by these plans
- Completion of creative campaigns to stimulate neighborhood corridors and inspire public confidence in San Francisco as a safe and healthy destination
- Increase in business revenue in commercial corridors with neighborhood plans

Program Administrator(s) and Community Partners

The initiative should be led by OEWD, SFAC, GFTA, and MOHCD. Coordinating with DPH will be key in implementing public health messaging and promoting public safety. City departments need to work with the Board of Supervisors as partners and stakeholders as these offices know their districts intimately and would be immensely helpful connecting planners with the various neighborhoods and local leaders.

Timeframe

As soon as possible, subject to available resources.

Cost

This effort would require dedication of existing City staff time, plus additional financial support for developing neighborhood plans, convenors, neighborhood engagement, and eventually implementation by local artists. The envisioned campaign would require staff time, in-kind resources, and scalable costs related to media buy. Sources could include the General Fund, eligible developer impact fees, and/or other funds from the private sector/philanthropy.

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers

Some small businesses and community organizations, especially in historically marginalized communities and communities of color have had challenges accessing government programs. Some residents may be reluctant to participate. Some neighborhood commercial corridors are not sufficiently resourced to put together marketing plans, advocate for the expansion of the Shared Space program, or build other creative uses of neighborhood outdoor spaces. The travel industry does not always highlight neighborhood arts and businesses.

Including outer neighborhoods in the development of a San Francisco civic pride and cleanliness campaign would help residents in these communities feel activated and supportive. In vulnerable communities, residents often do not come out to neighborhood events when outreach does not fully account for language or cultural barriers. Also, subjective citizen complaints regarding music genres and attire preferences can negatively impact BIPOC cultural events.

Technical assistance, outreach, and overall City coordination would support the proposed efforts and reduce these barriers. Specific outreach to artists with disabilities using accessible communication modes would be needed, and in-language communication to reach people with limited English proficiency.

Program Burdens

Because of the above barriers, communities of color, people with disabilities, people with limited English proficiency, and/or other vulnerable populations might be entirely or partially left out of the program, and therefore continue to be under-resourced. To mitigate this, culturally, linguistically, and accessible competent engagement needs to be done in communities of concern. In addition, specific funding and support for BIPOC artists and arts organizations will help address historical inequities.

Community Input and Partnership

Neighborhood plans should be community-driven, collaborative, and creative. The involvement of ACHE sector workers, residents, business owners, and CBOs is important. MOHCD's Cultural Districts can support this effort and bring an inclusive community-based cultural lens.

Community Assets

Embedded in each neighborhood are arts, culture, entertainment, hospitality, and community hubs. These neighborhood anchors can help lead the development and

implementation of these plans. To support a campaign’s development, merchant organizations, nightlife and hospitality industry groups, individual merchants, CBDs, SF Travel, and Visit California can be helpful partners. The City could also utilize resources including Shop Dine 49, SF Biz Connect, advertisements on digital boards and street furniture, ad space on SFMTA assets, and SFGovTV resources.

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	Yes
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	No
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	Yes
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	Yes
Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	Yes

If Yes, please briefly explain.

This proposal envisions engaging and employing artists from local neighborhoods - reflecting the diversity of San Francisco to lead recovery efforts in their own communities. Local cultural districts, community arts organizations, and City departments can assist with identifying local artists and organizations, especially for BIPOC and vulnerable populations. The preservation of entertainment venues and community arts facilities throughout San Francisco neighborhoods would ensure these spaces are available in the future for neighborhood gatherings and cultural celebrations reflecting the local community.

Additional Context

Select the type of solution this is:	Please "X" for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	
New program or initiative	X
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	
Advocacy (supporting efforts bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	

Feasibility

This proposal is feasible as it is neighborhood-driven and builds upon existing City programs (OEWD - Invest in Neighborhoods, MOHCD - Cultural Districts).

This proposal does not require further federal or state legislation.

