



Introduction

In support of the development of its 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan, Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice, and HIV Housing Plan, the City and County of San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) engaged in a community-wide outreach and engagement process with stakeholders and residents of San Francisco. This process serves as a framework to identify housing and community development priorities, which, in turn, drive the goals and strategies outlined in the final plans. Ultimately, MOHCD will use the community's input and priorities to inform decision-making for funding community and housing services.

MOHCD contracted with Resource Development Associates (RDA) to develop an integrated community outreach and engagement strategy for these three plans and as well as other planning efforts led by the Office of Economic and Workforce Development and the Planning Department. During this process, MOHCD outreached to a wide range of community stakeholders and residents for their perspectives, needs, feedback, and input, specifically targeting the City's most vulnerable populations.

Community input is a critical part of the strategic planning process, providing crucial data to ensure funded programs and services address the highest priority needs of vulnerable populations as well as the City holistically. During this process, public input was obtained through community meetings (neighborhood forums and population-specific focus groups) and two online surveys, for which paper surveys were also made available. Both participatory data-collection methods, and demographics of participants, are described in further detail below.

Community Forums and Focus Groups

MOHCD facilitated 10 neighborhood-based public forums and 38 population-specific focus groups. Representatives from across the housing spectrum participated in the forums and focus groups, including individuals experiencing homelessness, residents of public and subsidized housing, housing and social service providers, HIV/AIDS housing advocates, homeowners, new San Francisco residents, recent immigrants, and life-long residents of the City. MOHCD facilitated sessions with cultural groups including African American, Cambodian, Samoan, Vietnamese, Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual/Transgender/Questioning, and HIV community members. Participants responded to a series of structured questions on a range of relevant domains including housing and service needs, barriers to housing access and choice, neighborhood change, and discrimination and fair housing.

A total of 1,395 individuals took part in the community meetings, which were held across San Francisco between November 2018 and March 2019. A total of 656 residents and stakeholders participated in the 10 neighborhood forums and at least 684 participated in the 38 focus groups, 16 of which were held at public housing sites converted through the Federal Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) program. These numbers may under-represent actual attendance because some participants did not sign in. The following tables list the events held during this process.



MOHCD Neighborhood Forums	
Bayview Hunters Point / District 10	South of Market / District 6
Castro / District 8 and District 7	Sunset / District 4 and District 1
Chinatown / District 3 and District 2	Tenderloin / District 6
Excelsior and OMI / District 11	Visitacion Valley / District 10
Mission / District 9	Western Addition / District 5

MOHCD Community Focus Groups	
African American Community	Human Service Network
Cambodian Community	LGBTQ Community
Council of Community Housing Organizations	Local Homeless Coordinating Board
Eviction Prevention / Tenant Empowerment	Long Term Care Coordinating Council
HIV Community	Mayor's Disability Council
HIV Housing Providers	Samoan Community
Homeowners - BMR	Senior Disability Action
HOPE SF Hunters View Housing Community	SF Immigrant Legal & Education Network
HOPE SF Potrero Hill Housing Community	SF Latino Parity & Equity Coalition
HOPE SF Sunnyside Housing Community	Transgender Community
Housing Action Coalition	Vietnamese Community

Rental Assistance Demonstration Focus Group Sites	
1760 Bush Street	491 31st
1880 Pine Street	Bernal Dwellings
3850 18th Street	Clementina Towers
25 Sanchez	Hayes Valley North & South
255 Woodside	John F Kennedy Apts.
2698 California	Mission Dolores
345 Arguello	Robert B. Pitts
462 Duboce	Westside Courts

Community Surveys

MOHCD developed two community surveys to capture residents’ housing and non-housing service needs as well as their experiences with MOHCD and OEWD programs and services.

Planning Survey

This survey asked respondents what they need to get and stay in housing, which non-housing services are most important for them and their family, how they prefer to access services, their opinions of MOHCD, and other quality of life questions. There was a total of 2,219 responses for this survey.



Program Evaluation Survey

After completing the Planning Survey, participants had the opportunity to complete the Program Evaluation survey, which asked about utilization of MOHCD and OEWD programs and services. Respondents were asked about their utilization of economic and workforce development programs, housing placement programs, housing services, and community services and then asked to rate and describe their overall experience with these programs and services. This survey was thus able to collect and compare specific utilization data from a range of City and community programs and services and nuance this data with participants’ numerical rankings and qualitative assessments. There was a total of 1,537 responses for this survey.

