

2022 UPDATE

Housing Element

AN ELEMENT OF THE
SAN FRANCISCO GENERAL PLAN



ADOPTED - January 2023



San Francisco
Planning

Land Acknowledgement

The San Francisco Planning Department acknowledges that we are on the unceded ancestral homeland of the Ramaytush Ohlone, who are the original inhabitants of the San Francisco Peninsula. As the indigenous stewards of this land and in accordance with their traditions, the Ramaytush Ohlone have never ceded, lost, nor forgotten their responsibilities as the caretakers of this place, as well as for all peoples who reside in their traditional territory. As guests, we recognize that we benefit from living and working on their traditional homeland. We wish to pay our respects by acknowledging the Ancestors, Elders, and Relatives of the Ramaytush Ohlone community and by affirming their sovereign rights as First Peoples.

Acknowledgements

The Planning Department wishes to acknowledge the many community partners, members of the public, and sister city agencies who contributed their time and knowledge to shape new housing policy that reflects our collective values and vision for San Francisco. Staff were humbled by the energy, resilience, and grace of the community to come together during a global pandemic and engage in respectful dialogue about the complexities of the housing affordability crisis. Our partners were often also frontline service providers in the health crisis and many of the residents who participated were directly impacted by housing and job insecurity, making their contributions even more admirable. It is the Planning Department's hope that the following Housing Element does justice to the insights that were shared and that the policies accurately reflect the paths forward outlined by the community's collective voice.

Housing Element 2022 Update

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	i
Executive Summary	1
Introduction to the Plan	13
Goals, Objectives, and Policies	16
Overview	16
Goal 1. Recognize the right to housing as a foundation for health, and social and economic well-being	17
Objective 1.A Ensure housing stability and healthy homes	18
Objective 1.B Advance equitable housing access	21
Objective 1.C Eliminate homelessness	25
Goal 2. Repair the harms of racial and ethnic discrimination against American Indian, Black, and other people of color	27
Objective 2.A Make amends and inform reparative actions by telling the truth about discriminatory actions and the resulting harm	29
Objective 2.B Offer reparations for communities directly harmed by discriminatory action and bring back their displaced people	30
Objective 2.C Increase accountability to American Indian, Black and other communities of color	31

Goal 3. Foster racially and socially inclusive neighborhoods through equitable distribution of investment and growth	34
Objective 3.A Build intergenerational wealth for American Indian, Black, and other communities of color	37
Objective 3.B Create a sense of belonging for all communities of color within Well-resourced Neighborhoods through expanded housing choice	39
Objective 3.C Eliminate displacement of vulnerable communities and communities of color	
Goal 4. Provide sufficient housing for existing residents and future generations for a city with diverse cultures, family structures, and abilities	44
Objective 4.A Substantially expand the amount of permanently affordable housing for extremely low- to moderate-income households	46
Objective 4.B Expand small and mid-rise multi-family housing production to serve our workforce, prioritizing middle-income household	50
Objective 4.C Expand and diversify housing types for all	51
Goal 5. Promote neighborhoods that are well-connected, healthy, and rich with community culture	54
Objective 5.A Connect people to jobs and their neighborhood with numerous, equitable, and healthy transportation and mobility options	57
Objective 5.B Advance environmental justice, climate, and community resilience	58
Objective 5.C Elevate expression of cultural identities through the design of active and engaging neighborhood buildings and spaces	63
Policies	66
<hr/>	
Implementing Programs	84
1. Affordable Housing Resources and Equitable Access	86
1.1 Affordable Housing Funding	86
1.2 Affordable Housing Production	88
1.3 Inclusionary Housing	91
1.4 Affordable Housing Preservation	93
1.5 Deep Affordability and Rent Assistance for Lowest Income Renters	94
1.6 Homeownership Support	95
1.7 Eligibility and Access for Affordable Housing	96
2. Stabilizing Tenants and Rental Housing	99
2.1 Eviction Prevention and Anti-displacement	99
2.2 Tenant Protections	100
2.3 Acquisitions and Rehabilitation for Affordability	101
2.4 Preserving Rental Unit Availability	103

3. Preventing and Eliminating Homelessness	106
3.1 Coordinated Entry and Referrals	106
3.2 Problem Solving and Targeted Homelessness Prevention	107
3.3 Temporary Shelter	108
3.4 Supportive Housing	109
4. Centering Equity Communities and Cultural Heritage	111
4.1 Accountability	111
4.2 Community Planning	113
4.3 Access to Economic Opportunity	114
4.4 Cultural Districts	116
4.5 Cultural Heritage and Expression	117
5. Redressing and Preventing Discrimination	119
5.1 Truth-telling and Acknowledging Past Harm	119
5.2 Cultural Investment and Restitution	120
5.3 Fair Housing Compliance and Enforcement	121
5.4 Housing Programs to Redress Harm	122
6. Serving Special Needs Groups	124
6.1 Families with Children	124
6.2 Transgender and LGBTQ+ People	125
6.3 Seniors and People with Disabilities and Chronic Illness	126
7. Expanding Housing Choices	128
7.1 Rezoning Program	128
7.2 Mid-rise and Small Multifamily Buildings	129
7.3 Housing Near Job Centers and Transit	131
7.4 Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)	132
8. Reducing Constraints on Housing Development, Maintenance, and Improvement	133
8.1 Cost and Fees	133
8.2 Small Multifamily Financing and Support	136
8.3 Objective Design Standards & Findings	137
8.4 Process and Permit Procedures	138
8.5 Compliance with State Programs and Law	142
8.6 Support for Affordable Housing and Shelters	144
8.7 Facilitating Large Projects	146
8.8 Policy and Practice Review	147

8.9 Policy and Practice Review	147
9. Healthy, Connected, and Resilient Housing and Neighborhoods	149
9.1 Housing Rehabilitation for Health and Safety	149
9.2 Resilient and Healthy Neighborhoods and New Housing	151
9.3 Transportation	153
9.4 Community Services	155
Quantified Objectives	157
Key Constraints Reduction Actions	159
Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Actions	163

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Housing Needs Assessment and Assessment of Fair Housing
Appendix B: Site Inventory Analysis and Rezoning Program
Appendix C: Analysis of Governmental and Non-Governmental Constraints on Housing
Appendix D: General Plan Consistency
Appendix E: Public Input Summaries
Appendix F: 2014 Housing Element Evaluation
Appendix G: Glossary

Executive Summary

The Housing Element serves as San Francisco's roadmap for meeting the housing needs of all its residents. It is one component of the city's broader general plan, which also includes other elements on transportation, community safety, and open space. California expects all cities and counties to maintain a current general plan and specifically requires an update their housing element every eight years.

The Housing Element Law mandates that local governments must adopt plans and regulatory systems that provide opportunities for, and do not unduly constrain, private market housing development. As a result, housing policy in California rests largely on the effective implementation of local general plans and, in particular, housing elements. Additionally, the California legislature passed Assembly Bill 686 Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) in April 2020, a new law which builds upon existing fair housing protections to require housing

elements include policies to combat patterns of segregation to foster more inclusive communities. All housing elements must ultimately be adopted by each municipality's local government and approved by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).

To fulfill these mandates, the Housing Element 2022 Update (2022 Update) is San Francisco's first housing plan that is centered on racial and social equity. It includes policies and programs that express our city's collective vision and values for the future of housing in San Francisco. The 2022 Update articulates San Francisco's commitment to recognizing housing as a right, increasing housing affordability for low-income households and communities of color, opening small and mid-rise multifamily buildings across all neighborhoods, and connecting housing to neighborhood services like transportation, education, and economic opportunity.

Regulatory Context

California Housing Element Law requires that housing elements accommodate and prepare for the creation of enough housing to meet each region's specific housing target, called its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). This target was set by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), a regional planning agency, and approved by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for San Francisco. This assessment is based on San Francisco's unmet housing need at every income level and projected population growth. San Francisco's 2023-2031 RHNA mandates the creation of more than 82,000 units within the city, broken down into targets by income group.

The 2022 Update is both a policy framework and an actionable plan. While this document does not immediately alter land use or housing programs, it facilitates action by identifying priorities for decision makers, guiding resource allocation for

housing programs and services, and defining how and where the city should create new homes for existing and future residents.

This update is the result of a multi-year, cooperative, public, and interagency planning process that began in 2019. As a result, its goals and actions cut across agencies and are consistent with broader goals identified in the San Francisco General Plan. The main portion of the Housing Element contains the Housing Goals, Objectives, and Policies outlining the values and priorities for the 2022 Update, following by the Housing Implementation Plan that details actions to achieve the goals set forth. These goals and actions are supported by public input and data analysis – the Public Input Summary, Housing Needs Assessment and Fair Housing Assessment, Sites Inventory and Rezoning Program, Analysis of Governmental and Non-Governmental Constraints on Housing, General Plan Consistency and 2014 Housing Element Evaluation.

San Francisco 2023-2031 RHNA by Income Group

	<i>Units</i>	<i>Annual Target</i>	<i>Percent of Total</i>
Extremely Low Income ¹	13,981	1,748	17%
Very Low Income	6,886	861	8%
Low Income	12,014	1,502	15%
Moderate Income	13,717	1,715	17%
Above Moderate Income	35,471	4,434	43%
Total RHNA	82,069	10,258	100%

Source: Bay Area Metro. SF Planning.

Racial and Social Equity Context

San Francisco's housing problem is a racial and social equity challenge and an economic problem. Racial disparities are evident in income, housing cost burden, overcrowding, homeownership rates, and homelessness, with American Indian, Black, and other communities of color consistently worse off compared to white households. These severely disparate outcomes are the result of discriminatory policies that the City implemented or supported as well as private regulations and practices over the past decades. The recent COVID pandemic further spotlighted the inequities: the American Indian, Black, Hispanic or Latino(a,e), and Asian population was heavily impacted by the virus with higher infection, hospitalization, and death rates than the citywide averages. Primarily within those communities, essential workers and their families were exposed to the virus at higher rates than office workers who could work from home.

San Francisco's housing challenge is also an economic problem that impacts many residents. The city and the region have enjoyed a rapid and robust economic growth of capital and jobs based on their innovation, professional services, and visitor sectors as well as their diverse culture and natural resources. This strong economy has triggered higher housing needs. Jobs have grown faster than new housing. Wages have become increasingly polarized, with high-wage workers driving housing cost and displacing low-income communities.

Similarly, the housing built statewide hasn't matched the growth in population and workers. This increasingly acute housing shortage has led the State to increase the number of housing units that cities need to consider in their housing plans. San Francisco is now expected to produce over 82,000 units during the period from 2023 to 2031, three times higher than past requirements. More than half of these units should be affordable to very low-, low- or moderate-income households.

Public Input Highlights

SF Planning has engaged in substantial discussions on housing concerns, goals, and actions with constituents that are representative of diverse income levels, age, special needs, housing situations, race and ethnicity, sexual orientation and gender identity, immigration status, household type, and neighborhoods. The engagement process for the 2022 Update incorporates three phases of outreach and engagement, each summarized in a Public Input Summary (Appendix E). After vetting key ideas with the community in Phase I, the project team reviewed draft housing policy and related actions with residents, community and government leaders, and housing experts and advocates in Phase II. During Phase III of outreach and engagement, the project team demonstrated how community input was reflected in revised policy and further refined critical ideas such as the reparative framework for housing. The final phase of engagement allowed for deeper collaboration with key stakeholders to refine the implementation programs and keep them informed about the adoption process. In sum, residents directed the city to:

- Repair past harms of discrimination
- Improve housing services
- Prioritize the most vulnerable
- Eliminate community displacement
- Build accountability to communities
- Support community wealth building.

Outreach occurred in the following timeframes:

May - Dec 2020

Phase I outreach – Vetting Key Ideas with the Community

Apr - Sep 2021

Phase II outreach – Refining Policies Together

Jan - Mar 2022

Phase III outreach – Refining Policies & Verifying Public Input Findings


May - Nov 2022

Phase IV outreach – Moving Towards Adoption

Methods of outreach have included:

- 23 focus groups with vulnerable populations co-hosted or co-facilitated by community-based organizations
- 65+ community hosted community conversations, listening sessions, and presentations
- 11 in-language events in Cantonese and Spanish
- 21 community partners
- 2 Housing Policy Group discussion series (12 meetings total), including representatives of 27 organizations
- 4 Planning Commission and 2 Historic Preservation Commission hearings
- 226 respondents through the Digital Participation Platform (DPP), along with informational tools such as policy navigation tools
- 11 Community ambassadors (HEARD)
- A survey administered online and in person, completed by 1,631 respondents

Outreach and Engagement Map and List



Housing Needs Assessment and Assessment of Fair Housing

The Housing Needs Assessment and Assessment of Fair Housing (Appendix A) provides data and analysis to inform policies and objectives for housing in San Francisco. It directly informs the Housing Element 2022 Update by presenting data on the city's residents and existing housing stock to help identify unmet housing need and the needs of vulnerable groups.

For the first time, the State of California requires municipalities to further fair housing when updating their housing elements. State law and guidance defines "affirmatively furthering fair housing" as:

- Taking meaningful actions that address significant disparities in housing needs and in access to opportunity
- Replacing segregated living patterns with truly integrated and balanced living patterns
- Transforming racially and ethnically concentrated areas of poverty into areas of opportunity
- Fostering and maintaining compliance with civil rights and fair housing laws

The Housing Needs Assessment and Assessment of Fair Housing report includes detailed analysis of disproportionate housing needs and unequal access to opportunities. Overall, U.S. Census data reports that while San Francisco's population increased by 10% from 1990-2018, the city lost 5.5% of its American Indian and Alaska Native population over 2014-2019 and 5.7% of its Black or African American population from 1990-2020 as a share of the city's overall population. All racial and ethnic groups of color also report lower median incomes than the white population in San Francisco, with the median Black household making \$34,237 a year and the median American Indian and Alaska Native household making \$55,898. This reflects a growing income inequality

across San Francisco households generally – between 1990 and 2018, the number of households making above 120% AMI and households making below 30% AMI grew while the number of households making 30%-120% AMI between the two ends of the spectrum fell.

The household types and composition that make up the city's population have also changed, with the number of couples growing 51% between 1990-2018 while the number of households with children grew only 1% in that same period. Mirroring overall income inequality trends, couples in San Francisco are more likely to report incomes above 120% AMI while households with children are more likely to report incomes below 120% AMI. San Francisco is also an aging city, reporting higher percentages of residents 45 years and over and lower percentages of residents 44 years and under from 2000 to 2018.

With respect to its housing stock, San Francisco's housing is generally older than housing in the rest of the Bay Area. San Francisco is a renter-majority city, with Pacific Islanders, Latino and Hispanic, Black and African American, and American Indian and Alaska Native populations reporting the highest rates of renting. The majority of renters live in rent-controlled housing concentrated in specific neighborhoods, such as the Mission, Chinatown, Nob Hill, Tenderloin, Marina, and Outer Richmond. Many renters and homeowners, however, report spending over 30% of their incomes on housing costs.

Inequities are also apparent spatially. Low-income households primarily concentrate around downtown and the southern portions of San Francisco. A portion of these low-income households also include people experiencing homelessness, who are also concentrated around downtown and the southeast neighborhoods of Potrero Hill, Bayview-Hunters Point, and the Excelsior. These settlement patterns are mirrored in two other indices - California's State Tax Credit

Allocation Committee (TCAC)'s areas of "high segregation and poverty" on their Opportunity Maps and the Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) Racially and Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty (R/ECAP). These two indices both identify specific census tracts, located around Chinatown, Tenderloin, Fillmore, Bayview, and the Excelsior, as areas of high poverty and segregation.

Conversely, affluence is also concentrated in specific neighborhoods. Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence, defined by a high proportion of white residents and high median incomes, are primarily concentrated in the northern and central neighborhoods of San Francisco, such as the Marina, Pacific Heights, Russian Hill, Noe Valley, and West Portal. Together, segregated concentrations of poverty and affluence created an unevenly resourced infrastructure and deepen housing challenges for vulnerable communities. As such, racially and socially equitable housing framework must take into consideration these existing inequities.

Sites Inventory and Rezoning Program

According to California Housing Element law, San Francisco must show that it has adequate land zoned to accommodate the entirety of its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) for 2023 through 2030 of 82,069 units. The Sites Inventory and Rezoning Program (Appendix B) presents the City's inventory of land suitable for residential development, the methodologies used to identify these sites, and additional methods for satisfying the RHNA allowed by state law including preservation of existing affordable housing and provides an analysis of how the inventory complies with Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) requirements.

This Sites Inventory estimates that San Francisco is short of sufficient sites to accommodate full

RHNA targets by about 23,000 units under existing land use ordinances. San Francisco is short capacity for about 35,600 units to meet the target of 115% of RHNA encouraged by state law to ensure adequate sites over the 2023-2030 RHNA period.

The Sites Inventory also shows that San Francisco's capacity to accommodate housing falls short of meeting AFFH targets. The number of affordable housing units that can be accommodated on sites in Well-resourced Neighborhoods is substantially less than the 2022 Update's minimum 25% target for building new permanently affordable housing in those areas (Policy 19). Moreover, the capacity is insufficient to meet the Update 2022's goal of substantially increasing mid-rise and multi-family housing types in Well-resourced Neighborhoods (Policy 20).

As a result of the lack of zoned capacity to accommodate the target 115% of RHNA and to meet AFFH, the city will need to rezone to accommodate additional housing. The rezoning will focus on adding low- and moderate-income housing opportunities in Well-resourced Neighborhoods through a variety of approaches including privately funded mixed income development, 100% affordable subsidized housing, small and mid-rise multifamily developments, ADUs, and others.

Analysis of Governmental and Non-Governmental Constraints on Housing

The Analysis of Governmental and Non-Governmental Constraints on Housing (Appendix C) provides an overview and analysis of the public and private factors that impact the production of housing in San Francisco. This analysis is especially important given that public and private actors combined were only able to produce 71% of the 29,011 housing units required for San Francisco's 2015-2023 RHNA.

The analysis of constraints reveals that while there are some cases where one point in the process of improving, maintaining, or constructing housing has a large impact, it is often an accumulation of these uncertainties that create the biggest challenge. The analysis helps the City understand where to reduce constraints so that, little by little, changes in process and requirements will have a cumulative impact and tip projects into feasibility.

Affordable housing projects, especially, face complex development and funding challenges even though there are unique ministerial pathways they may be eligible for. They must provide detailed reporting of their construction and maintenance costs and verify the incomes of their tenants to ensure public accountability. Use of public funds also triggers additional expectations including review, use of long-lasting materials, and size requirements. Affordable housing projects are particularly subject to delays, costly upgrades, and equipment requirements related to utilities. Many projects incur additional expenses for outreach and to respond to both supportive and oppositional audiences.

Small, multi-family housing construction projects also face unique challenges and constraints. Proportionate to their scale and the number of units they deliver, small multi-family projects confront longer entitlement process than large projects. The current landscape of high land value and construction costs couple to create barriers that discourage the average homeowner and developer to pursue this housing type. Small projects in Well-resourced Neighborhoods have historically faced strong neighborhood opposition and have limited paths to build consensus.

Across projects of all sizes and income levels, challenges in the entitlement process result in uncertainty and higher development costs. Uncertainty in the time or even the eventual success of project approval increases financial risks and return expectations for private

investment. The project approval process may be extended by regulatory discretion and community opposition. City-required application, impact, and inclusionary fees and on- and off-site improvements may also contribute to unanticipated development costs.

The lack of affordable housing and displacement in low-income and communities of color can motivate community opposition to many projects. This opposition can take the form of CEQA litigation on individual projects, a tactic used by both advocates demanding greater equity and affordability and groups opposed to a specific project for aesthetic or financial reasons alike. This diverts public and private resources away from structural changes towards equity.

In resolving California's mandates to both affirmatively further fair housing and build more housing units, reducing inequities also reduces constraints on housing production. Making a reliable, implementable system that supports tenants and existing rent-controlled units and identifies community agreements on expected benefits then clears a pathway for new or preserved housing would substantially reduce stress in communities and offer more sites for new housing.

2014 Housing Element Evaluation

As part of the Housing Element update process, California Government Code Sections 65588(a) and (b) require an evaluation of San Francisco's existing Housing Element that was adopted in 2014. The 2014 Housing Element Evaluation (Appendix F) includes an assessment of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the objectives, policies, implementation the programs listed in the 2014 Housing Element. By examining past policies and objectives, as well as evaluating the implementation of programs initiated during the reporting period, the Housing Element can

illustrate the success and redress challenges posed by policies and objectives that may no longer apply to the current context.

San Francisco has met only half of its lower income housing targets over the past eight years. In the last five years, San Francisco more than doubled the annual average of new housing units built compared to prior decades.

The City has also expanded local affordable housing investments. In 2019-2020, local affordable housing funding reached \$500 million, more than four times the \$110 million which had been the average over the previous 15 years. Most recently, voters passed a housing bond, a gross receipts tax, and a real estate transfer tax to fund affordable housing and supportive housing for unhoused residents. The City has also strengthened eviction and tenant protections and preserved the affordability of 563 units across 53 properties through its Small Sites acquisition and rehabilitation program since 2014.

The 2014 Housing Element emphasized on retaining existing units and preserving affordability of rental units. However, the underlying policy direction and implementation emphasized more

on preventing demolition of single-family homes. Policies also considered older ownership units as "naturally affordable," referring to older single-family homes.

The 2014 Housing Element did not emphasize anti-displacement strategies, such as tenant and eviction protections, strongly enough. Home sales prices also indicate that older single-family homes are one of the most expensive and unaffordable homeownership opportunities in the city. Demolition controls to a great extent focused on preventing demolition of single-family homes, regardless of whether or not they were tenant occupied. Restricting the demolition of single-family homes is prohibitive to building small multi-family buildings that could house more of San Francisco's workforce in the same area, especially moderate-income households.

The 2014 Housing Element did direct equitable distribution of growth within the City. Programs such as HOME SF and ADUs were great first steps in advancing this policy directions but more substantial shifts are necessary to ensure that all neighborhoods contribute to addressing our housing needs.

San Francisco Regional Housing Needs Allocation Progress Summary, 2015 – 2021

<i>Household Affordability</i>	<i>Housing Goals</i>	<i>Authorized Units</i>	<i>Deficit</i>	<i>% Progress</i>	<i>Completed Units</i>
Very Low-income (<50% AMI)	6,234	2,688	3,546	43%	2,657
Low-income (50%-80% AMI)	4,639	2,500	2,139	54%	2,317
Moderate Income (80%-120% AMI)	5,460	2,847	2,613	52%	1,817
Above Moderate (> 120% AMI)	12,536	18,826	0	150%	22,220
Total	28,869	26,861	8,298	71%	29,011

*Includes units legalized under Ord. 43-14, and all ADUs.

Source: SF Planning, Authorized Permits

Housing Goals, Objectives, and Policies

The Housing Goals, Objectives, and Policies draws from all analysis reports prepared for the 2022 Update to identify a set of values and priorities to guide housing development over the next eight years – and beyond. These goals were not created in isolation at SF Planning, but a product of collaboration and engagement with San Francisco’s other city agencies, elected officials, community organizations, housing developers, and general public. As stated at the outset of 2022 Update’s development, the goals primarily aim to integrate equitable growth, the redress of harm, and anti-displacement into housing development.

The 2022 Update sets out to:

1. Recognize the right to housing as a foundation for health, and social and economic well-being.

Access to safe and affordable housing is a social determinant of health. Several studies have found that housing instability contributes to children and youth being more vulnerable to mental health problems – including developmental delays, poor cognitive outcomes, and depression - and inferior educational opportunities. This trauma can compound to impact health, education, and employment outcomes that can affect people throughout their lives and their descendants’ lives.

For the first time, San Francisco is formally recognizing the right to housing. By doing this, the City is making a commitment to offer housing solutions that are healthy and dignified to vulnerable households: those who are unhoused, poorly housed, have been subject to discrimination, or are exposed to instability or inequities due to disabilities, disorders, criminal records, traumas, immigration status, tenure, income, sexual orientation, gender identity, or race.

2. Repair the harms of historic racial, ethnic, and social discrimination against American Indian, Black, and other people of color.

San Francisco has a role to play in redressing the compounding effects of racial discrimination against American Indian, Black, and other people of color perpetuated at all levels of government and throughout American society. To advance this transformative work, the City must deepen its understanding of the direct harm that discriminatory housing programs and policies caused to American Indian, Black, Japanese, Filipino, and other communities of color in San Francisco. It must also understand the multiple ways in which broader mechanisms of racial and social discrimination reduce a person’s access to housing, such as job discrimination or racial disparities within the criminal justice system. The City must actively dismantle these discriminatory policies by reallocating resources to increase housing access, financial stability, economic opportunities, and community building investments for these communities. Lastly, the City must remain accountable to these communities and transparent in the processes it undertakes to redress harm.

3. Foster racially and socially inclusive neighborhoods through equitable distribution of investment and growth.

Racial concentrations overlapped with concentration of low-income households are strongly visible in San Francisco (Mission, Fillmore and Bayview, Chinatown, SoMa) indicating segregated living patterns. At the same time, well-resourced neighborhoods with greater access to parks, quality schools, better environmental conditions, and with higher median incomes have experienced the lowest rates of new housing development over the last few decades.

The goal of greater integration, and racially and socially inclusive neighborhoods, relies on building intergenerational wealth within areas with high concentration of American Indian, Black, or other communities of color. This goal requires the City to ensure low-income communities and communities of color can also benefit from investment in housing, including the opportunity to build wealth. The goal also requires the City to open wealthy, white, and well-resourced neighborhoods to all communities of color and low-income households in order provide access to high-quality neighborhood resources that foster positive economic and health outcomes. To prevent further inequities as an unintended impact of investments, targeted anti-displacement investments are needed to stabilize existing racially and socially inclusive communities.

