



As of 3/30/09

As Passed by the State Legislation Committee

## **CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO 2009 STATE AGENDA**

Each year the City and County of San Francisco adopts an agenda to guide its advocacy efforts in Sacramento. This document was created through a collaborative process involving the dozens of agencies and departments that serve the citizens of San Francisco, along with our state legislative advocates. Recognizing that the legislative process is a dynamic one, this agenda is subject to change as new issues surface during the year.

In light of the passage of the Federal American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, the federal government will be disbursing billions in stimulus money to states and local governments, and the City and County of San Francisco is uniquely positioned to garner a significant amount of federal dollars. While some of the federal stimulus money is already allocated, the majority of it is open to competitive bidding giving San Francisco the opportunity to aggressively compete for supplementary grants. In addition to funding "shovel ready" projects including the High Speed Rail project linking Northern and Southern California with its terminus in San Francisco and the rebuilding of the seismically deficient Doyle Drive approach to the Golden Gate Bridge, stimulus money may be made available directly to local governments and from the State for local public housing and public school improvements, energy efficiency upgrades and water improvement, port and airport infrastructure projects, health IT including electronic health records. San Francisco supports proposals that would provide a greater share of total available Federal funding to the City and opposes proposals that would disadvantage the City's ability to obtain the maximum amount of stimulus available.

### **I. Healthcare and Public Health**

San Francisco looks for innovative solutions to the complicated problems that face healthcare and public health. The City is at the forefront of health policy with our proven innovative programs to provide healthcare coverage to all individuals aged 0-19, is on the way to providing universal healthcare access for the uninsured through the Healthy San Francisco program, and caring for the general health and well-being of our residents. The City funds primary care clinics, including extended hours of service, and provides additional specialty, pharmacy and behavioral health services. In addition to providing acute, emergency, and trauma care, San Francisco General Hospital focuses on preventative medicine and chronic care to fight such chronic diseases as diabetes, heart failure, and asthma.

The City is looking for comprehensive healthcare reform so that affordable, accessible healthcare is available for all Californians. We need to increase our State's commitment to fighting HIV/AIDS, and lead the fight for expanded use of information technology in the health care system to decrease administrative costs, lower premiums, and reduce medical errors.

#### **A. Healthy San Francisco**

***Secure additional State resources to support Healthy San Francisco.*** The Healthy San Francisco Program offers uninsured adults access to quality healthcare regardless of the person's employment status, immigration status, or pre-existing medical condition. Uninsured city residents with incomes up to 500 percent of the federal poverty level (FPL) – approximately \$51,000 per year for an individual – can enroll in Healthy San Francisco for a sliding-scale fee based on income. Once enrolled, participants pick a "medical home" from any of the 27 participating public and non-profit health clinics throughout the City.

This is not health insurance, but patients do have regular access to health care in San Francisco to prevent disease, improve overall health, and avoid costly emergency room visits.

***Support legislation that expands access to purchasing pools for small employers.*** The other component of the Healthy San Francisco program, in effect for the first time in 2008, requires that all San Francisco employers with more than 20 workers contribute at least \$1.17 per hour worked per employee to pay for health care. Employers can pay toward private insurance, contribute toward the city clinic system, or set up individual health care accounts. As of February 2009, more than 35,000 adult San Francisco residents – out of an estimated 60,000 who were previously uninsured – have voluntarily enrolled in the program and now can see a doctor whenever they need to.

## **B. San Francisco General Hospital**

***Seek state reimbursement for the financing of the rebuild of a seismically safe San Francisco General Hospital as required under state law.*** San Francisco General Hospital (SFGH) is vital to the City's well-being. It is the Bay Area's only Level 1 trauma center north of Stanford serving San Francisco and northern San Mateo counties. SFGH provides primary and specialty care and is open to anyone who has a major injury in San Francisco, regardless of their financial status. Over 1,500 patients are treated each day and nearly 100,000 individuals per year – from delivering babies to HIV/AIDS care, from surgery to critical care. The hospital also provides more than half of the psychiatric, HIV/AIDS and substance-abuse care in San Francisco. On November 7, 2008, San Franciscans passed the City's largest bond initiative ever, \$887 million, to support the rebuilding of SFGH by a majority of 84 percent. However, the project will consume a large portion of the City's debt capacity. State reimbursement to cover debt payments would allow the City to address other high priority capital needs while ensuring the SFGH project proceeds on track.

## **C. Medi-Cal**

***Support legislation ensuring adequate funding of the Medi-Cal program and oppose efforts to cut funding to Medi-Cal and public hospitals.*** Medi-Cal reductions may help to balance the State Budget, but cutting Medi-Cal threatens to drive up the cost of health care for everyone and could cause the State to lose matching federal funds. Medi-Cal is the backbone of the state's healthcare system. It is its single largest source of medical insurance, providing coverage for one out of every six Californians. In the City and County of San Francisco, nearly 123,000 residents rely on Medi-Cal, and Medi-Cal accounts for one-third of SFGH's revenue.

***Oppose legislation that reduces Medi-Cal Rates.*** Medi-Cal rate reductions affect the San Francisco Department of Public Health and indirectly affect Healthy San Francisco as lost revenue to the Department could limit enrollment in the program. Any proposed Medi-Cal cuts to the already underfunded system compounds California's already low reimbursement rates. California has the lowest reimbursement rates in the nation, spending almost 30 percent less per Medi-Cal beneficiary than the national average. This has resulted in a severe shortage of physicians willing to treat Medi-Cal patients, further limiting access to medical care.

***Support legislation that would expand the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP), known as Healthy Families in California.*** The reauthorized federal SCHIP bill provides California with the opportunity to expand the Healthy Families program. California should preserve the existing Healthy Families program and expand the program to include children with incomes up to 300 percent FPL and parental coverage, even as a local option with matching funds.