Demographics of Participants

Participants in forums and focus groups were generally asked to complete forms identifying a number of demographic characteristics, including as gender, race or ethnicity, and sexual orientation, but not all participants opted to complete this form. The Planning Survey also included a demographic component where respondents indicated their age, race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, HIV/AIDS status, housing status, disability status, income level, educational attainment, and language preference.

The charts below outline demographic information for all forum, focus group and survey participants.

Table 1: Self-Reported Gender Identity Across Community Outreach Efforts

Gender Identity	%
Female	60%
Male	33%
I prefer not to answer	3%
Genderqueer/ Gender Non-binary	3%
Trans Female	<1%
Other	<1%
Trans Male	<1%

Table 2: Self-Reported Sexual Orientation Across Community Outreach Efforts

Sexual Orientation	%
Straight/Heterosexual	60%
Gay/Lesbian/Same Gender Loving	14%
Prefer not to answer	14%
Bisexual	9%
Other	3%
Questioning/Unsure	<1%

Table 3: Self-Reported Race/Ethnicity Across Community Outreach Efforts

Race/Ethnicity	%
Asian	33%
White	31%
Black, African American or African	14%
Latino/a or Hispanic	13%
American Indian or Alaska Native	5%
Middle Eastern or North African	2%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1%



Summary of Findings

General Community Needs and Concerns

1. Among the concerns identified during community engagement, San Francisco stakeholders are most frequently concerned about displacement, increasing housing prices, the overall cleanliness and safety of their neighborhoods, and transit accessibility.
2. Participants in MOHCD’s community engagement identified that services to support self-sufficiency and stability are as important as the need for housing itself.
3. Many stakeholders expressed a prominent need for culturally inclusive and culturally-specific services.
4. Participants expressed a need for greater awareness of, navigation of, and access to available services, including both housing and other supportive services.
5. Stakeholders expressed a desire for more inclusive and relaxed standards around affordable housing eligibility.
6. Many community members voiced the need for more opportunities to provide input on the City’s housing eligibility policies as well as participate in the development of affordable housing programs.
7. Stakeholders asked for more streamlined services, improved interagency collaboration, and stronger cross-agency communication to support the delivery of both housing and supportive services.

Housing Services

1. Community engagement participants emphasized the need for affordable housing environments at the most vulnerable end of the housing spectrum: shelters and transitional housing for persons experiencing homelessness, accessible housing for seniors and individuals with disabilities, and affordable housing for the lowest-income households.
2. While affordable housing was the most frequently mentioned housing services need, the recognition of the intersection of health and housing was a common thread throughout the discussions, as participants emphasized the need for safe and healthy living environments.
3. Community members expressed the need for stronger eviction and tenant supports and protections, including tenant education as well as City policies to prevent unlawful eviction.

**Top fifteen housing and housing service needs
(across all outreach methods)**

Affordable housing
Rental assistance/reduced-cost housing
Housing navigation and application assistance
Safe shelter, transitional, and permanent housing environments
More housing protections
Senior and accessible housing
Eviction prevention support
Housing subsidies
Tenant education
Supportive housing
Down-payment assistance
Housing close to employment
Landlord negotiation assistance
Relocation assistance
Mortgage, HOA dues or foreclosure assistance

Housing Access, Perceptions, and Barriers

1. Participants named displacement and increasing housing prices as the top concerns impacting housing access and the ability to remain in housing.
2. Both renters and homeowners express low overall housing choice because they feel “locked in.”



3. Participants highlighted barriers to homeownership centering on both housing prices and financing options.
4. Neighborhood forum participants shared the qualities that they believe make a neighborhood desirable, identifying such characteristics as public transit, green space, and safety.
5. Participants in community engagement shared multiple experiences of housing discrimination, but overall, their responses reveal that there is not one specific, overt type of discrimination. Their responses indicate a more pervasive and entrenched systemic discrimination that affects people of color and African American communities in particular.