8.3 Identify new revenue sources and support grant applications for arts, culture, hospitality, and entertainment funding

Problem Statement

Due to the shelter-in-place and social distancing restrictions at the local and state level and the public's fear of contracting coronavirus in social settings, San Francisco's arts, culture, hospitality, and entertainment (ACHE) sectors are experiencing major financial impacts that may continue until a vaccine is available or beyond. Some ACHE businesses have reopened, often at a reduced capacity, including restaurants and bars that serve food. Other ACHE businesses/organizations – such as bars, venues, hotels, museums, and street fairs – must remain closed until local and state authorities lift restrictions based on health indicators. These latter assets will be among the last to reopen, and that is challenging for nonprofit and for-profit entities alike.

Given the great financial losses and the unknown course of the pandemic, ACHE businesses, organizations, and workers need financial support to prevent permanent closure and displacement. Furthermore, with hotel tax revenue decreasing and major cuts to the City's budget, new sources of funding need to be identified to protect and sustain the ACHE sectors.

When surveyed, ACHE businesses indicated challenges based on reopening costs and fear of permanent closure. The businesses that have been allowed to open in a reduced capacity said that reopening requires increased expenses and yields decreased revenues. Increased expenses were attributed to PPE, sanitization, more staffing to help monitor customers, adding outdoor seating, and increased ventilation and filtering systems. Decreased revenue concerns stemmed from having fewer seats for customers and general lower consumer demand.

According to a May 2020 Entertainment Commission Industry Survey, entertainment and nightlife businesses have already experienced substantial financial losses to business and individual incomes, and they have expressed concerns about the need to permanently close. More than half of survey respondents reported having lost between 75-100% of their expected business income and between 75-100% of their expected individual income in 2020. Nearly half of respondents said they had a high amount of concern (rating 8, 9, or 10) that their business will need to close permanently due to the financial impact of COVID-19. The majority of those are bars, live music venues, and nightclubs.

Similarly, arts/culture organizations and individual artists have reported significant financial losses due to the pandemic. According to a May 2020 survey from the Community Arts Stabilization Trust (CAST):

- Nearly all small to large budget organizations and individual artists reported significant revenue loss between March 16 and May 18, 2020.
- Both organizations and individual artists are at risk of displacement (losing their commercial or residential spaces) over the next one to six months starting from May 18.
- Organizations that serve Black and Latinx communities are the most financially impacted by the pandemic and at risk of displacement.

Short-term and long-term measures must be taken to protect and sustain existing ACHE assets, such as businesses, organizations, buildings, and leaders. The City is in a position to find and leverage new revenue sources to help ACHE members cover their losses, pay their rent/mortgage and employee payrolls, and stay afloat during the pandemic. As hotel tax revenue returns, these new revenue sources could enable the City to deepen and expand its funding opportunities across communities, sectors, and programs.

Factors Affecting Communities of Color and/or Other Vulnerable Populations Differently

BIPOC-owned and -serving businesses and organizations in the ACHE sector have been disproportionately impacted by the pandemic in terms of infection rates and should be prioritized in developing financial relief strategies. More frontline workers in the ACHE sectors are people of color and thus disproportionately impacted.

For these strategies to be successful in all neighborhoods, the City must prioritize accessibility in terms of funding allocation, language access, digital access, and cultural competency.

Existing Programs/Policies that Address this Problem

Though the following are not new sources of funding, they do address sustainability issues within the sector:

- OEWD's nonprofit sustainability program provides technical assistance and funding for rent stipends, tenant improvements, and property acquisition for nonprofits. This program could be replicated and tailored to serve nonprofit arts organizations specifically.
- OEWD's Small Business Development Center Loan Preparation program could serve as a model for how to provide technical assistance for ACHE assets seeking loans.
- OEWD's Legacy Business program provides qualifying businesses with Business Assistance Grants of up to \$500 per full-time equivalent employee per year, while landlords who extend the leases of such businesses for at least 10 years may receive Rent Stabilization Grants of up to \$4.50 per square foot of space leased per year.

This program is a prime example of the grant and loan opportunities that ACHE businesses need.

