



**San Francisco Youth Commission  
Minutes  
Monday, December 19th, 2022  
5:00pm**

**Held via Videoconference  
(remote public access provided via teleconference)**

**Members:** Chloe Wong, Allister Adair, Qien Feng, Maureen Loftus, Hayden Miller, Gabrielle Listana, Ann Anish, Astrid Utting, Yoselin Colin, Vanessa Pimentel, Emily Nguyen, Ewan Barker Plummer, Steven Hum, Raven Shaw, Sahara Frett, Yena Im, Tyron S. Hillman III

**Present:** Chloe Wong, Allister Adair, Maureen Loftus, Hayden Miller, Gabrielle Listana, Ann Anish, Yoselin Colin, Vanessa Pimentel, Emily Nguyen, Ewan Barker Plummer, Steven Hum, Raven Shaw, Yena Im, Tyron S. Hillman III

**Absent:** Qien Feng (excused), Sahara Frett (unexcused).

The San Francisco Youth Commission met in-person and provided public comment through teleconferencing, on Monday December 19th, 2022, with Chair Nguyen presiding.

Chair Nguyen calls the meeting order at 5:12pm.

**1. Call to Order and Roll Call for Attendance**

On the call of the roll, the below Commissioners were noted presently.

Roll Call Attendance: 13 present, 4 absent.

Chloe Wong present  
Allister Adair present  
Qien Feng absent  
Maureen Loftus present  
Hayden Miller present  
Gabrielle Listana late  
Ann Anish present  
Astrid Utting present  
Yoselin Colin present  
Vanessa Pimentel present  
Emily Nguyen present  
Ewan Barker Plummer present  
Steven Hum present



Raven Shaw present  
Sahara Frett absent  
Yena Im absent  
Tyrone S. Hillman III present

A quorum of the Commission was present.

Vice Chair Barker Plummer, seconded by Commissioner Miller, motioned to excuse Commissioner Im. The motion was carried by the following voice vote:

Roll Call vote: 13 ayes, 4 absent.

Chloe Wong aye  
Allister Adair aye  
Qien Feng absent  
Maureen Loftus aye  
Hayden Miller aye  
Gabrielle Listana absent  
Ann Anish aye  
Astrid Utting absent  
Yoselin Colin aye  
Vanessa Pimentel aye  
Emily Nguyen aye  
Ewan Barker Plummer aye  
Steven Hum aye  
Raven Shaw aye  
Sahara Frett absent  
Yena Im absent  
Tyrone S. Hillman III aye

Action: Commissioner Im 's absence excused.

Chair Nguyen expresses that there needs to be more details when it comes to sending a notice of absence to YC Staff. Vice Chair Barker Plummer mentioned that the Executive Committee should have a further discussion regarding the Attendance Policy.

## **2. Communications**

Joshua Rudy Ochoa , Community Partnership Specialist of the San Francisco Youth Commission, shared communications and meeting announcements with the Commissioners.

## **3. Approval of Agenda**

Chair Nguyen inquired whether any Commissioner had any changes to the December 19th, 2022, Full Youth Commission agenda. There were no changes.



Commissioner Colin motion to approve agenda.

Commissioner Hum motioned to table Item 9, seconded by Vice Chair Barker Plummer.

Commissioner Colin withdraws motion.

Commissioner Colin motioned to approve the agenda with amendment to table Item 9. Seconded by Commissioner Pimentel.

Commissioner Hum withdraws amendment motion.

Commissioner Loftus explains that Item 9 is to be tabled due to Commissioner Im not being in attendance in today's meeting.

No public comment.

Commissioner Colin, seconded by Commissioner Pimentel, motioned to approve December 19th, 2022, Full Youth Commission Agenda with Item 9 tabled. The motion was carried by voice vote:

Roll Call vote: 13 ayes, 4 absent.

Chloe Wong aye  
Allister Adair aye  
Qien Feng absent  
Maureen Loftus aye  
Hayden Miller aye  
Gabrielle Listana aye  
Ann Anish aye  
Astrid Utting aye  
Yoselin Colin aye  
Vanessa Pimentel aye  
Emily Nguyen aye  
Ewan Barker Plummer aye  
Steven Hum aye  
Raven Shaw aye  
Sahara Frett absent  
Yena Im aye  
Tyrone S. Hillman III aye

Action: Agenda approved.

#### **4. Approval of Minutes December 5th, 2022**

Chair Nguyen inquired whether any Commissioner had any changes to the December 5th , 2022, Full Youth Commission Minutes. There were no changes. No discussion. No public comment.



Commissioner Anish, seconded by Commissioner Colin, motioned to approve the December 5th, 2022 Full Youth Commission Minutes. The motion was carried by the following voice vote:

Roll Call vote: 13 ayes, 4 absent.

Chloe Wong aye  
Allister Adair aye  
Qien Feng absent  
Maureen Loftus aye  
Hayden Miller aye  
Gabrielle Listana absent  
Ann Anish aye  
Astrid Utting aye  
Yoselin Colin aye  
Vanessa Pimentel aye  
Emily Nguyen aye  
Ewan Barker Plummer aye  
Steven Hum aye  
Raven Shaw aye  
Sahara Frett absent  
Yena Im absent  
Tyrone S. Hillman III aye

Action: Minutes approved.

Commissioner Hillman enters the legislative room at 5:19 pm.

##### **5. Public Comment on Items not on Agenda**

No Public Comment.

##### **6. Sugary Drinks Distributor Tax Advisory Committee Presentation Presented by Melinda Martin, Sugary Drinks Distributor Tax Advisory Committee Coordinator and Kiana Keshavarz, SDDTAC Youth Rep (Time Sensitive 5:15 pm)**

Melinda Martin, Sugary Drinks Distributor Tax Advisory Committee Coordinator and Kiana Keshavarz, SDDTAC Youth Rep present in front of the Youth Commission.

Commissioner Miller asks question regarding the outcomes and which ones have been achieved. Melinda Martin responds that many of the outcomes have been achieved due to the funding brought by the tax. Commissioner Miller asks clarifying questions regarding what data they used and what were those findings. Melinda Martin

Commissioner Loftus asks what is the main intent of the advisory group. Melinda Martin responds that it is to decrease the sale and consumption of sugary drinks in San Francisco.



Vice Chair Barker Plummer asked regarding breastfeeding being encouraged by the advisory group. Melinda Martin responded that it is highly recommended by the advisory group. Vice Chair Barker Plummer asks a question regarding allocation of funds. Melinda Martin responded by explaining that this was not a priority to the Mayor.

Commissioner Colin asks regarding why there has been an increase in sales of sugary drinks in San Francisco during the pandemic and is it currently increasing. Melissa Martin responded that they are still looking into data. Commissioner Colin asked if the sale consumption is increasing and if there are any preventive measures being worked on. Melissa answered yes and they are working with community organizations.

Commissioner Shaw asks regarding the education, awareness, and research about the consumption of sugar. Melissa Martin responds that they are currently working with DPH regarding nutrition education programming and research.

Commissioner Miller asks a question regarding the financial input and what the tax is collecting. Melissa gave guidance that the tax gets around \$10 million and  $\frac{1}{3}$  is used for voter outreach.

Commissioner Utting asks about outreach efforts and the YC responsibility about the youth seat vacancy. Kiana answered on what they are doing for outreach regarding the youth seat vacancy.

Vice Chair Barker Plummer gives a comment on how the YC can help with outreach and wonders how outreach will look like at schools. Melissa also gives comments that others in the advisory council will share with their connections as well.

Chair Nguyen gives questions regarding how the advisory group measures performance. Melissa answers by giving information regarding the consultant and process. Melissa also mentioned they will work with YC staff once they get any applicants for the youth seat for YC to review.

No Public Comment.

**7. Link 21 Presentation Presented by Nicole Franklin, Public Engagement Manager Link21**  
(Discussion Item) *(Time Sensitive 5:35 pm)*

Nicole Franklin, Public Engagement Manager at Link21 gives a presentation on the Link21 Program.

Vice Chair Barker Plummer asks a question regarding the length of the timeline. Nicole answers that they need feedback from different jurisdictions, environmental review, and funding.

Commissioner Colin asks questions about the timeline being the best or worst case scenario. Nicole answered that this is the best case scenario.



Commissioner Loftus questions about the Phase 1 and 2 time difference. Nicole answers that there was a typo in the presentation.

Commissioner Miller asks for a youth outreach strategy. Nicole informs they are doing a youth engagement strategy: social media, doing presentations, interacting with colleges and other youth public service groups. Commissioner Miller suggests including surveys and in high schools.

Commissioner Hum asks regarding a plan about coordinating counties and getting some financial help from the state. Nicole answers that this project is a part of the States Plan in the Speed Rail and also has been coordinating with local transit agencies.

Commissioner Colin wants clarity in how the network currently works and what they see for the future. Nicole answers by stating they are working with different agencies to see how it will look in the future.

Commissioner Anish asks about the Equity Council having a youth seat. Nicole answers by stating there is no specific youth seat, but many youth have already applied and are awaiting appointment to sit on the council. The council is currently 18 and over.

Chair Nguyen is curious about the collaboration/partnership with different community organizations and if there is an example. Nicole answers that they do research and look at the key findings, and then the Link21 will seek out different organizations and ask them to partner with them. Link21 will also pay the partnersing organization for the work they do and the input they give.

Commissioner Listana arrived via Webex at 5:30 pm.

No Public Comment.

**8. Opportunities for All Presentation Presented by Sara Williams, Opportunities for All (Time Sensitive 5:55 pm)**

Sara Williams from Opportunities for All gives a presentation on the Opportunities for All program.

Chair Nguyen hands over gavel to Vice Chair Barker Plummer at 6:25 pm.

Commissioner Shaw asks about the turnover from being an intern to being a full time employee with the program. Sara mentions the goal is to engage youth and open different leadership opportunities.

Commissioner Adair asks about the outreach methods and also how the YC can get involved with the outreach. Sara answers by asking the YC for help through posting outreach on social media and if there are any recommendations for outreach. Also mentioned partnering with the YC and other organizations to host interns/fellows.