4. Provide sufficient housing for existing residents and future generations for a city with diverse cultures, family structures, and abilities.

San Francisco has been in a state of affordability crisis in the past couple of decades, a crisis felt by low-, moderate-, and, more recently, middle-income households. As the cost of living in San Francisco has ballooned over the years, the city has lost much of the diversity that once defined its identity. The City has been unable to provide the needed housing for the diversity of workers that our economy requires and most importantly the housing for our diverse cultures and communities that define the essential values of San Francisco.

Achieving the goal of providing sufficient housing will require providing an abundance of permanently affordable housing, which requires a substantial increase in public funding. It also means continuing production of market-rate housing for all segments of San

Francisco's workforce. The City's future diversity also relies on ensuring that new housing responds to the needs of a diversity of cultures, incomes, household types and family structures, age, and abilities.

5. Promote neighborhoods that are well-connected, healthy, and rich with community culture.

San Francisco's neighborhoods have unique qualities and histories that enrich their residents and communities, but they also are the result of incremental decision-making and discriminatory practices that have left disparities in public services, resources, and impacts from environmental damage. Government agencies have sometimes organized past public investment around the location of new housing or land-use changes rather than an accounting for equity, which may consider needs, and quality of public investments.

Having a safe, sustainable, nurturing home means more than inhabiting an indoor structure, it must be in and connected to a larger place that fulfills residents' social, cultural, and physical growth. To achieve healthy neighborhoods for housing residents, the City must focus on repairing past harms through environmental justice and equitable mobility strategies to address the disparate outcomes in wealth and health in Priority Equity Geographies while protecting these communities against displacement.

Housing Implementation Program

The 2022 Update is San Francisco's first housing element to include a detailed implementation plan with actions, coordinating agencies, and approximate timelines to achieve the goals set out in its Goals, Objectives, and Policies document.

The Housing Implementation Plan would ensure **housing stability** and eliminate community displacement through policies and actions such as:

- Increasing production of housing for extremely low- and very low-income households
- Elevating rental assistance to prevent evictions, and enhance eligibility to affordable housing
- Measuring benchmarks for involuntary displacement resulting from public and private investments and supporting investments that would offset displacement impacts
- Expanding support for CBOs delivering tenant and eviction protection services, as well as financial education and outreach for accessing affordable rental and homeownership opportunities
- Tailoring zoning changes to the needs of American Indian, Black and other communities of color
- Updating Planning requirements to improve project sponsor engagement with Cultural Districts

The Implementation Plan would work towards **eliminating homelessness** by:

- Increasing investments in permanent supportive housing setting specific targets
- Prioritizing investments for racial and social groups overrepresented amongst our homeless population and those with the highest risks,
- Supporting strategies to house those with lower risks to avoid worsening their situation while waiting for housing and services.

The Implementation Plan begins the process of **redressing harm** committed against American Indian, Black, Japanese, Filipino, and other communities, groups directly harmed by past discriminatory government actions including redlining, Redevelopment and Urban Renewal, the

Indian Relocation Act or WWII Japanese incarceration, through:

- Homeownership opportunities that would support intergenerational wealth building and improved access to affordable rental and ownership opportunities
- Investing in cultural anchors and expand access to land and spaces that hold cultural importance
- Improving access to well paid jobs and business development through job training and business ownership assistance

The plan would direct the city to more strongly move towards equitable distribution of growth, focusing on **small and mid-rise multi-family buildings**, through:

- Supporting small- and mid-rise buildings by increased development capacity (heights or density) within well-resourced neighborhoods along transit corridors, or within low-density neighborhoods
- Streamlining approval of small and mid-rise buildings where community benefits are in place such as serving moderate-income households, and community benefit uses on the ground floors.
- Providing technical assistance and financing programs especially for low-income homeowners through new programs
- Build between 25% and 50% of the City's new permanently affordable housing within Well-resourced Neighborhoods within the next two RHNA cycles

Why the Housing Element Matters

Over the past decade, San Francisco has been implementing new housing programs and adding new resources. The city has been increasing rent subsidies, retaining affordable units, building more housing. But the severity of the housing challenges is demanding additional efforts.

Dismantling the underlying inequities requires substantial changes in our policies, programs, and investments as stated in the Planning Equity Resolution and Office of Racial Equity goals. Thus, the Housing Element 2022 Update is proposed as San Francisco's first housing plan that centers in racial and social equity. We can overcome our history and build a more affordable, resilient, and just city, but we must make real changes. These changes will require hard work and investments. They will take time and impact many parts of the city. But they will work. We can leave our grandchildren a better city than the one we inherited.

Introduction

Purpose

The Housing Element serves as San Francisco's roadmap for meeting the housing needs of all its residents. It is one component of the city's broader general plan, which also includes other elements on transportation, community safety, and open space. California expects all cities and counties to maintain a current general plan and specifically requires an update their housing element every eight years.

The Housing Element Law mandates that local governments must adopt plans and regulatory systems that provide opportunities for, and do not unduly constrain, private market housing development. As a result, housing policy in California rests largely on the effective implementation of local general plans and, in particular, housing elements. Additionally, the California legislature passed Assembly Bill 686 Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) in April 2020, a new law which builds upon existing fair housing protections to require housing elements include policies to combat patterns of segregation to foster more inclusive communities. All housing elements must ultimately be adopted by each municipality's local government and approved by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).

To fulfill these mandates, the Housing Element 2022 Update (2022 Update) is San Francisco's first housing plan that is centered on racial and social equity. It includes policies and programs that express our city's collective vision and values for the future of housing in San Francisco. The 2022 Update articulates San Francisco's commitment to recognizing housing as a right, increasing housing affordability for low-income households and communities of color, opening small and mid-rise multifamily buildings across all neighborhoods, and connecting housing to neighborhood services like transportation, education, and economic opportunity.

Regional Housing Needs Allocation

California Housing Element Law requires that housing elements accommodate and prepare for the creation of enough housing to meet each region's specific housing target, called its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). This target was set by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), a regional planning agency, and approved by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for San Francisco. This assessment is based on San Francisco's unmet housing need at every income level and projected population growth. San Francisco's 2023-2031 RHNA mandates the creation of more than 82,000 units within the city, broken down into targets by income group.

San Francisco 2023-2031 RHNA by Income Group

	<i>Units</i>	<i>Annual Target</i>	<i>Percent of Total</i>
Extremely Low Income ¹	13,981	1,748	17%
Very Low Income	6,886	861	8%
Low Income	12,014	1,502	15%
Moderate Income	13,717	1,715	17%
Above Moderate Income	35,471	4,434	43%
Total RHNA	82,069	10,258	100%

Source: Bay Area Metro. SF Planning.

The 2022 Update is both a policy framework and an actionable plan. While this document does not immediately alter land use or housing programs, it facilitates action by identifying priorities for decision makers, guiding resource allocation for housing programs and services, and defining how and where the city should create new homes for existing and future residents.

The main portion of the Housing Element contains the Housing Goals, Objectives, and Policies outlining the values and priorities for the 2022 Update, following by the Housing Implementation Plan that details actions to achieve the goals set forth. These goals and actions are supported by public input and analysis attached in the appendices – the Public Input Summary, Housing Needs Assessment and Fair Housing Assessment, Sites Inventory and Rezoning Program, Analysis of Governmental and Non-Governmental Constraints on Housing, General Plan Consistency, and 2014 Housing Element Evaluation.

Approach

This update is the result of a multi-year, cooperative, public, and interagency planning process that began in 2019. As a result, its goals and actions cut across agencies and are consistent with broader goals identified in the San Francisco General Plan. The drafting of 2022 Update relied extensively on outreach and engagement to communities historically underrepresented including low-income communities of color and vulnerable groups. Three phases of outreach and engagement, over the course of two years, inform the 2022 Update. For the first time at this scale, the Department funded and supported focus groups led or co-hosted by community-based organizations representing American Indian, Black, Latino, Chinese, Japanese, Filipino, low- and moderate-income households, seniors, people with disabilities, LGBTQ+ and transgender, and homeless advocates. Outreach and engagement also included housing policy experts, advocates, affordable housing developers, labor organizations, architects, and developers.

Reader's Guide

The housing element is organized as follows:

- *Goal* and underlying *Objectives* listed with brief framework narratives
- *Policies* listed with corresponding *Objectives* and related programs
- *Implementing Programs* listed with related *Policies*, responsible agencies, and timeframe for action
- *Quantified Objectives Table* listed with expected number of housing units or people served for each *Implementing Program*
- *Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) Actions Table* listed with metrics for monitoring progress

Census data cited in the goal and objective narratives have been updated since its last release in January 2022. This new data reflects population definitions based on conversations with the American Indian community. Data from other sources, such as the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development and Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, however, were not able to be updated along this new definition.

Technical supporting analyses and public input summaries are organized in the appendices.

A glossary of terms is provided in Appendix G at the end of this document as a reference.

The following is a list of acronyms used to identify the agencies responsible for each Housing Element action:

APD	Adult Probation Department
ARTS	Arts Commission
BOS	Board of Supervisors

DAS	Department of Disability and Aging Services
DBI	Department of Building Inspection
DOE	Department of the Environment
DPH	Department of Public Health
DPW	Department of Public Works
DSW	Department on Status of Women
DCYF	Department of Children, Youth and Their Families
HSA	Human Services Agency
HRC	Human Rights Commission
HSB	Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing
LIB	San Francisco Public Library
Mayor	Mayor's Office
MOD	Mayor's Office on Disability
MOHCD	Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development
OCII	Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure
OEWD	Office of Economic and Workforce Development
ORE	Office of Racial Equity
ORCP	Office of Resilience and Capital Planning
OSB	Office of Small Business
Planning	San Francisco Planning Department
SF Port	Port of San Francisco
SFCTA	San Francisco County Transportation Authority
SFFD	Fire Department
SFHA	San Francisco Housing Authority
SFMTA	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
SFPUC	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
SFRPD	San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department

Goals, Objectives, and Policies

Overview

1. Recognize the right to housing as a foundation for health, and social and economic well-being.
 - a. Ensure housing stability and healthy homes. *(Policies 1, 2, 3, 9, 39)*
 - b. Advance equitable housing access. *(Policies 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 27)*
 - c. Eliminate homelessness. *(Policies 8, 9, 22)*
2. Repair the harms of historic racial, ethnic, and social discrimination against American Indian, Black, and other people of color.
 - a. Make amends through truth-telling of the historic harms. *(Policy 10)*
 - b. Offer reparations for communities directly harmed by past discriminatory government action¹ and bring back their displaced people. *(Policies 11, 12)*
 - c. Increase accountability to American Indian, Black, and other communities of color. *(Policies 2, 13, 14, 18, 21, 29)*
3. Foster racially and socially inclusive neighborhoods through equitable distribution of investment and growth.
 - a. Build intergenerational wealth for American Indian, Black, and other communities of color.² *(Policies 5, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 38)*
 - b. Create a sense of belonging for all communities of color within [Well-resourced neighborhoods](#)³ through expanded housing choice. *(Policies 19, 20, 31)*
 - c. Eliminate community displacement within [areas vulnerable to displacement](#).⁴ *(Policies 1, 3, 11, 18, 21, 29)*
4. Provide sufficient housing for existing residents and future generations for a city with diverse cultures, family structures, and abilities.
 - a. Substantially expand the amount of permanently affordable housing for extremely low- to moderate-income households. *(Policies 3, 8, 15, 19, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30)*
 - b. Expand small and mid-rise multi-family housing production to serve our workforce, prioritizing middle-income households. *(Policies 4, 20, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31)*
 - c. Diversify housing types for all cultures, family structures, and abilities. *(Policies 7, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36)*
5. Promote neighborhoods that are well-connected, healthy, and rich with community culture.
 - a. Connect people to jobs and their neighborhood with numerous, equitable, and healthy transportation and mobility options. *(Policies 17, 37, 38)*
 - b. Advance environmental justice, climate, and community resilience. *(Policies 38, 39, 40)*
 - c. Elevate expression of cultural identities through the design of active and engaging neighborhood buildings and spaces. *(Policies 12, 37, 41, 42)*

-
- 1 Discriminatory programs led or sanctioned by government action, include but are not limited to urban renewal, redlining, segregated public housing, racial covenants, and exclusionary zoning regulations, such as single-family zoning and communities directly harmed include American Indian, Black, Japanese, Filipino, and other communities.
 - 2 For the purpose of the Housing Element these communities are defined as [Priority Equity Geographies](#) that are identified and updated by [Department of Public Health's Community's Health Needs Assessment as Areas of Vulnerability](#).
 - 3 These areas are identified under [California Housing and Community Development Opportunity Area Maps](#), as high and highest resource.
 - 4 Areas identified in the [Urban Displacement Project's displacement and gentrification analysis](#) as vulnerable or undergoing displacement or gentrification. This analysis is undergoing an update and a new version will be released early 2022, which will inform changes to the definition used under this objective.

Goal 1.

Recognize the right to housing as a foundation for health, and social and economic well-being.

Challenge - Access to safe and affordable housing is a social determinant of health. Several studies have found that housing instability contributes to children and youth being more vulnerable to mental health problems – including developmental delays, poor cognitive outcomes,⁵ and depression⁶ - and inferior educational opportunities.⁷ This trauma can compound to impact health, education, and employment outcomes that can affect people throughout their lives and their descendants' lives. The racial and social disparities associated with housing instability are well documented and include rent burden (paying more than 30% of their income on rent), homelessness, overcrowded living (more than one person per room, including the living room), and health conditions (see Figure 1).

The COVID-19 pandemic further exposed longstanding racial disparities. Communities of color have endured higher infection and death rates partially due to poor living conditions (such as overcrowding) and poor health conditions.

Path Forward - The United Nations (UN) defines the right to adequate housing as “the right to live somewhere in security, peace and dignity.” The UN sees the right to adequate housing as enacting policies, strategies, and programs that “are needed to prevent homelessness, prohibit forced evictions, address discrimination, focus on the most vulnerable and marginalized groups, ensure security of tenure to all, and guarantee that everyone’s housing is adequate.”⁸ For the first time, San Francisco is formally recognizing the right to housing. By doing this, the City is making a commitment to offer housing solutions that are healthy and dignified to vulnerable households: those who are unhoused, poorly housed, have been subject to discrimination, or are exposed to instability or inequities due to disabilities, disorders, criminal records, traumas, immigration status, tenure, income, sexual orientation, gender identity, or race.

In response to the current COVID-19 health crisis, the City prioritized housing and shelter for our unhoused populations embracing the connection between housing and health. A commitment to the right to housing will direct the City to scale up its resources in the long-term to offer these equitable outcomes through series of investments and prioritizations. Achieving this goal will mean eliminating

5 Coley, R. L., Leventhal, T., Lynch, A. D., & Kull, M. (2013). Relations between housing characteristics and the well-being of low-income children and adolescents. *Developmental psychology*, 49(9), 1775.


6 Hatem, C., Lee, C. Y., Zhao, X., Reesor-Oyer, L., Lopez, T., & Hernandez, D. C. (2020). Food insecurity and housing instability during early childhood as predictors of adolescent mental health. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 34(6), 721.

7 Ziol-Guest, K. M., & McKenna, C. C. (2014). Early childhood housing instability and school readiness. *Child development*, 85(1), 103-113.

8 Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, The right to adequate housing - Fact Sheet No. 21/Rev. 1 (2009). Geneva; United Nations. https://www.ohchr.org/documents/publications/fs21_rev_1_housing_en.pdf

homelessness, ensuring housing stability and reversing inequities in housing access for those who are vulnerable.

Figure 1. Overcrowding, Housing Rent Burden, and Homelessness by Race (San Francisco)




Source: ACS 2019 1-year Estimates; 2019 San Francisco Point-In-Time Homeless Count and Survey Report, Department of Homeless and Supportive Housing.

OBJECTIVE 1.A
ENSURE HOUSING STABILITY AND HEALTHY HOMES

Challenge - Around two thirds of San Francisco's households are renters. The majority of San Francisco's rental housing stock is subject to the [Rent Control Ordinance](#), which limits annual rent increases and includes eviction protections. Rent control, however, has been critical but insufficient to fully protect low-and moderate-income residents, as well as American Indian, Black, and other people of color from being at risk of eviction or displacement (see Figure 2). Evictions and displacement increased during recent economic booms during which time rental prices in San Francisco rose to among the highest in the country. The increase in rental prices far outpaced wage growth for low- and moderate-income renters. Now over 80% of very low-income renter households in San Francisco are rent burdened (paying more than 30% of their income on rent). More low- and moderate-income renters are severely cost burdened (paying more than 50% of their income on rent) today compared to 1990 (see Figure 3). Over the past two decades, the city has more households in the low-income category than any other income group (see Figure 4). A survey of around 3,200 renters indicated that about one third would have no housing choice if displaced from their current residence, and another third would have to leave San Francisco to find housing (see Figure 5).

Path Forward - Recognizing a right to housing must start ensuring housing stability for tenants, especially those with limited housing choices and who experience racial and social disparities. San Francisco will expand investment in rental assistance programs as a strong form of protection against housing instability, especially for low-income tenants. These programs have proven critical in preventing evictions during the recent pandemic and have received increased funding at the federal level. San Francisco continues to maintain some of the strongest eviction protections in the region and the country. For effective implementation of these protections, San Francisco passed an ordinance to create a new [rental housing inventory](#). Implementing this inventory will allow proactive enforcement and monitoring of our already strong protection measures, such as regulations controlling [Owner Move-Ins](#) or [Ellis Act Evictions](#). Full implementation will also inform a series of new improvements to these protections. The City will also focus on minimizing the abuse of temporary and nuisance related evictions. Ensuring housing stability also relies on preserving affordability of existing units with deed restrictions. The City's acquisition and rehabilitation programs have been in effect in the past decade and will need to be revamped to ensure the investments are effective and reach those who have been underserved. A renewed interest and focus on co-operative housing will offer expanded opportunities, whether through protections of existing cooperative housing or creating new shared equity and cooperative ownership models.


Figure 2. Percentage of the 2018 San Francisco Housing Survey respondents who reported being threatened with an eviction in the previous 5 years by race.



Source: San Francisco Housing Needs and Trends Report; San Francisco Planning Department 2018 Housing Survey.

Figure 3. Percentage of San Francisco households that were rent burdened* by income group (1990 vs 2015).


*Rent burden means paying between 30% and 50% of the household's income in rent; severe cost burden means paying more than 50% of the household's income in rent.



Source: San Francisco Housing Needs and Trends Report; 1990 Decennial Census (IPUMS-USA); ACS 2015 5-year Estimates IPUMS-USA).

Figure 4. Change in the number of households by household income group from 1990 to 2015.


Area median income (AMI) is a normalized measure of income in a geography. 100% AMI is the median income for SF.



Source: San Francisco Housing Needs and Trends Report; 1990 Decennial Census (IPUMS-USA); ACS 2015 5-year Estimates IPUMS-USA).

Figure 5. Housing choices for 2018 San Francisco Housing Survey respondents if forced out of their current residence by income group.

Area median income (AMI) is a normalized measure of income in a geography. 100% AMI is the median income for SF.



Source: San Francisco Housing Needs and Trends Report; San Francisco Planning Department 2018 Housing Survey.

OBJECTIVE 1.B

ADVANCE EQUITABLE HOUSING ACCESS

Challenge - Federal fair housing laws prohibit discrimination based on race, ability, sexual orientation, gender identity, and household type. Despite these laws, racial and social disparities in housing access are stark. A major hurdle to housing equity is housing cost. More than half of Black households are rent burdened (paying more than 30% of their income on rent), and households of color overall are more likely to be rent burdened compared to white households (see Figure 6). The American Indian population is 17 times more likely to be homeless compared to their share of population, and Black households are seven times more likely (see Figure 7). The transgender and gender non-conforming (TGNC) community in San Francisco faces specific, heightened, and disproportionate challenges in accessing fair housing opportunities. Half of respondents to the US Transgender Survey report having experienced homelessness in their lifetime, and approximately fifty percent (50%) of transitional aged youth experiencing homelessness in the 2019 point in time count identified as LGBTQ+. Seventy percent

(70%) of transgender people living in shelters nationally have reported being harassed,⁹ contributing to the 24% of homeless transgender people in California that have reported avoiding in staying in a shelter for fear of mistreatment.¹⁰ Seniors and transitional aged youth (between the ages of 18 to 24) collectively made up more than half of the homeless population in 2019 (see Figure 8). Seventy-four percent (74%) of respondents of the 2019 Point-In-Time Homeless Count and Survey¹¹ reported living with chronic physical illnesses, physical disabilities, chronic substance use, and severe mental health conditions (see Figure 9). Amongst tenants, renters of color continue to be disproportionately affected by evictions in San Francisco. In a survey of around 3,200 renters, 24% of Latino/e/x renters and 21% of Black renters reported being threatened with eviction as opposed to only 9% of white renters (see Figure 2). While Black, American Indian, and other people of color would most benefit from greater affordable housing access, federal regulations, and California Proposition 209, which bans institutions from affirmative action based on race, sex, or ethnicity, pose a challenge to the City to implement preference programs for the communities of color most affected by homelessness, eviction and displacement, such as the American Indian, Black, and Latino(a,e) communities.


Path Forward - San Francisco has adopted various strategies including [programs](#) designed to ensure access for historically disadvantaged or currently vulnerable households in awarding below market rate units. These programs include the Displaced Tenant Housing Preference Program, Neighborhood Preference Program, and the Certificate of Preference Program. To effectively advance equity, the City will revise existing and implement other programs to improve access to permanently affordable housing for underserved racial and social groups. The City will identify clearer strategies to remove barriers to housing access for transgender, LGBTQ+, seniors, people with disabilities, formerly incarcerated individuals, and other specific vulnerable populations, to inform and strengthen current and new programs.

9 National Center for Transgender Equality (2016). 2015 US Transgender Survey: Executive Summary. Washington, DC. Accessible at: <http://www.transequality.org/sites/default/files/docs/USTS-Executive-Summary-FINAL.PDF>

10 National Center for Transgender Equality (2017). 2015 US Transgender Survey: California State Report. Washington, DC. Accessible at: <http://www.transequality.org/sites/default/files/docs/usts/USTSCAStateReport%281017%29.pdf>

11 Due to COVID-19, San Francisco did not conduct a PIT Count in 2021. The most recently available data at the time of this report is from 2019. New data from the 2022 PIT Count will be available in the summer of 2022. The final version of this report will be updated to contain the 2021 counts.


Figure 6. Percentage of households that are rent burdened* by race and ethnicity (2018).



*Rent burden means paying between 30% and 50% of the household's income in rent; severe cost burden means paying more than 50% of the household's income in rent.

Source: ACS 2018 5 Year Estimates (IPUMS-USA).

Figure 7. Percentage of people experiencing homelessness by race and ethnicity (2019).




Homeless Survey Population n = 1,025

Note: Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding.

Source: San Francisco 2019 Point-In-Time Homeless Count and Survey Report, Department of Homeless and Supportive Housing.


Note: Hispanic/Latino/e/x was represented in a separate chart: 18% of respondents identified as Hispanic/Latino/e/x for 2019 Homeless Survey Population, 15% identified as Hispanic/Latino/e/x for the 2019 San Francisco General Population Estimates.

Figure 8. Percentage of people experiencing homelessness by age group (2019).



Source: San Francisco 2019 Point-In-Time Homeless Count and Survey Report, Department of Homeless and Supportive Housing.

Figure 9. Percentage of people experiencing homelessness with different health conditions (2019).



Source: San Francisco 2019 Point-In-Time Homeless Count and Survey Report, Department of Homeless and Supportive Housing.

OBJECTIVE 1.C


ELIMINATE HOMELESSNESS

Challenge - From 2005 to 2019,¹² the biennial Point-in-Time (PIT) Count of people experiencing homelessness increased from just over 5,400 individuals to approximately 8,000 individuals. Compared to 2015, homelessness increased by 17% (see Figure 10). Of these, 64% were unsheltered and 38% were experiencing chronic homelessness. Since 2015, the City has expanded considerably the number of Permanent Supportive Housing units, subsidies for operation, and temporary shelters. This will include approximately 4,000 units of additional Permanent Supportive Housing by end of 2022. The City has also reduced the number of unsheltered families. In 2016, the City and County of San Francisco created a new department, the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH), to make a significant and sustained reduction in homelessness in San Francisco through the coordinated provision of services. While improvements have been made at multiple levels, the number of unhoused residents has continuously grown over the years. Moreover, homelessness disproportionately impacts specific populations, such as Black and American Indian residents, transgender and LGBTQ+ people, people with disabilities, domestic violence survivors, and veterans. These inequities require targeted and tailored solutions to effectively meet their housing needs.

Path Forward - Recognizing the right to housing means providing basic access to healthy and dignified living for everyone. Eliminating homelessness is a foundation for this goal, which relies on a comprehensive set of strategies. The City will scale up investments in Permanent Supportive Housing and services, in addition to supporting and promoting other solutions such as housing vouchers, short and long-term rental assistance. For example, in July 2020, the city launched the Flexible Housing Subsidy Pool, a scattered-site Permanent Supportive Housing strategy that matches people experiencing homelessness to private market apartments across the city and provides supportive services so that they remain stably housed. The City will also increase the supply of deeply affordable housing as a homelessness prevention strategy for extremely low- and very low-income households as those households bear a higher risk of homelessness. The City prioritizes addressing chronic homelessness. San Francisco's current goal is to end family homelessness and reduce chronic homelessness by 50% by December 2022. Eliminating homelessness goes beyond focusing on what is urgent. In the long-term, meeting this objective means securing investments and solutions to also prevent households with less severe vulnerabilities from falling into homelessness.