- SF Arts Commission’s Arts Impact Endowment Fund prioritizes arts education, affordable arts and culture space, core support for arts organizations, and support for individual artists.

Program Overview

Proposed Solution, Goals, Intended Outcomes, and Beneficiaries

To help ACHE businesses and organizations survive the COVID-19 crisis and recover, San Francisco should identify new revenue sources for ACHE funding to offset the pandemic’s negative impact on the hotel tax revenue base. San Francisco should pursue a multi-pronged strategy to connect ACHE businesses and organizations to the funding sources they need to recover from the COVID-19 crisis:

- Actively engage philanthropy and the private sector to build, expand, and promote existing fundraising (Give2SF) and grantmaking (Arts Commission, Grants for the Arts, OEWD, and MOHCD) for the arts. The City should promote these programs to a broader audience of private funders to increase and diversify funding, including outreach to new or non-traditional arts funders, such as cannabis, tech, healthcare, and developers entering community benefits agreements. Communicate to private funders where funding gaps exist in ACHE sectors for coordinated support and advocacy, and connect ACHE businesses and organizations, and artists/creatives with private funders through online events, campaigns, and directories. Create financial incentives for private funders to support ACHE funding such as tax deductions and/or license fee waivers.
- Increase access to City funding and technical support (notifications, grant writing, administrative support) for ACHE assets. Provide loan application assistance modeled on OEWD’s Loan Preparation program, which provides loan-seeking organizations with services like business planning, consulting on the loan process, and assessing whether a loan is advisable. Ensure equitable access to these resources for businesses and organizations owned or operated by people belonging to BIPOC communities. Many businesses and residents in San Francisco specialize in information technology and related services, which can also be called upon provide technical support for grant-seeking ACHE assets, either through volunteering time or equipment.

- Explore other public funding streams, including working with state and federal government agencies to identify new streams – e.g., alcohol tax rebates to support music venues. Provide technical assistance to ACHE assets in accessing state and federal grants. Consider pursuing a bond issue in support of ACHE sectors.

The goals of this effort are as follows:

- Provide need-based financial relief to ACHE small businesses, organizations, and artists adversely impacted by the pandemic, prioritizing funding and outreach to BIPOC and other vulnerable communities.
- Build new, sustainable funding mechanisms and increase funding to provide relief for these entities.
- Diversify and expand funding sources in the private sector.
- Support dynamic, innovative public-private partnerships in fundraising, external matching pledges, and grantmaking to support the ACHE sector.

The intended outcomes for this work are envisioned as the preservation and strengthening of existing ACHE businesses and organizations, especially those owned by and serving BIPOC communities and other vulnerable populations. This effort should help ACHE assets survive the COVID-19 crisis and be a part of San Francisco’s recovery. Ideally, San Francisco would seize the opportunity to act as a global model for leveraging public and private funding to provide equitable financial relief to ACHE small businesses, organizations, and artists/creatives across all neighborhoods.

Beneficiaries of this effort would include arts organizations, independent artists/creatives, bars, restaurants, live music venues, nightclubs, theaters, hotels, museums, galleries, street fairs, and studios/rehearsal spaces. In addition, with an equity lens in implementation, beneficiaries would include BIPOC and other vulnerable populations within these sectors.

What Success Looks Like and Measures of Success

Success would look like the stabilization or increase of funding allocated for the ACHE sector and funding provided in greater proportion to BIPOC and other vulnerable businesses/organizations. Success would also look like ACHE businesses/ organizations across all neighborhoods remaining open within one year of receiving funding and BIPOC and other vulnerable businesses/organizations remaining open at the same rate.

Success could be measured through dollars fundraised and granted, and financial reporting from grantees. Reports could include grantee demographic data, survey responses for income and staffing losses/gains, and overall financial outlook. Success could also be measured through business license data.

Program Administrator(s) and Community Partners

Arts Commission should lead coordination with the Office of the City Administrator (Grants for the Arts), OEWD, and MOHCD.