Commissioner Colin gives questions about how interns are being placed in their placements. Sara answers by saying they need to increase in partner locations and also having youth get engaged in areas they care about.

Commissioner Miller mentions his experience about doing the program and how the program has changed its structure recently after the pandemic. Sara also gives more information about the flexibility of the program and the programming that comes with it.

Chair Nguyen mentioned her experience with the OAF program. They asked a question regarding payroll and how they keep up with any issues they may arise. Sara answers that it is daunting when it comes to payroll and they are hiring more individuals to handle payroll processes and opening the application earlier to turn in work documents in a timely manner.

Vice Chair Barker Plummer gives back gavel to Chair Nguyen at 7:00 pm.

Chair Nguyen called for a 10 mins recess. Majority voted in agreement at 7:00 pm.

Chair Nguyen called back to order at 7:11 pm.

Vice Chair Barker Plummer motions to excuse Commissioner Utting, seconded by Commissioner Hum.

No Public Comment.

Roll Call vote: 13 ayes, 4 absent.

Chloe Wong aye  
Allister Adair aye  
Qien Feng absent  
Maureen Loftus aye  
Hayden Miller aye  
Gabrielle Listana aye  
Ann Anish aye  
Astrid Utting absent  
Yoselin Colin aye  
Vanessa Pimentel aye  
Emily Nguyen aye  
Ewan Barker Plummer aye  
Steven Hum aye  
Raven Shaw aye  
Sahara Frett absent  
Yena Im absent  
Tyrone S. Hillman III aye

Action: motion passes.



**9. Sexual Harassment and Assault Resolution** Presented by Commissioner Loftus and Commissioner Im

Item 9 tabled during approval of the agenda.

**10. Stop Pretext Stops Resolution** (First Reading and Discussion Item) Presented by Commissioner Colin and Commissioner Shaw

Commissioner Colin and Officer Shaw go over the first reading of the Stop Pretext Stops Resolution.

Commissioner Colin goes over recent grammar and word changes. Chair Nguyen asks about clauses formatting. Commissioner Colin clarifies if there is a quote, it needs to be a part of the clause.

Commissioner Hum asks if grammatical errors can be fixed before the next FYC. YC Staff answered yes.

Commissioner Anish goes over another grammatical error. Commissioner Colin acknowledges and takes note of the error.

Vice Chair Barker Plummer has some concerns about the work the coalition is doing and the type of policy changes they are advocating on. Mentions that there should be a committee put together to determine the severity of the case. Also to include statistics in the resolution and go over examples in the resolution more in depth.

Commissioner Miller clarifies an example given by Vice Chair Barker Plummer. Vice Chair Barker Plummer main concern with the resolution is to highlight public safety.

Commissioner Colin goes over LAPD examples and the success of the programming. Vice Chair Barker Plummer is not sure if the Coalition is advocating on the same LAPD policies that were implemented and that the resolution is supporting the Coalition's policy goals.

Chair Nguyen asks about the resolution language on abolishing pretext stops and contradicting language on the LAPD policy. They want more clarification on the main task from the commission.

YC Staff gives reminders on one mic, one voice.

Commissioner Miller shares the same concerns regarding the violations when it comes to the pretext stop and highlights safety examples.

Commissioner Hum also asks for more clarity on examples and data. Has offered to help with the resolution.





Commissioner Adair has agreed with many of the comments, but gives notice of the dangerous traffic violations happening in SF.

Chair Nguyen agrees with Commissioner Miller and Commissioner Adair; requests for more data and refining wording and clarifying examples.

Commissioner Colin goes over TO-DO's to edit the resolution.

Public Comment made by Wes Saver, member of the Stop Pretext Stops Coalition.

**11. Referred Legislation File No. 220875 & 221202: Park Code - Upper Great Highway - Pilot Weekend and Holiday Vehicle Restrictions** (Discussion and Action Item)

YC Staff go over the legislation referred File No. 220875 and 221202. They also clarify why there are two files of the same legislation. Also went over youth impacts by the legislation.

Commissioner Miller goes over additional information about the legislation and about the positive effects of the Upper Great Highway.

Commissioner Miller goes over recommendations/questions regarding the legislation. Commissioner Miller reads it for the record.

Vice Chair Barker Plummer asks questions regarding the time. Commissioner Miller clarifies the time specifics.

Chair Nguyen asks for more data to be released for the memo response and including other points.

Commissioner Miller asks for clarification about Chair Nguyen's request. Chair Nguyen responds.

Vice Chair Barker Plummer asks if the memo can include accurate naming of the walkway.

YC Staff reminds the commissioners that the BOS is in recess and we can hear this legislation and other legislation referred to the next FYC meeting.

Chair Nguyen thinks there is no need to go over the legislation referred at the next FYC.

YC Staff gives an example motion for the referred legislation.

Commissioner Loftus speaks out about their experience using the Great Walkway and speaks on its importance.

Commissioner Hum motioned to support File No. 220875 & 221202 with the comments from Commissioner Miller and positive recommendation. Seconded by Chair Nguyen.

No Public Comment



Roll Call vote: 13 ayes, 4 absent.

Chloe Wong aye  
Allister Adair aye  
Qien Feng absent  
Maureen Loftus aye  
Hayden Miller aye  
Gabrielle Listana aye  
Ann Anish aye  
Astrid Utting absent  
Yoselin Colin aye  
Vanessa Pimentel aye  
Emily Nguyen aye  
Ewan Barker Plummer aye  
Steven Hum aye  
Raven Shaw aye  
Sahara Frett absent  
Yena Im absent  
Tyrone S. Hillman III aye

Action: motion passes.

**12. Referred Legislation File No. 221206: Creation of Programming and Services for Gun Violence Victims** (Discussion and Action Item)

YC Staff go over the legislation referred File No.221206. Also went over youth impacts by the legislation.

Vice Chair Barker Plummer expresses his interest in the referred legislation and goes over its importance. He recommends that the Youth Commission support this ordinance.

Vice Chair Barker Plummer reads over the Resolution written by the BOS for the record.

Commissioner Colin asks questions regarding the resolves in the resolution and seeks more information regarding the resources, programs, and funding.

Chair Nguyen asks what is the relationship between the state law and implementing it to local law.

Vice Chair Barker Plummer clarifies that the state bill is included in the resolution.

Commissioner Miller expresses how important it is for outreach and including youth.

YC Staff clarifies on the intent of the resolution and how DPH will have a more active roll on the program creation.



Vice Chair Barker Plummer also recommends that once DPH puts together a proposal, that they reach back out to the Youth Commission for input.

Commissioner Colin also asks for YC Staff to track the progress of this BOS request.

Chair Nguyen is also in support of the BOS resolution.

Vice Chair Barker Plummer motioned to support File No. 221206 with the comments and positive recommendation. Seconded by Commissioner Colin.

No Public Comment

Roll Call vote: 13 ayes, 4 absent.

Chloe Wong aye  
Allister Adair aye  
Qien Feng absent  
Maureen Loftus aye  
Hayden Miller aye  
Gabrielle Listana aye  
Ann Anish aye  
Astrid Utting absent  
Yoselin Colin aye  
Vanessa Pimentel aye  
Emily Nguyen aye  
Ewan Barker Plummer aye  
Steven Hum aye  
Raven Shaw aye  
Sahara Frett absent  
Yena Im absent  
Tyrone S. Hillman III aye

Action: motion passes.

**13. Referred Legislation File No. 22120: Sheriff's Department Staffing Levels** (Discussion and Action Item)

Commissioner Shaw motions to postpone Item 13 and 14 till the next scheduled FYC. Seconded by Commissioner Hum.

Chair Nguyen asks what are the most pressing items on the agenda. Commissioner Shaw responds.



Commissioner Colin asks if the agenda for the next FYC has been created already. Vice Chair Barker Plummer responds with no.

YC Staff give suggestions for the commission regarding the motion on the floor and parliamentary procedure.

Vice Chair Barker Plummer asks how important it is to review the legislation referred. YC Staff gives notice that both hearings have not been scheduled.

Commissioner Colin believes the YC should hear both items.

Commissioner Loftus mentions how late the meeting is going and needing a more productive meeting.

YC Staff asks if any of the commissioners have a hard stop. There is no response.

Chair Nguyen agrees with Commissioner Colin.

Commissioner Miller gives input on how the commission can voice their support for the legislation referred.

Chair Nguyen also gives information that there is not enough information on the hearing and to give more suggestions at a later meeting.

Commissioner Shaw motioned to table Item 13 and 14 till the next Youth Commission Meeting. Seconded by Commissioner Hum.

No Public Comment

Roll Call vote: 8 ayes, 4 absent, 5 nay

Chloe Wong nay  
Allister Adair aye  
Qien Feng absent  
Maureen Loftus aye  
Hayden Miller nay  
Gabrielle Listana aye  
Ann Anish aye  
Astrid Utting absent  
Yoselin Colin nay  
Vanessa Pimentel aye  
Emily Nguyen nay  
Ewan Barker Plummer nay  
Steven Hum aye  
Raven Shaw aye  
Sahara Frett absent



Yena Im absent  
Tyrone S. Hillman III aye

Action: motion fails.

Chair Nguyen motioned to excuse Commissioner Listana for the rest of the meeting.  
Seconded by Commissioner Colin.

No Public Comment

Roll Call vote: 12 ayes, 1 nay, 4 absent

Chloe Wong aye  
Allister Adair aye  
Qien Feng absent  
Maureen Loftus aye  
Hayden Miller nay  
Gabrielle Listana aye  
Ann Anish aye  
Astrid Utting absent  
Yoselin Colin aye  
Vanessa Pimentel aye  
Emily Nguyen aye  
Ewan Barker Plummer aye  
Steven Hum aye  
Raven Shaw aye  
Sahara Frett absent  
Yena Im absent  
Tyrone S. Hillman III aye

Action: motion approved.

YC Staff go over the legislation referred File No.22120. Also went over youth impacts by the legislation.