¹² Due to COVID-19, San Francisco did not conduct a PIT Count in 2021. The most recently available data at the time of this report is from 2019. New data from the 2022 PIT Count will be available in the summer of 2022. The final version of this report will be updated to contain the 2021 counts.

Figure 10. Number of counted people experiencing homelessness in San Francisco by shelter status from 2005 to 2019.



Source: San Francisco 2019 Point-In-Time Homeless Count and Survey Report, Department of Homeless and Supportive Housing.

Goal 2.

Repair the harms of racial and ethnic discrimination against American Indian, Black, and other people of color.

Challenge - Our nation, from its inception, has initiated and perpetuated harm against people of color, including the genocide, exploitation, and dispossession of American Indian people, the enslavement of Black people, and the systematic denial of suffrage and civil rights to American Indian, Black, and other people of color. San Francisco has participated in this national legacy by creating or enforcing laws, policies, actions, and institutions that have perpetuated racial discrimination and led to disparate outcomes for American Indian, Black, and other people of color (see Figure 11). In San Francisco land use, racial discrimination is evident in the City's 1870 Cubic Air Ordinance and 1880 Laundry Ordinance which targeted San Francisco's Chinese population by limiting where they could live or work. In the 20th Century, housing discrimination in San Francisco occurred through direct government action such as [urban renewal](#) or redevelopment and through a failure of the City to act to provide equal protection to all San Francisco's residents in the face of private instruments of racial discrimination including bank [redlining](#) (see Figure 12), [racial covenants](#), and predatory subprime loans. Furthermore, the City has at times directly removed targeted communities from their homes through local use of eminent domain or stood quietly by while federal actions like WWII Japanese American incarceration unjustly targeted San Francisco citizens based on their race. Lastly, the majority of American Indian people who live in San Francisco today are here due to the Indian Relocation Act of the 1950s.¹³ This policy removed American Indian peoples from their reservations and relocated them to cities nationwide. The policy enticed American Indian youth to come to seven large urban areas, including the San Francisco Bay, with promises of job training, housing, and stipends. The promises often fell short; checks did not arrive, job training was for menial labor, and people were housed in inferior housing, separated from their families and extended tribal communities. The cumulative effects of these discriminatory acts have contributed to the economic oppression that pushed and continues to push American Indian, Black, and other people of color out of San Francisco. As a result, American Indian, Black, and other people of color continue to face significant income inequality, poor health outcomes, exposure to environmental pollutants, low homeownership rates, high eviction rates, and poor access to healthy food, quality and well-resourced schools, and infrastructure.


Path Forward - San Francisco has a role to play in redressing the compounding effects of racial discrimination against American Indian, Black, and other people of color perpetuated at all levels of government and throughout American society. While federal action is required to redress the harms of American Indian genocide or the enslavement of Black people, San Francisco can incrementally work towards healing these deep wounds and the disparities that have resulted from centuries of oppression. The San Francisco Planning Commission passed a [resolution](#) on June 11, 2020, that acknowledges and

13 SF Human Rights Commission. Discrimination by Omission: Issues of Concern for Native Americans in San Francisco. August 23, 2007. Accessed online March 16, 2022 at: https://sf-hrc.org/sites/default/files/Documents/HRC_Publications/Articles/Discrimination_by_Omission_Issues_of_Concern_for_Native_Americans_in_San_Francisco.pdf

apologizes for the history of racist, discriminatory, and inequitable planning policies and practices that have resulted in racial disparities. The resolution provides direction for the Planning Department to develop proactive strategies to address and redress structural and institutional racism. The resolution explicitly directs the Planning Department to redress the consequences of government-sanctioned racial harm via meaningful City-supported, community-led processes.


To advance this transformative work, the City must deepen its understanding of the direct harm that discriminatory housing programs and policies caused to American Indian, Black, Japanese, Filipino, and other communities of color in San Francisco. It must also understand the multiple ways in which broader mechanisms of racial and social discrimination reduce a person’s access to housing, such as job discrimination or racial disparities within the criminal justice system. The City must actively dismantle these discriminatory policies by reallocating resources to increase housing access, financial stability, economic opportunities, and community building investments for these communities. Lastly, the City must remain accountable to these communities and transparent in the processes it undertakes to redress harm.

Figure 11. Percentage change of population by race and ethnicity from 1990 to 2015.



Source: 1990 Decennial Census (IPUMS-USA); ACS 2015 5-year Estimates (IPUMS-USA).

Figure 12. Redlining map shows in red neighborhoods that were discriminated for home and improvement loans.



Source: The University Of Richmond's Mapping Inequality Project.

OBJECTIVE 2.A

MAKE AMENDS AND INFORM REPARATIVE ACTIONS BY TELLING THE TRUTH ABOUT DISCRIMINATORY ACTIONS AND THE RESULTING HARM

Challenge - Throughout history, communities of color have been the targets of federal, state and locally sponsored and supported programs which have segregated neighborhoods, displaced, and stripped wealth from communities, and undermined their general health and well-being. The impact of these discriminatory actions on American Indian, Black, and other communities of color has yet to be fully documented or understood. While historians have described national events such as the Japanese Internment Bill of 1942 or the Indian Relocation Act of 1956, or government endorsed practices such as [redlining](#) (see Figure 12), [racially restrictive covenants](#), and [urban renewal](#), the City needs to study and understand how these actions specifically impacted the residents of San Francisco in order to take reparative action. The City cannot make amends or take steps to repair past harm without identifying the persons who suffered these acts of discrimination and, by speaking with them, documenting the nature and magnitude of the harm. In many cases, this will mean tracking how harm to an individual

repercussed through generations and communities. This level of investigation and documentation, centering the voices of the American Indian, Black, and other communities of color, has been limited in San Francisco to date. For example, the Planning Department has constructed historical narratives to explain segregation in public housing or development patterns resulting from [redlining](#) and [urban renewal](#) to inform the department's regulatory review; however, the department is only just beginning to apply this information in a reparative framework to ask, "What actions must we take as a department and a city to redress the harm that resulted from these events?" This is a challenging and urgent task because truth-telling will necessarily rely on oral histories to reveal the largely undocumented stories of impacted communities, and first-hand accounts of these events will become rarer as members of those communities pass on. Moreover, the opportunity to repair harm for those individuals will be lost.

Path Forward - To begin to repair and redress the harm, it is crucial that the City undergoes a truth-telling process to acknowledge the impacts government-sanctioned actions that led to wealth loss, disparate housing outcomes and displacement in the American Indian, Black, Japanese, Filipino and other communities of color. This process of investigation, documentation, and acknowledgment is essential for establishing accountability, raising consciousness, and informing the mechanisms and magnitude of resources required to repair the harm. The City must support the affected communities to lead this investigation and documentation, and acknowledgement of harms and their disparate outcomes must be communicated at all levels of power. This truth-telling can illuminate how City agencies build programs that are harm reductive, culturally competent, accessible, and that do not reproduce racist practices from the past. Lastly, truth-telling can begin to correct the erasure from the historic record, both in its written form and in the city's built-form, that these communities have suffered.

OBJECTIVE 2.B

OFFER REPARATIONS FOR COMMUNITIES DIRECTLY HARMED BY DISCRIMINATORY ACTION AND BRING BACK THEIR DISPLACED PEOPLE

Challenge - Racial discrimination has led to disparate outcomes in income for American Indian, Black, and other communities of color, leaving them vulnerable to housing insecurity and limiting their ability to build intergenerational wealth. The median income for Black households was \$30,442 in 2018, 23% of median income for a white household, and for American Indian households' median income was \$61,250 (see Figure 13), 46% of a white household's median income. As a result, these communities are far more impacted by displacement as discussed also in objective 2.b. San Francisco has a moral obligation to repair the harms of racial discrimination, especially those harms for which it holds the greatest responsibility. Calls for reparations from the federal government have occurred since the Civil War, but it was only in 2021 that House Resolution 40, first introduced in 1989 to create a commission to study slavery and discrimination and potential reparations, moved out of committee. In California, Assembly Bill 3121 was enacted on September 30, 2020 to establish the Task Force to Study and Develop Reparation Proposals for Black Americans. And in May 2021, San Francisco's Board of Supervisors appointed the city's African American Reparations Advisory Committee, described as the first body of its kind to create a comprehensive reparations plan for Black Americans.

Path Forward - The City can build on current and past local and state initiatives to pursue reparations for American Indian, Black, as well as Japanese American and Filipinos harmed by government actions to

create local programs that use housing as tool of repair that addresses persistent housing disparities for these groups and continued community displacement. Reparative acts through housing tools targeted to harmed communities could include dedicating land or housing, offering homeownership loans and grants, ensuring access to below market rate units, facilitating communal forms of land or housing ownership, creating pathways for displaced people and their descendants to return, and strengthening and sustaining their cultural anchors, such as businesses, community and cultural centers, and historic sites.

The city should use the [Cultural District program](#) to help anchor and stabilize American Indian, Black and other communities of color by leveraging the community-government partnerships the program has created to lead community planning and guide resource allocation. The program's mandate requires that the City coordinate resources to assist in stabilizing the districts, which house and provide for vulnerable communities facing, or at risk of, displacement or gentrification. Their community-led processes such as their Cultural History, Housing, and Economic Sustainability Strategies (CHHESS) and direct services, provide a culturally competent framework for stabilizing harmed communities and devising ways to bring back their displaced members.

To incrementally repair the harm inflicted on American Indian and Black people throughout our nation's history and to reverse the displacement and overrepresentation in homelessness of American Indian and Black residents, the City should support these groups for homeownership opportunities, rental housing assistance and other housing services programs. Similarly, to address direct displacement caused by government actions, the City will explore implementing the newly passed State Assembly Bill 1584 that expands the [Certificate of Preference program](#) to serve the descendants of households displaced.

The goal of such actions is to erase racial and ethnic disparities across indicators such as homelessness, homeownership, and rent burden, to improve life outcomes for residents in vulnerable communities, and to grow the city's communities of color whose populations have been diminished by displacement. Housing reparative acts should work in concert with more comprehensive local, state, and federal efforts to redress the nation's history of harm against American Indian, Black, and other communities of color.

OBJECTIVE 2.C

INCREASE ACCOUNTABILITY TO AMERICAN INDIAN, BLACK, AND OTHER COMMUNITIES OF COLOR

Challenge - Limited commitment at the local, state, and federal levels to adequately fund housing programs to meet the City's existing housing need has contributed to profound public frustration and distrust in the agencies that are meant to serve them. In focus groups for the Housing Element with communities of color and vulnerable groups in 2021, participants reported the sense of powerlessness that they have experienced when attempting to access city programs and resources. Participants shared housing-related experiences that have left them feeling unheard, overwhelmed, exhausted, and powerless to improve housing challenges that seem insurmountable. Participants expressed that existing housing programs and systems sometimes contribute to this sense of powerlessness by de-humanizing

already vulnerable community members, and by operating without enough transparency, or accountability to the communities served.

More needs to be done to improve information sharing with the public about why their needs are not being met, how decisions are being made, and why resources have been inadequate. Unmet housing needs for low-income people are the norm around the state and nation as represented by only one Section 8 voucher available for every four qualified households, and very-low-income renters everywhere face cost burdens and a scarcity of affordable housing. Locally, hundreds of households apply for each new affordable housing unit (see Figure 14). American Indian, Black, and other people of color are disproportionately impacted by the failure to adequately fund our housing systems. These are the same communities that are most marginalized from the electoral process and therefore, have fewer means to impact political and government decisions regarding housing policy and resource allocation and to hold those in power accountable to their needs. Likewise, communities of color have not been sufficiently elevated in the City's outreach and engagement efforts or adequately represented in decision-making bodies, further marginalizing their voices.

Path Forward - The City must create systems of accountability that empower American Indian, Black, and other communities of color with the knowledge and means to effect positive change for their communities. Elevating the voices of communities of color and other marginalized groups will require that the City proactively support community-based organizations in leading community engagement, and planning. Working with community organizations that serve American Indian, Black, and other people of color will help expand access to housing programs and ensure that new policies and larger programmatic changes effectively meet the housing needs of these communities. Outreach and engagement processes should be community-led, culturally appropriate, long-term, and with clear expectations about the outcome of the engagement. Whenever possible, the time and knowledge shared by community advisors should be compensated. Elevating the voices of communities of color also means increasing representation of American Indian, Black, and other people of color in advisory and decision-making bodies.

Improving accountability to advance racial and social equity in housing outcomes will require identifying priorities in this housing plan. While the City needs to significantly expand its resources, priority actions will guide City agencies to prioritize their existing limited resources into actions that carry the highest impact in serving the needs of communities of color, and improving housing affordability for all. Working with bodies and organizations that represent American Indian, Black, and other Communities of color, such as the Community Equity Advisory Council, the African American Reparations Committee, or Cultural Districts, the City will update those priorities frequently, and report on their performance. This process will equip communities of color with more knowledge of the functions and performance of housing programs and policies and the means to hold agencies accountable and support efforts to hold greater power in the decisions that affect their communities. The dissemination of information to and capacity building with American Indian, Black, and other communities of color should expand access to housing programs and result in more effective policies and strategies for meeting the housing needs of their communities.

Additionally, transparent processes and interagency coordination will support the City to continuously identify the funding gaps to implement those priorities and inform the City's budgeting process. A new racial and social equity analysis framework will help evaluate the impact of the Housing Element's

policies and programs to ensure timely adjustments to increase accountability and effectiveness in advancing racial and social equity. This new framework will include metrics to evaluate progress, and investment solutions to prevent and reverse adverse impacts and to advance equity. Overall, these new tools should make possible a healthier democratic system in which the needs of all residents are more equitably addressed.

Figure 13. Median household income by race and ethnicity (2018).

SAN FRANCISCO	\$104,552
American Indian / Alaskan Native	\$61,250
Black or African American	\$30,442
Hispanic or Latino/e/x (Any Race)	\$72,578
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	\$76,333
Some Other Race	\$ 59,497
Two or More Races	\$114,399
White (Non-Hispanic)	\$132,154

Source: ACS 2018 5-year Estimates (IPUMS-USA).

Figure 14. Below Market Rate Rental Applicants vs Occupants by Race and Ethnicity.

589 units (new and rental)	<i>Applicants</i>	<i>Occupants</i>
American Indian / Alaskan Native	1,818	4
Asian	36,301	214
Black or African American	19,045	71
Hispanic or Latino	28,005	140
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	1,710	6
White	18,392	90
Other or Multi-Racial	6,597	24
Unknown	8,169	51
TOTAL	120,037	602

Source: 2019-2020 MOCHD Progress Report

Goal 3.

Foster racially and socially inclusive neighborhoods through equitable distribution of investment and growth.

Challenge - Racial and economic segregation is defined by the UC Berkeley Othering and Belonging Institute (OBI) as “an attempt to deny and prevent association with another group, and a strategy that institutionalizes othering of racial or social groups through inequitable resource distributions.”¹⁴

Racial concentrations overlapped with concentration of low-income households are strongly visible in San Francisco (Mission, Fillmore and Bayview, Chinatown, SoMa) indicating segregated living patterns (Figure 15). Many of these neighborhoods have hosted most of the new growth, with 85% of new housing built since 2005 concentrated in the eastern and central parts of the city: Downtown/South Beach, SoMa, Mission Bay, Potrero Hill/ Dogpatch, Bayview Hunters Point, the Mission, Tenderloin, and Hayes Valley (see Figure 16). While these investments in housing development brought new infrastructure, jobs, and residents to the east side, many lower income communities of color were locked out of access to these benefits and are still contending with the lingering effects of discrimination that make them more vulnerable to homelessness, evictions, and displacement. At the same time, well-resourced neighborhoods with greater access to parks, quality schools, better environmental conditions, and with higher median incomes have experienced the lowest rates of new housing development over the last few decades. Multi-family homes in these neighborhoods are either not currently allowed or zoning restrictions render them too expensive to deliver. These restrictions have the effect of excluding low- and moderate-income households from being able to live in these neighborhoods and in that way serve to maintain racial and economic segregation in San Francisco (see Figure 17).

Path Forward - A new state law, [Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing \(AFFH\)](#), requires that all public agencies administer programs and activities related to housing and community development in a manner that promotes fair housing. Affirmatively furthering fair housing means “taking meaningful actions, in addition to combating discrimination, that overcome patterns of segregation and foster inclusive communities free from barriers that restrict access to opportunity.”¹⁵ The California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) prescribes that in order to prevent further segregation and concentration of poverty, and to increase access to opportunity and redress past actions that led to current inequities, city agencies and decision-makers “must create land-use and funding policies to increase affordable housing in high resource neighborhoods that have often been exclusionary (explicitly or indirectly due to costs or zoning policies) and bring additional resources to traditionally under-resourced neighborhoods.”¹⁶


14 <https://www.otheringandbelonging.org/the-problem-of-othering/>

15 AB 686 https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB686

16 https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/affh/docs/affh_document_final_4-27-2021.pdf#page=16

The goal of greater integration, and racially and socially inclusive neighborhoods, relies on building intergenerational wealth within areas¹⁷ with high concentration of American Indian, Black, or other communities of color. This goal requires the City to ensure low-income communities and communities of color can also benefit from investment in housing, including the opportunity to build wealth. The goal also requires the City to open wealthy, white, and well-resourced neighborhoods to all communities of color and low-income households in order provide access to high-quality neighborhood resources that foster positive economic and health outcomes. To prevent further inequities as an unintended impact of investments, targeted anti-displacement investments are needed to stabilize existing racially and socially inclusive communities.


Figure 15. Map of predominant racial and ethnic concentrations and Racially and Ethnically Concentrated Areas of Poverty (R/ECAP) (2017).



Source: Esri, Predominant Race/Ethnicity by Block Group, 2013-2017 (2013-2017 American Community Survey 5 Year)


17 Ibram Kendi, "How to Be an Antiracist" (One World, August 13, 2019).

Figure 16. Map of housing production by neighborhood from 2005 to 2019.



Source: San Francisco Housing Affordability Strategies (2020).

Figure 17. Map of permanent affordable housing by units per building (2018).



Source: San Francisco Housing Affordability Strategies (2020) with data from the San Francisco's Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (2018).

OBJECTIVE 3.A


BUILD INTERGENERATIONAL WEALTH FOR AMERICAN INDIAN, BLACK, AND OTHER COMMUNITIES OF COLOR.

Challenge - Government actions in the form of [redvelopment and urban renewal](#) have dispossessed specific communities in San Francisco, such as American Indian, Black, Japanese, Filipino, and other communities, of homes and entire neighborhoods. The median household wealth (the difference between total assets and total debts) for white households is more than five times greater than Latino/e/x households and more than seven times greater than Black households (see Figure 18). Income data from San Francisco echoes these national trends (see Figure 13). The median income for Black households is less than one fourth of non-Hispanic white households. Similarly, the median household income for American Indians (\$61,250), Latinos/es/x (\$72,578), and Asians (\$88,016) was also lower than non-Hispanic white households.

These wealth gaps have left households of color more likely to experience housing instability and cycles of intergenerational poverty, and often unable to build wealth to pass down to their children over decades. Wealth allows people and families to secure safe and healthy housing, open businesses, sustain themselves in retirement, and facilitate education and access to homeownership for their children. Homeownership is one of the primary sources of building wealth for most U.S. families. But decades of lost opportunity due to housing discrimination and neighborhood disinvestment, along with educational and workplace discrimination, have locked many people of color out of homeownership and contributed to the racial wealth gaps we see today. While some neighborhoods with the high concentration of low-income American Indian, Black, and other communities of color in San Francisco have experienced significant housing and infrastructure investments in the past two decades, these communities have experienced limited benefits and, in some cases, experienced displacement of residents and businesses. In addition, these low-income communities of color have had limited access to the new permanently affordable housing units due to income or credit requirements beyond their reach.


Path Forward - Racially and socially inclusive neighborhoods rely on low-income American Indian, Black, and other communities of color having the opportunity to build wealth to pass on to future generations. This Housing Element defines [Priority Equity Geographies](#), as places where the city will target direct investments to achieve this outcome and implement reparative strategies described in the previous goal (see Figure 19). Wealth building strategies should start with a people-based approach and include access to affordable housing and homeownership, as well as trainings for well-paid jobs, business ownership, and fostering financial literacy and readiness. Wealth building strategies will also include place-based strategies to improve access to opportunity: resources in one's neighborhood that are linked to positive economic, social and health outcomes for communities, such as quality public schools, affordable and accessible transportation options that connect residents to educational and economic development opportunities, affordable community serving businesses, and a healthy environment. These resources create the conditions for thriving neighborhoods that, along with people-based approaches, can build lasting wealth that can be passed on from one generation to the next.

Figure 18. National median household wealth (2019).



Source: [US Federal Reserve \(2019\)](#)

Figure 19. Map of Priority Equity Geographies



Source: San Francisco Department of Public Health's [Areas of Vulnerability map](#).

Note: Priority Equity Geographies are areas with a higher density of vulnerable populations as defined by the San Francisco Department of Health, including but not limited to people of color, seniors, youth, people with disabilities, linguistically isolated households, and people living in poverty or unemployed.

OBJECTIVE 3.B


CREATE A SENSE OF BELONGING FOR ALL COMMUNITIES OF COLOR WITHIN WELL-RESOURCED NEIGHBORHOODS THROUGH EXPANDED HOUSING CHOICE

Challenge - [Well-resourced Neighborhoods](#) are areas the state has identified in each jurisdiction as places that have a high concentration of resources that have been shown to support positive economic, educational, and health outcomes for low-income families — particularly long-term outcomes for children (see Figure 20). Since 2005, just 10% of all new housing in San Francisco and 10% new affordable housing has been built in [Well-resourced Neighborhoods](#) though these areas cover nearly 52% of the residential land in the city (see Figures 16 & 17). In part this is because 65% of land in these areas is limited to one or two units and most of the rest also has fixed restrictions on the number of units allowed- even near major commercial districts and transit lines (see Figure 21). This pattern of development has had a two-fold effect on low-income communities and communities of color which mostly reside outside of these neighborhoods. First, these communities disproportionately carry the burden of accommodating growth in our city. Second, a lack of new housing, particularly affordable housing, in neighborhoods with better services and amenities means those neighborhoods remain largely inaccessible to low-income communities and communities of color.

Current restrictions on the number of homes that can be built on most of the city's residential land date largely to the 1970s, when the city faced a substantially different housing context. The city had lost population from 1950 to 1980 as many middle- and high-income households, who were typically white, moved to rapidly growing suburban communities of single-family homes. Jobs were also growing quickly in suburban areas including manufacturing, logistics, and new suburban office parks. The amount of housing produced regionally was significantly higher than today and housing costs were lower to what people earned at the time. These zoning changes from the 1970s often were an indirect way to institutionalize and perpetuate racial and social exclusion from affluent, white neighborhoods in San Francisco. These practices and regulations are known as [exclusionary zoning](#).

Path Forward - Fostering racially and socially inclusive neighborhoods throughout the city means increasing housing choice for all in all neighborhoods. It means ensuring access to housing for American Indian, Black, and other communities of color across all neighborhoods. To promote a sense of belonging for all communities in [Well-resourced Neighborhoods](#), the City needs to shift course regarding where new housing is built, so more diverse communities can call these neighborhoods home. The new [Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Law](#) also requires local jurisdictions to create programs that would reverse segregation and promote inclusive neighborhoods, including allowing for more housing, particularly affordable housing, to be built in [Well-resourced Neighborhoods](#). Increasing housing development capacity through changes to zoning in [Well-resourced Neighborhoods](#), focusing on small- to mid-rise multifamily buildings is the first step the City must pursue to shift development patterns. Increasing housing choice in these areas also will rely on incentives and community benefits in order to provide housing choices affordable to not just to low-income residents, but also to middle-income residents, families with children, seniors, and people with disabilities. Opening access to housing choices in the [Well-resourced Neighborhoods](#) must be supplemented with strategies to foster openness to new neighbors, support to those previously excluded in accessing new neighborhoods, and financial strategies for affordable housing.


Figure 20. Map of Well-resourced Neighborhoods



Source: [2020 TCAC/HCD Opportunity Map](#).

Note: Well-resourced Neighborhoods are shown below and defined as “High Resource/Highest Resource” by the [California Fair Housing Task Force](#). The purpose of this map is to identify every region of the state whose characteristics have been shown by research to support positive economic, educational, and health outcomes for low-income families—particularly long-term outcomes for children.

Figure 21. Map of simplified zoning categories for the Housing Affordability Strategies analysis.



Source: San Francisco Housing Affordability Strategies.

OBJECTIVE 3.C

ELIMINATE DISPLACEMENT OF VULNERABLE COMMUNITIES AND COMMUNITIES OF COLOR

Challenge - Due to social and economic inequities, low-income households and households of color are particularly vulnerable to displacement. The impacts of displacement, the involuntary or forced movement of households due to causes outside of the household's ability to control on communities are deep and destabilizing. Members of displaced communities report feelings of loss, anxiety, and fear,¹⁸ experience the disintegration of social fabrics,¹⁹ face greater food insecurity,²⁰ and self-report poorer health outcomes.²¹ In San Francisco, economic booms are often accompanied with an increase in eviction rates (see Figure 22).

Eviction notices are only one metric to measure displacement. The Urban Displacement Project has measured displacement through a variety of social and economic indicators (see Figure 23),²² including new metrics such as in and out migration to neighborhoods.²³ Displacement constitutes not only loss of people but also cultural heritage, businesses and services, and social networks, all of which provide vital spaces for immigrants, transgender and LGBTQ+ residents, people of color, and other groups. These resources are also essential to the fabric of San Francisco. Displacement is more likely to occur in neighborhoods with high populations of seniors, low-income households, and Black, American Indian, and other communities of color, making these populations even more vulnerable and disadvantaged. Studies have suggested that major infrastructure improvements, such as new rail or major transit investments, could result in displacement impacts if parallel anti-displacement investments have not been made.²⁴ Low-income communities of color also have expressed concerns about displacement due to rental and price adjustments which can occur along with major zoning changes, or major new market-rate buildings. At the same time neighborhoods without such investments have also experienced high eviction rates and have been identified as [vulnerable to displacement, such as places in the](#) Richmond and Sunset.