***Support rapid implementation of the state option to use Social Security Number validation to establish citizenship and identity for purposes of determining MediCal eligibility.*** The Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 imposed new requirements for documenting the citizenship status and identity of MediCal

applicants and beneficiaries. Recently adopted federal legislation reauthorizing the SCHIP provides states with a new option for meeting this requirement by accessing existing information gathered by the Social Security Administration. This new process has the potential to significantly reduce administrative burden on county MediCal eligibility offices while simultaneously reducing barriers to coverage for eligible low-income people. The CA Department of Health Care Services should be urged to establish procedures for SSN validation as quickly as possible.

***Support legislative and regulatory changes that increase the availability of local Medi-Cal Home and Community Based Services waivers, increase the value of non-distinct part waivers, and streamline the process for organizations becoming approved providers of waiver services.*** The State Nursing Facility/Acute Hospital Waiver (NF/AH) has combined three previous waivers and added 500 slots and new services for community transition, and habilitation to allow at risk persons to remain in, or return to, the community by providing funding equal to the cost of institutionalization to be used for integrated services provided in a home and community environment. Currently waiver eligible persons leaving distinct part facilities such as Laguna Honda Hospital can receive \$77, 600 per year in community services, and waiver eligible persons discharged from acute care facilities, who are at risk of institutionalization, may receive up to \$48,000 per year in community based services. Increasing availability of waivers and waiver service providers, and increasing the value of non-distinct part waivers will enable more persons to remain in the community rather than be institutionalized.

#### **D. Behavioral Health**

***Support improved funding for delivery of mental health services to indigent and low-income clients, and support efforts to increase the recruitment and training of the public mental health workforce.***

***Support policies that coordinate and combine funding and services for mental health and substance abuse treatment needed by increasing numbers of individuals with co-morbid conditions, including policies that allow for the exchange of substance abuse and mental health records and data between clinicians for purposes of patient treatment.***

#### **E. Environmental Health**

***Support legislation improving the livability of the built environment and legislation promoting safe and healthy living and working environments.*** Address socio-economic/social equality issues, such as food access, livable neighborhoods, accessible transportation and recreation, and family support policies. Protect occupational health for workers vulnerable to occupational hazards and labor rights violations, including occupational health advocacy and prevention programs for all workers within the City. Monitor businesses involved in hazardous materials, hazardous waste, or dangerous conditions.

## **II. Human Services**

#### **A. Human Services Funding Deficit**

***Oppose legislation resulting in reductions to human services programs.*** While recognizing that cuts must be made in an unprecedented State Budget shortfall, San Francisco remains a vocal advocate for prioritizing services to the neediest and most vulnerable populations. Human service programs have borne a disproportionate share of budget reductions in recent years. Moreover, due to the fact that county welfare allocations have been frozen or cut since 2001, the State now underfunds counties by more than \$1 billion annually; San Francisco's share of that shortfall is \$31 million. San Francisco's opposition to further budget cuts must go hand in hand with support for proposals that generate new revenue. Any budget balancing plan that relies solely on expenditure cuts will prove devastating to human service program.

## **B. In Home Supportive Services**

***Oppose reductions in state funding for In Home Supportive Services (IHSS).*** The 2009-10 budget may result in a reduction in state participation in IHSS workers' wages and benefits from \$12.10 to \$9.50 per hour. It would cost San Francisco more than \$16 million annually to hold low-wage homecare workers harmless from this cut. The City anticipates a significant increase in the need for IHSS provider hours in the coming years because of the increase in the aging population, which will increase the City's cost of providing IHSS services.

## **C. Foster Care System**

***Support foster care system reforms, including state implementation of the federal Fostering Connections to Success Act and increasing foster care rates.*** Major child welfare reform legislation adopted by Congress last year authorizes federal participation in kin caregiver payments, provides a state option to extend foster care and adoption services to age 21, de-links adoptions assistance from income eligibility rules, increase incentives for adopting older youth and special needs children and makes other needed reforms. The State should act quickly to pass legislation that takes maximum advantage of these options. Additionally, the City supports an increase to foster care rates in California, which are grossly insufficient, by some estimates covering only 60-70% of the actual cost of raising a child, making it difficult to recruit and retain foster families. In a recent lawsuit brought against the State, a federal court ruled that California's rates place it in violation of the Child Welfare Act. The judge did not mandate increased rates but as a first step ordered the California Department of Social Services to conduct a systematic review to determine the actual cost of providing foster care (i.e., shelter, food, clothing, transportation, etc.). The court win presents an opportunity to advocate for completion of the CDSS study, and to push for an eventual increase in state rates.

***Sponsor legislation extending the deadline by which already-appropriated Older Youth Adoption pilot project funds must be spent down to June 30, 2010 and extend the deadline for submission of a final report to the Legislature from November 30, 2010 to May 30, 2011.***

## **D. Aging and Adult Services**

***Support legislative and budget proposals that promote and expand access to community-based living options and services that enable the elderly and disabled to avoid institutionalization and receive appropriate levels of support and care in the community.*** Expand the reach of Medicaid waivers as many seniors and younger adults with disabilities do not require skilled nursing facilities but are not safe at home alone. Expanding access to a range of integrated long term care solutions which include housing as well as community based services is more cost effective and will provide a choice of living arrangements to better serve these individuals needing various levels of support.

***Support measures to restore or increase funding for Long Term Care Ombudsman Program.*** The Ombudsman serves the most vulnerable elderly and dependent adults in nursing homes and all types of residential care facilities. Mandated functions include investigating complaints of abuse and neglect, monitoring facilities, witnessing advanced care directives, advocating for better care, patient rights, and participating in transition plans if desired by the resident. The clients are dependent on the institutions they reside in for care, which can dampen their expression of grievances and obscure their rights; this is where the Ombudsman Program is crucial. Last year the governor signed into law further mandates for the Ombudsmen, requiring them to report to the District Attorney, as well as continue all other federal and state mandates. The Governor's recent line item veto eliminated all state funding for local Long Term Care Ombudsman Programs, a \$3.8 million cut that represents about half of local program funding. San Francisco's Ombudsman Program has reduced staff by 50% to 2.6 FTE for more than 3000 beds, not counting Board & Care homes, which they also monitor.