Commissioner Miller gives his own opinion regarding the situations happening in jail.

Commissioner Colin recommendation/question: How has this affected those incarcerated mental/emotional/physical health?

Commissioner Miller recommendation/question: Do other jails require the same ratio of sheriff to those incarcerated to access the outside facilities?

Commissioner Hum recommendation/question: Why is there a staff shortage?



Vice Chair Barker Plummer recommendation/question: Is there any suggestions from the Sheriff's Office about things the BOS and Mayor's office can do to rectify the staffing shortage?

Commissioner Loftus recommendation/question: Is there a clarification between the cause in staffing shortage being a financial or personal capacity issue?

Commissioner Colin recommendation/question: How are youth who are incarcerated being impacted by this staffing shortage?

Chair Nguyen asks Commissioner Colin how the Transformative Justice Committee is working on this issue. Commissioner Colin responds.

Vice Chair Barker Plummer asks what kind of motion is being asked to take for the Youth Commission. YC Staff clarify.

Commissioner Colin also requests for YC Staff to notify the commission when the hearing is taken place/scheduled.

Commissioner Miller motioned to support File No. 22120 with the comments and positive recommendation. Seconded by Chair Nguyen

No Public Comment

Voice Vote: 12 ayes, 5 absent.

Chloe Wong aye  
Allister Adair aye  
Qien Feng absent  
Maureen Loftus aye  
Hayden Miller aye  
Gabrielle Listana absent  
Ann Anish aye  
Astrid Utting absent  
Yoselin Colin aye  
Vanessa Pimentel aye  
Emily Nguyen aye  
Ewan Barker Plummer aye  
Steven Hum aye  
Raven Shaw aye  
Sahara Frett absent  
Yena Im absent  
Tyrone S. Hillman III aye

Action: Minutes approved.



#### **14. Referred Legislation File No. 221258: Evictions in Permanent Supportive Housing Project-Based Sites** (Discussion and Action Item)

YC Staff go over the legislation referred File No.221206. Also went over youth impacts by the legislation.

Commissioner Colin asks if the Mayor's staff will be in attendance. YC Staff responds.

Commissioner Hum recommendation/question: How many of those evicted were youth and if any attended schooling? Also requesting for more information about demographics.

Vice Chair Barker Plummer recommendation/question: How many are queer youth who were affected?

Commissioner Miller asks what kind of evictions are they? Are they from a shelter in place? YC Staff responds that they are from supportive housing and they house unhoused individuals. Commissioner Miller asks if the city owns these facilities and if the city is evicting people from their owned facilities. YC Staff responds by quoting the SF Chronicle.

Commissioner Miller recommendation/question: Why were there evictions in city funded supportive housing? What was the main intent of supportive housing is to solve homelessness.

Director Esquivel Garcia gives context on deferred maintenance on the city owned buildings, the living conditions many live in, and safety concerns.

Commissioner Colin recommendation/question: Were these individuals evicted due to deferred maintenance, safety, and poor living conditions? Were any of these evictions met with temporary or new housing opportunities? How was taxpayer funding was used to evict the residents in supporting housing?

YC Staff also gives more information about the eviction findings from the SF Chronicle article.

Commissioner Anish asks if there is a basis for the evictions. YC Staff reads quotes from the SF Chronicle article.

Commissioner Anish recommendation/question: Were those who were evicted given the resources and tools necessary to understand their eviction and any other supporting housing resources? Were they read their housing rights? Any mental health resources?

Commissioner Colin gives her opinion regarding hoarding in the facilities and the need for assistance of these units.

YC Staff give a bit more context regarding hoarding and fire code being potentially breached by excessive hoarding from the supportive housing tenants. Also gave content about the oversight advisory board that will be taking effect in early 2023.



Chair Nguyen recommendation/question: What is the criteria that constitutes having a tenant in supportive housing be evicted?

Commissioner Shaw asks for clarification on when the evictions started. YC Staff responded that they started in early 2019 and have continued throughout the pandemic.

Commissioner Shaw recommendation/question: What were the impacts of those evicted during the height of the pandemic? Any physiological, psychological, and mental difficulties and implementation?

Commissioner Colin recommendation/question: How many individuals were evicted during the height of the pandemic? What happened to those who got evicted? Is there any data?

Commissioner Loftus mentions that cluttering is a violation of the city's fire code, is there a determining voice on who makes the ultimate decision? Is it the organization running the building or like city policy? YC Staff responds.

YC Staff answers Commissioner Colin's question regarding how many individuals were evicted. That was about 2%. Commissioner Colin seeks clarification on who evicted the rest of individuals during the pandemic. YC Staff responds by quoting the SF Chronicle article.

Commissioner Loftus seeks clarification regarding the total number of individuals evicted who are supporting housing were 2%. YC Staff responds and that the report will be sent later.

Commissioner Colin asks to be notified when the meeting will be held.

Commissioner Colin motioned to support File No. 221258 with the comments and positive recommendation. Seconded by Commissioner Hum.

No Public Comment

Voice Vote: 12 ayes, 5 absent.

Chloe Wong aye  
Allister Adair aye  
Qien Feng absent  
Maureen Loftus aye  
Hayden Miller aye  
Gabrielle Listana absent  
Ann Anish aye  
Astrid Utting absent  
Yoselin Colin aye  
Vanessa Pimentel aye  
Emily Nguyen aye  
Ewan Barker Plummer aye  
Steven Hum aye





Raven Shaw aye  
Sahara Frett absent  
Yena Im absent  
Tyrone S. Hillman III aye

Action: Minutes approved.

**15. Reviewing Civic Engagement Survey** (Discussion and Action Item)

A. Presenter: Civic Engagement and Education Committee

Director Esquivel Garcia shares the new version of the survey with the commission.

Commissioner Loftus and Commissioner Hum go over the timeline of the survey being distributed.

Commissioner Miller asks why these items need to be approved by the commission. Vice Chair Barker Plummer clarifies.

Commissioner Colin asks why there is 6th grade added to the survey.

Commissioner Miller asks if there are better practices for gender. YC Staff clarifies that they will look into policies and what are better policies.

Commissioner Miller gives input on giving more context to the individuals taking the survey.

Commissioner Colin gives input that the survey conveys more of pre-registering. Commissioner Loftus clarifies the need to include the younger population.

Commissioner Hum gives additional context on the intent of the survey.

Commissioner Shaw asks if there are two-part questions and components to the survey.

Commissioner Colin also gives her opinion on some of the questions. Commissioner Loftus agrees with Commissioner Colin's comment.

Commissioner Anish also gives her input on how questions will be answered and how it should be structured. Commissioners chime in regarding the structure of google surveys.

Commissioner Anish also mentions inclusivity of non-citizens being able to take the survey.

YC Staff gives some suggestions for the structure of the survey, and also examples of questions to be asked regarding being inclusive.

Commissioner Miller is also concerned regarding how we distribute the survey. Commissioner Loftus talks about different channels to distribute the survey.



Commissioner Miller is still concerned regarding who is taking the survey. Commissioner Hum agrees but also recognizes that the data may be skewed by those who take the survey.

Chair Nguyen asks if there is an incentive to taking the survey. YC Staff will look into seeing if there can be an incentive or prize.

Vice Chair Barker Plummer motioned to table till next meeting. Seconded by Commissioner Hum.

No Public Comment

Voice Vote: 12 ayes, 5 absent.

Chloe Wong aye  
Allister Adair aye  
Qien Feng absent  
Maureen Loftus aye  
Hayden Miller aye  
Gabrielle Listana absent  
Ann Anish aye  
Astrid Utting absent  
Yoselin Colin aye  
Vanessa Pimentel aye  
Emily Nguyen aye  
Ewan Barker Plummer aye  
Steven Hum aye  
Raven Shaw aye  
Sahara Frett absent  
Yena Im absent  
Tyrone S. Hillman III aye

Action: motion approved.

## **16. Committee Reports (Discussion Item)**

### **A. Executive Committee**

#### **a. Legislative Affairs Officers**

LAO's go over legislation referred and legislation they are tracking. There is discussion on how legislation can be referred to and being more inclusive on getting input from the rest of the commission. They also gave an update on resolutions being worked on.

#### **b. Communication and Outreach Officers**

No Report

#### **c. General Committee Updates**



Vice Chair Barker Plummer speaks about the last Exec Committee meeting and training that was held.

#### **1. Youth Commission Attendance**

Director Esquivel Garcia will be sending an email regarding attendance and sending over attendance to appointing officers.

Commissioner Miller is concerned regarding attendance and the excuses commissioners are giving.

Vice Chair Barker Plummer mentions commitment being key.

Commissioner Colin also likes to add engagement also lacking from some commissioners.

#### **B. Housing, Recreation, and Transit Committee**

Vice Chair Anish goes over the last HRT meeting. BART gave a presentation at the last committee.

#### **C. Civic Engagement and Education Committee**

Commissioner Loftus gives a brief report.

#### **D. Transformative Justice Committee**

The Transformative Justice Committee met on 12/12 to go over Resolution and talked about committee goals for the new year.

#### **E. LGBTQ+ Task Force**

Commissioner Pimentel mentions that the task force will be meeting soon.

No Public Comment

#### **17. Staff Report (Discussion Item)**

Director Esquivel Garcia goes over their report. Gives notice of extension of online training deadline.

Youth Development Specialist Zhan explains of a possible joint hearing and seeks interests from the commissioners.

No Public Comment.



**18. Announcements, including Community Events.**

No Announcements

**19. Adjournment**

There being no further business, the Youth Commission adjourned at 9:30 pm.

Dear Youth Commission,

Please accept this letter as formal notice that Commissioner Frett has effectively resigned.