Path Forward - Preventing further displacement is key to the goal of racial and socially inclusive neighborhoods as it contributes to greater neighborhood and individual stability and cultivates culturally

18 Atkinson, Rowland, Maryann Wulff, Margaret Reynolds, and Angela Spinney. "Gentrification and displacement: the household impacts of neighborhood change." AHURI Final Report 160 (2011): 1-89.

19 Betancur, John. "Gentrification and community fabric in Chicago." Urban studies 48, no. 2 (2011): 383-406.

20 Whittle, Henry J., Kartika Palar, Lee Lemus Hufstедler, Hilary K. Seligman, Edward A. Frongillo, and Sheri D. Weiser. "Food insecurity, chronic illness, and gentrification in the San Francisco Bay Area: an example of structural violence in United States public policy." Social science & medicine 143 (2015): 154-161.

21 Izenberg, Jacob M., Mahasin S. Mujahid, and Irene H. Yen. "Health in changing neighborhoods: A study of the relationship between gentrification and self-rated health in the state of California." Health & place 52 (2018): 188.


22 Social and economic indicators include: household income, change in household income, housing costs, rent increases, and housing affordability

23 Chapple, K., & Thomas, T., and Zuk, M. (2021). Urban Displacement Project website. Berkeley, CA: Urban Displacement Project.

24 Zuk, Miriam, Ariel H. Bierbaum, Karen Chapple, Karolina Gorska, and Anastasia Loukaitou-Sideris. "Gentrification, displacement, and the role of public investment." Journal of Planning Literature 33, no. 1 (2018): 31-44.


appropriate commercial and social spaces for the most vulnerable communities. The City must understand and measure displacement impacts more clearly and directly to prevent further displacement. Upcoming analyses will identify metrics to measure displacement, especially in [geographies identified as vulnerable to displacement](#). The findings of that analysis will inform anti-displacement investments that will ameliorate, and ideally reverse the displacement impacts. Anti-displacement investments include funding eviction defense programs, such as right to counsel and tenant rights education, bolstering and enforcing existing eviction protections and rent stabilization laws, and providing relief through emergency or targeted rent subsidies, as well as medium- to long-term investments such as preservation of affordability of existing housing that primarily house low-income households and households of color, and building new permanently affordable housing targeted to [communities vulnerable to displacement](#).

Figure 22. GDP growth and eviction notices in San Francisco from 2002 to 2019.



Source: San Francisco Rent Board, US Bureau of Economic Analysis

Figure 23. San Francisco Bay Area gentrification and displacement map.



Source: San Francisco Bay Area Gentrification and Displacement Map, Urban Displacement Project; accessed in January 2022.

Goal 4.

Provide sufficient housing for existing residents and future generations for a city with diverse cultures, family structures, and abilities.

Challenge - San Francisco has been in a state of affordability crisis in the past couple of decades, a crisis felt by low-, moderate-, and, more recently, middle-income households. Current residents or workers wanting to call San Francisco home cannot afford the housing they need. While this crisis is fueled by the consistent housing shortage throughout the state, San Francisco has become one of the least affordable cities in the nation. The median condominium price of \$1.2 million is affordable to households making \$222,000 annually. Less than 25% of San Francisco households earn this income and less than 10% of San Francisco workers have this salary. In 2022, median rent was \$3,800 for a 2-bedroom apartment, affordable to a household earning \$137,000, that is less than 40% of our households.

During the economic boom of the last decade, the city attracted major job growth particularly high salaried jobs. The increasing demand for city living by high earning households, along with historic low housing production rates drove up the rental and sales prices (see Figure 24), and triggered waves of displacement especially in low-income communities of color (see Figure 4). This challenge has been compounded by a significant decline of public funding for affordable housing from the Federal and State governments over the past four decades. High housing costs in our region mean that this disinvestment has had an even greater impact. Securing State affordable housing funds has become more competitive recently, and San Francisco does not fare well due to high costs of construction. Staggeringly high costs of housing development also mean that new homes delivered by private investment are only affordable to higher-income earners, further aggravating the affordability crisis. High costs of construction material, skilled labor priced out of living in the region, and complex review and permitting processes, and with increased investment risk all contribute to increases in the cost of building homes.

As the cost of living in San Francisco has ballooned over the years, the city has lost much of the diversity that once defined its identity. Seniors, families with children and middle-wage workers are confronted with very limited choices. Many are forced to find housing choices that meet their needs across the bay or further away and endure long commute hours. Many are forced to leave the Bay Area or California completely. The City has been unable to provide the needed housing for the diversity of workers that our economy requires and most importantly the housing for our diverse cultures and communities that define the essential values of San Francisco.

Path Forward - There has been a growing commitment to address housing scarcity in California. Cities throughout the state are required to facilitate sufficient housing that not only responds to natural population growth but also address existing housing needs. These needs are measured by the share of households who bear high housing cost burden (paying more than 30% of their income on rent), or by those living in overcrowded conditions (more than one person per room, including the living room), or by low rates of available units on the market for rent or sale. San Francisco's allocation for the 2023-2031

cycle is 82,069 units, over three times the targets of the most recent regional planning cycle (2014-2022) (See Figure 25).

Many studies illustrate the importance of increasing the supply of housing to address the affordability crisis throughout California. New market-rate housing is generally only affordable to high-income earners. In San Francisco, new housing is also mostly limited to certain neighborhoods, and often in certain typologies within high-rise or mid-rise buildings that may not serve families with children, multi-generational living, or seniors.


Achieving the goal of providing sufficient housing will require providing an abundance of permanently affordable housing, which requires a substantial increase in public funding. It also means continuing production of market-rate housing for all segments of San Francisco's workforce. It means supporting private investments to build housing for middle-income households. Small and mid-rise multi-family buildings have been a typology that historically played this role without public subsidies or income restrictions. This is a typology that fits the scale of most of San Francisco's neighborhoods, and new strategies can promote the feasibility of these buildings. The City's future diversity also relies on ensuring that new housing responds to the needs of a diversity of cultures, incomes, household types and family structures, age, and abilities.

Figure 24. Percentage change in job growth compared to percentage change in housing unit production from 2010 to 2019.



Source: 2010, 2019 BLS QCEW; ACS 2010 and 2019 1-Year Estimates.

Figure 25. San Francisco Regional Housing Needs Allocation by income level (Cycle 5 vs Cycle 6).



Source: ABAG

OBJECTIVE 4.A

SUBSTANTIALLY EXPAND THE AMOUNT OF PERMANENTLY AFFORDABLE HOUSING FOR EXTREMELY LOW- TO MODERATE-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS.

Challenge - Building housing permanently affordable to people with extremely low- to moderate-incomes requires subsidy to cover the gap between the cost of development and operations and the reduced revenue due to lower rents and prices. Annual affordable housing production has varied from year to year over the past decade, generally following overall housing production (see Figure 26). Federal funding for affordable housing has continually decreased for the past several decades. In the past 15 years, San Francisco has only built or preserved 13,320 units permanently affordable to extremely low- to moderate-income households, 33% of our regional targets. San Francisco also lost a significant and continuous source of funding due to State dissolution of Redevelopment Agencies in 2011. To continue building affordable housing, non-profit developers piece together a variety of public and private funding sources. The City also created new sources of local funding to make up for the loss of redevelopment funds. These include:

- Affordable housing trust fund, established in 2012, a general fund set aside of approximately \$50 million/yr for 30 years.
- Employer gross receipts tax, established in 2018, expected to create \$300 million per year for supportive housing

- Real Estate Transfer tax for properties valued at \$10 million or higher, expected to create \$196 million per year²⁵
- Affordable Housing General Obligation Bonds, \$310 million in 2015, and \$600 million in 2019, and \$147 million in the Health and Recovery G.O. Bond in 2020.


Despite limited funding sources, San Francisco continues to build affordable housing at a faster rate than most other cities. According to the Housing Affordability Strategies report, the City needs to spend over \$517 million per year on building or preserving permanently affordable housing to secure 30 percent affordability of 5,000 new or preserved units (see Figure 27a). This study assumed an average cost of construction of \$700,000 per unit and a subsidy of \$350,000. The City was able to reach the high funding target in 2019. With the additional funding from the new gross receipts tax for Permanent Supportive Housing, the City reached approximately \$650 million in 2021 for production and preservation of affordable housing. However, the new RHNA goals have increased significantly and will require substantially larger investments. Initial analysis shows a significant deficit per year to meet the affordability targets ranging from \$1.3 billion in the 2023 to \$2.5 billion in 2031. This gap also relies on private development providing a portion of our affordable housing units through inclusionary requirements and contributing to housing related fees such as jobs housing linkage fees.

Path Forward - Substantial expansion of permanently affordable housing for extremely low to moderate-income households is a critical pillar of addressing housing needs and housing our workforce. Without that investment the City will continue to lose its racial, social, and cultural diversity. To achieve this objective, the City must seek new paths to substantially expand funding sources for affordable housing whether through new local sources, or expanded State and Federal funding. Figure 27(b) shows projected funding that is fairly certain. The City should utilize the two new sources of funding, gross receipts tax, and the Real Estate Transfer tax, to partially meet our funding gap, and consider new funding sources such as a new affordable housing bond, and other sources to meet the gap. Reducing the cost per unit for building affordable housing is also a critical path forward, which can be possible with streamlined review, and neighborhood support of mid-rise buildings for permanently affordable housing in all neighborhoods. The City will continue and expand streamlined review of all permanently affordable housing, reduce the cost of construction in regulatory review processes, and rely on innovative materials to make more efficient use of limited public funds. The City must also distribute affordable housing investments across all neighborhoods, including investments in Well-resourced Neighborhoods where the production of affordable housing has been limited. Expanding the types of permanently affordable housing beyond non-profit owned and operated or privately-owned below market rate rental units into cooperative housing, shared equity models, and land trusts will expand paths to increase affordable homeownership opportunities. The City must also target its investment to provide permanently affordable housing that serves the particular needs of vulnerable groups, such as transgender and LGBTQ+, transitional-aged youth, seniors and people with disabilities, and families with children. As the City, state and federal governments, continue to expand investment in affordable housing, it is important to recognize the role of private housing developers in building permanent affordable housing, through [inclusionary requirements](#), or affordable housing fees. Beyond the distinct contributions of the

²⁵ This funding source is for the general fund and is subject to annual appropriation. For FY20-21, \$10M of supplemental appropriation was approved for affordable housing

government and private sectors, the City must continue to support public-private partnerships to leverage public funds with private investments to maximize the number of affordable housing units produced.


Figure 26. Affordable housing production by income level from 2006 to 2018.



* Does not include new or legalized ADUs.

Source: City of San Francisco Planning Department Housing Inventory Reports, 2006 to 2018; Strategic Economics, 2020.

Figure 27b. Affordable Housing Expenditures by Source Past (2006-2019) and Projected (2020-2030)



Note: OCII will fund about 2,500 new affordable units on specific sites to meet its enforceable obligations in coming years and these units are accounted for in the 50,000 unit, 30-year total. Redevelopment and OCII are included in past expenditures above because they were the main affordable housing funding source. Projected expenditures by funding source shown above and the \$517 million estimate of annual funding need are for MOHCD-funded affordable units and do not include OCII.

(1) Includes HOME and CDBG

(2) Includes land sales and Certificates of Participation (COPs)

(3) Includes area-specific fees, inclusionary housing fees, and jobs-housing linkage fees

(4) Includes 2015 Proposition A and 2019 Proposition A housing bonds In 2019

(5) The Board of Supervisors passed an ordinance to establish the use of excess Education Revenue Augmentation Fund (ERAF) revenue for affordable housing production and preservation

OBJECTIVE 4.B

EXPAND SMALL AND MID-RISE MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING PRODUCTION TO SERVE OUR WORKFORCE, PRIORITIZING MIDDLE-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS.

Challenge - While middle income households in San Francisco were not cost burdened (paying more than 30 percent of their income for housing) at all in 1990 more recent data shows that middle-income households are now cost-burdened (see Figure 3). San Francisco's housing costs are so high that even middle-income households – such as teachers, nurses, or first responders - are increasingly finding it hard to remain in the city. Data from the San Francisco Unified School District, for example, shows that anywhere from 300 to 700 educators leave San Francisco every year, leading to a shortage of teachers. While middle-income households may find rental housing affordable in many neighborhoods, median sales prices are completely out of reach. Middle-income households can find homeownership opportunities more easily across the bay, and that alone presents an incentive to leave the city.

Middle-income households have been increasingly left out as a target for newly built private market housing. While San Francisco has consistently met or exceeded regional housing targets for “above moderate-income households,” this housing is not affordable to middle-income households. Factors contributing to this high cost include: land value, construction material costs, labor shortages, a complex regulatory environment, lengthy permitting processes, as well as uncertainties of discretionary approval processes. The high cost of developing housing increases investment risk and focus on projects that can endure uncertainty and yield higher rents and sales prices.

The cost of housing is also conditioned by the city's attractiveness to workers, businesses, and investors from the region, the country, and the world²⁶. San Francisco has been an attractive place for many high-income workers and investors around the world. This attractiveness makes housing in San Francisco a valuable global commodity. The availability of resources to pay for housing partially defines what is being produced by the private market for new housing and drives the market for renovations and modification to existing housing stock. These trends have resulted in market rate housing that is only affordable to higher-income earners.

These pressures leave middle-income households with very limited choices, as federal and state funding resources only target lower income households for affordable housing. The City has recently created programs, such as educator housing, that would produce deed restricted units for eligible middle-income households. [Inclusionary requirements](#) for market rate housing have also been updated to include below market rate units that are affordable to households earning up to 150% of AMI, or \$179,850 for a three-person household. Relying on City housing subsidies to serve middle-income households would certainly mean taking away limited public funding resources from moderate-, low-, and very low-income households who are left without choices in most of the region.

Path Forward - Finding new paths to ensure that the private housing market serves the middle-income workforce is key to maintaining our city's diversity. Expanding where small and mid-rise buildings can be constructed throughout the city provides a path for the market to provide more middle-income housing

²⁶ San Francisco is the third city in the world with the highest concentration of billionaires Source and the Bay Area has concentrated around 20 percent of global venture capital, half of 'unicorn' companies and 8 out of 13 valued over \$10 billion.

opportunities without public subsidy. This objective will be met not only by increasing development capacity for small and mid-rise buildings in areas where they are not currently allowed, but also by removing uncertainty from regulatory review processes, streamlining review, and cost abatements. The smaller scale of these buildings fit within the existing scales of most of the neighborhoods in the city which provides better opportunities for a clearer regulatory framework and streamlined processes, including units that serve middle-income households without deed restrictions. Adding new units to our existing housing stock on vacant lots, and through demolition and reconstruction is a critical strategy to increase small multi-family homes particularly for middle income households. However, new units should meet the affordability rates of existing units and tenants should be offered competitive relocation programs during construction. As building multi-unit buildings has been legalized in areas designated for single-family homes throughout the city and the State, the City must encourage multi-family buildings whenever possible. The retention of single-family homes should include contributions towards affordable multi-family housing given the missing opportunities and high use of land and infrastructure resources by a single household.

OBJECTIVE 4.C


EXPAND AND DIVERSIFY HOUSING TYPES FOR ALL

Challenge - San Francisco is home to a diverse range of family and household structures including multigenerational families, LGBTQ+ families, single parents, roommate living, artist co-ops, single-person households, couples, or families with multiple children among many others. As people's lifestyles change, children move out, families grow, partners move in or out, or physical abilities change, their housing needs change as well. San Francisco residents are finding it increasingly challenging to find housing that meets their changing needs, either within their current neighborhood, or anywhere in the city. Households with children, particularly those with two or more children are having an increasingly hard time staying in San Francisco (see Figure 28), and households with children in San Francisco experience high rates of overcrowding (more than 1 person per room, including the living room) as well (see Figure 29). Other household types are also experiencing pressure: many have been doubling or tripling up to live in the City as roommates or related adults (see Figure 29). Many are forced to live in these arrangements or leave the City because they cannot find housing that is within their financial reach and meets their needs. Seniors, aging adults, and people with disabilities are unable to afford living conditions that match their abilities. A two-person educator household is likely cost burdened (paying more than 30% of their income on rent) or may not live in housing that meets their needs if interested in growing their family. Artists who once found a haven in San Francisco, and who are often the promoters of the city's diverse cultures, are turned away without viable housing choices.

Path Forward - Ensuring a diversity of housing types at various affordability levels is critical to maintaining and advancing the diversity that once defined San Francisco. The City must employ targeted programs and products that serve the particular needs of seniors, people with disabilities, transgender and LGBTQ+, transitional aged youth, or families with children. To meet these unique needs, new housing must offer varying design and amenities, promote certain typologies, be located in certain

neighborhoods, or in proximity to transit amenities. For example, promoting co-housing²⁷ will address the growing interest among some communities in living in small rooms with shared amenities (kitchen, living room, etc.). Housing for seniors and people with disabilities, at variety of income levels, must be promoted along transit corridors to address limited mobility issues. Transgender and LGBTQ+ households are interested in living in neighborhoods where they have built a community over decades. Families with children, at a variety of income levels, need improved access to child friendly amenities, and shared open spaces. All neighborhoods should provide a range of housing types, at a range of affordability levels, as well as amenities that serve the changing needs of seniors, children, people with disabilities, young individuals, and various family structures.

Figure 28. Percentage change in number of households with children from 1990 to 2015.




Source: San Francisco Housing Needs and Trends Report. Data: Decennial Census (1990 and 2000) and ACS (2015)

27 Co-housing, group housing, or co-living rooms are a type of housing that may have limited cooking facilities and do not contain a full kitchen in each room. Co-housing may include (but is not limited to) communes, fraternities and sororities, or Residential Hotels.

Figure 29. Percentage of households living in overcrowded* units by household type (2015).

* Overcrowded conditions are defined as more than one person per room, including the living room.



Source: San Francisco Housing Needs and Trends Report. Data: ACS 2015 5-year Estimates.

Goal 5.

Promote neighborhoods that are well-connected, healthy, and rich with community culture.

Challenge - San Francisco's neighborhoods have unique qualities and histories that enrich their residents and communities, but they also are the result of incremental decision-making and discriminatory practices that have left disparities in public services, resources, and impacts from environmental damage. Government agencies have sometimes organized past public investment around the location of new housing or land-use changes rather than an accounting for equity, which may consider needs, and quality of public investments.

Additionally, private enterprise that supports essential services like healthy food, healthcare, laundry, or childcare, has become increasingly pushed to serve high earners as their economic margins have dropped, even prior to the pandemic. Small businesses provide some of these essential services in addition to serving as neighborhood centers. However, according to the California Employment Development Department, the number of retail establishments with fewer than 10 employees in San Francisco dropped over 8%, between 2007 and 2017. As land values and online shopping and delivery services have increased and brick-and-mortar retail declined, the health of neighborhood commercial corridors varied with some corridors struggling, reducing residents' access to nearby services and opportunities to support community culture and cohesion.


Path Forward - Having a safe, sustainable, nurturing home means more than inhabiting an indoor structure, it must be in and connected to a larger place that fulfills residents' social, cultural, and physical growth. For a neighborhood to house people, it must provide access to good quality grocery stores, healthcare, schools, community services, arts, and cultural institutions. It must create a healthy environment with clean air, water, and soil and be prepared for the heightened impacts of the climate crisis, especially protecting those most at-risk. It must connect us to areas and resources beyond the neighborhood and across the city and region through equitable transit and transportation infrastructure. While a set of amenities may not be the same across neighborhoods, the City should support the unique ecosystem of each one that will nourish its communities and center equity in government investments.

This Goal provides a solid framework for the allocation of resources where changes are more urgent. To achieve healthy neighborhoods for housing residents, the City must focus on repairing past harms through environmental justice and equitable mobility strategies to address the disparate outcomes in wealth and health in [Priority Equity Geographies](#) while protecting these communities against displacement.

At the same time, as San Francisco population grows the existing community facilities and services, including parks, schools, libraries, police, and fire departments, must address the growing need. Recent neighborhood zoning changes have included planning for infrastructure such as transit, open space, and street improvements using development impact fees to help fund such infrastructure, such as the [Southeast Framework](#) and [Greater SoMa Community Facilities Needs Assessment](#) (see Figures 30 to 32).

Housing in a neighborhood can foster relationships, identities, creativity, and individual well-being. Neighborhoods that express individual personalities and shared connections across cultures, race, and ethnicity, or art and architectural heritage provide a sense of community. Considering housing proximity and access to goods and services can reduce burdens, enhance the experience, or encourage healthy habits in daily life. Each neighborhood is a result of its people and histories and their efforts and challenges and should reflect these specific experiences, undo past harms, and adapt to changing conditions.

Figure30. Infrastructure impact fees generated from development in Area Plans.



Source: SF Planning and DBI.

Figure 31. Nearly half of the cost of, In Chan Kaajal Park, a park built in 2017 in the Mission was funded by development impact fees.



Photo: San Francisco Recreation & Parks

Figure 32. Streetscape improvements along 22nd street to improve pedestrian safety was largely funded by development impact fees.



Rendering: San Francisco Public Works

OBJECTIVE 5.A

CONNECT PEOPLE TO JOBS AND THEIR NEIGHBORHOOD WITH NUMEROUS, EQUITABLE, AND HEALTHY TRANSPORTATION AND MOBILITY OPTIONS

Challenge - As the city and region have developed through decades of changes in economic, living, and land use patterns, transportation infrastructure has often been deployed to reconnect people's needs, primarily around jobs and housing. However, local governmental agencies often focused on the needs of middle- and high-income workers (e.g., freeways, regional commuter transit) and left many populations, especially those of color or with low-wage jobs or those outside the workforce or with other needs, with few or burdensome options. For example, Golden Gate Park, with its world-class cultural institutions and well-maintained open space full of programs and activities, is an hour-long bus ride from the areas in the city with the highest percentage of children, including Bayview, Outer Mission, and the Excelsior.

It has become increasingly difficult and more expensive to complete new infrastructure projects, including transportation projects. Thus, the City is challenged to keep up with growth, which, limits persons quality and life and access to opportunities (e.g., jobs, parks, schools, etc.). Those living in historically underserved communities and those with limited mobility options continue to face greater challenges than those able-bodied persons with more resources.

Additionally, the past two decades have transformed former mostly industrial neighborhoods into more mixed-use neighborhoods, including with housing. This has occurred primarily in the southeast portion of the city where historically there was less investment and stability in the types of small businesses that serve residents. These redeveloping areas include public benefits such as new or improved infrastructure. However, some residents may feel some benefits are oriented to future residents rather than supporting the needs of existing residents and businesses.

Path Forward - A more equitable San Francisco requires planning for how housing, jobs, services, institutions, and resources are interconnected in and between vibrant neighborhoods.

Some areas of the city, primarily lower density neighborhoods in the middle, western, and northern neighborhoods, have had greater per capital public investment in infrastructure. This includes more per capita investments in schools, transit, parks, and other community facilities. Providing more housing in these locations opens access to these benefits to more people. The City will address how new housing impacts existing neighborhoods depending on their geography, history, cultural identity, and past discrimination. These efforts address and support neighborhood life, such as economic development, facility planning, collaboration across agencies, and community-based organizations. The priority is to help people thrive by meeting their needs and providing opportunities that are easily accessible, which also supports San Francisco's goals for of healthier transportation and climate.

San Francisco has been a Transit First City for 45+ years, with a clear intention of supporting public transportation and walkable and bikeable neighborhoods. In the past decade, it has also significantly invested in [Vision Zero](#), a program to get to zero traffic fatalities by 2024; the [Climate Action Plan 2021](#), to reduce carbon emissions; and [ConnectSF](#) a fifty-year vision for San Francisco's mobility. [ConnectSF](#) relates directly to housing considerations, for example that we should preserve permanently affordable housing. Maintaining – and increasing – the City's stock of permanently affordable housing is critical, especially in areas receiving new infrastructure investment and add new low- and moderate-income

housing near essential services and schools. The city's transportation policies will also be anchored in the upcoming [Transportation Element Update](#) which will be designed to center racial and social equity to redress historic harms, prioritize undoing damage, promote equity, and prioritize those most at-risk of being excluded from transportation resources.

One of the City's climate goals is to have 80% of trips be made using low carbon modes by 2030 – such as transit, walking, biking, or electric vehicle. Building multi-family housing near transit helps the City meet these goals. It helps the City meet climate goals by providing access to transit for more people; it improves the cost-effectiveness of existing transit investments and makes the City more competitive for regional, state, and federal funds to expand transit; and it provides a larger customer base for businesses located along or nearby transit lines.

OBJECTIVE 5.B

ADVANCE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE, CLIMATE, AND COMMUNITY RESILIENCE

Challenge – Many environmental perils exist for residents of San Francisco, some natural and others exacerbated by human action, resulting in inequitable consequences. In San Francisco, as in many other cities, low-income households and people of color are more likely to live in neighborhoods with environmental hazards, such as toxic groundwater, polluting industrial activities, congested freeways, and hazardous and solid waste facilities. In large part, this is the direct result of [racial covenants](#), [redlining](#), [urban renewal](#) and other discriminatory programs that have historically restricted where people of color may live. Furthermore, these communities may be less likely to have access to health-supportive resources, such as grocery stores, safe parks and open spaces, adequate and stable employment, health facilities, and frequent public transit. These disparities result in worse health outcomes and shortened life expectancy for our most vulnerable populations. For instance, in San Francisco, the average life expectancy for Black men (68 years) is more than a decade shorter than the citywide average (80 years), and 15 years shorter than the group with the longest life expectancy, Asian men (83 years).²⁸

The COVID-19 pandemic has exacerbated the consequences of these existing health disparities. To date, the pandemic has disproportionately impacted communities of color, with those in the Latino/e/x and Black communities at highest risk (see Figure 33). The same health conditions that are more prevalent in neighborhoods most impacted by environmental injustice – asthma, heart disease, diabetes, hypertension – have also been identified as major risk factors for COVID-19.