***Support use of the Elder Economic Security Standard Index (EESSI) in order to more accurately measure the number of seniors living with economic insecurity and support efforts to meet the needs of seniors below the standard.*** The existing federal poverty measure is a nearly 50 year old antiquated measurement tool that does not consider real basic living expenses of seniors such as housing, transportation and healthcare as well as food. The EESSI will modernize federal poverty measures and guidelines, capture regional variations in the cost of living, recalculate the number and demographic profile of elders whose basic needs are not being met, and enable evaluation of the impact of public supports and any current or new federal and state initiatives to help elders age in place. In San Francisco the “Security Gap” the percent difference between the 2007 federal poverty index and the actual basic cost of living for an elder person was 172% for an owner with no mortgage, 373% for an owner with mortgage payments, and 269% for renters with one bedroom.

#### **E. Poverty/Hunger**

***Support legislative proposals and budgetary investments that make progress toward the goal of eradicating hunger, beginning with childhood hunger.*** These include reducing administrative barriers in federal food programs such as food stamps, school meals, summer meals and meals in childcare and encouraging access to fresh, local, healthy, and affordable food, increasing access to nutritious food for elderly, children, pregnant women, homeless shelters, and food pantries; and expanding funding to provide healthy congregate and home-delivered meals to seniors and adults with disabilities. Last year over 108,000 San Franciscans were served at food pantries and soup kitchens and the San Francisco Food Bank distributed 31 million pounds of food. The City’s high cost of living is a major contributing factor to hunger, one that will be exacerbated as a result of the economic downturn.

***Strongly support efforts to reduce the incidence of child hunger, prevent child obesity, and promote good nutrition for children and youth such as imposing a fee on sweetened beverages.*** Obesity rates are escalating while at the same time child nutrition programs have been systematically dismantled. Specifically, the City supports improvements that will expand access, encourage enrollment, and provide funding to allow for the purchase of healthier, fresher foods, and ultimately improve outcomes for children and youth. Revenue from fees on beverages that have been demonstrated to contribute to childhood obesity could help to fund such efforts.

***Support increased funding for Food Stamp Program eligibility and outreach.*** Incentivize and reward counties that use web applications and other innovative strategies to improve access to Food Stamps and other benefits.

***Support rewarding counties that purchase food from California producers and the creation of incentives for school gardens.*** Building on the support of the Slow Food movement, growing food locally and creating a sustainable food system for the City helps protect the environment, supports our local and regional economy, and ensures access to wholesome, nutritious food for all San Franciscans.

***Support legislation which enables low income families to increase their income, build and maintain assets, and attain self-sufficiency.***

### **III. Energy/Environment**

Global warming is an impending crisis, the first signs of which are already evident. For San Francisco, the results could be devastating. We are a coastal city, surrounded on three sides by water, so projected rises in sea level could threaten coastal wetlands, infrastructure and property. We are stewards for the health of our environment, and San Francisco will not let up in the fight to reverse global warming. San Francisco has been called the “greenest” city in the nation based on its advancement of landmark policies in the areas of transportation, energy and waste, and we will further our commitment to groundbreaking municipal climate change initiatives. The City

is committed to increasing public transit ridership and biking, establishing the Bay Area as the electric vehicle capital of the US, vastly expanding local solar energy generation, and pioneering ocean, wind and other renewable energy technologies. Many of the specific projects that San Francisco is advancing symbolize this environmental vision, from the multi-modal Transbay Terminal—which will bring high speed rail to downtown San Francisco, to the Civic Center Sustainable Resources District, which will make the local government center a beacon of sustainable and renewable energy.

## **A. Climate**

***Support aggressive implementation of policies to reduce the State’s greenhouse gas emissions by 25 percent by 2020.*** The City has led the way in California by reducing greenhouse gas emissions in San Francisco over 6% since 1990. But even more leadership is needed. San Francisco’s Climate Action Plan sets the goal of a 20% reduction of greenhouse gas emissions below 1990 levels and Mayor Newsom has set a goal of “carbon neutrality” by 2020. For San Francisco to meet these ambitious goals, local government must continue to pass landmark policies, and businesses and residents need to intensify their actions to control their energy usage and use green forms of transportation. San Francisco has consistently provided comments to the California Air Resources Board (CARB) that suggest ways to leverage pioneering cities in achieving the emission reduction targets of AB 32.

***Advocate the advancement of consistent greenhouse gas emissions inventories where local governments perform a standardized emissions inventory of Scope 1 (direct emissions, e.g. vehicle fuels) and Scope 2 (indirect emissions, e.g. electricity) for municipal operations and for community emissions using protocols established by the California Air Resources Board.*** Support assistance for local governments to obtain appropriately aggregated energy usage data from electric and gas utilities. Actively engage all city departments in participating in state efforts to implement AB 32, the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, and SB 375 the landmark regional transportation planning and land use measure. Successful best practices developed and implemented in San Francisco should be considered in the creation of new regulations, programs and incentives that are created by State government to meet the ambitious goals set forth in AB 32 and SB 375. New regulations and programmatic requirements that are created to meet the State’s climate goals in areas such as transportation must include appropriate stable and long-term funding sources adequate to support the required transit service.

## **B. Renewable Energy**

***Seek ongoing State support for financial incentives and policies to promote installation of solar power.*** San Francisco has been a long-time leader on municipal solar projects by creating showcase solar power projects such as the 675kw solar installation at the Moscone Center. These efforts will be intensified in 2009, including the completion of a 5MW solar installation at the Sunset Reservoir, which will be the largest municipal solar installation in the US. To increase solar generation among residents and business, San Francisco has created GoSolarSF, a local solar rebate program that—when paired with the California Solar Incentive and the federal tax credit— makes installation of solar panels more affordable for residents, businesses and non-profits. This program represents the largest local solar incentive program in the country and has increased monthly installations of solar projects by over 300%.

***Seek State support for ocean power and establish California as the leading wave energy generator in the United States.*** The City is considering innovative solutions such as harnessing clean, safe and renewable wave and tidal power to add to San Francisco’s portfolio. Support offering state incentives and tax credits for developing ocean power projects along the coast of California, similar to the State of Oregon’s Wave Energy Trust, which provides funding for initiatives. San Francisco also supports the improvement and expansion of the electricity distribution grid to better facilitate the creation and operation of concentrated renewable energy projects throughout California.