Here's Commissioner Frett's Attendance Record:

Full Youth Commission September 19, 2022 PRESENT

Full Youth Commission October 3, 2022 ABSENT (UNEXCUSED)

Full Youth Commission October 17, 2022 PRESENT

Full Youth Commission October 24, 2022 ABSENT (EXCUSED)

Full Youth Commission November 7, 2022 PRESENT

Transformative Justice Committee November 14, 2022 ABSENT (UNEXCUSED)

Full Youth Commission November 21, 2022 ABSENT (UNEXCUSED)

Full Youth Commission December 5, 2022 ABSENT (UNEXCUSED)

Transformative Justice Committee December 12, 2022 ABSENT (UNEXCUSED)

Full Youth Commission December 19, 2022 ABSENT (UNEXCUSED)

In accordance with Sec. 4.123. Youth Commission Membership; Appointment; Terms; Meetings; Compensation; Director, sub-section (c) Removal of Members of the San Francisco Charter, "Any member whom the Commission certifies to have missed three regularly scheduled meetings of the Commission in any six month period without authorization of the Commission shall be deemed to have resigned from the Commission effective on the date of the written certification from the Commission. "

Youth Commission Staff recognize with all Commissioner Fretts Unexcused absences, it is deemed they have resigned from the San Francisco Youth Commission.

The Youth Commission must take action to affirm the resignation at the next scheduled meeting, January 3, 2023. Article IV, Section C of the San Francisco 22-23 Bylaws states "After a Commissioner has been found to have missed 3 meetings, Commission staff shall prepare a written resignation form to be voted on by the full Commission at the next full Commission meeting. The Commissioner shall have an opportunity to account for their absences prior to the Commission's vote to certify a resignation. Only by supermajority vote shall the full Commission have the power to not certify such a Commissioner's resignation. "

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Alondra Esquivel Garcia', with a stylized, flowing script.

Alondra Esquivel Garcia

San Francisco Youth Commission Director

[Sexual Assault and Harassment in Schools]

**Resolution urging the San Francisco Unified School District and the City and County of San Francisco to increase transparency about the Title IX reporting process to protect and create effective support systems for victims of sexual assault and harassment, and urging the San Francisco Board of Supervisors to restart the Safer Schools Task Force with adequate youth voice and representation.**

WHEREAS, sexual assault and harassment, both between student to student and between adult to student, has been a consistent and pervasive issue in San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) schools, San Francisco Charter schools, and San Francisco independent schools; and,

WHEREAS, sexual assault and harassment in SFUSD high schools has been “swept under the rug” (KQED) for years and is in no way a new issue; and,

WHEREAS, multiple forms of student protest and collective action have taken place for over two decades demanding action and resources, recently with large-scale walkouts from SFUSD high schools in December 2021<sup>1</sup>; and,

WHEREAS, recent reporting from the San Francisco Chronicle and the San Francisco Standard shows serious allegations that SFUSD teachers who have been accused of sexual abuse, despite law enforcement being contacted, were permitted to “quietly resign” and able to teach after being accused of sexual harassment with only a verbal reprimand<sup>2</sup>; and,

WHEREAS, in 2005, the San Francisco Youth Commission, in collaboration with the SFUSD Student Advisory Council, produced a report on sexual assault and harassment in San Francisco schools entitled “*Youth Commission Report on Sexual Assault and Harassment in San Francisco Schools*” which showed the primary factor preventing

---

<sup>1</sup> *Hundreds of SF Students Walk Out Over District's Handling of Sexual Assault Complaints* (NBC Bay Area), December 10, 2021.

<https://www.nbcbayarea.com/news/local/sf-students-to-stage-walkout-to-protest-districts-handling-of-sexual-assault-complaints/2752577/>

<sup>2</sup> *S.F. high school athletic director who abused a student was allowed to 'quietly resign,' lawsuit alleges* (San Francisco Chronicle), August 29, 2022.

<https://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/article/S-F-high-school-athletic-director-who-abused-a-17406113.php>; *George Washington High's Ex-Athletic Director Molested Student, Groomed Classmates for Years, Lawsuit Claims* (San Francisco Standard), August 29, 2022.  
<https://sfstandard.com/education/george-washington-high-athletic-director-molested-student-groomed-classmates-for-years-lawsuit-claims/>

Commissioners Barker Plummer; Im, Nguyen, Loftus

**YOUTH COMMISSION**

students from receiving needed resources and support is the disconnection between service providers and San Francisco students; and,

WHEREAS, this report made general recommendations<sup>3</sup>, including: 1) that students be encouraged and supported to be involved with the development of policies aimed to address sexual assault and harassment, 2) that student government organizations be engaged in work to stop sexual assault and harassment, and 3) that there be a greater push for full cooperation between City departments, schools, and Community Based Organizations (CBOs); and,

WHEREAS, this report made specific recommendations to the Department on the Status of Women<sup>4</sup>, including: 1) that the department implement a student-oriented public service announcement campaign, 2) that the department facilitate the outreach and use of CBOs with San Francisco schools, 3) that the department aid schools in training teachers on student-to-student sexual assault and harassment, and 4) that the department aid schools in enriching curricula for all grade levels; and,

WHEREAS, this report made specific recommendations to the Department of Public Health<sup>5</sup>, including: 1) that the department maintain or increase funding for student counseling, and 2) that the department expand the Intimate Partner Violence Screening Protocol to all public and private health clinics and hospitals; and,

WHEREAS, this report made a specific recommendation to the Department of Children, Youth, and Their Families (DCYF)<sup>6</sup> that the department distribute information about preventing and responding to sexual assault and harassment, including information on how to identify sexual assault and harassment, how to report incidents of sexual assault and harassment, and how to access counseling services; and,

WHEREAS, this report made specific recommendations to public, private, and charter schools in San Francisco<sup>7</sup>, including: 1) that they ensure they are in compliance with

---

<sup>3</sup> *Youth Commission Report on Sexual Assault & Harrasement in San Francisco Schools* (San Francisco Youth Commission), [Page 11].  
[https://sfgov.org/youthcommission/ftp/uploadedfiles/youth\\_commission/Documents\\_and\\_Publications/FINALSA%26HReport041205.pdf](https://sfgov.org/youthcommission/ftp/uploadedfiles/youth_commission/Documents_and_Publications/FINALSA%26HReport041205.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> *Youth Commission Report on Sexual Assault & Harrasement in San Francisco Schools* (San Francisco Youth Commission), [Page 12].

<sup>5</sup> *Youth Commission Report on Sexual Assault & Harrasement in San Francisco Schools* (San Francisco Youth Commission), [Page 14].

<sup>6</sup> *Youth Commission Report on Sexual Assault & Harrasement in San Francisco Schools* (San Francisco Youth Commission), [Page 15].

<sup>7</sup> *Youth Commission Report on Sexual Assault & Harrasement in San Francisco Schools* (San Francisco Youth Commission), [Page 15].

Commissioners Barker Plummer; Im, Nguyen, Loftus

**YOUTH COMMISSION**

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, and 2) that they should fully cooperate with any valuable support from outside sources, particularly CBOs; and,

WHEREAS, in April 2016, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed, and Mayor Edwin Lee signed, legislation (FILE NO. 150944, ORDINANCE NO. 89-16) sponsored by Supervisor Jane Kim to create the Safer Schools Sexual Assault Task Force and set out membership requirements for the ten seats<sup>8</sup>; and,

WHEREAS, the legislation made the San Francisco Department on the Status of Women responsible for providing administrative support and staffing the task force through a consultant who began in October 2016<sup>9</sup>; and,

WHEREAS, the taskforce made the overarching recommendations<sup>10</sup> of 1) establishing an ongoing Task Force and staff to coordinate sexual assault prevention and response broadly, including on campus and in the broader community, and 2) fully implementing state and federal laws reflecting years of work to prevent sexual assault on campus and respond effectively when it occurs; and,

WHEREAS, In 2017, the Department on the Status of Women put together the 71-page Safer Schools Sexual Assault Task Force Report and Recommendations, which did not include any specific recommendations for reducing sexual assault on all school campuses, failed to provide concrete recommendations and solutions, and interviewed only 18<sup>11</sup> of the 60,263 SFUSD students at the time; and therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the 2022-2023 San Francisco Youth Commission publicly states its support for all victims of sexual assault and/or harassment in San Francisco schools and calls on the City and County of San Francisco, San Francisco Unified School District, San Francisco charter schools, and San Francisco independent schools to reevaluate their responses to and prevention policies for sexual assault and harassment; and be it

---

<sup>8</sup> *Safer Schools Sexual Assault Task Force Report and Recommendations* (San Francisco Department on the Status of Women), [Page i].  
<https://sfgov.org/dosw/sites/default/files/Safer%20Schools%20Sexual%20Assault%20Task%20Force%20Report.pdf>

<sup>9</sup> *Safer Schools Sexual Assault Task Force Report and Recommendations* (San Francisco Department on the Status of Women), [Page 1].

<sup>10</sup> *Safer Schools Sexual Assault Task Force Report and Recommendations* (San Francisco Department on the Status of Women), [Page 23].

<sup>11</sup> *Safer Schools Sexual Assault Task Force Report and Recommendations* (San Francisco Department on the Status of Women), [Page 22].



FURTHER RESOLVED, that the 2022-2023 San Francisco Youth Commission urges the San Francisco Board of Supervisors to restart the Safer Schools Sexual Assault Task Force, while including adequate youth voice and representation ages 10-18, as well as policymakers, volunteers, experts, parents, stakeholders, and survivors, and do so in consultation with the Youth Commission; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, that the 2022-2023 San Francisco Youth Commission urges the Board of Supervisors Public Safety and Neighborhood Services Committee to work with SFUSD to adopt mandatory training for youth, education, and school site staff on the definitions of sexual harassment and assault, reporting procedures, supporting students, and identifying and preventing these crimes.

FURTHER RESOLVED, that Youth Commission staff are directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Office of the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, Department on the Status of Women, Department of Public Health, SFUSD, SFUSD Board of Education, and the SFUSD Student Advisory Council.