San Francisco is increasingly vulnerable to climate crisis-related hazards like sea level rise, poor air quality, and extreme heat events. For example, approximately 37,200 people in San Francisco live in areas vulnerable to flooding from sea level rise (see Figure 34) and recent wildfires have shown that the entire city is vulnerable to poor air quality. Environmental pollution also affects certain neighborhoods that

28 "Mortality." SFHIP. San Francisco Health Improvement Partnership. Accessed January 14, 2022. <http://www.sfhip.org/chna/community-health-data/mortality/>

are identified by the State as “disadvantaged communities.”²⁹ Similarly, earthquakes have been a historic hazard to San Francisco residents despite the city having the highest building code rating for structural safety required in new buildings. The city has had programs that require or encourage seismic upgrades to existing buildings, with the aim of fostering a housing stock resilient to possible future earthquakes. This continues to be a challenge, along with the possible massive disruptions to infrastructure.

Even under normal conditions, housing is in constant need of repair and rehabilitation to remain safe and supportive. Those who have housing instability are more likely to stay in housing that is unsafe or inadequate where either landlords or low-income homeowners defer improvements, with the latter facing increasing pressure to sell and leave the city altogether. Or in cases where the housing is maintained, households may have a higher occupancy than is safe, rendering fire codes insufficient in case of emergency.

Path Forward - Addressing both safe housing and a safe environment for neighborhoods requires substantial investment, planning, and inter-agency coordination. The City’s [Climate Action Plan 2021](#), [Earthquake Safety Implementation Program](#), and the [Environmental Justice Framework](#) (see Figure 35) currently in process are three significant efforts across the city to address the many environmental challenges in relation to housing. In 2019, San Francisco declared a climate emergency in accordance with the Paris Climate Agreement and committed to eliminating greenhouse gas emissions by 2050. This commitment relies on the transformation of energy supply, buildings, transportation, and waste system to reduce emissions. New housing development can help contribute to these goals by meeting the City’s Green Building Code standards. Emissions from buildings stem mostly from the use of natural gas for water and from space heating, recently eliminated as an option through the City’s New Construction Ordinance. San Francisco has committed to zero emissions in new construction by no later than 2030.


As most of San Francisco’s housing was built before the middle of the last century, many buildings may require upgrades to improve resiliency against these hazards as well as general habitability. Older and inadequately maintained buildings are less able to weather the impacts of these climate and environmental challenges. When these buildings fail, the outcomes are worse for lower-income households and those with health conditions and other existing vulnerabilities. As local, state, and federal resources are made available to address efficiency and resiliency of residential buildings, for example the State-funded and locally run [CALHome program](#), and the [Capital Improvement Program](#), these resources should be prioritized to address existing inequities faced in vulnerable neighborhoods. The city should continue to support seismic upgrades and lead remediation, in such programs as DPH’s [Childhood Prevention Lead Program](#), prioritizing homeowners in Environmental Justice communities.

New housing development can also include neighborhood retail and other services on the ground floor, such as grocery stores, childcare, stores, restaurants, community centers, health facilities, etc. that meet the needs of residents. Finally, new housing can provide open space as required by SF Planning Code, community gardens, living roofs as required by the SF [Better Roofs Ordinance](#) (see Figure 36), and street trees as required by the [SF Better Streets Plan](#) that benefit existing and new neighbors. Integrating

29 “Disadvantaged communities” is an area identified by the California Environmental Protection Agency pursuant to Section 39711 of the Health and Safety Code or an area that is a low-income area that is disproportionately affected by environmental pollution and other hazards that can lead to negative health effects, exposure, or environmental degradation.” Source: CA Office of Planning and Research, General Plan Guidelines, Chapter 4: Required Elements, June 2020

and designing sites to accommodate nature, through requirements such as [Bird Safe Building Standards](#), throughout our streets and buildings improves air quality, plant and wildlife health, human wellness, and climate adaptation.

Figure 33. Percent of cases and death by race or ethnicity.



Source: Data SF; extracted January 14, 2022.


Figure 34. Areas vulnerable to sea level rise.



Source: San Francisco Sea Level Rise Action Plan


Figure 35. Draft Environmental Justice Communities (2021).

Areas of San Francisco that have higher pollution and are predominately low-income. This map is based on [CalEnviroScreen](#), a tool created by CalEPA& OEHHA that maps California communities that are most affected by pollution and other health risks. “EJ Communities” are defined as the census tracts with the top 30% of cumulative environmental and socioeconomic vulnerability across the city.



Source: SF Planning’s Environmental Justice Framework.

Figure 36. San Francisco has recently required certain development projects to provide a 'living roof'.



Source: San Francisco Planning

OBJECTIVE 5.C

ELEVATE EXPRESSION OF CULTURAL IDENTITIES THROUGH THE DESIGN OF ACTIVE AND ENGAGING NEIGHBORHOOD BUILDINGS AND SPACES

Challenge - The cultural diversity of San Francisco's neighborhoods is threatened by the displacement of racial, ethnic, and other marginalized cultural groups, such as transgender and LGBTQ+ residents. While San Francisco's neighborhoods still retain a high level of cultural identity which contributes to their sense of place and to the residents' sense of belonging, this aspect of community stability is hard to sustain when the culture bearers and community members that embody that identity can no longer afford to live in the neighborhood. Across communities of color and other marginalized groups, the forces of displacement are making it difficult for cultural groups to transmit the traditions, practices, and artistic expressions that define them and their heritage. This erodes the health and cultural richness of the community, which can be witnessed through the loss of culturally significant businesses, community spaces, art, and cultural programming.

As an example of this challenge to retain the city's cultural diversity, the city has lost significant Legacy Businesses³⁰ over the past decade due to displacement pressures and lower income communities of

³⁰ In order to be designated by the Board of Supervisors as a Legacy Business, businesses must generally have operated in San Francisco for 30 or more years, have contributed to the city's history and/or the identity of a particular neighborhood or community, and be committed to maintaining the physical features and traditions that define the business, including crafts, cuisines, art forms, or activities.

color have been hit particularly hard. A 2014 report by the City's Budget and Legislative Analyst's Office showed the closure of small businesses in San Francisco had reached record numbers with almost 4,000 small businesses closing in 2014 alone. In contrast, only 693 small businesses closed in 1994, the first year of the study. The report drew connections to San Francisco's skyrocketing rents and the high level of commercial evictions, which continue today. The [Legacy Business Registry](#) and corresponding fund were created in 2015 in recognition of this loss and to mitigate or reverse the trend.

Similarly, the city's [Cultural Districts](#) Initiative was formalized in 2018 with the aim of stabilizing vulnerable communities facing or at risk of displacement or gentrification, and to preserve, strengthen and promote our cultural assets and diverse communities. While both of these innovative programs provide potentially effective models for government interventions to fight community displacement and elevate expressions of cultural identity, the funding needs of both programs to date have far exceeded the allocated resources.

While many parts of the city, such as the Cultural Districts, aim to reinforce cultural identities that are at-risk, other parts of the city not identified as such may expect new housing opportunities to arrive subject to more general design guidance. Historically, San Francisco design guidance has reinforced existing patterns, whether in massing or façade or roofline expression, even though some of the original housing stock was mass-produced with little individual character or architectural quality. While this desire for compatibility was intended to prevent vast and dramatic changes in scale, in practice over time scale has mostly been addressed through code or zoning requirements and these have mostly limited creativity, architectural expression, and muted the voices of an expanding diversity of residents. While continuity of place is essential in cities, public space, facades, and street environments should also reflect the evolutions in personal and cultural expression.

Path Forward - As new development comes to San Francisco's neighborhoods, good building design should remain sensitive to the unique neighborhood context while enhancing these neighborhoods. New buildings can improve the experience of existing and new neighbors through architecture, services or retail provided on the ground floor, or the streetscape improvements on the fronting street. New development should help maintain neighborhoods' historic architectural heritage and landmarks as well as their cultural heritage: objects, beliefs, traditions, practices, artistic interpretation, and significant places that develop a sense of belonging and identity. New development must also recognize the erased histories and heritage from American Indian, Black, and other communities of color.

[Cultural Districts](#) will be an important platform to move forward; they have been defined by the city as areas containing a concentration of cultural and historic assets, culturally significant enterprise, arts, services, or businesses and a significant portion of its residents or people who spend time in the area, are members of a specific cultural community or ethnic group that historically has been discriminated against, displaced or oppressed. By reflecting the cultural identities of their residents in new development, building design can create environments that cultivate understanding and appreciation of diverse peoples, that honor the stories of all communities, and that foster a sense of belonging for all residents. This can be achieved through design and artistic expression in the built environment – buildings, parks, sidewalks, streets, structures, and other public spaces – and through the activation and use of public and private spaces. By elevating expression of cultural identities, the City can encourage more equitable local economies, and advance social justice. In this way, this objective also furthers Objective 3a to “Build intergenerational wealth for American Indian, Black, and other communities of

color.” The creativity and sense of belonging resulting from this work will promote mental health while resulting in layered cultural landscapes and experiences for residents, workers, and visitors.

Achieving this objective will mean re-evaluating how existing and new design guidelines can be utilized to foster creativity while implementing foundational design principals and ensuring durable building materials. It also requires the Planning Department to explore how design, especially at the ground floor, supports social engagement and the vibrancy of neighborhoods. At the same time, it requires tools that ensure that existing expressions of cultural identity and places that hold cultural and historic meaning are respected. In other cases, the city should explore limiting or revising discretionary guidelines to balance the needs of new housing and neighborhood scale, which is already governed by definitive height and bulk controls. By creating and adopting objective standards that focus on the major concerns—light and air, dramatic shifts in scale—the city can allow for more flexibility in how neighborhoods look and feel, inviting new residents to join in and creative disciplines to deploy their talents.

The management of culturally and historically significant spaces must be guided by the culture bearers and descendants of those cultural groups, and special attention should be paid to those groups that have been marginalized from these decisions in the past. Ramaytush descendants and the American Indian community more broadly both hold special roles in guiding how the city manages tribal cultural resources and places significant for American Indian cultural practices. Consultation methods and information systems must be improved to ensure their full participation in decisions affecting the Ramaytush and American Indian community.

The City can utilize and expand existing historic preservation tools such as protective ordinances, rehabilitation incentives, and environmental laws to improve the management of places that express cultural identity. And the City can grow new and innovative programs such as the [Legacy Business Registry](#), the [Citywide Retail Strategy](#), and [Cultural District program](#) to guide cultural resource management and programs intended to support cultural uses and activities throughout the city.

POLICIES

POLICY 1: Minimize [no-fault](#) and [at-fault](#) evictions for all tenants, and expand direct rental assistance as a renter stabilization strategy.

Related Objectives
OBJECTIVE 1.A ENSURE HOUSING STABILITY AND HEALTHY HOMES.
OBJECTIVE 1.B ADVANCE EQUITABLE HOUSING ACCESS.
OBJECTIVE 3.C ELIMINATE COMMUNITY DISPLACEMENT WITHIN AREAS VULNERABLE TO DISPLACEMENT.

Implementing Program Areas
1 Affordable Housing Resources and Equitable Access 1.5 Deep Affordability and Rent Assistance for Lowest Income Renters
2 Stabilizing Tenants and Rental Housing 2.1 Eviction Prevention and Anti-displacement; 2.2 Tenant Protections
3 Preventing and Eliminating Homelessness 3.2 Problem Solving and Targeted Homelessness Prevention

POLICY 2: Preserve affordability of existing subsidized housing, government-owned or cooperative-owned housing, or [SRO hotel rooms](#) where the affordability requirements are at risk or soon to expire.

Related Objectives
OBJECTIVE 1.A ENSURE HOUSING STABILITY AND HEALTHY HOMES.
OBJECTIVE 1.B ADVANCE EQUITABLE HOUSING ACCESS.
OBJECTIVE 3.C ELIMINATE COMMUNITY DISPLACEMENT WITHIN AREAS VULNERABLE TO DISPLACEMENT.

Implementing Program Areas
1 Affordable Housing Resources and Equitable Access 1.4 Affordable Housing Preservation
2 Stabilizing Tenants and Rental Housing 2.2 Tenant Protections; 2.3 Acquisitions and Rehabilitation for Affordability; 2.4 Preserving Rental Unit Availability

POLICY 3: Acquire and rehabilitate privately-owned housing as permanently affordable to better serve residents and [areas vulnerable to displacement](#) with unmet affordable housing needs.

Related Objectives
OBJECTIVE 1.A ENSURE HOUSING STABILITY AND HEALTHY HOMES.
OBJECTIVE 1.B ADVANCE EQUITABLE HOUSING ACCESS.
OBJECTIVE 4.A SUBSTANTIALLY EXPAND THE AMOUNT OF PERMANENTLY AFFORDABLE HOUSING FOR EXTREMELY LOW- TO MODERATE-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS.
Implementing Program Areas
2 Stabilizing Tenants and Rental Housing 2.3 Acquisitions and Rehabilitation for Affordability

POLICY 4: Facilitate the legalization of unauthorized dwelling units while improving their safety and habitability.

Related Objectives
OBJECTIVE 4.B EXPAND SMALL AND MID-RISE MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING PRODUCTION TO SERVE OUR WORKFORCE, PRIORITIZING MIDDLE-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS.
Implementing Program Areas
2 Stabilizing Tenants and Rental Housing 2.4 Preserving Rental Unit Availability

POLICY 5: Improve access to the available Affordable Rental and Homeownership units especially for disproportionately underserved racial and social groups.

Related Objectives
OBJECTIVE 1.B ADVANCE EQUITABLE HOUSING ACCESS.
OBJECTIVE 3.A BUILD INTERGENERATIONAL WEALTH FOR AMERICAN INDIAN, BLACK, AND OTHER COMMUNITIES OF COLOR.
Implementing Program Areas
1 Affordable Housing Resources and Equitable Access 1.3 Inclusionary Housing; 1.4 Affordable Housing Preservation; 1.7 Eligibility and Access for Affordable Housing
5 Redressing and Preventing Discrimination 5.4 Housing Programs to Redress Harm

POLICY 6: Advance equal housing access by eliminating discrimination based on race, ethnicity, immigration status, HIV+ status, gender identity, sexual orientation, disabilities, age, prior incarceration, or mental health and improving housing programs for underserved groups.

Related Objectives
OBJECTIVE 1.B ADVANCE EQUITABLE HOUSING ACCESS.
Implementing Program Areas
1 Affordable Housing Resources and Equitable Access 1.7 Eligibility and Access for Affordable Housing 3 Preventing and Eliminating Homelessness 3.1 Coordinated Entry and Referrals 5 Redressing and Preventing Discrimination 5.3 Fair Housing Compliance and Enforcement 6 Serving Special Needs Groups 6.3 Seniors and People with Disabilities and Chronic Illness

POLICY 7: Pursue permanently affordable housing investments that are specific to the geographic, cultural, and support needs of recently arrived or newly independent residents or residents from marginalized groups, including transgender and LGBTQ+ people.

Related Objectives
OBJECTIVE 1.B ADVANCE EQUITABLE HOUSING ACCESS.
OBJECTIVE 4.C DIVERSIFY HOUSING TYPES FOR ALL CULTURES, FAMILY STRUCTURES, AND ABILITIES.
Implementing Program Areas
1 Affordable Housing Resources and Equitable Access 1.7 Eligibility and Access for Affordable Housing 6 Serving Special Needs Groups 6.2 Transgender and LGBTQ+ People; 6.3 Seniors and People with Disabilities and Chronic Illness

POLICY 8: Expand permanently supportive housing and services for individuals and families experiencing homelessness as a primary part of a comprehensive strategy to eliminate homelessness.

Related Objectives
<p>OBJECTIVE 1.C ELIMINATE HOMELESSNESS.</p> <p>OBJECTIVE 4.A SUBSTANTIALLY EXPAND THE AMOUNT OF PERMANENTLY AFFORDABLE HOUSING FOR EXTREMELY LOW- TO MODERATE-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS.</p>
Implementing Program Areas
<p>3 Preventing and Eliminating Homelessness 3.1 Coordinated Entry and Referrals; 3.3 Temporary Shelter; 3.4 Supportive Housing</p> <p>5 Redressing and Preventing Discrimination 5.3 Fair Housing Compliance and Enforcement</p> <p>6 Serving Special Needs Groups 6.2 Transgender and LGBTQ+ People</p>

POLICY 9: Prevent homelessness and eviction through comprehensive evidence-based systems, including housing and other services targeted to serve those at risk of becoming unhoused³¹.

Related Objectives
<p>OBJECTIVE 1.A ENSURE HOUSING STABILITY AND HEALTHY HOMES.</p> <p>OBJECTIVE 1.B ADVANCE EQUITABLE HOUSING ACCESS.</p> <p>OBJECTIVE 1.C ELIMINATE HOMELESSNESS.</p>
Implementing Program Areas
<p>1 Affordable Housing Resources and Equitable Access 1.5 Deep Affordability and Rent Assistance for Lowest Income Renters</p> <p>2 Stabilizing Tenants and Rental Housing 2.1 Eviction Prevention and Anti-displacement</p> <p>3 Preventing and Eliminating Homelessness 3.1 Coordinated Entry and Referrals; 3.2 Problem Solving and Targeted Homelessness Prevention; 3.3 Temporary Shelter; 3.4 Supportive Housing</p> <p>6 Serving Special Needs Groups 6.2 Transgender and LGBTQ+ People</p>

³¹ People with prior experience of homelessness, with involvement with the criminal justice system, extremely-low and very-low income American Indian, Black, and Latino/es, domestic violence victims, transgender people, and those at imminent risk of losing housing (e.g., tenants with an eviction notice or subject to landlord harassment).

POLICY 10: Acknowledge the truth about discriminatory practices and government actions³² as told by American Indian, Black, and other communities of color to understand the root causes of the housing disparities in these communities and to inform how to redress the harms.

Related Objectives
OBJECTIVE 2.A MAKE AMENDS THROUGH TRUTH-TELLING OF THE HISTORIC HARMS.
Implementing Program Areas
5 Redressing and Preventing Discrimination 5.1 Truth-telling and Acknowledging Past Harm

POLICY 11: Establish and sustain homeownership programs and expand affordable housing access for American Indian, Black, Japanese, Filipino, and other communities to redress harm directly caused by past discriminatory government actions including [redlining](#), [urban renewal](#), the Indian Relocation Act, or WWII Japanese incarceration.

Related Objectives
OBJECTIVE 2.B OFFER REPARATIONS FOR COMMUNITIES DIRECTLY HARMED BY PAST DISCRIMINATORY GOVERNMENT ACTION AND BRING BACK THEIR DISPLACED PEOPLE.
OBJECTIVE 3.A BUILD INTERGENERATIONAL WEALTH FOR AMERICAN INDIAN, BLACK, AND OTHER COMMUNITIES OF COLOR.
OBJECTIVE 3.C ELIMINATE COMMUNITY DISPLACEMENT WITHIN AREAS VULNERABLE TO DISPLACEMENT.GOVERNMENT ACTION AND BRING BACK THEIR DISPLACED PEOPLE.
Implementing Program Areas
5 Redressing and Preventing Discrimination 5.4 Housing Programs to Redress Harm

32 Discriminatory programs include, but are not limited to, redlining, urban renewal, segregated public housing, and exclusionary zoning regulations, such as single-family zoning.

POLICY 12: Invest in and expand access to cultural anchors, land, and spaces that are significant to American Indian, Black, Japanese, Filipino, and other communities directly harmed by past discriminatory government actions including [redlining](#), [urban renewal](#), the Indian Relocation Act or WWII Japanese incarceration to redress histories of dispossession, social disruption, and physical displacement.

Related Objectives	
OBJECTIVE 2.B	OFFER REPARATIONS FOR COMMUNITIES DIRECTLY HARMED BY PAST DISCRIMINATORY GOVERNMENT ACTION AND BRING BACK THEIR DISPLACED PEOPLE.
OBJECTIVE 3.A	BUILD INTERGENERATIONAL WEALTH FOR AMERICAN INDIAN, BLACK, AND OTHER COMMUNITIES OF COLOR.
OBJECTIVE 5.C	ELEVATE EXPRESSION OF CULTURAL IDENTITIES THROUGH THE DESIGN OF ACTIVE AND ENGAGING NEIGHBORHOOD BUILDINGS AND SPACES.
Implementing Program Areas	
4 Centering Equity Communities and Cultural Heritage	
4.4 Cultural Districts	
5 Redressing and Preventing Discrimination	
5.2 Cultural Investment and Restitution	

POLICY 13: Amplify and prioritize voices of American Indian, Black, and other people of color, and other disadvantaged communities, and embrace the guidance of their leaders throughout the engagement and planning processes for housing policy, planning, programs, and developments.

Related Objectives	
OBJECTIVE 2.C	INCREASE ACCOUNTABILITY TO AMERICAN INDIAN, BLACK, AND OTHER COMMUNITIES OF COLOR.
Implementing Program Areas	
4 Centering Equity Communities and Cultural Heritage	
4.2 Community Planning; 4.4 Cultural Districts; 4.5 Cultural Heritage and Expression	
5 Redressing and Preventing Discrimination	
5.2 Cultural Investment and Restitution; 5.4 Housing Programs to Redress Harm	

POLICY 14: Establish accountability tools to advance racial and social equity in housing access with measurable progress.

Related Objectives
OBJECTIVE 2.C INCREASE ACCOUNTABILITY TO AMERICAN INDIAN, BLACK, AND OTHER COMMUNITIES OF COLOR.
Implementing Program Areas
4 Centering Equity Communities and Cultural Heritage 4.1 Accountability

POLICY 15: Expand permanently affordable housing investments in [Priority Equity Geographies](#) to better serve American Indian, Black, and other People of color within income ranges underserved, including extremely-, very low-, and moderate-income households.

Related Objectives
OBJECTIVE 3.A BUILD INTERGENERATIONAL WEALTH FOR AMERICAN INDIAN, BLACK, AND OTHER COMMUNITIES OF COLOR.
OBJECTIVE 4.A SUBSTANTIALLY EXPAND THE AMOUNT OF PERMANENTLY AFFORDABLE HOUSING FOR EXTREMELY LOW- TO MODERATE-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS.
Implementing Program Areas
1 Affordable Housing Resources and Equitable Access 1.2 Affordable Housing Production; 1.4 Affordable Housing Preservation; 1.5 Deep Affordability and Rent Assistance for Lowest Income Renters; 1.7 Eligibility and Access for Affordable Housing
4 Centering Equity Communities and Cultural Heritage 4.2 Community Planning

POLICY 16: Improve access to well-paid jobs and business ownership for American Indian, Black and other communities of color, particularly those who live in [Priority Equity Geographies](#), to build the wealth needed to afford and meet their housing needs.

Related Objectives
OBJECTIVE 3.A BUILD INTERGENERATIONAL WEALTH FOR AMERICAN INDIAN, BLACK, AND OTHER COMMUNITIES OF COLOR.
Implementing Program Areas
4 Centering Equity Communities and Cultural Heritage 4.3 Access to Economic Opportunity

POLICY 17: Expand investments in [Priority Equity Geographies](#) to advance equitable access to resources while ensuring community stability.

Related Objectives	
OBJECTIVE 3.A	BUILD INTERGENERATIONAL WEALTH FOR AMERICAN INDIAN, BLACK, AND OTHER COMMUNITIES OF COLOR.
OBJECTIVE 5.A	CONNECT PEOPLE TO JOBS AND THEIR NEIGHBORHOOD WITH NUMEROUS, EQUITABLE, AND HEALTHY TRANSPORTATION AND MOBILITY OPTIONS.
Implementing Program Areas	
4 Centering Equity Communities and Cultural Heritage	
4.1 Accountability	
9 Healthy, Connected, and Resilient Housing and Neighborhoods	
9.3 Transportation	

POLICY 18: Tailor zoning changes within [Priority Equity Geographies](#) and intersecting Cultural Districts to serve the specific needs of American Indian, Black, and other communities of color while implementing programs to stabilize communities and meet community needs.

Related Objectives	
OBJECTIVE 2.C	INCREASE ACCOUNTABILITY TO AMERICAN INDIAN, BLACK, AND OTHER COMMUNITIES OF COLOR.
OBJECTIVE 3.A	BUILD INTERGENERATIONAL WEALTH FOR AMERICAN INDIAN, BLACK, AND OTHER COMMUNITIES OF COLOR.
OBJECTIVE 3.C	ELIMINATE COMMUNITY DISPLACEMENT WITHIN AREAS VULNERABLE TO DISPLACEMENT.
Implementing Program Areas	
4 Centering Equity Communities and Cultural Heritage	
4.2 Community Planning	

POLICY 19: Enable low and moderate-income households, particularly American Indian, Black, and other people of color, to live and prosper in [Well-resourced Neighborhoods](#) by increasing the number of permanently affordable housing units in those neighborhoods.