## **C. Energy Efficiency**

The City has demonstrated national leadership by passing the strongest local green building standards for residential, commercial, and municipal buildings of all sizes. This landmark legislation built off successful efforts to fast-track green building projects that maximize energy efficiency and resource utilization. The City also successfully operates the Energy Watch Program through the CPUC Public Goods Surcharge, which has saved local business and multi-unit residential buildings enough energy in the last five years to power 30,000 homes. The City is working in 2009 to pass new policies to increase energy efficiency standards among existing buildings and promote energy benchmarking of all commercial buildings in San Francisco.

***Support adoption of state-wide residential green building guidelines and energy conservation standards and provision of increased financial incentives for green building and renewable energy projects in the private sector.***

Encourage and incentivize commercial buildings to have Performance Verification or Retro-Commissioning at specified time intervals.

#### **D. Zero Waste/Recycling**

***Establish recycling goals and introduce product fees in an effort to encourage waste reduction.*** San Francisco has adopted nation-leading goals of 75 percent landfill diversion by 2010 and zero waste by 2020. The City to date has achieved a 70 percent diversion rate, which is the highest in the nation. Materials are diverted from landfill according to the hierarchy of source reduction, reuse, recycling, and composting. Each 1 percent of diversion is more difficult to achieve than the previous point. In 2009, San Francisco will consider implementing mandatory recycling and composting to increase the City's diversion rate to even higher levels than currently.

***Support legislation to extend producer responsibility.*** Advance towards zero waste by holding producers and consumers responsible for their waste. Create a strong producer responsibility framework or product category specific requirements for manufacturers to reformulate their products to make them less toxic and easier to recycle or compost, as well as take actual or financial responsibility for handling disposal of their products. Also, set up specific producer responsibility systems for pharmaceuticals and fluorescent lighting.

#### **E. Water**

***Support water conservation and retrofit upon resale legislation.*** One of the ways that government can help meet the challenges of water conservation in California is to require the use of water efficient plumbing fixtures such as toilets, urinals, showerheads and faucets. The City of San Francisco is committed to water-use efficiency and sustainability. In May 2007 Mayor Gavin Newsom and the PUC began a regional public education campaign aimed at reminding residents and businesses to curb water use, calling for a voluntary reduction of 10%. In July 2008 the Mayor issued an executive order that directed City Departments to reduce their water consumption by ten percent. This legislation would help reduce the need to divert waters from California rivers, supporting a sustainable approach to water usage in the state.

***Seek funding to mitigate pharmaceuticals in the water stream.*** There is concern about potentially adverse effects of pharmaceuticals released in the environment through treated wastewater and what chemical exposure does to the quality of drinking water. Prescription drugs such as hormones, antidepressants and antibiotics; over-the-counter medicines such as pain relievers, cold/flu remedies; and veterinary medicines have been flushed down the toilet, drain, and sink. Wastewater treatment plants are designed to remove biodegradable organic material, but lack the financial resources to remove low concentrations of these synthetic pollutants.

## **F. Urban Forestry**

***Support increased funding for urban forestry programs.*** Create conservation easements for land near metropolitan areas. Promote a healthy and sustainable urban forest. The urban forest is a vital component of San Francisco's ecosystem. Trees provide environmental and economic benefits through improving air and water quality, increasing property values, lowering building energy use and providing an experience of nature amidst expanses of concrete. Trees improve public health and well being by reducing UV radiation exposure, providing restorative healing for people with illness, and creating safe public spaces.

## **IV. Education**

Little is more important than the investment we make in our children and their education. San Francisco is recognized as a high performing urban school district and we want to continue to ensure success for our children. We continue to work to keep families in San Francisco by funding high-quality early care and education, and afterschool programs.

### **A. Higher Education**

***Support sound State investments in education initiatives and programs that prepare students for college.*** Greater investment in higher education is crucial in giving students and families the tools and supports to make college a reality. In 2007, in partnership with the San Francisco Unified School District and San Francisco State University, the City launched SF Promise, an initiative that would guarantee all 6<sup>th</sup> grade students in the City's public schools a spot at San Francisco State University. SF Promise reinstates the concept of college access for all students. A college education means a more competitive workforce. Students who attend college are higher-earning and more productive, furthering their own economic health and the vitality of the City.

### **B. Drop-out Rate**

***Support addressing the drop-out crisis.*** The high school drop-out crisis is reaching epic proportions in the United States. Presently, only 70 percent of American students earn a high school diploma. More than 12 million students are expected to drop out of high school in the next decade at a cost of more than \$3 trillion to the U.S. economy. Urge the implementation of programs that provide incentives to at-risk students to ensure they stay in school and obtain the necessary skills for post-secondary education and a competitive workforce. Initiatives should support partnerships to create models of innovation in middle and high schools to increase student achievement and provide students a pathway to higher education through college readiness activities and financial assistance.

### **C. Early Care and Education**

***Support early care and education as the "first pillar" of education.*** San Francisco remains devoted to strengthening its early childhood education system –investing millions in the early learning and child care needs of children and their families, especially for those at-risk. The City understand that early care and education it not a luxury, but rather a necessity and therefore has developed strong partnerships and leveraged state, federal, and private foundations efforts to better ensure a high-quality care and education delivery system for children from birth through age five. Support increased resources and flexibility within and across subsidized systems that will help enhance families' access to quality programs and services that support investments in children early to improve their chances for school and life success, while also meeting the needs of working families.

### **D. Preschool for All/ Afterschool for All**

***Support universal preschool and afterschool programs.*** San Francisco has made a historic local investment in preschool education, called the *Preschool for All* Initiative, which has made high-quality preschool available to all 4-year-old children in the City. San Francisco is the only county in the State to start making this investment in our children's futures so all children have access to the skills and



experiences they need to start kindergarten better prepared. *Preschool for All* is a landmark commitment by the City to provide high-quality preschool opportunities and services to children and families. San Francisco has also committed to provide high-quality afterschool programs to all elementary and middle school youth by 2010 as the cornerstone of the *SF Afterschool for All* Initiative. Support for increased flexibility within state subsidized school-age care, afterschool, and other learning support funding streams will help enhance families' access to quality afterschool programs that support students' learning and development, while also meeting the needs of working families.