Social and Supportive Services

1. Community members need affordable, targeted support for trauma, PTSD, substance use disorders, and other mental health conditions. Mental health and substance use services together were the most frequently mentioned social and supportive service need for all community meetings.
2. Compared to housing needs, social and supportive service needs are more intensive and vary by population. Surprisingly, across all community meetings, participants expressed a need for any type of social or supportive service roughly 860 times. Participants expressed any type of housing-related need 530 times. In addition to being expressed more frequently, social and supportive service needs also varied more by population.

Top fifteen social and supportive service needs (across all outreach methods)
Benefits assistance (CalWorks, SNAP, Medi-Cal, etc.)
Better access to healthcare
Access to healthy food
Mental health and substance use support
Language support
Knowledge of available services
Support for seniors and people with disabilities
Affordable childcare
Case management
Legal services – consumer/civil rights
Legal services – worker/employment rights
Legal services – immigration support
Access to recreation
Nutrition programs
Neighborhood clean-up and safety programs

Knowledge of and Access to Services

1. Participants indicated limited knowledge about availability of and eligibility for housing and social services, as well as a need for assistance navigating those services.
2. In addition to needing greater knowledge of eligibility requirements, stakeholders conveyed that eligibility requirements can be a barrier to accessing services.
3. Participants expressed a need for inclusive language support services, in order to promote both knowledge of services and service access, especially for health and housing.
4. Residents experience several barriers to transportation in San Francisco, including long wait times, safety, and cost of transportation, which impede their access to jobs, medical appointments, and other services.



Coordination of Services

1. Stakeholders asked for more streamlined services, improved interagency collaboration, and stronger cross-agency communication to support the delivery of both housing and supportive services.
2. Community members that participated in forums and focus groups asked for more financial and capacity-building support for nonprofit organizations and other service providers, including changes to contracting rules.

Economic Self-Sufficiency

1. Participants expressed an overwhelming need for paid job training programs that provide pathways to living-wage, sustainable employment. Participants emphasized that while there are current job training opportunities, they may not be paid and/or may not link to long-term employment.
2. There is a large need for financial literacy and planning programs as well as financial services, specifically savings and credit counseling services. In addition to significant income barriers, participants felt they lacked the financial planning tools and financial literacy to even start considering the process of homeownership.
3. Residents want San Francisco employers to hire more local residents. Participants have a nuanced understanding of the impact of hiring practices on very low-income residents. They indicated that incentivizing high-paying employers, who may hire locally for high-wage positions in specific industries, to move to San Francisco does not benefit the residents who most need living-wage jobs.

Top fifteen economic self-sufficiency needs (across all outreach methods)
Job training
Getting a job
Financial planning and education
Learning new job skills
Access to ESL classes
GED and high school diploma programs
Local hiring
Financing and credit services
Tech access/tech education
Permanent job/career opportunities
Employment coaching
“Working class” jobs
Employer programs
Senior/disability employment
Affordable higher education opportunities

Community Empowerment and Engagement

1. Vulnerable community stakeholders want better relationships and accountability with MOHCD. Overall, community members were very appreciative to have the opportunity to participate in the forums and focus groups and share their perspectives and suggestions, but participants expressed that they would like MOHCD to continue to hold community meetings like the forums to be able to keep a pulse on community needs, particularly the needs of vulnerable populations. Participants emphasized that, in order to rectify historical inequities, there must be accountability measures in place to which the City can be responsive.



2. Participants articulated a wide need for culturally-competent and inclusive outreach and community engagement strategies that promote community-building and link residents to services. Culturally-competent and inclusive community outreach was the most frequently mentioned need related to community engagement. Community members acknowledge that there are current outreach efforts marketing City-sponsored housing and supportive services, but these efforts are not reaching certain communities. Participants felt strongly that using culturally-competent outreach strategies will yield increased awareness of and engagement in services.

3. Similarly, respondents indicated that increasing the number of cultural events available to community members would increase their sense of community.

Top fifteen community empowerment & engagement needs (across all outreach methods)

Culturally competency and inclusivity (cultural events, cultural-based outreach)
Community events (block parties, holiday events, sports events, farmers markets)
Community space (recreational space, green space, art space)
Nonprofit support and capacity
Parking
Community planning
Support for small businesses
Volunteer opportunities
Community meetings and outreach
Accountability
Community engagement and communication efforts
Targeted marketing of services
Community-based neighborhood clean-up efforts
Senior services
Better street and outdoor lighting