Related Objectives	
OBJECTIVE 3.B	CREATE A SENSE OF BELONGING FOR ALL COMMUNITIES OF COLOR WITHIN WELL-RESOURCED NEIGHBORHOODS THROUGH EXPANDED HOUSING CHOICE.
OBJECTIVE 4.A	SUBSTANTIALLY EXPAND THE AMOUNT OF PERMANENTLY AFFORDABLE HOUSING FOR EXTREMELY LOW- TO MODERATE-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS.
Implementing Program Areas	
1 Affordable Housing Resources and Equitable Access 1.2 Affordable Housing Production; 1.5 Deep Affordability and Rent Assistance for Lowest Income Renters; 1.7 Eligibility and Access for Affordable Housing	

POLICY 20: Increase mid-rise and small multi-family housing types by adopting zoning changes or density bonus programs in [Well-resourced Neighborhoods](#) and adjacent lower-density areas near transit, including along SFMTA Rapid Network³³ and other transit.

Related Objectives	
OBJECTIVE 3.B	CREATE A SENSE OF BELONGING FOR ALL COMMUNITIES OF COLOR WITHIN WELL-RESOURCED NEIGHBORHOODS THROUGH EXPANDED HOUSING CHOICE.
OBJECTIVE 4.B	EXPAND SMALL AND MID-RISE MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING PRODUCTION TO SERVE OUR WORKFORCE, PRIORITIZING MIDDLE-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS.
OBJECTIVE 5.A	CONNECT PEOPLE TO JOBS AND THEIR NEIGHBORHOOD WITH NUMEROUS, EQUITABLE, AND HEALTHY TRANSPORTATION AND MOBILITY OPTIONS.
Implementing Program Areas	
7 Expanding Housing Choices 7.1 Rezoning Program; 7.2 Mid-rise and Small Multifamily Buildings; 7.3 Housing Near Job Centers and Transit	

33 The 13 rail and bus lines that account for the majority of Muni's ridership. Before the pandemic, Rapid Network lines were scheduled to operate every 10 minutes or better all day on weekdays.

POLICY 21: Prevent the potential displacement and adverse racial and social equity impacts of zoning changes, planning processes, or public and private investments especially for populations and [areas vulnerable to displacement](#).

Related Objectives	
OBJECTIVE 2.C	INCREASE ACCOUNTABILITY TO AMERICAN INDIAN, BLACK, AND OTHER COMMUNITIES OF COLOR.
OBJECTIVE 3.C	ELIMINATE COMMUNITY DISPLACEMENT WITHIN AREAS VULNERABLE TO DISPLACEMENT.
Implementing Program Areas	
2 Stabilizing Tenants and Rental Housing	
2.1 Eviction Prevention and Anti-displacement	
4 Centering Equity Communities and Cultural Heritage	
4.1 Accountability	

POLICY 22: Create dedicated and consistent local funding sources and advocate for regional, State, and Federal funding to support building permanently affordable housing for very low-, low-, and moderate-income households that meets the Regional Housing Needs Allocation targets.

Related Objectives	
OBJECTIVE 1.C	ELIMINATE HOMELESSNESS.
OBJECTIVE 4.A	SUBSTANTIALLY EXPAND THE AMOUNT OF PERMANENTLY AFFORDABLE HOUSING FOR EXTREMELY LOW- TO MODERATE-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS.
Implementing Program Areas	
1 Affordable Housing Resources and Equitable Access	
1.1 Affordable Housing Funding; 1.2 Affordable Housing Production	

POLICY 23: Retain and increase the number of moderate- and middle-income households by increasing their homebuying opportunities and reversing the shortage in housing that is affordable to these households.

Related Objectives	
OBJECTIVE 4.A	SUBSTANTIALLY EXPAND THE AMOUNT OF PERMANENTLY AFFORDABLE HOUSING FOR EXTREMELY LOW- TO MODERATE-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS.
Implementing Program Areas	
1 Affordable Housing Resources and Equitable Access	
1.6 Homeownership Support	

POLICY 24: Enable mixed-income development projects to maximize the number of permanently affordable housing units constructed, in balance with delivering other permanent community benefits that advance racial and social equity.

Related Objectives

OBJECTIVE 4.A SUBSTANTIALLY EXPAND THE AMOUNT OF PERMANENTLY AFFORDABLE HOUSING FOR EXTREMELY LOW- TO MODERATE-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS.

Implementing Program Areas

1 Affordable Housing Resources and Equitable Access

1.2 Affordable Housing Production; 1.3 Inclusionary Housing

7 Expanding Housing Choices

7.3 Housing Near Job Centers and Transit

8 Reducing Constraints on Housing Development, Maintenance, and Improvement

8.4 Process and Permit Procedures; 8.7 Facilitating Large Projects; 8.9 Post-Entitlement Permitting and Pipeline Support

POLICY 25: Reduce governmental constraints on development in Well-resourced Neighborhoods to enable small and mid-rise multi-family buildings providing improved housing choice and affordability.

Related Objectives

OBJECTIVE 4.B EXPAND SMALL AND MID-RISE MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING PRODUCTION TO SERVE OUR WORKFORCE, PRIORITIZING MIDDLE-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS.

Implementing Program Areas

8 Reducing Constraints on Housing Development, Maintenance, and Improvement

8.4 Process and Permit Procedures

POLICY 26: Streamline and simplify permit processes to provide more equitable access to the application process, improve certainty of outcomes, and ensure meeting State- and local-required timelines, especially for 100% affordable housing and shelter projects.

Related Objectives	
OBJECTIVE 4.A	SUBSTANTIALLY EXPAND THE AMOUNT OF PERMANENTLY AFFORDABLE HOUSING FOR EXTREMELY LOW- TO MODERATE-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS.
OBJECTIVE 4.B	EXPAND SMALL AND MID-RISE MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING PRODUCTION TO SERVE OUR WORKFORCE, PRIORITIZING MIDDLE-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS.
Implementing Program Areas	
3 Preventing and Eliminating Homelessness 3.3 Temporary Shelter	
7 Expanding Housing Choices 7.2 Mid-rise and Small Multifamily Buildings; 7.3 Housing Near Job Centers and Transit	
8 Reducing Constraints on Housing Development, Maintenance, and Improvement 8.1 Cost and Fees; 8.3 Objective Design Standards & Findings; 8.4 Process and Permit Procedures; 8.6 Support for Affordable and Supportive Housing and Shelters	
9 Healthy, Connected, and Resilient Housing and Neighborhoods 9.4 Community Services	

POLICY 27: Improve coordination, alignment, shared mission, and functionality of post-entitlement permit processes across agencies and jurisdictions to speed housing construction starts after approvals, especially for 100% affordable housing and development agreements.

Related Objectives	
OBJECTIVE 4.A	SUBSTANTIALLY EXPAND THE AMOUNT OF PERMANENTLY AFFORDABLE HOUSING FOR EXTREMELY LOW- TO MODERATE-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS.
OBJECTIVE 4.B	EXPAND SMALL AND MID-RISE MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING PRODUCTION TO SERVE OUR WORKFORCE, PRIORITIZING MIDDLE-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS.
Implementing Program Areas	
8 Reducing Constraints on Housing Development, Maintenance, and Improvement 8.1 Cost and Fees; 8.3 Objective Design Standards & Findings; 8.4 Process and Permit Procedures; 8.6 Support for Affordable and Supportive Housing and Shelters; 8.7 Facilitating Large Projects; 8.9 Post-Entitlement Permitting and Pipeline Support	

POLICY 28: Affirm compliance in State housing law, requirements, and intent by strengthening data collection, clarifying definitions, and further supporting implementation.

Related Objectives	
OBJECTIVE 4.A	SUBSTANTIALLY EXPAND THE AMOUNT OF PERMANENTLY AFFORDABLE HOUSING FOR EXTREMELY LOW- TO MODERATE-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS.
OBJECTIVE 4.B	EXPAND SMALL AND MID-RISE MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING PRODUCTION TO SERVE OUR WORKFORCE, PRIORITIZING MIDDLE-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS.
Implementing Program Areas	
2 Stabilizing Tenants and Rental Housing	
2.2 Tenant Protections	
4 Centering Equity Communities and Cultural Heritage	
4.2 Community Planning	
8 Reducing Constraints on Housing Development, Maintenance, and Improvement	
8.3 Objective Design Standards & Findings; 8.4 Process and Permit Procedures; 8.5 Compliance with State Programs and Law; 8.8 Policy and Practice Review; 8.9 Post-Entitlement Permitting and Pipeline Support	

POLICY 29: Complete community-led processes in Priority Equity Geographies that provide defined community benefits or mitigations for effects of new development consistent with state and federal law in order to reduce burdens on advocates of vulnerable populations and community members and establish more predictable outcomes for housing applications.

Related Objectives	
OBJECTIVE 2.C	INCREASE ACCOUNTABILITY TO AMERICAN INDIAN, BLACK, AND OTHER COMMUNITIES OF COLOR.
OBJECTIVE 3.C	ELIMINATE COMMUNITY DISPLACEMENT WITHIN AREAS VULNERABLE TO DISPLACEMENT.
OBJECTIVE 3.B	CREATE A SENSE OF BELONGING FOR ALL COMMUNITIES OF COLOR WITHIN WELL-RESOURCED NEIGHBORHOODS THROUGH EXPANDED HOUSING CHOICE.
OBJECTIVE 4.B	EXPAND SMALL AND MID-RISE MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING PRODUCTION TO SERVE OUR WORKFORCE, PRIORITIZING MIDDLE-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS.
Implementing Program Areas	
1 Affordable Housing Resources and Equitable Access	
1.2 Affordable Housing Production	
7 Expanding Housing Choices	
7.2 Mid-rise and Small Multifamily Buildings	
8 Reducing Constraints on Housing Development, Maintenance, and Improvement	
8.4 Process and Permit Procedures	

POLICY 30: Support the reduction of non-governmental challenges that enable affordable housing and small and mid-rise multi-family buildings as a prominent housing type.

Related Objectives

OBJECTIVE 4.A SUBSTANTIALLY EXPAND THE AMOUNT OF PERMANENTLY AFFORDABLE HOUSING FOR EXTREMELY LOW- TO MODERATE-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS.

OBJECTIVE 4.B EXPAND SMALL AND MID-RISE MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING PRODUCTION TO SERVE OUR WORKFORCE, PRIORITIZING MIDDLE-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS.

Implementing Program Areas

8 Reducing Constraints on Housing Development, Maintenance, and Improvement

8.1 Cost and Fees; 8.2 Small Multifamily Financing and Support; 8.6 Support for Affordable and Supportive Housing and Shelters

POLICY 31: Facilitate small and mid-rise multi-family buildings that private development can deliver to serve middle-income households without deed restriction, including through adding units in lower density areas or by adding [Accessory Dwelling Units \(ADUs\)](#).

Related Objectives

OBJECTIVE 3.B CREATE A SENSE OF BELONGING FOR ALL COMMUNITIES OF COLOR WITHIN WELL-RESOURCED NEIGHBORHOODS THROUGH EXPANDED HOUSING CHOICE.

OBJECTIVE 4.B EXPAND SMALL AND MID-RISE MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING PRODUCTION TO SERVE OUR WORKFORCE, PRIORITIZING MIDDLE-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS.

Implementing Program Areas

7 Expanding Housing Choices

7.2 Mid-rise and Small Multifamily Buildings; 7.4 Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)

POLICY 32: Promote and facilitate aging in place for seniors and multi-generational living that supports extended families and communal households.

Related Objectives

OBJECTIVE 4.C DIVERSIFY HOUSING TYPES FOR ALL CULTURES, FAMILY STRUCTURES, AND ABILITIES.

Implementing Program Areas

Serving Special Needs Groups

6.1 Families With Children; 6.3 Seniors and People with Disabilities and Chronic Illness

POLICY 33: Prevent the outmigration of families with children and support the needs of families to grow.

Related Objectives
OBJECTIVE 4.C DIVERSIFY HOUSING TYPES FOR ALL CULTURES, FAMILY STRUCTURES, AND ABILITIES.
Implementing Program Areas
4 Centering Equity Communities and Cultural Heritage 4.2 Community Planning
Serving Special Needs Groups 6.1 Families With Children
9 Healthy, Connected, and Resilient Housing and Neighborhoods 9.4 Community Services

POLICY 34: Encourage co-housing³⁴ to support ways for households to share space, resources, and responsibilities, especially to reinforce supportive relationships within and across communities and generations.

Related Objectives
OBJECTIVE 4.C DIVERSIFY HOUSING TYPES FOR ALL CULTURES, FAMILY STRUCTURES, AND ABILITIES.
Implementing Program Areas
1 Affordable Housing Resources and Equitable Access 1.2 Affordable Housing Production
7 Expanding Housing Choices 7.2 Mid-rise and Small Multifamily Buildings

34 Co-housing, group housing, or co-living rooms are a type of housing that may have limited cooking facilities and do not contain a full kitchen in each room. Co-housing may include (but is not limited to) communes, fraternities and sororities, or Residential Hotels.

POLICY 35: Require new commercial developments and large employers, hospitals, and educational institutions to help meet housing demand generated by anticipated job growth to maintain an appropriate jobs-housing fit, and address housing needs of students.

Related Objectives
OBJECTIVE 4.C DIVERSIFY HOUSING TYPES FOR ALL CULTURES, FAMILY STRUCTURES, AND ABILITIES.
Implementing Program Areas
1 Affordable Housing Resources and Equitable Access 1.1 Affordable Housing Funding; 1.2 Affordable Housing Production 7 Expanding Housing Choices 7.3 Housing Near Job Centers and Transit

POLICY 36: Maximize the use of existing housing stock for residential use by discouraging vacancy, short-term use, and speculative resale.

Related Objectives
OBJECTIVE 4.C DIVERSIFY HOUSING TYPES FOR ALL CULTURES, FAMILY STRUCTURES, AND ABILITIES.
Implementing Program Areas
2 Stabilizing Tenants and Rental Housing 2.4 Preserving Rental Unit Availability

POLICY 37: Facilitate neighborhoods where proximity to daily needs and high-quality community services and amenities promotes social connections, supports caregivers, reduces the need for private auto travel, and advances healthy activities.

Related Objectives
OBJECTIVE 5.A CONNECT PEOPLE TO JOBS AND THEIR NEIGHBORHOOD WITH NUMEROUS, EQUITABLE, AND HEALTHY TRANSPORTATION AND MOBILITY OPTIONS.
OBJECTIVE 5.C ELEVATE EXPRESSION OF CULTURAL IDENTITIES THROUGH THE DESIGN OF ACTIVE AND ENGAGING NEIGHBORHOOD BUILDINGS AND SPACES.
Implementing Program Areas
4 Centering Equity Communities and Cultural Heritage 4.3 Access to Economic Opportunity; 4.4 Cultural Districts; 4.5 Cultural Heritage and Expression 9 Healthy, Connected, and Resilient Housing and Neighborhoods 9.2 Resilient and Healthy Neighborhoods and New Housing; 9.3 Transportation; 9.4 Community Services

POLICY 38: Ensure transportation investments create equitable access to transit and are planned in parallel with increase in housing capacity to advance well-connected neighborhoods consistent with the City’s [Connect SF vision](#), and encourage sustainable trips³⁵ in new housing.

Related Objectives
OBJECTIVE 5.A CONNECT PEOPLE TO JOBS AND THEIR NEIGHBORHOOD WITH NUMEROUS, EQUITABLE, AND HEALTHY TRANSPORTATION AND MOBILITY OPTIONS.
OBJECTIVE 5.B ADVANCE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE, CLIMATE, AND COMMUNITY RESILIENCE.
Implementing Program Areas
9 Healthy, Connected, and Resilient Housing and Neighborhoods 9.3 Transportation

POLICY 39: Support the repair and rehabilitation of housing to ensure life safety, health, and well-being of residents, especially in [Environmental Justice Communities](#), and to support sustainable building practices.

Related Objectives
OBJECTIVE 1.A ENSURE HOUSING STABILITY AND HEALTHY HOMES.
OBJECTIVE 5.B ADVANCE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE, CLIMATE, AND COMMUNITY RESILIENCE.
Implementing Program Areas
9 Healthy, Connected, and Resilient Housing and Neighborhoods 9.1 Housing Rehabilitation for Health and Safety

35 Sustainable trips utilize priority modes include walking, bicycling, transit, and vanpooling that have a low-carbon impact.

POLICY 40: Enforce and improve planning processes and building regulations to ensure a healthy environment for new housing developments, especially in [Environmental Justice Communities](#).

Related Objectives
OBJECTIVE 1.A ENSURE HOUSING STABILITY AND HEALTHY HOMES.
OBJECTIVE 5.B ADVANCE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE, CLIMATE, AND COMMUNITY RESILIENCE.
Implementing Program Areas
4 Centering Equity Communities and Cultural Heritage 4.1 Accountability
9 Healthy, Connected, and Resilient Housing and Neighborhoods 9.2 Resilient and Healthy Neighborhoods and New Housing

POLICY 41: Shape urban design policy, standards, and guidelines to enable cultural and identity expression, advance architectural creativity and durability, and foster neighborhood belonging.

Related Objectives
OBJECTIVE 5.C ELEVATE EXPRESSION OF CULTURAL IDENTITIES THROUGH THE DESIGN OF ACTIVE AND ENGAGING NEIGHBORHOOD BUILDINGS AND SPACES.
Implementing Program Areas
4 Centering Equity Communities and Cultural Heritage 4.5 Cultural Heritage and Expression
8 Reducing Constraints on Housing Development, Maintenance, and Improvement 8.3 Objective Design Standards & Findings

POLICY 42: Support cultural uses, activities, and architecture that sustain San Francisco's diverse cultural heritage.

Related Objectives
OBJECTIVE 5.C ELEVATE EXPRESSION OF CULTURAL IDENTITIES THROUGH THE DESIGN OF ACTIVE AND ENGAGING NEIGHBORHOOD BUILDINGS AND SPACES.
Implementing Program Areas
4 Centering Equity Communities and Cultural Heritage 4.4 Cultural Districts; 4.5 Cultural Heritage and Expression
9 Healthy, Connected, and Resilient Housing and Neighborhoods 9.1 Housing Rehabilitation for Health and Safety

Implementing Programs

Per California Government Code Section 65583(c), the Housing Element must include a program of actions that San Francisco is undertaking or intends to undertake to implement the Housing Element's policies and achieve its goals and objectives. Implementing actions could include administration of land use and development controls, planning and community engagement processes, regulatory concessions and incentives to support housing development, protections and services to stabilize renters and housing, and the use of federal, state, and local financing and subsidy programs for affordable housing production and preservation.

The Implementing Programs are presented below under broad program areas. Each Implementing Program is organized in a table that contains various implementing actions, ongoing activities associated with those actions, a timeframe for initiating the action, responsible agencies, and funding sources. All program areas and programs are listed in the table of contents at the start of the document to navigate to programs of interest more easily. Implementing actions included in each program table include existing City programs as well as newly proposed actions.

The broad program areas include:

1. Affordable Housing Resources and Equitable Access
2. Stabilizing Tenants and Rental Housing
3. Preventing and Eliminating Homelessness
4. Redressing and Preventing Discrimination
5. Centering Equity Communities and Cultural Heritage
6. Serving Special Needs Groups
7. Expanding Housing Choices
8. Reducing Constraints on Housing Development, Maintenance, and Improvement
9. Healthy, Connected, and Resilient Housing and Neighborhoods

Timeframes for each program action completion is provided using the following categories:

Short (0-2 years) Medium (3-5 years) Long (6-8 years) Ongoing

Various actions support **Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH)** law in one or more of the following ways:

1. Addressing significant disparities in housing needs and in access to opportunity.
2. Replacing segregated living patterns with truly integrated and balanced living patterns.
3. Transforming racially and ethnically concentrated areas of poverty (R/ECAP) into areas of opportunity.
4. Fostering and maintaining compliance with civil rights and fair housing laws.

Actions related to AFFH are summarized in a table below and include metrics for measuring their progress.

The Implementing Programs also must include **quantified objectives**, particularly for housing units planned for, built, or preserved. The quantified objectives are summarized in a table concluding this section and are shown for applicable programs that involve specific housing unit targets.

1. Affordable Housing Resources and Equitable Access

Affordable housing programs and rent assistance help subsidize housing to make it more accessible for lower income renters who otherwise would spend large amounts of their income on housing and/or live in substandard or crowded conditions. For many low-, moderate-, and middle-income residents in high-cost cities like San Francisco, homeownership can also be out of reach. Homeownership assistance programs can help people buy and keep a home, and build an asset for future generations. San Francisco's RHNA targets over the 8-year Housing Element period include over 46,000 units that should be affordable at very low-income, or "VLI" (including extremely low-income, or "ELI"), low-, and moderate- incomes. The programs covered under the Affordable Housing and Housing Assistance program area illustrate a path to meet the needs of low- and moderate-income households and include: Affordable Housing Funding, Affordable Housing Production, Inclusionary Housing, Affordable Housing Preservation, Deep Affordability and Rent Assistance for the Lowest Income Households, Homeownership Support, and Eligibility and Access for Affordable Housing. The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII), and the San Francisco Housing Authority, along with the Planning Department, are key implementing agencies of affordable housing programs. Related actions on affordable housing and housing assistance can also be found in the program areas on Stabilizing Tenants and Housing, Preventing and Eliminating Homelessness, Redressing and Preventing Discrimination (within 5.4 Housing Programs to Redress Harm), and in Reducing Constraints on Housing Development.

1.1. Affordable Housing Funding

Related Policies: 22, 35

Actions	Timeline
1.1.1 By March 2023, convene City leadership, staff, policymakers, affordable housing advocates, and industry experts to collaborate on an Affordable Housing Implementation and Funding Strategy that provides specific recommendations and responsible parties to achieve and sustain the substantial public funding from local, state, and federal sources, that would join with public-private partnerships, needed to achieve the RHNA targets of over 46,000 units affordable at low- and moderate-incomes. Assign appropriate City staff to include a budget proposal for Fiscal Year 2023-2024 and complete this effort by January 31, 2024. <i>Existing programs: (NEW)</i>	Short, Ongoing
1.1.2. Include affordable housing investment needs in annual City budget process and Capital Planning process to identify existing housing funding sources, funding gaps and potential new funding sources, including regular general fund allocations that can be made as part of the budget process and local general obligation bonds or other funding sources that require voter approval. <i>Existing programs: City Budget; Capital Planning</i>	Short

Actions	Timeline
<p>1.1.3 Create a budgeting tool to track housing investments, including permanently affordable housing production, preservation, and housing services; including investments that advance community identified priority actions, per Action 4.1.3; tracking investments that advance racial and social equity, per Action 4.1.1 and achieve targets for investment in Well-resourced Neighborhoods as referenced in Action 1.2.1 and in Priority Equity Geographies.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: (NEW)</i></p>	Short, Ongoing
<p>1.1.4 Explore the development of public financing tools such as Infrastructure Finance Districts or a municipal bank to leverage the City's co-investments in order to lower direct City subsidy for permanently affordable housing and/or increase feasibility of approved projects.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Infrastructure Finance District</i></p>	Short, Ongoing
<p>1.1.5 Continue to develop and support alternative and philanthropic funding sources to deliver permanently affordable housing faster and at a cheaper per unit cost through tools such as the Housing Accelerator Fund.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Housing Accelerator Fund</i></p>	Short
<p>1.1.6 Support the Bay Area Housing Financing Authority's expected efforts to secure voter approval for a regional measure to fund permanently affordable housing.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Bay Area Housing Financing Authority; (NEW)</i></p>	Short
<p>1.1.7 Advocate for federal legislation to increase Low-Income Housing Tax Credits and Private Activity Bonds (PAB), for example, by changing federal rules to lower the minimum bond financing needed to access 4% LIHTC (currently 50 percent) or increase the cap on PAB to help unlock more LIHTC in San Francisco and statewide.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: City's Annual State and Federal Advocacy</i></p>	Short
<p>1.1.8 Advocate for State legislation to change the voter approval threshold for General Obligation Bonds from two-thirds to at most 55 percent.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: City's Annual State and Federal Advocacy</i></p>	Medium
<p>1.1.9 Advocate for State legislation to expand non-competitive, permanently affordable housing funding sources that would be distributed to jurisdictions by formula, like the Permanent Local Housing Allocation (PLHA).</p> <p><i>Existing programs: City's Annual State and Federal Advocacy</i></p>	Short
<p>1.1.10 Collaborate with key organizations to reform Proposition 13 (1978) for commercial property to provide funding support for local jurisdictions to meet their permanently affordable housing targets.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: City's Annual State and Federal Advocacy</i></p>	Medium
<p>1.1.11 Assess the City's capacity to finance a mixed-income and/ or mixed-use, social housing program.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: (NEW)</i></p>	Medium

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<p>1.1.12 Maintain the jobs-housing linkage program and adjust the fee levels based on an updated nexus study and feasibility study on a regular basis. Future nexus studies should evaluate adjustments in the Jobs-Housing Linkage Fee commensurate with commitments to hiring higher rates of San Francisco residents.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Jobs-Housing Linkage Fee</i></p>	Ongoing
<p>1.1.13 Conduct a feasibility study in coordination with Action 1.1.12 to assess large employers' affordable housing funding on an ongoing basis to complement the jobs-housing linkage requirements and provide paths for large employers to contribute funding to and/or partner with non-profit developers to provide homeownership opportunities.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: (NEW)</i></p>	Short
<p>1.1.14 Explore expanding jobs-housing linkage fees to large employer institutional developments (medical and educational) who are currently not subject to jobs-housing linkage fees, in coordination with Action 1.1.12.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Jobs-Housing Linkage Fee</i></p>	Short
<p>1.1.15 Increase staffing at responsible agencies for analysts and community development specialists to implement expanded affordable housing programs in relation to increased funding and targets and to incorporate community strategies into the implementation of the Housing Element.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: City's Annual Budget</i></p>	Short
<p>1.1.16 Expand redevelopment tax increment financing to complete the affordable housing programs of the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII) and to replace affordable units destroyed and never replaced.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Redevelopment Tax Increment Financing</i></p>	Long
<i>Responsible Agencies: Mayor/BOS, MOHCD, OEWD, SF Planning</i>	
<i>Funding Sources: Local Sources: Impact Fees, General Fund, Housing Trust Fund, General Obligation (GO) Bonds, Certificates of Participation, State sources: LHTF, PLHA, HHC, NPLH, AHSC, BAHFA ; Federal Sources: HOME, CDBG, HOPWA, LIHTC, PBA</i>	