#### **E. Qualified teachers and principals**

***Support programs that train, recruit, and retain highly qualified teachers and principals.*** Support funding for teacher training and tuition assistance, as well as financial incentives to encourage and attract exceptional teachers and administrators to remain in the education field, including early education/child development.

#### **F. State Data System**

***Support a statewide data system to track and analyze student data.*** A statewide data system that analyzes individual student data, from preschool through 12<sup>th</sup> grade, which can be used to improve student achievement and provide teachers and administrators with effective tools across the early childhood to high school-age populations.

### **V. Housing/Homelessness**

San Francisco is still far from ending chronic homelessness, but we are confident we are headed in the right direction. Earlier this year, the Care Not Cash program was recognized as accomplishing the goals it set forth five years ago, proving that permanent housing can solve homelessness. San Francisco will continue to fight the battle of chronic homelessness and remain focused on placing homeless clients in permanent supportive housing.

Further the ambitious goal to rebuild San Francisco's dilapidated public housing set forward with the HOPE SF program. The HOPE SF pilot project is the revitalization of Hunters View and construction will start in 2009 on the first phase of this 741 home redevelopment project. The first phase will include 80 replacement homes for public housing residents along with 26 new affordable rental homes, 12 affordable homes for-sale, and 68 market-rate homes.

#### **A. State Rental Assistance**

***Support legislation and administrative action to provide state rental assistance to families at risk of becoming homeless.*** Support restoring the \$4 million in Emergency Housing and Assistance Program (EHAP) funding in the 2009-10 state budget.

#### **B. Local Housing Trust Fund Matching Grant Program**

***Support a dedicated revenue stream for California's Housing Trust Fund.*** Proposition 46 (2002) and Proposition 1C (2006) were steps in the right direction to provide funds to build new housing in California, including supportive housing through the Local Housing Trust Fund Matching Grant Program. To meet California's long-term housing needs, require a permanent, steady, dedicated source of funding to produce or preserve affordable housing. Support legislation and administrative action that will assist the City with increasing its low income housing stock, including redevelopment of public housing. Seek funds for infrastructure improvement for eligible infill development projects and housing related park grants.

#### **C. Unfreeze State Affordable Homeownership Programs**

***Support legislative and administrative action to revive HCD and CalHFA homeownership lending programs.*** The State budget crisis and bond market collapse have combined to virtually halt activity in the State's affordable homeownership programs. Funds designated from Proposition 1C for the BEGIN and CalHOME programs have ceased. Additionally, CalHFA has discontinued lending activity, including refinancing of existing loans, due to a lack of bonding capacity. These are critical resources urgently needed to restabilize affordable homeownership activity in San Francisco

#### **D. Extend Proposition 1C Funding Sunset for Homeless Youth**

***Support legislative and administrative action to extend the MHP Homeless Youth Program by one year.*** The MHP Homeless Youth program included in Proposition 1C will expire July 31, 2009, at which time the remaining funds (currently \$26M) will go into the MHP-General program. The large amount of remaining funds may deter legislators from designating homeless youth funding in the future. HCD is working with their legal team and with the Legislature to extend the date. The City and County of San Francisco potentially has three specific projects that would pursue, and likely require, MHP Homeless Youth funding if extended.

### **VI. Public Safety**

San Francisco, like so many cities across the nation, grapples with urban crime and violence. San Francisco has extensively invested in numerous public safety and violence prevention efforts. Without adequate state support for local criminal justice and emergency services, it is difficult to sustain progress and enhance public safety.

San Francisco has made significant investment to ensure more police officers are walking the streets. The City will meet its minimum police staffing requirement of 1,971 officers for the first time in the City's history this year.

Recognizing that public safety cannot be achieved without front-end prevention efforts, the City also supports community-based violence prevention and intervention programs to address the needs of youth and young adults most at risk of entering the justice system. The Community Justice Center, a national best practice, is designed to ensure that people in need are connected to services and the requirements of an efficient and rehabilitative justice system. The Community Justice Center provides accountability for lower-level criminal behavior, and at the same time address the root issues underlying causes of quality-of-life crimes to make our community safer. This is the first CJC in California, and will be a state-wide best practice.

#### **A. Gun Safety**

***Support legislative efforts to ensure gun safety.*** States with lax gun laws have had higher rates of handgun killings, fatal shootings of police officers, and sales of weapons that were used in crimes in other states, according to a study underwritten by a group of more than 300 U.S. mayors. The Assault Weapons Ban should be reenacted, along with a ban on component parts for these military style weapons. Strongly oppose legislation that would weaken laws governing the sale of firearms and restrict the access of local law enforcement to traceable gun data. At a time when cities nationwide, including San Francisco, are fighting increased gun violence in our cities, we need more tools, not fewer, to remove dangerous guns from our streets.

#### **B. Reentry Programs to Reduce Offender Recidivism**

***Support legislation that replicates successful reentry programs with a proven track record to reduce recidivism rates among former offenders.*** The vast majority of California prisoners will be released. If these prisoners do not make a successful transition into a productive and law-abiding life style, they harm community safety and cycle in and out of the criminal justice system costing local and state agencies millions of dollars. On average, over 70 percent of offenders

return to custody within three years of release. The development of innovative programs that help offenders successfully reenter their communities is a critical public safety strategy. In many instances, local jurisdictions have demonstrated successful reentry programs. These programs should be supported and replicated throughout the state.

### **C. Gang Violence**

***Support legislation to strengthen local anti-gang violence initiatives.*** Across urban America, gangs are terrorizing communities and ruining kids' futures. From 2004 to 2007, nearly half of all homicides in San Francisco were gang-related. Comprehensive strategies to target gang leadership with tough law enforcement and divert younger teens away from gangs through street outreach, mentoring, and employment opportunities, work best to stamp out gang violence. These strategies are intensive and require sufficient resources and support.