[Pretext Stops]

**Resolution advocating for the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor of San Francisco to limit Pretext Stops in San Francisco.**

WHEREAS, Traffic stops are often racially biased, and are known as “driving, bicycling, or walking while Black or Brown” or “pretext stops”<sup>1</sup>; and

WHEREAS, A pretext stop can be caused by minor traffic violations such as failure to display a front license plate; failure to display proper registration tags; failure to illuminate license plate; driving with malfunctioning tail lights (unless all lights are out); driving with malfunctioning brake lights (unless all brake lights are out); having an object affixed to a car window or hanging from the rearview mirror (unless the item obstructs the driver’s view and substantially increases likelihood of injury or death); failure to signal while turning or changing lanes; sleeping in a parked car; having tinted windows; parking infractions unless unoccupied; riding a bike or non-motorized scooter on the sidewalk; and so on<sup>2</sup>; and

WHEREAS, Using racial profiling, police officers often stop individuals that pose little to no safety hazard in order to search for unrelated criminal offenses based on internalized racial biases; and

WHEREAS, Pretext stops funnel people of color into the criminal justice system causing communities of color to be further disproportionately harmed; and

---

<sup>1</sup> Office of the Public Defender, “Coalition of 60 Civil Rights, Traffic Safety, and Community Groups Urging San Francisco Police Commission to End Racially-Biased Pretext Stops,” San Francisco Public Defender’s Office, August 30, 2022, <https://sfpublicdefender.org/news/2022/05/coalition-of-60-civil-rights-traffic-safety-and-community-groups-urging-san-francisco-police-commission-to-end-racially-biased-pretext-stops/>.

<sup>2</sup> Zac Dillon, Carolyn Ji Jong Goossen, Yoel Haile, Wesley Saver, “Coalition to End Biased Stops; Stop the Pretext!” Powerpoint Presentation for Transformative Justice Committee, October 17, 2022

WHEREAS, In 2021, the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) conducted 27,543 stops that resulted in 6,003 searches, and the 5% Black population of San Francisco made up for 35% of all police searches<sup>3</sup>; and

WHEREAS, SFPD, using the term “officer safety,” has searched Black San Franciscans 50% more than White San Franciscans with Bayview (a predominantly Black community) having the highest percentage of these stops<sup>4</sup>; and

WHEREAS, San Francisco mirrors the state and nation in over-policing communities of color via pretextual stops, with data showcasing that in 2021, SFPD stopped Black and Brown people at least five times the rate of White people, searched Black and Brown people at least eight times the rate of White people, and were thirteen times more likely to use force on Black and Brown people than White people, despite Black and Brown people being less likely to be found carrying contraband than White people<sup>5</sup>; and

WHEREAS, SFPD 2021 traffic stop data also shows that enforcing pretextual infractions has little demonstrable impact on reducing crime, has significant downsides in terms of the harassment and profiling of communities of color, especially Black, Indigenous, and People of Color youth, and is a waste of taxpayer resources<sup>6</sup>; and

WHEREAS, The destructive legacy of pretext stops has led to the killings of innocent lives such as Sandra Bland (Texas), Philando Castile and Daunte Wright (Minnesota), and Walter Scott (South Carolina), to name a few, because of alleged

---

<sup>3</sup> Zac Dillon, Carolyn Ji Jong Goossen, Yoel Haile, Wesley Saver, “Coalition to End Biased Stops; Stop the Pretext!”

<sup>4</sup> Zac Dillon, Carolyn Ji Jong Goossen, Yoel Haile, Wesley Saver, “Coalition to End Biased Stops; Stop the Pretext!”

<sup>5</sup> ACLU, et al, “Supplemental Briefing for October 6 DGO 9.01 Working Group” (San Francisco), September 13, 2022, <https://sf.gov/sites/default/files/2022-09/Supplemental%20Briefing%20Draft%20%28Oct.%206%20Meeting%29.pdf>

<sup>6</sup> Zac Dillon, Carolyn Ji Jong Goossen, Yoel Haile, Wesley Saver, “Coalition to End Biased Stops; Stop the Pretext!”

traffic violations such as hanging a car air freshener, sleeping in their car, driving with a broken taillight, and riding a bike without headlights<sup>7</sup>; and

WHEREAS, In some cases, conducting traffic stops can lead to the decrease in motor vehicle crashes and fatalities, and promote public safety and the protection of the public from serious and sometimes violent crime<sup>8</sup>, such traffic stops can also subject motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists to inconvenience, confusion, and anxiety, as well as strain relationships between law enforcement and the community because members of the community may perceive these traffic stops as biased, racially motivated, or unfair, and can lead to life-threatening interactions<sup>9</sup>; and

WHEREAS, Racial disparities in traffic enforcement and the continued killing of Black and Brown driver's show that regardless of intentions, the harms of traffic stops often outweigh any potential public safety benefits<sup>10</sup>; and

WHEREAS, Miguel Bustos, Senior Director of GLIDE's Center for Social Justice, has stated that "Many GLIDE clients have been harmed by racially-biased pretext stops and repeated harassment. Pretext stops further alienating some of our most marginalized neighbors and makes them feel as though they are not welcome in their own community. These negative interactions perpetrate physical, psychological, and

---

<sup>7</sup> Zac Dillon, Carolyn Ji Jong Goossen, Yoel Haile, Wesley Saver, "Coalition to End Biased Stops; Stop the Pretext!"

<sup>8</sup> James W. Davis, et al. "Aggressive traffic enforcement: a simple and effective injury prevention program,," The Journal of trauma vol. 60,5 (2006), <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16688057/>

<sup>9</sup> Jany, Poston, "Minor police encounters plummet after LAPD put limits on stopping drivers and pedestrians."

<sup>10</sup> Charles Epp, Steven Maynard-Moody, Donald P. Haider-Markel, "Beyond Profiling: The Institutional Sources of Racial Disparities in Policing," July 202, [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/311863335\\_Beyond\\_Profiling\\_The\\_Institutional\\_Sources\\_of\\_Racial\\_Disparities\\_in\\_Policin\\_g](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/311863335_Beyond_Profiling_The_Institutional_Sources_of_Racial_Disparities_in_Policin_g).

financial harm; they inflict and reinforce trauma on our community, particularly communities of color”<sup>11</sup>; and

WHEREAS, Sameena Usman, Senior Government Relations Coordinator for the Council on American-Islamic Relations-SFBA, has stated that “Pretext stops are an excuse to pull people over for simple things such as an item hanging from a rearview mirror or tinted windows, and question, search, and even detain people. They do not help public safety and they disproportionately target communities of color, especially Black people”<sup>12</sup>; and

WHEREAS, Avi Frey, the Deputy Director of the Criminal Justice Program, ACLU of Northern California, affirmed that “Pretext stops do nothing for public safety and routinely escalate into violence against Black and brown people. Their use is a constant reminder that the freedoms and lives of people of color are at the mercy of a government that views them as a suspect. It is past time to abolish this tool of racial oppression”<sup>13</sup>; and

WHEREAS, Jurisdictions such as Cambridge, Massachusetts; Montgomery County, Maryland; Berkeley and Los Angeles, California; Minneapolis and Ramsey County, Minnesota; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Virginia; and Washington, D.C, have taken initial or significant steps toward banning and/or limiting pretext stops<sup>14</sup>; and

---

<sup>11</sup> Office of the Public Defender, “Coalition of 60 Civil Rights, Traffic Safety, and Community Groups Urging San Francisco Police Commission to End Racially-Biased Pretext Stops.”

<sup>12</sup> Office of the Public Defender, “Coalition of 60 Civil Rights, Traffic Safety, and Community Groups Urging San Francisco Police Commission to End Racially-Biased Pretext Stops.”

<sup>13</sup> Office of the Public Defender, “Coalition of 60 Civil Rights, Traffic Safety, and Community Groups Urging San Francisco Police Commission to End Racially-Biased Pretext Stops.”

<sup>14</sup> Office of the Public Defender, “Coalition of 60 Civil Rights, Traffic Safety, and Community Groups Urging San Francisco Police Commission to End Racially-Biased Pretext Stops.”

WHEREAS, Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) 2022 data<sup>15</sup> demonstrates that limiting pretext stops has caused a huge decrease in minor police stops, and has pushed Los Angeles Police officers to have a genuine reason to suspect a more serious crime is afoot before initiating a pretext stop, and are required to record their reasoning on body camera before the stop; and

WHEREAS, LAPD data also shows that officers received consent to search in 24% of all searches, compared with 30% during the same five-month period last year, and have become more purposeful in whom they stop and search, which has benefited LAPD because police officers have found something illegal in 26% of the searches conducted during stops for minor violations — a slight increase compared with their success rate before the new policy<sup>16</sup>; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the 2022-2023 Youth Commission of the City and County of San Francisco urges the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to support legislation that confronts the issue of pretext stops by revising the Department General Order (DGO) 9.01<sup>17</sup>, which governs San Francisco traffic enforcement, to ensure San Francisco's policies limit pretext stops and are not racially biased; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the 2022-2023 Youth Commission of the City and County of San Francisco urges the City and County of San Francisco to implement policies that also limit the searches of vehicles from traffic stops for other minor traffic violations such as a driving with a cracked windshield or broken windshield wipers,

---

<sup>15</sup> Libor Jany, Ben Poston, "Minor police encounters plummet after LAPD put limits on stopping drivers and pedestrians," Los Angeles Times, Published November 14, 2022,

<https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2022-11-14/minor-traffic-stops-plummet-in-months-after-lapd-policy-change>

<sup>16</sup> Jany, Poston, "Minor police encounters plummet after LAPD put limits on stopping drivers and pedestrians."

<sup>17</sup> San Francisco Police Department [SFPD]. "DGO9.01 Traffic Enforcement," August 10, 2010.