Potential community partners include business networks and organizations like Community Vision, Center for Cultural Innovation, Golden Gate Restaurant Association, Community Arts Stabilization Trust, SF Foundation, Merchant Associations, Northern California Grantmakers Arts Loan Fund. Partners could also include neighborhood-based organizations like CBDs and Cultural Districts.

Timeframe

The program/effort could start immediately and last through the end of 2021 with quarterly reassessment and course-correction as needed.

Cost

The cost to the City is staff time to administer the program and potential funds to support additional grants. Staffing and mechanisms already exist in these City departments mentioned above. Private funders could build in administration/overhead costs into their monetary donations if funds are re-granted by community partners. Costs would need to cover culturally-competent, targeted outreach, and support for BIPOC/vulnerable applicants, whether paid for by private funders or the City.

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers

Anticipated barriers are lack of technology access, language barriers, lack of awareness of grant opportunities, and onerous grant application processes. These barriers could be mitigated by:

- Linking communities with computers and free/affordable internet (See Recommendations 5.4 and 5.5).
- Providing multi-lingual materials and services when promoting grant programs and delivering technical assistance.
- Targeted outreach to vulnerable communities through community partners, holding virtual events, and in-person outreach to bridge the digital divide, such as street teams visiting businesses.
- Engaging the community to articulate what type of funding they need and the best methods of distribution.
- Prioritizing allocation and granting of funds to BIPOC and other vulnerable businesses/organizations.

- Building upon Arts Commission, Office of the City Administrator (Grants for the Arts), OEWD and MOHCD funding strategies to promote racial equity and inclusion, and advance equitable funding efforts that promote cultural competency.

Program Burdens

Potential risk is the inequitable distribution of funding and resources, perpetuating existing socioeconomic disparities. Measures to prevent this are addressed in the Proposed Solutions and Community Input sections.

Community Input and Partnership

Golden Gate Restaurant Association, Hotel Council of SF, SF Travel, and neighborhood-based small-scale businesses and nonprofits that are unaffiliated with networks – particularly those owned by or serving BIPOC communities – should be consulted in design and implementation. Engaging these communities could include a survey measuring their most pressing needs and virtual town-halls to understand their challenges, priorities, and the best mechanisms to distribute funds.

Community Assets

- CBDs
- Merchant Associations
- Cultural Districts
- Hotel Council of San Francisco
- Golden Gate Restaurant Association
- Center for Cultural Innovation
- Community Arts Stabilization Trust
- SF Foundation
- SF Travel
- Neighborhood-based, small scale businesses/nonprofits that are unaffiliated with networks – particularly BIPOC-owned and serving businesses/nonprofits

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	Yes
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	No
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	Yes
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	No
Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	Yes

If Yes, please briefly explain.

The proposal financially supports the stabilization, preservation, and strengthening of BIPOC led and serving operators in the ACHE sector. It better positions these operators for health and prosperity throughout the recovery and beyond.

Additional Context

Select the type of solution this is:	Please “X” for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	
New program or initiative	
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	X
Advocacy (supporting efforts bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	X

Feasibility

This program is feasible as it leverages existing capital (private sector funding) and mechanisms (Give2SF, City agencies doing grantmaking).

This proposal does not require further federal or state legislation.

8.4 Appoint more arts, culture, hospitality, and entertainment sector representatives to advisory groups and policy bodies

Problem Statement

Arts and culture businesses and nonprofits are important economic drivers and job creators for San Francisco. According to a 2018 economic impact update prepared by the Office of Economic and Workforce Development, over 3,850 nightlife and entertainment establishments in San Francisco employed over 63,000 workers, and generated an estimated \$7.2 billion. These establishments were contributing over \$80 million in payroll and sales taxes to the City, annually.

As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, artists and arts businesses and organizations have been among the hardest hit. As community conveners and visionaries, arts, culture, hospitality and entertainment (ACHE) leaders are uniquely positioned to help create the conditions –public trust, social cohesion and connection, access to learning and engagement – that will be needed for San Francisco’s economic recovery.