### **D. Law Enforcement Technology**

***Support legislation to improve local law enforcement technology.*** In the fight to keep our streets safe, effective technology is critical. Police, prosecutors, and probation departments are often woefully lacking the kind of sophisticated equipment needed to rapidly track and investigate increasingly sophisticated criminal schemes,

### **E. Domestic Violence**

***Support legislation increasing funding for domestic violence service providers to ensure adequate funding levels for these vital services.***

### **F. Human Trafficking**

***Support legislation addressing the human trafficking problem in San Francisco.*** Every year, thousands of individuals are brought into San Francisco against their will, and forced into sexual slavery, coerced prostitution, or indentured servitude. The City is committed to ending this particular form of violence. Human trafficking is a multibillion-dollar business that is on its way to overtaking drug and arms trafficking and the City is making every effort to ending human trafficking.

### **G. Sanctuary Cities**

***Oppose legislation that would deny state funding to “sanctuary cities” that do not have a policy of collecting information on the immigration status of residents seeking city services, and which refuse to provide such information to the state and federal government.*** Such provisions pose a threat to public health and safety by discouraging City residents from using public health clinics and cooperating with local law enforcement.

## **VII. Homeland Security/ Disaster Preparedness, Response & Recovery**

Understanding that San Francisco is likely to experience a major earthquake in the near future, the City invests in multiple emergency preparedness strategies. The City has reenergized planning and preparation around the likelihood of a major earthquake in our region by launching a “culture of preparedness” campaign that will involve increased neighborhood outreach and exercises throughout all communities of San Francisco.

### **A. Regional Interoperability**

***Support maximum funding for the Bay Area Regional Interoperable Communications System (BayRICS), through allocation of Interoperable Emergency Communications Grant Program (IECGP) funds and other sources.*** San Francisco is working on regional interoperability capacity and improving emergency medical dispatch. Support assistance for major urban areas to build and operate their own public safety communications systems. San Francisco Mayor Gavin Newsom, Oakland Mayor Ron Dellums, and San Jose Mayor Chuck Reed announced the creation of BayRICS on September 11, 2007. Under this initiative, the 10 Bay Area counties (including Santa Cruz) are creating an interoperable communications network for public safety for the entire Bay Area, using both voice and data.

## **B. State Grant Funding**

***Maximize grant funding and flexibility for emergency management programs in San Francisco, including federal funds that are allocated by the State of California.*** Monitor the transition of the State Office of Emergency Services (OES) and Office of Homeland Security (OHS) into a single new agency, the California Emergency Management Agency. Support adequate staffing and funding for Regional Emergency Operations Centers, which are critical during major disasters.

## **VIII. Transportation Policy & Critical Infrastructure**

Funding for transit operations, capital improvements, and “smart growth” is inherently good environmental policy and good for urban cities like San Francisco. The City supports legislation aimed at improving safety for customers, pedestrians, bicyclists and SFMTA operators/employees.

### **A. Transportation Funding**

***Support legislation and administrative action to maximize transit funding for San Francisco, and oppose efforts to eliminate or divert transit funding to non-public transit purposes.*** Support efforts to protect existing state transportation funding sources including Proposition 42 funding (state sales tax on gas), the Public Transportation Account, voter-approved State Infrastructure Bonds and funding for Safe Routes to School and the Bicycle Transportation Account. Support efforts to secure new funds to meet transportation investment needs including local approval options such as restoration of the vehicle license fee equal to pre-1998 levels. The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency oversees both the San Francisco Municipal Railway and the Department of Parking and Traffic. SFMTA is the 7<sup>th</sup> largest transit system in the nation and 2<sup>nd</sup> largest in the State, carrying over 700,000 passengers per day.

#### **1. 2009 State Budget and Transportation Funding.**

***Support efforts to build support for a constitutional amendment that would fully dedicate gasoline sales taxes to transportation purposes once and for all.*** This would be accomplished by eliminating the Spillover funds which have been repeatedly raided in the state budget process. All gasoline sales taxes would then flow in Proposition 42 which currently dedicates 40 percent of funds to the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), 40 percent to local streets and roads and 20 percent to public transit. Support efforts to reform overall state budget process to balance revenues and expenditures and bring more predictability to state transportation funding.

#### **2. State Infrastructure Bond Implementation.**

***Support efforts related to on-going implementation of voter-approved State Infrastructure Bonds to maximize San Francisco’s share of funding from bond programs.*** Support significant annual appropriations from the Prop. 1B Public Transit Modernization, Improvement, Service Enhancement Account (PTMISEA) in the 2009-2010 state budget process, support future allocations of these funds based on three-year State Transit Assistance (STA) average for all operators that has been basis for previous allocations and support efforts to establish a mechanism

to authorize advance spending authority for these funds. Also support appropriation of the remaining Prop. 1B Local Streets and Roads (LS&R) account in the FY 2009-10 budget.

### **3. Funding for local streets and roads**

***Support new dedicated funding source for resurfacing and reconstruction of local streets and roads.*** Poor roadway surfaces impact the safety and comfort of cyclists, pedestrians, transit riders and motorists, alike. Cities and Counties throughout the state are facing a crisis in local street and road funding. In older cities like San Francisco, with aging infrastructure, the situation is more acute, and as San Francisco is successful in shifting more commuters to public transit from private automobiles, the increasing number (and weight) of buses on the streets accelerates their deterioration.

The state excise tax on gasoline has not been increased since 1990, and as fuel efficiency increases, total revenues coming to San Francisco have actually declined over the past 18 years, while the cost of construction has increased. The state should increase taxes on motor vehicle fuels and dedicate a significant portion of the increase to fund local street and road repair needs.