<https://www.sanfranciscopolice.org/sites/default/files/2018-11/DGO9.01%20Traffic%20Enforcement.pdf>.

sound violations, having an expired registration tag, sleeping in a parked car, having tinted windows, and having an object affixed to window or hanging from rearview mirror (unless the item obstructs the driver's view and substantially increases likelihood of injury or death), in order to minimize dangerous police-driver interactions and racial disparities in police exercising their discretion in stops; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the 2022-2023 Youth Commission of the City and County of San Francisco urges that in revising DGO 9.01, the San Francisco Police Commission either ban the use of the aforementioned vehicle, pedestrian, and bike stops or place a limit on these aforementioned vehicle, pedestrian, and bike stops; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the 2022-2023 Youth Commission of the City and County of San Francisco urges the City and County of San Francisco to emphasize the use of parking control officers to enforce the aforementioned violations on parked vehicles; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the 2022-2023 Youth Commission of the City and County of San Francisco urges that the San Francisco Police Department and its policies should give less attention to observations of vehicle equipment violations where no strong causal connection to collisions, and hence public safety, exists; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the 2022-2023 Youth Commission of the City and County of San Francisco urges that to maintain public trust, the San Francisco Police Department's use of pretext stops as a crime reduction strategy to be measured, in

furtherance of achieving the necessary balance between the perception of fairness and identifying those engaged in serious criminal conduct; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the 2022-2023 Youth Commission of the City and County of San Francisco urges that for all traffic stops, citations, and warnings done for public safety be articulated on police officers' body-worn videos and should include an officer's response to any questions posed by the individual stopped, thus following Department General Order 10.11<sup>18</sup> which was created to bring accountability in regards to police officer's engagement with the public, increase the public's trust in officers, and protect officers from unjustified complaints of misconduct; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the 2022-2023 Youth Commission of the City and County of San Francisco urges the San Francisco Police Department to effectively address police violence and the legacy of police brutality on Black and Brown people, and urges San Francisco policymakers to shift their attention to listening to the people most harmed by traffic stops, and shift the power to community members to define and address their public safety concerns and solutions; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the 2022-2023 Youth Commission of the City and County of San Francisco recommends the San Francisco Police Department establishes a formal plan for continued two-way communication between community members and the Police Department in which community members can voice their needs, concerns, questions, and recommendations to further address and improve

---

<sup>18</sup> San Francisco Police Department [SFPD]. "Department General Order 10.11 'Body Worn Camera Policy' Update Packet #52," June 22, 2016.  
<https://www.sanfranciscopolice.org/sites/default/files/2018-11/A%2016-090%20Department%20General%20Order%2010.11%20Body%20Worn%20Camera%20Policy%20Update%20Packet%20%2352.pdf>.



public safety between police officers and constituents, particularly Black Indigenous People Of Color (BIPOC) youth, in San Francisco; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the 2022-2023 Youth Commission of the City and County of San Francisco calls on the San Francisco Police Department and Department of Police Accountability to create updated and more frequent training on discrimination and implicit biases for all San Francisco police officers, and whenever police officers are found violating department policies created to eliminate implicit biases and discrimination on traffic stops, appropriate disciplinary actions be taken to hold police officer's accountable; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the 2022-2023 Youth Commission urges the City and County of San Francisco follow other jurisdictions, such as Cambridge, Massachusetts; Montgomery County, Maryland; Berkeley and Los Angeles, California; etc, who have taken initial or significant steps toward banning pretext stops, in order for San Francisco to not become an outlier; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the 2022-2023 Youth Commission urges the San Francisco Police Department to model its traffic stops policy changes similar to that of the Los Angeles Police Department, such as requiring police officers to state on body-worn camera their reason(s) for the traffic stop, given their positive results in limiting pretext stops and finding illegal contraband in the intentional stops made; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the 2022-2023 Youth Commission urges the City and County of San Francisco to foster a safe and trusting environment between the San

Francisco Police Department and the Youth of San Francisco by prioritizing and validating youth voices when sharing incident(s) of racially biased pretext stops; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the 2022-2023 Youth Commission urges the Department of Police Accountability to properly and legally assist victims of racially biased pretext stops; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the 2022-2023 Youth Commission urges the San Francisco Department of Police Accountability to gather data regarding police stops in a report specifically for San Francisco Youth Aged 17-25, including data on racially biased pretext stops; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the 2022-2023 Youth Commission of the City and County of San Francisco urges the Mayor and Board of Supervisors to publicly support this resolution, in favor of limiting pretext stops in San Francisco.

[Freeway Removal]

**Resolution urging the City and County of San Francisco and the California Department of Transportation to study and explore the ideas of the Central Freeway removal.**

WHEREAS, on November 28, 2022, California Senator Scott Wiener (District 11) sent a letter to the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) requesting a study on a removal of the Central freeway<sup>1</sup>; and

WHEREAS, when United States President Dwight Eisenhower created the Federal Aid Highway Act in 1956, he created a foundation for mass suburbanization and an economy centered on the automobile,<sup>2</sup> and as the act facilitated highway construction, these highways facilitated the economic development of predominantly white communities while facilitating the physical and economic destruction and underdevelopment of Black and low income communities<sup>3</sup>; and

WHEREAS, between 1993 and 2017, highway planners built more than 30,000 miles of freeway lanes in the country's 100 largest urban areas, according to Transportation for America, a national advocacy group,<sup>4</sup> and A *Los Angeles Times* investigation found that out of 200,000 people who lost their homes in that time period, nearly two-thirds of them resided in Black and Latino neighborhoods<sup>5</sup>; and

---

<sup>1</sup> "Forget the Central Subway—What's Happening With the Central Freeway?," *San Francisco Standard*, <https://sfstandard.com/housing-development/forget-the-central-subway-whats-happening-with-the-central-freeway/>.

<sup>2</sup> "How freeways bulldoze California communities of color," Calmatters, <https://calmatters.org/housing/2021/11/california-housing-crisis-podcast-freeways/>.

<sup>3</sup> Deborah N. Archer, *Transportation Policy and the Underdevelopment of Black Communities*, [https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=3797364#](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3797364#).

<sup>4</sup> Rayla Bellis, *Transportation for America The Congestion Con: How More Lanes and More Money Equal More Traffic*, [Page 4], <https://t4america.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/Congestion-Report-2020-FINAL.pdf>.

<sup>5</sup> Liam Dillon and Ben Poston, "Freeways force out residents in communities of color — again," *Los Angeles Times*, <https://www.latimes.com/projects/us-freeway-highway-expansion-black-latino-communities/>.

WHEREAS, planners of the interstate highway system routed many highways directly and intentionally through Black and Brown communities, and

WHEREAS, Deborah Archer, professor at the New York University School of Law, explains that “The highway development popped up at a time when the idea of integration in housing was on the horizon. And so very intentionally, highways were sometimes built right on the formal boundary lines that we saw used during racial zoning. Sometimes community members asked the highway builders to create a barrier between their community and encroaching Black communities”<sup>6</sup>; and

WHEREAS, Archer continues, “our system exists not to develop, but to underdevelop Black people. To effect this underdevelopment, racism is embedded into the core of power, the economy, culture, and society. The result is that Black people have been intentionally sacrificed to feed America’s growth and expansion”, demonstrating how the construction of highways benefited white communities, while exploiting Black communities”<sup>7</sup>; and

WHEREAS, the late Congressman John Lewis described this discrimination when he said “the legacy of Jim Crow transportation is still with us. Even today, some of our transportation policies and practices destroy stable neighborhoods, isolate and segregate our citizens in deteriorating neighborhoods, and fail to provide access to jobs and economic growth centers”<sup>8</sup>; and

WHEREAS, in a 2016 Dear Colleague Letter, the then-secretaries of the United States Departments of Housing and Urban Development (Julián Castro), Education (John B. King, Jr), and Transportation (Anthony R. Foxx) acknowledged how the intersection of transportation, housing, and education policies created and maintained concentrated

---

<sup>6</sup> “A Brief History Of How Racism Shaped Interstate Highways,” NPR, <https://www.npr.org/2021/04/07/984784455/a-brief-history-of-how-racism-shaped-interstate-highways>.

<sup>7</sup> Archer, *Transportation Policy*, [Page 1].

<sup>8</sup> Archer, *Transportation Policy*, [Page 8].

poverty and racial segregation which continues to impede economic mobility and access to opportunity from marginalized communities”<sup>9</sup>; and

WHEREAS, Archer explains, “highways, roads, bridges, sidewalks, and public transit have been planned, developed, and sustained to pull resources from Black communities that are subsequently deployed and invested to the benefit of predominantly white communities and their residents”, showing how freeways specifically perpetuate the underdevelopment of Black communities”<sup>10</sup>; and

WHEREAS, the transportation sector is the single largest source of greenhouse gas emissions in California, and according to the state’s most recent pre-pandemic inventory, the transportation sector accounts for 41%, or 171 million metric tons, of the state’s Carbon Dioxide Equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e) emissions, and in San Francisco, transportation accounts for 2.2 million metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e, or roughly 47% of emissions, based on the most recent pre-pandemic inventory<sup>11</sup>; and

WHEREAS, the highway system carries high volumes of traffic volumes, and therefore high concentrations of greenhouse gas emissions, other particulate matter, volatile organic compounds, brake dust, tire wear, and noise pollution<sup>12</sup>; and

WHEREAS, people who live near major highways have an increased likelihood and severity of health problems associated with exposure to pollution from traffic, including higher rates of asthma, cardiovascular disease, impaired lung development in children, preterm and low-birthweight infants, childhood leukemia, and premature death<sup>13</sup>; and

---

<sup>9</sup> Archer, *Transportation Policy*, [Page 10].

<sup>10</sup> Archer, *Transportation Policy*, [Page 1].

<sup>11</sup> Letter by Scott Wiener, "Caltrans Central Freeway Letter," November 28, 2022, <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1qDBIKNdZXyejOi3bbiqRBADm2l3kXgy/view>.

<sup>12</sup> Letter by Scott Wiener, "Caltrans Central Freeway Letter," November 28, 2022, <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1qDBIKNdZXyejOi3bbiqRBADm2l3kXgy/view>.

<sup>13</sup> "Near Roadway Air Pollution and Health: Frequently Asked Questions," United States Environmental Protection Agency, [https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2015-11/documents/420f14044\\_0.pdf](https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2015-11/documents/420f14044_0.pdf).