The July 2020 ACHE Policy Group survey indicates that 81% of 460 respondents believe appointing more ACHE sector representatives to commissions, citizen advisory committees, and other decision-making bodies to promote our economic recovery is important/very important. Comments included “ACHE (arts especially) needs to have a larger voice in City decision-making – especially in regards to land use,” and “ACHE members on these bodies need to adequately represent the city’s LGBTQ, Black, Latinx populations.”

Factors Affecting Communities of Color and/or Other Vulnerable Populations Differently

Without adequate representation on decision-making policy bodies, communities of color and vulnerable populations within the ACHE industry are stymied in influencing policies and programs that affect their neighborhoods and residents. It is important to note that representation on policy bodies does not inherently impact decision-making. Historically BIPOC representation and ideas can be sidelined by majority opinion or pre-determined criteria that undermine new and more equitable ideas. Representation, decision-making, and implementation protocols need to be examined within policy-making bodies. Cohorts of new members, particularly from communities not typically represented, can help mitigate these issues.

Existing Programs/Policies that Address this Problem

The City and County of San Francisco has a few specific policy and decision-making bodies with appointed arts and culture leaders including the Arts Commission, Grants for the Arts, the Entertainment Commission, and the Film Commission.

Program Overview

Proposed Solution, Goals, Intended Outcomes, and Beneficiaries

To rebuild a more equitable San Francisco, appoint more ACHE sector representatives to commissions, citizen advisory committees, and other decision-making and policy bodies. In addition, embed ACHE sector experts into City departments and policy-development teams as either staff members or consultants.

These times demand new ways of thinking about the local economy, civic spaces, job creation and business development programs, city planning, and public-private partnerships. Arts and culture leaders are creative design thinkers and can be catalysts in our economic and community recovery. They are proven leaders in multi-disciplinary, multi-sector, and community-based processes and programs.

In the selection of these ACHE sector experts, equity should be a guiding criterion. Experts should represent the voices of communities of color and vulnerable populations; small, neighborhood-based businesses and organizations; a diversity of business and cultural worker types (for-profit, nonprofit, arts education, contract worker) and disciplines (visual and performing arts, arts education, food/restaurant, tourism-related). ACHE representatives should be directly tied to neighborhood voices, particularly those from BIPOC and disability communities, and have expertise in convening and listening to diverse communities.

What Success Looks Like and Measures of Success

- Increased number of ACHE sector experts on commissions, citizen advisory committees, and other decision-making and policy bodies
- Increased number of ACHE workers and businesses benefiting from City policies and programs
- Quantitative and qualitative data reflecting the revitalization of the City's ACHE sectors, and its positive impact on other sectors
- Increased number of persons from BIPOC and vulnerable communities benefiting from City policies and programs

Program Administrator(s) and Community Partners

The Mayor, Board of Supervisors, City Administrator, and City departments including Planning, would deliver this effort with guidance from the Office of Racial Equity and the Human Rights Commission. Outreach and engagement of ACHE sector candidates could be led by staff at the Arts Commission or the Office of the City Administrator (Grants for the Arts, Entertainment Commission), and include DCYF (which funds arts education) and MOHCD (which supports and funds Cultural Districts).

Timeframe

Efforts to recruit candidates and backfill policy-body vacancies with ACHE sector appointees could begin immediately.

Cost

Appointment of ACHE candidates to City policy bodies would incur minimal costs beyond the staff time required to build a recruitment strategy and monitor results. Consultants (or Artists in Residence) with City departments could be fee-based and supported from the General Fund. Recently, the Planning Department had an artist-in-residence program. In this case, the artist-in-residence developed a work of art and did not contribute directly to advising on policy making. But, it does serve as a model of embedding artists in a City department. The program was a collaboration between the Arts Commission and Planning.

Program Equity Analysis

Program Barriers

Previously unrepresented groups will not have an existing “place at the table” and may not be connected to community networks and decision-making bodies. With an intentional mandate and broader and deeper outreach strategy, this can be addressed. Changing criteria for seats on policy-making bodies to dedicate seats for ACHE sector members would ensure that the necessary outreach is implemented. As an example, many citizen advisory committees and City commissions have specific criteria for each seat. However, there is evidence that some policy body members with little government experience and/or from BIPOC communities can feel isolated and find the experience difficult. Intentional onboarding, mentoring, and building a connected cohort of ACHE sector appointees across-City departments would help mitigate this problem.