## **B. Transportation Projects**

Major transportation projects in the City, such as those listed here, will reduce congestion, improve service reliability and travel times, enhance transit connections, and help generate economic opportunities and jobs for local residents and business owners:

**1. Transbay Terminal/High Speed Rail terminus in San Francisco.** With the passage of Proposition 1A by California voters, the project has critical momentum to become the Grand Central Station of the West Coast. The project underway will replace the outdated Transbay Terminal with a new model intermodal Transit Center, which will serve as the San Francisco terminus of California's High Speed Rail service; extend Caltrain to the new downtown Transit Center; and create a new neighborhood with homes, offices, parks and shops surrounding the new Transit Center.

**2. Central Subway/Third Street Light Rail,** which was reauthorized for funding under SAFETEA-LU, is being constructed in two phases—Phase 1, a surface light rail line with 18 stops, began service in April 2007. Phase 1 is funded almost exclusively with state and local funds sources. Phase 2 will extend this light rail line through San Francisco's booming South of Market area and the downtown-Union Square shopping district into the heart of the city's Chinatown. Once complete, the line is projected to carry over 78,000 riders per day.

**3. Hunters Point-Candlestick Park Transportation Program** will revitalize Hunters Point and Candlestick neighborhoods by implementing infrastructure improvements and effective transit oriented development (TOD) strategies to provide residents with immediate access to recreational and open spaces while increasing the availability of affordable housing. Redevelopment plans include transit, roadway and streetscape initiatives, and significant new parks and open space development.

**4. Doyle Drive Replacement (South Access to Golden Gate Bridge)** will eliminate the dangerous conditions that exist for drivers and transit riders accessing the Golden Gate Bridge from the south end of the bridge, where lack of shoulders and the absence of a dividing median create hazardous operating conditions that often result in serious accidents. The new South Access project will also provide direct multimodal access to the Presidio while improving earthquake and operating safety, as well as replacing an elevated freeway with a well-designed parkway more appropriate for this national park setting.

**5. Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit Project** will bring major bus improvements to Van Ness Avenue, possibly including dedicated bus lanes, distinctive boarding stations, and real time arrival information. This project will reduce travel time, increase reliability and improve passenger comfort beyond regular bus service.

### **C. Parking Policy Issues**

The City monitors legislation related to parking policy including disabled placard abuse, towing, and the administration of parking citations and recommend positions are appropriate.

#### **1. Disabled Placard Abuse.**

***Sponsor legislation to increase penalty for misuse of disabled license plates and placards, decriminalize conduct that is currently a misdemeanor, allowing the vehicle to be cited for a parking violation instead, and increase potential fine amounts.*** Proposed legislation would also allow a 10 percent fine enhancement for parking in a blue zone without a valid plate or placard and to allocate the proceeds of that enhancement to the SFMTA along with other revenues from parking violations.

#### **2. Increase in parking citation amount.**

***Support legislation to increase current maximum penalties for parking violations.*** Current maximum levels were set more than 24 years ago in 1984. Cost of living increases have reduced the relative deterrent impact of these fines. Increased compliance for violations, such as double parking, sidewalk parking, crosswalks, etc., would have a positive impact on safety conditions and Muni operations along with generating increased revenue.

#### **3. Improve accessible parking.**

***Support legislation to improve accessible parking throughout the City.*** SFpark is conducting an extensive, current and best practices analysis of accessible or disabled parking as well as outreach with stakeholders to develop potential changes to how accessible parking is managed in San Francisco, most likely on a pilot basis.

### **D. Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP) and Transit First Policy.**

The City will sponsor and support legislation that aims to advance the objectives of the TEP, that streamlines project delivery and is supportive of San Francisco's *Transit First* Policy.

#### **1. Yield to Bus.**

***Sponsor legislation that would authorize San Francisco to implement a Yield to Bus program in an effort to improve Muni system reliability and performance.*** On busy streets, Muni transit vehicles have difficulty merging back into existing traffic after pulling over for a stop. Similar to programs in place in Florida, Oregon and Washington, this proposal would, through signage and safety campaign efforts, encourage vehicles to yield to a transit bus re-entering the active traffic lane from a designated bus stop location. It is a priority recommendation of the TEP.

#### **2. Streamline Capital Project Delivery**

***Support legislation clarifying that local agencies, like state agencies, may award follow-on contracts to architectural and engineering (A&E) consultants whose previous A&E work is***

*appropriate to the scope of subsequent A&E work.* Support legislation as necessary to advance projects that receive state or federal economic stimulus funding.

## **E. SFMTA Enforcement and Safety**

### **1. PCO/TFI Assault Penalties**

*Sponsor legislation to provide enhanced protection under current law for Parking Control Officers (PCOs) and Transit Fare Inspectors (TFIs).* AB 1686 (Leno) signed into law in 2007 provided for increased fines, from \$1000 to \$2000, for assault on a PCO. In 2009, proposed legislation will further advance this issue by seeking to increase the penalty for such assaults including driver's license suspension and ensuring similar protections for TFIs.

## **F. Critical Infrastructure**

### **1. Hunters Point Shipyard & Treasure Island Remediation/Transfer**

*Sponsor legislation to accelerate environmental remediation and transfer of the Hunters Point Shipyard and Treasure Island.* Redevelopment of these sites is critical to the economic development of the City, building and promoting the next generation of the City's growth industries, and, for the Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood, helping remedy over 30 years of significant adverse environmental and economic impacts. Accelerating the negotiated transfer of Treasure Island will allow for the creation of the most environmentally sustainable redevelopment project in the country.

*Sponsor legislation to implement land swaps with State Lands and State Parks.* Modify both the Treasure Island and Hunters Point Shipyard Trust Exchanges' authorizing legislation which is necessary to reflect negotiations with the State Lands Commission. Additionally new authorizing legislation is necessary to implement a negotiated land swap with the State Department of Parks and Recreation for Hunters Point Shipyard/Candlestick Point.

### **2. Port of San Francisco**

*Sponsor legislation to promote adaptive reuse of Pier 70 at the Port of San Francisco.* An infrastructure financing districts (IFD) would authorize the Port of San Francisco to capture local growth in tax increment from development of Port property. Sponsor legislation that allows the Port of San Francisco to capture ERAF, provided that the City dedicates all available local tax increment to a Port IFD and the Port commits to spending 20% of total tax increment collected to waterfront restoration purposes such as waterfront parks, environmental remediation of the Bay shoreline and extension of the San Francisco Bay Trail. This is critical economic development legislation, and could help the City attract more than \$2 billion in private investment to the waterfront (at Pier 70).