WHEREAS, youth, older adults, people with preexisting cardiopulmonary disease, and people of low income in particular have higher risks for health impacts from air pollution near roadways<sup>14</sup>; and

WHEREAS, finding alternatives to freeways is consistent with the City's climate goals, as the 2021 San Francisco Climate Action Plan which laid out a climate action framework across six sectors, including the transportation and land use sector, aimed at least 80% of all San Francisco trips would be low-carbon trips, meaning trips by transit, walking or biking by 2050<sup>15</sup>; and

WHEREAS, The areas surrounding the Central Freeway have "long been blighted by the ugly, noisy freeway and its presence has caused the surrounding neighborhoods to be marginalized and blighted. This imaginative proposal will help revive this part of the City and create opportunities for much needed new housing", said a critic at the University of California, Berkeley<sup>16</sup>; and

WHEREAS, in addition to eliminating or significantly mitigating these problems, ripping out the three miles of the Central Freeway and 101's 200-foot right of way could, all together, make space for some 13,000 new homes<sup>17</sup>; and

WHEREAS, the late San Francisco Mayor Ed Lee, SPUR, and the Spring 2014 graduate design studio at UC Berkeley explored and endorsed the proposal to take down the spur of Interstate 280 from 16th Street northward and replace it with a landscaped multiway boulevard<sup>18</sup>; and

---

<sup>14</sup> "Near Roadway," United States Environmental Protection Agency.

<sup>15</sup> *San Francisco's Climate Action Plan 2021*, [Page 16], [https://sfenvironment.org/sites/default/files/events/cap\\_fulldocument\\_wappendix\\_web\\_220124.pdf](https://sfenvironment.org/sites/default/files/events/cap_fulldocument_wappendix_web_220124.pdf).

<sup>16</sup> Robert Steuteville, "Urban repair through freeway removal," CNU, <https://www.cnu.org/publicsquare/2021/04/22/urban-repair-through-freeway-removal#:~:text=A%20mile%2Dlong%20section%20of,to%20the%20I%2D80%20interchange>.

<sup>17</sup> Roger Rudick, "SPUR Talk: Bury or Tear Down US-101 and the Central Freeway," StreetsBlog SF, <https://sf.streetsblog.org/2022/11/18/spur-talk-bury-or-tear-down-us-101-and-the-central-freeway/>.

<sup>18</sup> John Norquist, *A Freeway-Free San Francisco*, [Page 18], [https://www.cnu.org/sites/default/files/freeway-free-san-francisco\\_0.pdf](https://www.cnu.org/sites/default/files/freeway-free-san-francisco_0.pdf).

WHEREAS, there have been many other examples of highways that have turned to successful community spaces, while also preventing harmful impacts on marginalized communities; for example, when the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake in San Francisco damaged the elevated double-decker Embarcadero Freeway, officials turned the area into the Embarcadero which has now become a beautiful water-facing, pedestrian-friendly urban boulevard, and became one of the most popular attractions in the city<sup>19</sup>; and

WHEREAS, traffic increases from the Embarcadero Freeway removal predicted by Caltrans and others failed to materialize, and traffic actually improved without the freeway because the network of local streets, which were underutilized because of the nearby freeways, were able to manage a great deal of traffic capacity<sup>20</sup>; and

WHEREAS, the property tax base for the city increased and thousands of units of affordable housing were added, and since the freeway removal, John Norquist from the Congress for the New Urbanism in "A Freeway-Free San Francisco" wrote "the Embarcadero boulevard has prospered with added jobs, increased retail sales, and new housing, including thousands of affordable units"<sup>21</sup>; and

WHEREAS, in 1999, voters approved a proposition to build Octavia Boulevard to replace the concrete section of the Central Freeway west of Market Street that was severely damaged 10 years earlier,<sup>22</sup> and in 2003, the Central Freeway ramp north of Mission Street was demolished, plans for the new Octavia Boulevard were approved, and in 2004 construction on the new Octavia Boulevard began<sup>23</sup>; and

---

<sup>19</sup> Claire Wang, "Federal Highway Removal Program Raises Hopes in California," The American Prospect, <https://prospect.org/infrastructure/building-back-america/federal-highway-removal-program-raises-hopes-in-california/>.

<sup>20</sup> Norquist, *A Freeway-Free*, [Page 5].

<sup>21</sup> Norquist, *A Freeway-Free*, [Page 10].

<sup>22</sup> "Forget the Central,"

<sup>23</sup> "Timeline / A look back at Octavia St. and the Central Freeway," *San Francisco Chronicle*, <https://www.sfchronicle.com/news/article/Timeline-A-look-back-at-Octavia-St-and-the-2680322.php>.

WHEREAS, in 2004, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed Resolution No. 304-04 urging the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) to study relocating the freeway's on-and off-ramps and urging Caltrans to work with the city to study alternatives to the freeway, and postpone retrofits in order to to lessen the negative impacts on the surrounding neighborhoods<sup>24</sup>; and

WHEREAS, the land beneath the section north of Market Street has been redeveloped into housing and Octavia Boulevard while the remainder south of Market Street was repaired,<sup>25</sup> and according to Norquist from the Congress for the New Urbanism in "A Freeway-Free San Francisco", "The transformation of the Hayes Valley around Octavia Boulevard has been remarkable. What was once considered a high-crime, depressed area of San Francisco is now thriving"<sup>26</sup>; and

WHEREAS, the SFCTA highlighted that full removal was actually the cheapest of the alternatives analyzed, that removal would distribute traffic in such a way that it was more dispersed, and equitable because not one neighborhood was absorbing the brunt of automobility, that even though more intersections would be congested by removing the freeway, the congestion was really acute only during rush hour while at most other times of the day freeway removal would not cause traffic<sup>27</sup>; and

WHEREAS, in a follow-up study of the Octavia Boulevard freeway closure, Caltrans concluded that a public information campaign alerting drivers of alternatives was a success and that drivers learned new ways to navigate the city by car, and it was evident the traffic increase did not ensue after a segment of urban freeway was removed without a replacement boulevard<sup>28</sup>; and

---

<sup>24</sup> "Resolution urging the Governor to postpone future retrofits of the Central Freeway deck and to commit the State to participate in a study of alternative future configurations for the Central Freeway.," San Francisco Board of Supervisors, <https://www.sfbos.org/ftp/uploadedfiles/bdsupvrs/resolutions04/r0304-04.pdf>.

<sup>25</sup> Alex Mullaney, "Any Plan for the Central Freeway Must Be Community-Led, New Coalition Says," San Francisco Standard, <https://sfstandard.com/transportation/future-plans-central-freeway-community-coalition/>.

<sup>26</sup> Norquist, *A Freeway-Free*, [Page 10].

<sup>27</sup> Jason Henderson, "Conservative Fight to Save Central Freeway," FoundSF, [https://www.foundsf.org/index.php?title=Conservative\\_Fight\\_to\\_Save\\_Central\\_Freeway](https://www.foundsf.org/index.php?title=Conservative_Fight_to_Save_Central_Freeway).

<sup>28</sup> Henderson, "Conservative Fight," FoundSF.



WHEREAS, in 1973, the San Francisco City Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors adopted the Transit First Policy, “giving top priority to public transit investments as the centerpiece of the city's transportation policy and adopting street capacity and parking policies to discourage increases in automobile traffic. This policy encourages multi-modalism, including the use of transit and other transportation choices, including bicycling and walking, rather than the continued use of the single-occupant vehicle”, as stated in the San Francisco Planning Department’s Transportation Element of the General Plan<sup>29</sup>; and

WHEREAS, Norquist from the Congress for the New Urbanism wrote that, “The Bay Area is expected to grow by 1.7 million more residents by 2035, with San Francisco proper projected to gain 160,000 new residents. (SPUR 2011). How will the city accommodate these new jobs, residents, and commuters? Freeway removal could play a key role. The idea of removing a road—particularly a big road that carries a lot of cars—to meet transportation needs is perhaps counterintuitive. Yet cars are only one component of what constitutes traffic. Transit, walking, and cycling, if properly planned for, are viable ways to move through urban spaces—and these modes add to street vitality. When San Francisco built the double-decked Embarcadero along its waterfront, it claimed the space for cars and little else. When the Embarcadero was removed, people returned to the area and today co-exist with the streetcar, buses, and cars”<sup>30</sup>; and

---

<sup>29</sup> "San Francisco General Plan," San Francisco Planning, <https://generalplan.sfplanning.org/>.

<sup>30</sup> Norquist, *A Freeway-Free*, [Page 16].

WHEREAS, the San Francisco Standard uncovered a 2005 provision in the San Francisco General Plan's Transportation Element that calls for a comprehensive study the removal of the Central Freeway south of Market Street and an "analysis of the impacts and benefits on surrounding neighborhood livability, local and regional transportation, especially Muni and regional transit services, and economic impacts"<sup>31</sup>, but the study was never done, which San Francisco County Transportation Authority Executive Director, Tilly Chang was unaware of, and said the San Francisco Planning Department needs to take the lead<sup>32</sup>; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Department is updating the transportation section of the General Plan this year and what will happen to the section regarding the comprehensive study of the Central Freeway and the impact of its removal is yet to be seen<sup>33</sup>; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Department's chief of staff, Dan Sider, said the department still has not conducted any meaningful engagement on the freeway removal study<sup>34</sup>; and

WHEREAS, recently, the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL) established the new Reconnecting Communities Pilot discretionary grant program, funded with \$1 billion for the next 5 years for planning grants and capital construction grants, as well as technical assistance, to restore community connectivity through the removal, retrofit, mitigation, or replacement of eligible transportation infrastructure facilities<sup>35</sup>; and

WHEREAS, the Central Freeway is eligible for these grants, as eligible facilities include highways, roads, streets, parkways or other transportation facilities which create barriers between communities, including barriers to mobility, access, or economic development, due to high speeds, grade separations, or other design factors<sup>36</sup>; and

---

<sup>31</sup> "San Francisco," San Francisco Planning.

<sup>32</sup> "Forget the Central,"

<sup>33</sup> Mullaney, "Any Plan," San Francisco Standard.