1.2. Affordable Housing Production

Related Policies: 15, 19, 22, 24, 29, 34, 35

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<p>1.2.1 Build between 25% and 50% of the City's new permanently affordable housing within Well-resourced Neighborhoods over the next two RHNA cycles, implementing the zoning strategies of Policy 20.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: MOHCD Consolidated Plan</i></p>	Long

Actions	Timeline
<p>1.2.2 Strategically acquire sites and identify targeted funding for land acquisition and banking for affordable housing throughout the city. This will include lots for consolidation that can accommodate permanently affordable housing of at least 50 to 100 units or more through publicly funded purchases, in balance with investment in affordable housing preservation and production and in strategic coordination with sites owned by religious, nonprofit, and public property owners. Prioritize sites of interest identified in coordination with American Indian, Black, and other communities of color. Consider sites that accommodate fewer than 50 units as additional affordable housing funding, financing, and operating approaches are secured.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: N/A</i></p>	Short
<p>1.2.3 Prioritize land dedication, donation, or purchase of sites as a major strategy for securing affordable housing, including social housing and shared equity cooperatives, through partnerships with religious institutions, other philanthropic or private property owners, and non-profit developers, including ownership models referenced under Action 1.6.1.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: (NEW)</i></p>	Short
<p>1.2.4 Regularly track the pipeline of development sites and land banked for affordable housing development funded by OCIL, MOHCD, and other relevant agencies, and develop strategies to ensure sufficient sites to accommodate affordable housing production relative to available funding over a rolling 4- to 8-year outlook and to meet the goals to construct housing in Priority Equity Geographies and Well-resourced neighborhoods per Action 1.2.1.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: (NEW)</i></p>	Short
<p>1.2.5 Develop a land acquisition process and program that permits inexpensive long-term leases for land developed with high affordability.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: (NEW)</i></p>	Short

Actions	Timeline
<p>1.2.6 Continue and expand the City's Public Land for Housing Program through public-private partnerships and use City resources to support the maximum number of permanently affordable housing units on underutilized publicly owned and surplus sites, balancing the financial needs of enterprise agencies and ensuring adequate space and resources to address gaps in community infrastructure, services, and amenities. As part of this program, continue to implement the City's Surplus Public Lands Ordinance codified in Administrative Code Chapter 23A, in compliance with the state Surplus Lands Act (Government Code 54220-54234).</p> <p>The Public Lands Program should include, but not be limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual outreach and marketing of these sites to developers, especially non-profit developers; • Coordination across agencies, including the Mayor's office; • Continue negotiations and completion of any necessary rezoning efforts on identified publicly owned sites that will accommodate the RHNA; • Facilitation and streamlining of any approvals and subsequent entitlements for proposed projects on publicly identified sites; • Development and implementation of site-specific incentives including but not limited to financial assistance, streamlined approvals, and reduced fees, to encourage and facilitate affordable housing development on publicly owned sites; and • Issuance of RFPs for sites ready for development annually. <p>The City will target 500 to 2000 affordable units in the RHNA planning period. Revisit strategies as appropriate.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Public Land for Housing; Development Agreements</p>	Short, Ongoing
<p>1.2.7 Support the maximum number of permanently affordable housing units and improved transit facilities on SFMTA-owned sites slated for development by leveraging private investment in market-rate units with public funding.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Public Land for Housing; Inclusionary Housing; Development Agreements</p>	Short
<p>1.2.8 Prioritize support to neighborhood-based affordable housing developers, particularly those managed by American Indian, Black, and other communities of color. Partner with affordable housing developers to purchase privately owned entitled sites where construction may be stalling.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)</p>	Short
<p>1.2.9 Support and expedite delivery of the permanently affordable housing projects in former Redevelopment Areas led by the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (OCII).</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Redevelopment Areas</p>	Short, Ongoing
<p>1.2.10 Support co-housing developments on parcels owned by non-profits, like sites owned by religious institutions, to further encourage philanthropically financed affordable housing.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)</p>	Short

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<p>1.2.11 Work with geographically impacted communities, Cultural Districts, and the State, including Caltrans, to study freeway removal opportunities throughout the city as a means of redressing cultural and environmental harm to American Indian, Black and other communities of color through the use of state-owned public land, prioritizing affordable housing and land dedication (as referenced in Actions 1.2.3 and 1.6.1). Focus on freeway segments that need replacement most urgently; contribute the highest air pollution impacts, particularly to persons in Priority Equity Geographies that overlap with Environmental Justice Communities; and offer the greatest multi-benefit potential for transforming neighborhoods and producing new housing.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: (NEW)</i></p>	Long
<p>1.2.12 Collaborate with geographically impacted communities and Cultural Districts to study the removal of the Central Freeway stub between Interstate 80 and Octavia Boulevard as a means of making new parcels available for housing uses, especially for affordable housing.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: (NEW)</i></p>	Medium
<p>1.2.13 Encourage and provide opportunities for large commercial developments to build housing or dedicate land in lieu of their jobs-housing linkage fee obligations, with affordability requirements that align with the income levels of the households anticipated to fill new jobs.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Jobs-Housing Linkage Fee; (New)</i></p>	Medium
<i>Responsible Agencies: Mayor/BOS, MOHCD, OEWD, OCII, SF Planning, SFMTA</i>	
<i>Funding Sources: General Fund; ROPs (OCII); Impact Fees; Housing Trust Fund; General Obligation (GO) Bonds; Certificates of Participation; State sources awarded to City: LHTF, PLHA, NPLH, AHSC, IIG; Federal Sources awarded to City: HOME, HOPWA</i>	

1.3. Inclusionary Housing

Related Policies: 5, 24

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<p>1.3.1 Through the Controller's Office triennial study of financial feasibility of the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program (including feedback from the Technical Advisory Committee), study a more real-time and systematic methodology for evaluating the inclusionary rates so that they are better tied to local conditions and can maximize total number of Below Market Rate (BMR) units delivered without public subsidy, in balance with the directions of Action 1.3.2.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Controller's Study of Inclusionary Housing and Technical Advisory Committee</i></p>	Medium

Actions	Timeline
<p>1.3.2 Through the Controller's Office triennial study of financial feasibility of the Inclusionary housing Program including feedback from the Technical Advisory Committee, assess by 2024 whether affordability levels of rental and ownership units created through the program could be made accessible to lower income groups in balance with ensuring financial feasibility as referenced in Action 1.3.1.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Controller's Study of Inclusionary Housing and Technical Advisory Committee; Inclusionary Housing</i></p>	Short
<p>1.3.3 Assess inclusionary tiers to address constraints on housing development including financial feasibility, to increase certainty for housing projects, to ensure that inclusionary requirements do not impede or undermine use of State Density Bonus Law, and to reduce staff time and need for specific expertise. Changes to inclusionary tiers should improve or maintain average affordability of inclusionary housing units. Changes to inclusionary tiers and their requirements should retain or expand the percentage of units required, including with consideration to rents, purchase prices, and HOA fees.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Inclusionary Housing</i></p>	Medium
<p>1.3.4 Explore the potential advantages of modifying proximity inclusionary requirements to provide more flexibility to small housing projects to provide 100% affordable housing offsite, to allow sites beyond a half-mile radius from the market-rate project site if the off-site affordable housing is located in Priority Equity Geographies.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Inclusionary Housing</i></p>	Medium
<p>1.3.5 Explore new tier for onsite inclusionary housing serving moderate-income households in Well-resourced Neighborhoods, to reduce the financial burden on small, multifamily projects and create more workforce housing. As part of this analysis, consider the prices of surrounding market-rate units, aim for inclusionary tiers at least 20% below surrounding market-rate prices, and consider the number of inclusionary units needed to match local need.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Inclusionary Housing</i></p>	Medium
<p>1.3.6 Prioritize achieving the maximum number of permanently affordable housing units at lower- and moderate-incomes that are financially feasible, as an essential benefit of new mixed-use development agreements alongside other benefits such as community facilities and transit investments.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Development Agreements</i></p>	Ongoing
<p>1.3.7 Incentivize development projects to exceed the required inclusionary housing percentages to maximize the total number of Below Market Rate units via density bonus programs or streamlined regulatory paths as defined in Policy 25.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Inclusionary Housing; Local Density Bonus Programs; State Density Bonus; SB 35</i></p>	Medium
<p>1.3.8 Amend the Inclusionary Housing Program regulations to allow existing homeowners of Below Market Rate units to purchase another Below Market Rate unit and sell their current unit in cases where household size changes or another reasonable accommodation is required, in order to respond to changing household needs.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Inclusionary Housing</i></p>	Short

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<p>1.3.9 Ensure that implementation of the City's inclusionary ordinance for State Density Bonus projects does not undermine the feasibility of projects that already provide affordable units and are consistent with State Density Bonus Law.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For projects already providing affordable housing through State Density Bonus Law, consider applying the inclusionary tier and requirement to the base project to increase the financial feasibility of smaller density bonus projects. Allow greater flexibility for projects that invoke State Density Bonus Law by allowing more deeply affordable units to be counted toward the affordability tiers required under the inclusionary ordinance. Study the applicability of the Affordable Housing Fee to bonus projects, evaluating its impacts on project feasibility and affordable housing production. Based on the findings of this study, take action to mitigate impacts of the Affordable Housing Fee program. <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Inclusionary Housing</p>	Short
<i>Responsible Agencies:</i> Planning, Controller, MOHCD, Board of Supervisors	
<i>Funding Sources:</i> Inclusionary Program; General Fund	

1.4. Affordable Housing Preservation

Related Policies: 2, 5, 15

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<p>1.4.1 Continue to rebuild and replace public housing units at HOPE SF sites without displacement of the current residents.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Affordable Housing Preservation and Rehabilitation; HOPESF; Rental Assistance Demonstration Program (RAD)</p>	Medium
<p>1.4.2 Continue to implement temporary relocation plans that ensure affordable housing tenants do not pay more than they are currently paying during rehabilitation or redevelopment of existing affordable housing, including identifying units in permanently affordable housing developments that can be used as relocation housing, and ensure tenants are relocated within San Francisco.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Affordable Housing Preservation and Rehabilitation</p>	Short
<p>1.4.3 Conduct a comprehensive needs assessment of existing housing cooperatives to identify impediments to success and their need for support, and expand technical assistance and support to cooperatives to meet identified needs.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Affordable Housing Preservation and Rehabilitation; Coop Housing; Coop Living for Mental Health</p>	Short

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<p>1.4.4 Expand resources for preservation, rehabilitation, or rebuilding of cooperative buildings, and adopt requirements such as preservation of affordability, right-to-return, and relocation plans as informed by the needs assessment referenced under Action 1.4.3.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Affordable Housing Preservation and Rehabilitation; Coop Housing; Coop Living for Mental Health; Tenant Rights</p>	Medium
<p>1.4.5 Continue to monitor at-risk affordable housing units on a regular basis to track status, continue to outreach with owners and non-profits to negotiate preservation agreements for properties with expiring affordability restrictions, and fund and enforce noticing requirements within three years, twelve months, and six months of the affordability expiration date. Provide education, counseling, and other services for tenants in affected properties to ensure permanent affordability for all units and housing stability for tenants. Services, education, and resources include but may not be limited to actions referenced under Action 2.1 and 2.2.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Monitoring of Affordable Housing Preservation and Rehabilitation</p>	Medium
<p>1.4.6 Utilize value capture from up-zonings to support large affordable housing developments in need of substantial repair or rehabilitation, to fund rebuilding and financial feasibility of existing affordable units for current residents while creating more affordable homes.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)</p>	Short
<p>1.4.7 Strengthen monitoring and enforcement of Below Market Rate units to avoid fraud and abuse of units and to unlock more units for those eligible and in need, through active enforcement of existing obligations, expedited leasing of new and turnover units, and completing the build out of the DAHLIA partners database.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Affordable Unit Occupancy Compliance</p>	Short
<i>Responsible Agencies:</i> MOHCD, Mayor/BOS, Planning	
<i>Funding Sources:</i> General Fund; Impact Fees; Housing Trust Fund; General Obligation (GO) Bonds; Certificates of Participation; State sources awarded to City: LHTF, PLHA, NPLH, HHC, AHSC; Federal Sources awarded to City: CDBG, HOPWA	

1.5. Deep Affordability and Rent Assistance for Lowest Income Renters

Related Policies: 1, 9, 15, 19

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<p>1.5.1 Increase production of housing affordable to extremely low and very low-income households and increase the share of units affordable to these households in affordable housing. This includes identifying and deploying operating subsidies necessary to serve these income groups.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> 100% Affordable; Building-based Rental Subsidies; Very Low Income Below Market Rate Units.</p>	Medium

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<p>1.5.2 Maximize the use of ongoing tenant-based rental assistance to expand eligibility for extremely and very low-income households who otherwise do not qualify for affordable units.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Rental Subsidies; Very Low Income Below Market Rate Units</p>	Short
<p>1.5.3 Increase housing that is affordable to extremely low and very low-income households in Well-resourced Neighborhoods, as well as in Priority Equity Geographies and Cultural Districts, through City-funded permanently affordable housing projects.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> 100% Affordable Housing; Inclusionary Affordable Housing; Rental Subsidies; Tenant-based Rental Subsidies</p>	Medium
<p>1.5.4 Reduce severe cost burdens and increase stability for extremely low- and very low-income renters through ongoing rental assistance for qualifying vulnerable households, including people harmed by past government discrimination, seniors, people with disabilities, transgender people, and families with children, particularly those living in SROs.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Rental Subsidies; Single-Room Occupancy Units (SROs)</p>	Short
<p>1.5.5 Engage with target communities to determine needs and advocate for expanded tenant and building-based rental assistance programs at the federal and state and local levels to meet the needs of extremely and very low-income households and households with fixed incomes, such as seniors and people with disabilities, as also referenced in Actions 2.1.2, 3.2.1, 1.5.4.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Tenant-based Rental Subsidies; Rental Subsidies; Local Operating Subsidy; Senior Operating Subsidy; Housing Choice Vouchers</p>	Short
<p><i>Responsible Agencies:</i> Mayor/BOS, MOHCD, HSH, SFHA</p> <p><i>Funding Sources:</i> Local sources: General Fund; State sources: LHTF, PLHA, NPLH, HHC. Federal sources: CDBG, HOME, HOPWA, ESG, Continuum of Care, SFHA (e.g., HCV, EHV, HUD-VASH, etc.)</p>	

1.6. Homeownership Support

Related Policies: 23

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<p>1.6.1 Study and implement expansion of shared equity models that offer moderate- and middle-income homeownership (such as Shared Equity, land trusts, or cooperative ownership) through development of smaller sized lots. Use the studies cited in Actions 2.3.4 and 5.4.6 to inform expansion of these models and pursue partnership with private and philanthropic property owners referenced under Action 1.2.3.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Community Land Trust; Coop Housing; Shared Equity Housing</p>	Short
<p>1.6.2 Study and implement expansions of programs that create workforce housing for educators to serve other public-sector essential workers such as transit operators and hospital workers.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Homeownership Assistance Programs; First Responders Down Payment Assistance Loan Program; SFUSD Educators Down Payment Assistance Loan Program; (NEW)</p>	Short

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<p>1.6.3 Fund the First Responders Down Payment Assistance Loan Program and the SFUSD Educators Down Payment Assistance Loan Program. Explore potential expansion of down payment assistance programs to transit, utilities, and public works workers.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Homeownership Assistance Programs; First Responders Down Payment Assistance Loan Program; SFUSD Educators Down Payment Assistance Loan Program</p>	Ongoing
<p>1.6.4 Promote location-efficient mortgage and energy-efficient mortgage programs as a tool for expanding the purchasing power of residents while incentivizing more sustainable trip choices and energy-efficient building practices.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)</p>	Medium
<p><i>Responsible Agencies:</i> Planning, MOHCD, Mayor/BOS</p> <p><i>Funding Sources:</i> Local: Housing Trust Fund, General Obligation Bonds, Revolving Loan Funds; Federal: CDBG</p>	

1.7. Eligibility and Access for Affordable Housing

Related Policies: 5, 6, 7, 15, 19

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<p>1.7.1 Identify racial, ethnic, and social groups who have been disproportionately underserved by MOHCD's Affordable Rental and Homeownership units and the underlying reasons why those groups are underrepresented in obtaining such housing. Previously identified groups include American Indian, Black, Latinos, and other people of color, transgender and LGBTQ+ people, transitional-aged youth, people with disabilities, senior households, and households currently living in SROs. This study can inform the housing portal and access points cited in Action 1.7.6.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> DAHLIA; Housing Placement</p>	Short
<p>1.7.2 Evaluate and update existing policies and programs to increase the percentage of Affordable Rental and Homeownership units awarded to underserved groups identified through the studies referenced in Actions 1.7.1 and 5.4.9, including but not limited to preferences, strengthening targeted outreach, education, housing readiness counseling, and other services specific to the needs of each group, ensuring accessible accommodations in these services, in coordination with production of affordable housing per Actions 1.5.1, 1.5.3, and 1.6.2.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> 100% Affordable Housing; Inclusionary Affordable Housing; Housing Placement; Community-Based Services; Tenant Counseling and Education; Financial Capability Services; Rental Housing Counseling; Homeownership Assistance Programs</p>	Medium
<p>1.7.3 Identify strategies to secure housing for applicants to the Affordable Rental and Homeownership unit lottery program who have not won the lottery after more than five years of submitting applications.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> DAHLIA; Housing Placement</p>	Short

Actions	Timeline
<p>1.7.4 Identify and adopt local strategies and advocate for State legislation to remove barriers to access permanently affordable housing for immigrants or people who lack standard financial documentation such as credit histories, bank accounts, or current leases; and for transgender people whose documentation may need corrections not possible due to immigration status, and/or non-California state laws.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> 100% Affordable Housing; Inclusionary Affordable Housing; Housing Placement; City's Annual State and Federal Advocacy</p>	Short
<p>1.7.5 Expand existing culturally responsive housing counseling to applicants of MOHCD Affordable Rental and Homeownership Opportunities through a network of community-based housing counseling agencies, in consultation with Cultural Districts, and as informed by the needs identified under Actions 1.7.1, 1.7.2, and 5.4.9. These programs include financial counseling, market-rate and below market rate rental readiness counseling, and other services that lead to finding and keeping safe and stable housing; expansion of such services should be in coordination with Actions 2.1.4 and 4.1.2.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> 100% Affordable Housing; Inclusionary Affordable Housing; Housing Placement; Community-Based Services; Tenant Counseling and Education; Financial Capability Services; Rental Housing Counseling; Homeownership Assistance Programs</p>	Short
<p>1.7.6 Explore changes to the DAHLIA affordable housing application portal and other access points for housing programs and services, including affordable housing as well as resources administered by the SF Housing Authority such as rental assistance vouchers and public housing, to better serve groups identified in Action 1.7.1.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> DAHLIA</p>	Short
<p>1.7.7 Identify new strategies to address the unique housing and service needs of specific vulnerable populations to improve housing access and security for each group, using the findings from the City's housing Consolidated Plans and through direct engagement of these populations. Studies should address the needs of veterans, seniors, people with disabilities, transitional-aged youth, transgender and LGBTQ+ populations.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Senior Housing; Supportive Services; Housing for People with Disabilities; Housing for TAY; Housing for LGBTQ+; 100% Affordable Housing; Permanent Supportive Housing; Consolidated Plan</p>	Short
<p>1.7.8 Evaluate increasing neighborhood preference allocation for Below Market Rate units in Priority Equity Geographies to better serve American Indian, Black, and other communities of color, if possible, per the Federal Fair Housing regulations, as informed by Policy 5 and related actions.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Neighborhood Resident Housing Preference</p>	Short
<p>1.7.9 Create or expand programs to provide housing counseling, financial literacy education, and housing readiness to low-income American Indian, Black and other people of color households who seek housing choices in Well-resourced Neighborhoods by 2024, and provide incentives and counseling to landlords in Well-resourced Neighborhoods to offer units to low-income households. Consider similar incentives referenced in Action 8.4.16.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)</p>	Short

Actions	Timeline
<p>1.7.10 Expand housing for transitional-aged youth in permanently affordable housing, integrated with supportive programs that address their unique needs such as a past criminal record, substance abuse, sexual orientation, gender identity, or other specific needs, as informed by the strategies referenced in Action 8.7.3.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> 100% Affordable Housing; Permanent Supportive Housing; Supportive Services</p>	Medium
<p>1.7.11 Study and identify programs, geographies, and building types that respond to the needs of recently arrived immigrants to inform permanently affordable housing investments in the neighborhoods in which they initially settle, such as Chinatown, the Tenderloin, the Mission, Cultural Districts, and other gateway neighborhoods.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> 100% Affordable Housing</p>	Short
<p><i>Responsible Agencies:</i> Mayor/BOS, MOHCD, HSH, SF Planning, SFHA, Digital Services</p>	
<p><i>Funding Sources:</i> Housing Trust Fund, General Fund</p>	

2. Stabilizing Tenants and Rental Housing

Tenants often face greater housing precarity because they do not own their own homes and are more likely than homeowners to be lower income, face high housing cost burdens, and are often at greater risk of displacement. A majority of San Francisco residents are tenants, so tenant stability is often key to stabilizing communities. In addition, maintaining and preserving rental housing can be an important tool for preventing displacement of renters. The Stabilizing Tenants and Rental Housing program area covers a range of programs meant to help maintain housing security for renters including Eviction Prevention and Anti-displacement, Tenant Protections, Acquisitions and Rehabilitation for Affordability, and Preserving Rental Unit Availability. Key implementing agencies include the Rent Board, the Planning Department, Department of Building Inspections, and MOHCD.