## **G. CEQA Reform**

Over the past several decades our understanding of sustainable urban development has evolved but CEQA has not kept pace with this change. In some instances, CEQA is used to discourage or stop development in the very places where it makes the most sense in terms of Greenhouse Gas emissions, regional environmental impact and resource conservation. San Francisco would like to work with a broad coalition to advance strategic legislative initiatives that will allow for smart growth and explore more smart growth solutions.

***Support revising the CEQA Guidelines and Public Resources Code to expressly permit local jurisdictions to use “Automobile Trips Generated” (ATG) as an alternative means of assessing transportation-related environmental effects under CEQA.*** Support local efforts to replace Level-of-Service (LOS) standard for analysis of transportation-related environmental effects under CEQA.

***Support the requirement that HCD’s preferred growth pattern serves as the baseline for all CEQA analysis.***

***Support exemptions to help facilitate soft story retrofits under current difficult market conditions.***

Legislation requiring mandatory upgrades to soft-story wood frame buildings (building that typically have large openings on the ground floor such as multiple garage doors or large storefront windows) that exist throughout San Francisco. Proper seismic retrofitting can give buildings a fighting chance against a sizeable earthquake to protect homes and workplaces.

## **H. Eminent Domain**

***Oppose legislation that proscribes the City’s ability to use eminent domain in the limited instances where it may be necessary as a tool of last resort for projects that benefit the community.*** Closely monitor legislation that limits the ability of redevelopment agencies to use eminent domain for economic development purposes. The City remains committed to procedural protections that afford full public input into land-use planning decisions that may involve the City’s acquisition of private property, to continuing to use eminent domain only in the last instance, and to treating and compensating fairly owners whose property may be acquired through eminent domain.

## **I. Prop 84 Grants**

***Support amendments to Proposition 84 grant guidelines:*** On November 7, 2006, voters passed Proposition 84 by 53.9 percent. The 5.4 billion dollar “Safe Drinking Water, Water Quality and Supply, Flood Control, River and Coastal Protection Bond Act of 2006” (Safe Drinking Water Bond) is detailed in Sections 75001 through 75090 of the Public Resources Code. The Act provides a dedicated source of new funds for park improvements during tough economic times. To meet the challenges of developing adequate park space in an urban environment, the City and County of San Francisco supports amendments to proposed guidelines to address the following issues:

- Apply a cost of living adjustment to the median household income criteria.
- In determining “Significant Poverty”, use the percentage of public school *children living near* the project site who are enrolled in federal free and reduced lunch programs, instead of considering the program participation rates for *schools near* the project sites.
- Develop adjusted criteria for large scale redevelopment projects, such as Hunter’s Point Shipyard and Treasure Island.
- Elevate the value of projects that renovate or add new recreation features to existing parks.

## **IX. Community & Workforce Development**

### **A. Neighborhood Improvement and Job Creation**

***Support increased and focused efforts to leverage community assets and stability by investing strategically in undervalued, urban areas.*** Every San Franciscan deserves a decent job and place to live. For far too long, too many City residents, especially those in our southeast neighborhoods, have gone without both. The City is expanding training slots in a “green” CityBuild and creating a pipeline for green collar jobs created by the City’s climate change and greening agenda. Support efforts to develop more effective training for those with barriers to employment such as immigrants, homeless adults, and ex-offenders, offering dignity and second chances to those who want them.



## **B. Digital Divide**

***Support greater investment in technology and digital inclusion.*** Invest in digital equity initiatives to bring the advances of technology and broadband services to underserved and under resourced communities that face widening gaps in social, economic and political equity. Support the development of a national network linking local, state, and federal government, schools, libraries, hospitals and community-based social service agencies.

## **X. Administration of Justice**

### **A. Litigation**

***Support legislation that would strengthen litigation filed by the City and County.*** Monitor, work against, and work to prevent legislation that is adverse to litigation filed by the City and County and litigation in defense of the City and County or will result in increased litigation costs for the City and County.

- **Liability.** Oppose legislation that would increase the City's liability.
- **Expert witness fees.** Oppose legislation that would reverse a California Supreme Court decision that held that expert fees are not recoverable as part of an attorney's fee award under California Civil Procedure, Section 1021.5.
- **Unfair Competition and Business Practice – SEC. 17200 of the Business and Professions Code.** Protect San Francisco's statutory authority under Section 17200. Support bills that strengthen provisions of section 17200 and oppose bills that seek to weaken it.
- **Attorney's Fees.** Support legislation that allows public entities that prosecute unfair competition lawsuits to recover their costs of prosecution, including attorney's fees.
- **Challenges to Voter-Passed Measures.** Oppose legislation that weakens or removes the authority of cities and counties to file actions that challenge voter passed local initiatives, statewide initiatives, and constitutional amendments that violate constitutional principles or conflict with other provisions of law.

### **B. Health Insurance Coverage: discriminatory pricing**

***Support legislation that eliminates statutory provisions that permit insurance companies to charge women more for health insurance based solely on their sex.***

### **C. Code Enforcement**

***Support legislation that enhances the litigation tools used in code enforcement and nuisance abatement cases.*** Oppose legislation that weakens the ability to enforce unsafe housing laws.

### **D. Land Use**

***Oppose amendments to CEQA that would establish time limits on the certification of an EIR and requires recertification of the environmental impact report before the public agency takes action on the project.***

### **E. Public Contracts**

***Oppose amendments to the Public Contracts Code that would place the burden of proof on a public entity in cases related to the implied warranty established under Section 1104 or create strict liability for the public entity for any error or omission in the plans and specifications for a public work.*** Oppose statutory amendments that require a mediation and arbitration process for claims between a contractor and a charter city or a charter county in a public works project.

**F. Conflict of Interest Code**

*Oppose amendments to the Conflict of Interest Code that would affect enforcement of Conflict of Interest laws.*