<sup>34</sup> Mullaney, "Any Plan," San Francisco Standard.

<sup>35</sup> "Reconnecting Communities Pilot Program – Planning Grants and Capital Construction Grants,"

<sup>36</sup> "Reconnecting Communities," United States Department of Transportation.

WHEREAS, states, local governments, metropolitan planning organizations, and nonprofit organizations can apply for a planning grant to study the feasibility and impacts of removing, retrofitting, or mitigating an existing eligible facility or to conduct planning activities necessary to design a project to remove, retrofit, or mitigate an existing eligible facility<sup>37</sup>; and now therefore be it

WHEREAS, the City and County of San Francisco is eligible for a planning grant from the Reconnecting Communities Pilot program to study and complete the following; 1) Current traffic patterns on the eligible facility proposed for removal, retrofit, or mitigation and the surrounding street network; transportation network capacity; alternative roadway designs or other uses for the right-of-way; impacts to the mobility of freight and people; impacts to the safety of the traveling public; cost; anticipated economic impacts and environmental impacts both human and natural, 2) Public engagement activities to provide the public opportunities to provide input into a plan to remove and convert an eligible facility, and 3) Other transportation planning activities required in advance of a project to remove, retrofit, or mitigate an existing eligible facility to restore community connectivity, as determined by the Department of Transportation<sup>38</sup>; and be it,

RESOLVED, the 2022-2023 San Francisco Youth Commission urges the City and County of San Francisco to identify relevant historical documents, and grant sources to develop freeway removal plans, such as the Reconnecting Communities Pilot program, in order to support communities affected by freeways; and, be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, the 2022-2023 San Francisco Youth Commission urges the the City and County of San Francisco to complete the study on the freeway removal from the San Francisco Planning Department General Plan's Transportation Element; and, be it

---

<sup>37</sup> "Reconnecting Communities," United States Department of Transportation.

<sup>38</sup> "Reconnecting Communities," United States Department of Transportation.

FURTHER RESOLVED, the 2022-2023 San Francisco Youth Commission urges Caltrans to work with San Francisco to identify alternatives to the existing Central Freeway spur, for which a study has already been explicitly called for.

FURTHER RESOLVED, the 2022-2023 San Francisco Youth Commission urges the City and County of San Francisco to center the voices of black and low income community members, seeing that more than 100 organizations—many of which are community-serving nonprofits and cultural districts sent a letter to the Planning Department and city officials asking to be in the center of any and all actions made in regard to the 1.2-mile section of elevated freeway forming the boundary between SoMa and the Mission<sup>39</sup>; and, be it

---

<sup>39</sup> Mullaney, "Any Plan," San Francisco Standard.

# Youth Local Civic Engagement Survey

This survey is designed by the San Francisco Youth Commission to capture San Francisco youth engagement in local government and elections. Your feedback is essential to understanding how the city and county of San Francisco can support local youth engagement in government and elections. You can contact the San Francisco Youth Commission through email at [youthcom@sfgov.org](mailto:youthcom@sfgov.org) and on social media @sfyouthcom.

\* Required

1. Name

---

2. Email (if you would like to be contacted regarding this survey)

---

3. Which of the following best describes you? Select all that apply. \*

*Check all that apply.*

- ☐ Asian or Pacific Islander
- ☐ Black or African American
- ☐ Hispanic or Latino
- ☐ Native American or Alaskan Native
- ☐ White or Caucasian
- ☐ A race/ethnicity not listed here
- ☐ Prefer not to say

## 4. Grade \*

*Mark only one oval.*

- ☐ 6th
- ☐ 7th
- ☐ 8th
- ☐ 9th
- ☐ 10th
- ☐ 11th
- ☐ 12th
- ☐ None

## 5. Which of the following best describes your gender identity? \*

*Mark only one oval.*

- ☐ Male
- ☐ Female
- ☐ Transgender male
- ☐ Transgender female
- ☐ Genderqueer
- ☐ Prefer not to say
- ☐ Not listed here
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## 6. Which of the following best describes your sexual orientation? \*

*Mark only one oval.*

- ☐ Asexual
- ☐ Bisexual
- ☐ Gay/Lesbian
- ☐ Heterosexual/Straight
- ☐ Pansexual
- ☐ Queer
- ☐ A sexual orientation not listed here
- ☐ Prefer not to say
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## 7. School \*

---

## 8. District (insert find your district link) \*

*Mark only one oval.*

- ☐ District 1
- ☐ District 2
- ☐ District 3
- ☐ District 4
- ☐ District 5
- ☐ District 6
- ☐ District 7
- ☐ District 8
- ☐ District 9
- ☐ District 10
- ☐ District 11

## 9. Age \*

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ 10      Skip to question 28
- ☐ 11      Skip to question 28
- ☐ 12      Skip to question 28
- ☐ 13      Skip to question 28
- ☐ 14      Skip to question 28
- ☐ 15      Skip to question 28
- ☐ 16      Skip to question 19
- ☐ 17      Skip to question 19
- ☐ 18      Skip to question 10
- ☐ 19      Skip to question 10
- ☐ 20      Skip to question 10
- ☐ 21      Skip to question 10
- ☐ 22      Skip to question 10
- ☐ 23      Skip to question 10

Over 18

## 10. Are you registered to vote? \*

Mark only one oval.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_



## 11. Have already voted or plan to vote in a local election? \*

*Mark only one oval.*

- ☐ Yes, I plan to vote or have voted in a local election.
- ☐ No, I do not plan to vote or have not voted in a local election.
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## 12. If you do not plan to vote in a local election, or have not already voted in a local election, why? \*

*Check all that apply.*

- ☐ I don't know where to vote
- ☐ I don't understand what to vote for
- ☐ I don't see the importance of voting
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## 13. Please select the answer you feel best represents your opinion about this statement: "I feel prepared to vote in a local election" \*

*Mark only one oval.*

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

14. If you answered disagree/neutral, what would make you feel prepared to vote? (you may select multiple answers) \*

*Check all that apply.*

- ☐ Information about voter guides  
☐ More outreach in schools  
☐ More outreach from local government and elected officials  
☐ More youth voter engagement events  
☐ I answered agree/strongly agree/neutral  
☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

15. Please select the answer you feel best represents your opinion about this statement: "I think San Francisco provides many opportunities for youth to be educated on local government" \*

*Mark only one oval.*

- ☐ Strongly disagree  
☐ Disagree  
☐ Neutral  
☐ Agree  
☐ Strongly agree

16. Please list any programs (through school or community organizations) that have helped you vote/become engaged in government \*

\_\_\_\_\_

17. Prior to this survey, did you know who your District Supervisor is? \*

*Mark only one oval.*

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

18. This is an optional space for you to elaborate on any answers or opinions you were not able to express in this survey:

---

---

---

---

---

Pre-Registration (for people who answered ages 16-17)

19. Are you preregistered to vote? \*

*Mark only one oval.*

☐ Yes      *Skip to question 20*

☐ No      *Skip to question 28*

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

16-17 AND Can Pre-Register

20. Do you plan to vote in a local election when you are 18? \*

*Mark only one oval.*

- ☐ Yes, I plan to vote in a local election.
- ☐ No, I do not plan to vote in a local election.

21. If you do not plan to vote in a local election, why? \*

*Check all that apply.*

- ☐ I don't know where to vote
- ☐ I don't understand what to vote for
- ☐ I don't see the importance of voting
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

22. Please select the answer you feel best represents your opinion about this statement: "I feel prepared to vote in a local election when I turn 18." \*

*Mark only one oval.*

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

23. If you answered disagree/neutral, what would make you feel prepared to vote? (you may select multiple answers) \*

*Check all that apply.*

- ☐ Information about voter guides
- ☐ More outreach in schools
- ☐ More outreach from local government and elected officials
- ☐ More youth voter engagement events
- ☐ I answered agree/strongly agree/neutral
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

24. Please select the answer you feel best represents your opinion about this statement: "I think San Francisco provides many opportunities for youth to be educated on local government" \*

*Mark only one oval.*

- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly agree

25. Please list any programs (through school or community organizations) that have helped you vote/become engaged in government \*

\_\_\_\_\_

26. Prior to this survey, did you know who your District Supervisor is? \*

*Mark only one oval.*

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

27. This is an optional space for you to elaborate on any answers or opinions you were not able to express in this survey:

---

---

---

---

---

Under 16 & Cannot Pre-Register

28. Prior to this survey, did you know who your District Supervisor is? \*

*Mark only one oval.*

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

29. This is an optional space for you to elaborate on any answers or opinions you were not able to express in this survey:

---

---

---

---

---

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms

# 2023 January

SUN	MON	TUE	WED	THU	FRI	SAT
1	2	3 First Budget Meeting • Discussion: what are basic needs and what aren't basic needs? • Department and CBO presentations of programs relating to Youths	4 LGBTQ + Task Force Budget & Policy Priorities Meeting #1	5 CEEC Budget & Policy Priorities Meeting #1	6	7
8 HRT & TJ Budget and Policy Priorities Meeting #1	9	10	11 Exec • No compilation this meeting • Check in on the presentations	12	13	14 Retreat Budget and policy priorities with focus on Districts and marginalized groups
15	16	17 Second Budget Meeting • Discussion of needs • Department and CBO presentations	18	19 CEEC Budget & Policy Priority Meeting #2	20 LGBTQ + Task Force Budget & Policy Priority Meeting #2	21
22 HRT & TJ Budget and Policy Priorities Meeting #2	23	24	25 Exec • Check in on presentations • Compilation of all BPP	26	27	28
29	30	31				



# 2023 February

SUN	MON	TUE	WED	THU	FRI	SAT
			1 Exec • Check in on presentations • Compilation of all BPP	2	3	4
5	6 Full YC Meeting Full review of all budget recommendations	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20 Full YC Meeting Review and vote on full budget recommendations	21 Publication of Youth Commission's recommendations + Press Release + Press Conference with Depts + CBOs	22	23	24	25
26	27	28				