Many ACHE sector members, especially in the nonprofit sector, are overwhelmed with keeping their own businesses and organizations afloat during this pandemic. This might be a barrier to getting them to take on an additional role.

Program Burdens

To reduce burdens, include representatives from communities of color, the disability community, and vulnerable populations during the planning stage. Allow for a timeline that includes robust outreach to ensure diversity of participants and voices. City agency leads should not only connect with current and past grantees but work with the Office of Racial Equity and the HRC, the Board of Supervisors, and the Mayor’s Office of Disability to help identify those artists and cultural workers who have not yet been City grantees nor partnered or collaborated with City government.

Community Input and Partnership

This effort should include mechanisms where community groups and organizers in the ACHE sector can hold City government accountable. It is key that ACHE sector businesses/organizations that are run by and serve people of color and vulnerable populations are at the forefront of this work, and that small, neighborhood-serving ACHE sector businesses/organizations have strong representation. The City should seek to work with existing artists networks like CAST (Community Arts Stabilization Trust), Arts Town Hall (organized by Yerba Buena Center for the Arts and others), as well as other hospitality and entertainment networks.

Does this proposal address at least one of the following outcomes:

	Yes/No
Explicitly addresses racial disparities, and its implementation should result in the reduction or elimination of racial inequities	Yes
Protects against racial violence, racial profiling, implicit/explicit bias, and discrimination	No
Helps eliminate barriers to access resources, social services, public benefits, and institutions	Yes
Advances full inclusion, belonging, and civic engagement for San Franciscans	Yes
Meaningfully improves the conditions of communities of color and/or preserves or strengthens the ability of San Franciscans to achieve their full potential	Yes

If Yes, please briefly explain.

This proposal is most closely aligned with advancing full inclusion. The intention is that it would also explicitly result in the reduction of racial inequities.

Additional Context

Select the type of solution this is:	Please "X" for applicable item
Big idea (system changes to society to reflect new normal)	
New program or initiative	X
Expansion or continuation of existing effort	
Advocacy (supporting efforts bigger than CCSF can handle on its own)	

Feasibility

This recommendation is feasible.

This proposal does not require further federal or state legislation.

Glossary

ADM	Office of the City Administrator
ACHE	Arts, Culture, Hospitality, and Entertainment
BIPOC	Black, Indigenous, and People of Color
CBD	Community Benefit District
CBO	Community Based Organization
CCC	COVID Command Center
CDC	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
CPUC	California Public Utilities Commission
COVID-19	Novel Coronavirus Pandemic
DAS	Department of Disability and Aging Services
DBI	Department of Building Inspection
DCYF	Department of Children, Youth and Their Families
DPH	Department of Public Health
EOC	Emergency Operations Center
ERTF	Economic Recovery Task Force
HRC	Human Rights Commission
HSA	Human Services Agency
HSH	Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing
ISPs	Internet Service Providers
JIC	Joint Information Center
LBE	Local Business Enterprise
LGBTQI	Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, Questioning, and Intersex
MOHCD	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
NERT	Neighborhood Emergency Response Team
OECE	Office of Early Care and Education
OEWD	Office of Economic and Workforce Development
ORCP	Office of Resilience and Capital Planning
Planning	Planning Department
PSH	Permanent Supportive Housing
PPE	Personal Protective Equipment

PW	San Francisco Public Works
RPD	Recreation and Parks Department
SFDT	Department of Technology
SFE	San Francisco Department of the Environment
SFMTA	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
SFPD	San Francisco Police Department
SFPL	San Francisco Public Library
SFPUC	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
SFUSD	San Francisco Unified School District
SRO	Single Room Occupancy
TAY	Transitional age youth
TTX	Treasurer and Tax Collector