2.1. Eviction Prevention and Anti-displacement

Related Policies: 1, 9, 21

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
2.1.1 Fund the Tenant Right-to-Counsel program to match the need for eviction defense. <i>Existing programs:</i> Tenant Right to Counsel	Short
2.1.2 Provide a priority in the allocation of direct rental assistance to vulnerable populations and in areas vulnerable to displacement . Geographies will be updated based on most up-to-date data and analysis. Assess rental assistance need for these groups and allocate additional funding secured by Action 1.1.1. <i>Existing programs:</i> Direct Rental Assistance	Short
2.1.3 As informed by Action 2.1.4 and in coordination with community liaisons referenced under Action 4.1.2, support and expand community-led navigation services and systems to provide tenants' rights education and support and expand other related programs such as the existing culturally competent Code Enforcement Outreach Program that is offered within the Department of Building Inspection. <i>Existing programs:</i> Tenant Counseling and Education; Code Enforcement Outreach Program; Organizational Capacity Building; Community-Based Services	Medium
2.1.4 Increase funding to expand the services of community-based organizations and providers for financial counseling services listed under Action 1.7.5, as well as tenant and eviction prevention services listed under Program 2, to better serve vulnerable populations, populations in areas vulnerable to displacement , and Cultural Districts. Tenant and eviction protection services include legal services, code enforcement outreach, tenant counseling, mediation, and housing-related financial assistance; expansion of such services should be informed by community priorities referenced under Action 4.1.3. Complete by completion of Rezoning Program or no later than January 31, 2026. <i>Existing programs:</i> Tenant Counseling and Education; Code Enforcement Outreach Program; Organizational Capacity Building; Community-Based Services; Rental Subsidies; Tenant and Landlord Assistance; Financial Capability Services	Short

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<p>2.1.5 Provide adequate legal services to support eviction prevention including support for rent increase hearings, habitability issues, or tenancy hearings with the Housing Authority.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Tenant Right-to-Counsel</p>	Short
<p>2.1.6 Expand on-site case management services that focus on removing barriers to housing stability to support non-profit housing providers in preventing evictions of their tenants.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Permanent Supportive Housing; Tenant and Landlord Assistance; Tenant Counseling and Education</p>	Medium
<p>2.1.7 Expand housing retention requirements to prevent evictions and support tenants of non-profit affordable housing. Allocate additional funding needed to support these functions and staff in non-profit organizations.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> 100% Affordable Housing; Inclusionary Housing</p>	Short
<p>2.1.8 Develop a system to respond to housing transfer requests, especially in affordable and supportive housing, and monitor their potential as a housing retention and eviction prevention strategy.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> 100% Affordable Housing; Inclusionary Housing</p>	Medium
<p><i>Responsible Agencies:</i> MOHCD, HSH, APD, Mayor/BOS</p>	
<p><i>Funding Sources:</i> Local: General Fund, Housing Trust Fund, Prop C; Federal: CDBG, ESG, HOPWA, HOME, Continuum of Care, Public Housing Authority programs: Housing Choice Vouchers, Emergency Housing Vouchers, HUD-VASH (Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing)</p>	

2.2. Tenant Protections

Related Policies: 1, 2, 28

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<p>2.2.1 Implement the digital Rental Housing Inventory to collect data that informs the evaluation of anti-displacement programs, including rental rates, rent control status, vacancy, and services provided.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Rental Housing Inventory</p>	Short
<p>2.2.2 Increase relocation assistance for tenants experiencing either temporary or permanent evictions, including increasing the time period during which relocation compensation is required for temporary evictions from three to six months. Explore options to ensure long-term affordability of low-income tenants who return to their units.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Tenant Rights</p>	Short
<p>2.2.3 Clarify and limit the definition of nuisance or other just cause evictions to limit abuse.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Eviction Protections</p>	Short

Actions	Timeline
<p>2.2.4 Pursue proactive and affirmative enforcement of eviction protections programs, especially for Owner Move-in and Ellis Act evictions, including annual reporting by owners that is enforced by site inspections and confirmation of owner occupancy, funded through owner fees.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Tenant Rights; Eviction Protections</p>	Short
<p>2.2.5 Proactively enforce eviction protection and avoid predatory practices or tenant harassment by pursuing affirmative litigation models.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Tenant Rights; Eviction Protections</p>	Medium
<p>2.2.6 Advocate for State legislation to reform the Ellis Act (Government Code Chapter 12.75) to stabilize rental housing by, for example, imposing a minimum holding period of five years before the Act can be used to evict tenants.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> City's Annual State and Federal Advocacy</p>	Medium
<p>2.2.7 Advocate for State legislation to reform the Costa-Hawkins Housing Law to allow cities to better stabilize tenants by, for example, allowing cities to extend rent control to multifamily housing that is at least 25 years old. Assign City staff to lead this task.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> City's Annual State and Federal Advocacy</p>	Medium
<p>2.2.8 Increase fines and enforcement for illegally preventing SRO residents from establishing tenancy by forcing short-term stays.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Tenant Rights</p>	Short
<p>2.2.9 Collaborate with HCD and the State legislature to clarify expectations and advocate for changes for tenant protections and community anti-displacement based on recent legislation.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> City's Annual State and Federal Advocacy</p>	Short
<i>Responsible Agencies:</i> Mayor/BOS, Rent Board, Planning, City Attorney	
<i>Funding Sources:</i> Local: General Fund, including Rent Board Fees	

2.3. Acquisitions and Rehabilitation for Affordability

Related Policies: 2, 3

Actions	Timeline
<p>2.3.1 Prioritize and expand funding for the purchase of buildings, including those with chronically high residential vacancy, underutilized tourist hotels, and SRO residential hotels, for acquisition and rehabilitation programs that serve extremely low to moderate-income households, including unhoused populations.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Small Sites; Affordable Housing Preservation and Rehabilitation</p>	Short

Actions	Timeline
<p>2.3.2 Identify SRO residential hotels in advanced states of disrepair, particularly those owned by nonprofits and/or master-leased by the City as supportive housing, for rehabilitation and repair with public and/or philanthropic assistance. Explore cost-effectiveness of acquisition and demolition of severely deteriorated SROs and rebuilding as Permanent Supportive Housing, if it is cheaper than rehabilitation, allowed by planning code, and meets requirements for tenant relocation during construction and right to return for tenants.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Affordable Housing Preservation and Rehabilitation; Permanent Supportive Housing; Tenant Rights</p>	Medium
<p>2.3.3 Increase non-profit capacity-building investments, particularly for American Indian, Black, and other community organizations of color, to purchase and operate existing tenant-occupied buildings as permanent affordable housing in Well-resourced Neighborhoods, particularly for populations at risk and in areas vulnerable to displacement, to expand implementation of the Community Opportunity to Purchase Act (COPA).</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> COPA; Community-Based Services; Organizational Capacity Building</p>	Short
<p>2.3.4 Evaluate the feasibility of utilizing the Small Sites program to increase shared equity or cooperative ownership opportunities for tenants. This study would also inform expansion of shared equity homeownership models cited in Actions 5.4.6 and 1.6.1.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Small Sites; Shared Equity Housing; Coop Housing</p>	Short
<p>2.3.5 Incentivize private owners to sell residential buildings to non-profit affordable housing developers via transfer tax exemptions or other financial measures.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)</p>	Medium
<p>2.3.6 To achieve the objective of over 1,000 units, the city will pursue acquiring affordability and preserving at-risk units pursuant to Government Code 65583.1 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify the specific, existing sources of committed assistance and dedicate a specific portion of the funds from those sources to the provision of housing pursuant to this subdivision. Indicate the number of units that will be provided to both low- and very low-income households and demonstrate that the amount of dedicated funds is sufficient to develop the units at affordable housing costs or affordable rents. <p>At-risk units to meet the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrate that the units will meet the following requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> long-term affordability covenants and restrictions for occupancy of at least 55 years; located within an “assisted housing development”; found (via a public hearing) eligible for preservation, with a reasonable expectation that the units will change from affordable to another use during the next eight years; At the time of occupancy, the unit is in decent, safe, and sanitary condition; and At the time of identification, the unit is available at affordable cost to persons or families of low- or very low-income. <p>Or for acquisition and conversion to affordable rental housing, including permanent supportive housing, the City shall meet the following requirements:</p>	Short, Ongoing

Actions	Timeline
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The unit will be made available for rent at a cost affordable to low- or very low-income households. • At the time the unit is identified for acquisition, the unit is not available at an affordable housing cost to either of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Low-income households, if the unit will be made affordable to low-income households. ○ Very low-income households, if the unit will be made affordable to very low-income households. ○ At the time the unit is identified for acquisition the unit is not occupied by low- or very low income households or if the acquired unit is occupied, the local government has committed to provide relocation assistance prior to displacement, if any, pursuant to Chapter 16 (commencing with Section 7260) of Division 7 of Title 1 to any occupants displaced by the conversion, or the relocation is otherwise provided prior to displacement; provided the assistance includes not less than the equivalent of four months' rent and moving expenses and comparable replacement housing consistent with the moving expenses and comparable replacement housing required pursuant to Section 7260. ○ The unit is in decent, safe, and sanitary condition at the time of occupancy. ○ The unit has long-term affordability covenants and restrictions that require the unit to be affordable to persons of low- or very low income for not less than 55 years. ○ For units located in multifamily ownership housing complexes with three or more units, or on or after January 1, 2015, on foreclosed properties, at least an equal number of new-construction multifamily rental units affordable to lower income households have been constructed in the city or county within the same planning period as the number of ownership units to be converted. <p><i>Existing programs: (NEW)</i></p>	
<i>Responsible Agencies: Mayor/BOS, MOHCD, DBI, Planning</i>	
<i>Funding Sources: Local: General Fund, Housing Trust Fund, Impact Fees, San Francisco Housing Accelerator Fund</i>	

2.4. Preserving Rental Unit Availability

Related Policies: 2, 4, 36

Actions	Timeline
<p>2.4.1 Implement recently voter-approved vacancy tax for residential units that stay empty for over 6 months on owners of properties with at least three residential units. Explore additional legislation to tax other unit types and vacancies, such as units used as secondary or vacation homes.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: (NEW)</i></p>	Short

Actions	Timeline
<p>2.4.2 Explore regulatory paths, including a tax or other regulatory structures, to discourage short term speculative resale of residential units, particularly those which seek to extract value out of evicting tenants, or rapid reselling to more lucrative markets.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: (NEW)</i></p>	Short
<p>2.4.3 Continue to improve compliance, enforcement, and restrictions on intermediate-length occupancy dwelling units. Explore tracking and publishing data on short-term rentals on the Rental Housing Inventory.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Office of Short-Term Rentals</i></p>	Short, Ongoing
<p>2.4.4 Increase fines and enforcement for illegally converting SROs to new uses.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: DBI Regulation</i></p>	Short
<p>2.4.5 Facilitate and encourage more legalizations of unauthorized units through financial support such as low-interest or forgivable loans for property owners.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Legalization of Unauthorized Dwelling Units (UDUs); (NEW)</i></p>	Medium
<p>2.4.6 Update the Conditional Use findings requirements for removal of unauthorized units to (1) account for tenancy within the unauthorized unit and (2) to identify alternative findings that account for the cost and construction burdens of legalization.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Legalization of Unauthorized Dwelling Units</i></p>	Short
<p>2.4.7 Reduce cost of legalization of unauthorized units by removing Planning and Building Code requirements that are not critical for health or safety.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Legalization of Unauthorized Dwelling Units; Land-use Controls; Building Code</i></p>	Medium
<p>2.4.8 Adopt incentives or explore other mechanisms to encourage property owners to rebuild buildings struck by fire to house prior tenants within two years or by when the transitional housing program timeline expires.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: (NEW)</i></p>	Short
<p>2.4.9 Adopt requirements for replacement of units affordable to the same or lower income level as a condition of any development on a nonvacant site consistent with those requirements in state Density Bonus Law (Government Code section 65915(c)(3).) Replacement requirements shall be required for sites identified in the Sites Inventory that currently have residential uses, or within the past five years have had residential uses that have been vacated or demolished, and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were subject to a recorded covenant, ordinance, or law that restricts rents to levels affordable to persons and families of low or very low-income, or • Subject to any other form of rent or price control through a public entity's valid exercise of its police power, or • Occupied by low or very low-income households <p>For the purpose of this action, "previous five years" is based on the date the application for development was submitted.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: (NEW)</i></p>	Short, Ongoing

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<i>Responsible Agencies:</i> Planning, DBI, DPH, MOHCD, HSA, HSH, Mayor/BOS	
<i>Funding Sources:</i> General Fund, Housing Trust Fund	

3. Preventing and Eliminating Homelessness

Most of the City and County of San Francisco's programs serving unhoused people and those at risk of homelessness are consolidated under the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH). Over the next 8 years, HSH and the Department's partners plan to strengthen, streamline, and expand the Homelessness Response System, as outlined in the four key areas below: Coordinated Entry and Referrals, Problem Solving and Targeted Homelessness Prevention, Temporary Shelter, and Supportive Housing. The City will work to continue to reduce the number of people experiencing homelessness – especially those unsheltered – by strategically expanding and implementing programs across these four areas.

3.1. Coordinated Entry and Referrals

Related Policies: 6, 8, 9

Actions	Timeline
<p>3.1.1 Identify and implement strategies by Spring 2023 to increase and accelerate placement in Permanent Supportive Housing through the Coordinated Entry System for racial and social groups who are overrepresented in the unhoused population, such as extremely and very-low income American Indian, Black, and Latino(a,e) people, transgender people, or people with prior involvement in the criminal justice system.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Coordinated Entry</i></p>	Short
<p>3.1.2 Study and remove barriers to entry for temporary shelters, transitional housing, Rapid Rehousing, and Permanent Supportive Housing for unhoused individuals and families, particularly for individuals with mental health or substance use issues, and prior involvement with the criminal justice system.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Coordinated Entry</i></p>	Medium
<p>3.1.3 Redesign the Coordinated Entry System for housing placement and services for unhoused residents to reflect the evaluation recently completed by HSH, to house the most vulnerable populations and to ensure vacant units are filled in a timely manner. Consider a system that is inclusive of self-referrals by unhoused people to case managers in our communities and streamline the process for case managers to refer unhoused people to community-based shelter beds and vacant units in PSH sites.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Coordinated Entry</i></p>	Medium
<p>3.1.4 Provide housing navigation services, case management when applicable, and rental assistance as available to people exiting homelessness during the housing search stage. Provide ongoing services to ensure tenant retention.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Coordinated Entry; Tenant-based Vouchers; Permanent Supportive Housing; Rapid Rehousing</i></p>	Short

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<p>3.1.5 Improve programs intended to transfer people experiencing violent crime and domestic violence to safe housing.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Violence Against Women Act; (NEW)</p>	Short
<p>3.1.6 Strengthen housing navigation services by assigning a support counselor, with similar lived experience, to individuals. Counselors should be assigned regardless of where that person lives instead of being tied to a particular location, so that consistent support can continue through residential transitions.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Coordinated Entry</p>	Short
<p><i>Responsible Agencies:</i> HSH, MOHCD, Mayor/BOS, DPH, APD, OTI, SFHA, Department on Status of Women</p> <p><i>Funding Sources:</i> Federal sources, including Continuum of Care funding; Local sources, including General Fund and Prop C</p>	

3.2. Problem Solving and Targeted Homelessness Prevention

Policies: 1, 9

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<p>3.2.1 Expand rental assistance programs as a homelessness prevention tool, including those designed for emergency response and population-specific assistance. Advocate for additional federal and state resources per action 1.5.5.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Targeted Homelessness Prevention; Problem Solving</p>	Medium
<p>3.2.2 Prioritize those at risk of becoming unhoused for homelessness prevention investments, such as flexible financial assistance or the Step Up to Freedom¹ program and other programs that offer a continuum of care and wrap around services in addition to housing. Highest risk is known to include those with prior experience of homelessness, people with involvement with the criminal justice system, extremely low and very low-income American Indian, Black, and Latino/es, domestic violence victims, transgender people, and those at imminent risk of losing housing (i.e., an eviction notice, or subject to landlord harassment).</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Targeted Homelessness Prevention; Step Up to Freedom</p>	Short
<p>3.2.3 Collaborate with jurisdictions across the Bay Area to create and expand a regional homelessness prevention response system to share data across systems, and administer the increased funds from local, State, and federal agencies.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)</p>	Short
<p><i>Responsible Agencies:</i> HSH, MOHCD, ADP</p>	

¹ Step Up to Freedom is a reentry rapid rehousing and rental subsidy program for justice involved unstably housed/homeless adults who are between the ages of 18 – 35 years on parole or post release supervision.

Actions	Timeline
<i>Funding Sources:</i> Local sources, including Prop C; Federal sources, including Emergency Solutions Grants and American Rescue Plan funding; State Homeless Housing, Assistance and Prevention funding	

3.3. Temporary Shelter

Related Policies: 8, 9, 26

Actions	Timeline
<p>3.3.1 Expand the capacity of temporary shelter models that are low barrier and that incorporate housing-focused case management, such as non-congregate shelter options and Navigation Centers. Per HSH's forthcoming strategic plan, aim to increase temporary shelter investments, along with Permanent Supportive Housing and homelessness prevention investments to improve the rate of successful exits from homelessness to stable housing.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Shelters; Navigation Centers; Transitional Housing</p>	Medium
<p>3.3.2 Evaluate the needs of unsheltered people and explore creating more types of shelters in the system with tailored amenities and services. Examples could include wellness hubs, 'clean and sober' shelters, and safe consumption shelters for legal and illegal substances; this could also mean an expansion of existing models, such as non-congregate shelters and shelters focused on transgender people.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Shelters; Transitional housing</p>	Medium
<p>3.3.3 Expand the timeline during which transitional housing programs² are offered for people coming out of jails, prisons, immigration detention centers, and substance use treatment.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Transitional Housing; Homecoming Project</p>	Short
<p>3.3.4 Remove approval barriers for shelter sites that are City-funded but not City-owned or -leased under local Ordinance 60-19. The over-the-counter review process for shelter construction authorized under a declared shelter crisis should be allowed regardless of the declaration of a shelter crisis.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Land Use Controls</p>	Short
<p>3.3.5 Improve access to medication for addiction treatment, such as methadone and buprenorphine, for opioid use disorders in temporary shelters to support people in their journey out of homelessness.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)</p>	Medium
<p>3.3.6 Offer safe places to park for unhoused people living in their vehicles and access to financial assistance to help address their barriers to housing.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Crisis Interventions, SFMTA Fine and Fee Waiver Program</p>	Ongoing

² A list of transitional housing programs run by the San Francisco Adult Probation Office is catalogued [here](#).

Actions	Timeline
<i>Responsible Agencies:</i> HSH, APD, DPH, MOHCD	
<i>Funding Sources:</i> Federal sources, including Emergency Solutions Grant and Continuum of Care funding; local sources, including Prop C and General Fund; state sources, including Homeless Housing, Assistance, and Prevention	

3.4. Supportive Housing

Related Policies: 8, 9

Actions	Timeline
<p>3.4.1 Identify a numerical target in the 2023 HSH Strategic Plan for building or acquiring permanent supportive housing, in proportion to the expansion of shelter and homelessness prevention services, to continue the trend in reduction in homelessness seen in the Point-in-Time Count from 2019 to 2022 over the Housing Element cycle.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Permanently Supportive Housing, Rapid Rehousing</p>	Short
<p>3.4.2 Increase funding needed to meet the targets set in Action 3.4.1, in balance with funding needed for the other actions to reduce homelessness, including short and long-term rental subsidies, temporary shelter and targeted homelessness prevention.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Permanent Supportive Housing; Supportive Services</p>	Medium
<p>3.4.3 Prioritize tenant-based rental assistance with social services for people who are: (1) unhoused, (2) at risk of homelessness or displacement, or (3) ready to exit Permanent Supportive Housing for more independent living.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Permanent Supportive Housing; Rapid Rehousing; Tenant-Based Rental Subsidies; Housing Ladder</p>	Short
<p>3.4.4 Increase operating subsidy funding for services and rent in City-funded affordable housing projects so that the share of housing units for formerly unhoused people can increase to 30% or greater of all project units.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Local Operating Subsidies; Permanent Supportive Housing; Tenant-Based Rental Subsidies</p>	Medium
<p>3.4.5 Expand and improve on-site supportive services within Permanent Supportive Housing projects, including sustained care for mental health or substance abuse issues, case management, and childcare.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Permanent Supportive Housing</p>	Medium
<p>3.4.6 Advocate for and secure additional funding for building and operation of Permanent Supportive Housing from state and federal sources.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> City's Annual State and Federal Advocacy</p>	Medium

Actions	Timeline
<p>3.4.7 Strengthen the Housing Ladder³ strategy to support residents of Permanent Supportive Housing to move to less-supportive settings, freeing up supportive housing units for unhoused people. Actions include potentially revising San Francisco Housing Authority preference system to grant higher preference to these households in using direct rental assistance or other available subsidies or creating a new City-supported shallow subsidy for these households.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Housing Ladder; Tenant-Based Rental Subsidies; (NEW)</p>	Medium
<p>3.4.8 Increase flexibility within Rapid Rehousing programs⁴ so that the length of the subsidy can be extended based on the household needs and to prevent future experiences of homelessness.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Rapid Rehousing</p>	Medium
<p>3.4.9 Continue to provide mobile services for residents in scattered-site supportive housing, for example the Flexible Housing Subsidy Pool program.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Permanent Supportive Housing, Rapid Rehousing; Flexible Housing Subsidy Pool</p>	Ongoing
<p>3.4.10 Assess reasons for individuals exiting permanent supportive housing to address high turnover in permanent supportive housing.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Permanent Supportive Housing</p>	Short
<p>3.4.11 Continue to invest in step-down housing to improve outcomes for substance use treatment of people experiencing homelessness.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Step-Down Housing</p>	Ongoing
<p>3.4.12 Increase board and care and other high-acuity housing programs to provide a safe and service-rich environment for people who need a higher level of care than PSH can provide.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Permanent Supportive Housing, Supportive Services</p>	Medium
<p><i>Responsible Agencies:</i> HSH, MOHCD, Mayor/BOS, DPH, HSA, DPH, APD</p>	
<p><i>Funding Sources:</i> Federal sources, including Continuum of Care; state sources, including Project Homekey; local sources, including Prop C and General Fund</p>	

3 A rehousing approach that offers opportunities for residents of Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) to move from intensive supportive housing to more independent living, thus freeing up their PSH unit for others.

4 Rapid Rehousing is a time-limited subsidy that gradually decreases as the tenant stabilizes and finds housing outside of the Homelessness Response System. Tenants live in private-market units and access supportive services, including case management and housing retention assistance.

4. Centering Equity Communities and Cultural Heritage

The Centering Equity Communities and Cultural Heritage implementing program supports the Housing Element goals of elevating the visions and prioritizing the needs of American Indian, Black, and other people of color and of fostering racially and socially inclusive neighborhoods. Actions are organized along the principles of accountability, community visibility, planning, engagement, and wealth building. The actions build primarily upon the work of the following local bodies and will require their continued coordination: Human Rights Commission, Office of Racial Equity, Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development, the African American Reparations Advisory Committee, the Cultural Districts, the Community Equity Advisory Council, and the Planning Department.

4.1. Accountability

Related Policies: 14, 17, 21, 40

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<p>4.1.1 Develop and align citywide metrics that measure progress towards positive outcomes for American Indian, Black, and other people of color, and other disadvantaged communities resulting from housing policies using methods consistent with the San Francisco Equity Index prepared by the Office of Racial Equity. These metrics will be part of the Monitoring Program in Action 8.1.9 and will include affordable housing placement, displacement mitigation measures, and homeownership rates.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> San Francisco Equity Index; Office of Racial Equity; (NEW)</p>	Short
<p>4.1.2 Identify and fund liaisons within key City agencies such as MOHCD and Planning to support the housing needs and priorities of American Indian, Black, and other people of color, and other disadvantaged communities; such liaisons should provide regular check-ins with the community at centralized community spaces and reporting on housing programs and Housing Element implementation progress.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)</p>	Short
<p>4.1.3 Identify priority actions in the Housing Element Implementing Programs that respond to the needs of American Indian, Black, and other people of color, and other disadvantaged communities, through collaboration with Cultural Districts or other racial and social equity-focused community bodies such as the Community Equity Advisory Council or the African American Reparations Committee. Report back to communities on the progress of those priority actions and update prioritization annually.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Cultural Districts; Community Equity Advisory Council; African American Reparations Committee</p>	Short

Actions	Timeline
<p>4.1.4 By January 31, 2023, establish an interagency Housing Element implementation committee. This committee should meet with members of racial and social equity focused bodies as cited in Action 4.1.3, to inform the City's budget and work program on housing equity. The committee would be responsible for creating a Monitoring Program described in Action 8.1.9, developing an affordable housing strategy, reviewing the City's annual affordable housing funding budget, and reporting progress measured in Actions 8.1.9, 4.1.1 and 4.1.3 to the Planning Commission and Mayor's Office and for identifying financial or legal challenges to progress.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: (NEW)</i></p>	Short
<p>4.1.5 Monitor and shape housing investments, including permanently affordable housing production, preservation, and housing services, using the affordable housing funding and investment tracking cited in Action 4.1.1 so that resource allocation is accountable to the community priority actions identified in Action 4.1.3.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: (NEW)</i></p>	Short
<p>4.1.6 Continue to improve demographic data collection and reporting on applicants and recipients of various housing services, including affordable housing lotteries, rental assistance and vouchers, and public housing.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: DAHLIA; Data, Evaluation and Compliance</i></p>	Medium
<p>4.1.7 Continue racial and social equity and displacement analysis to target levels of investments that prevent community displacement through increased permanently affordable housing production, equitable access to housing, and other community stabilization strategies for vulnerable populations. This will include a triennial progress report on the displacement of population by income, race, and geography in relation to existing community stabilization programs and production of affordable housing.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: (NEW)</i></p>	Medium
<p>4.1.8 Identify and implement affordable housing production and preservation investments and other community stabilization strategies targeted at levels that will prevent displacement and other adverse racial and social equity impacts of future zoning changes, development projects and infrastructure projects, as informed by ongoing racial and social equity analysis related to housing.⁵</p> <p><i>Existing programs: (NEW)</i></p>	Medium
<p>4.1.9 Develop and require community accountability measures, including notification and engagement of residents, when building housing on environmentally contaminated sites.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Environmental Justice Framework; (NEW)</i></p>	Short
<p><i>Responsible Agencies: Planning, HRC, ORE, MOHCD, Digital Services, SFHA, HSH, SFMTA, Port, Public Works, SFRPD</i></p>	
<p><i>Funding Sources: Departmental budget (ORE, Planning, MOHCD), General Fund, Dream Keeper Initiative</i></p>	

⁵ The Racial and Social Equity Impact analysis of the Housing Element will be completed prior to the adoption of the Housing Element 2022, and this action will be updated based on the findings accordingly

4.2. Community Planning

Related Policies: 13, 15, 18, 28, 33

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<p>4.2.1 Develop and implement community outreach and engagement strategies that center racial and social equity and cultural competency to be used by Planning Department staff as well as developers or community groups.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Planning Outreach and Engagement Strategy, (NEW)</p>	Short
<p>4.2.2 Increase resources and funding to partner with community-based organizations primarily serving and representing American Indian, Black, and other people of color, and other disadvantaged communities, to ensure inclusive outreach and engagement and meaningful participation in housing and planning processes through focus groups, surveys, and other outreach events.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Community Plans; Community Strategies; General Plan Updates</p>	Short
<p>4.2.3 Develop and implement guidelines, and update the municipal codes where needed, to ensure elevated representation of American Indian, Black, and other people of color, and other disadvantaged communities in decision-making or advisory bodies such as Community Advisory Councils (CACs).</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Community Advisory Councils</p>	Short
<p>4.2.4 Implement the upcoming housing strategies recommended by the African American Reparations Advisory Committee.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> African American Reparations Advisory Committee; Cultural Districts; Community Equity Advisory Council</p>	Medium
<p>4.2.5 Support the development and implementation of community-led plans in the Tenderloin, the Fillmore, the Mission, Sunset and all Cultural Districts through their CHHESS reports. These community plans, reports, and boards will guide priorities and investments in their neighborhoods.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Tenderloin Plan; Cultural Districts; Community Equity Strategies; Sunset Forward</p>	Short
<p>4.2.6 Identify and adopt zoning changes that implement priorities of American Indian, Black, Filipino, Latino(a,e), and other communities of color identified in Cultural Districts or other community-led processes within Priority Equity Geographies.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Cultural Districts; Land Use Control; (NEW)</p>	Medium
<p>4.2.7 Consult with related Cultural Districts or other racial equity-focused community bodies such as the Community Equity Advisory Council to evaluate the racial and social equity impacts of proposed zoning changes within Priority Equity Geographies and areas vulnerable to displacement, using the framework identified under Actions 4.1.7 and 4.1.8.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Cultural Districts; Community Equity Advisory Council</p>	Medium

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<p>4.2.8 Allocate resources and create an implementation plan for any applicable anti-displacement measures parallel with the adoption of zoning changes within Priority Equity Geographies and areas vulnerable to displacement.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)</p>	Medium
<p>4.2.9 Prioritize Planning Staff and resources for housing improvement projects for low-income residents, and community-led housing projects in Priority Equity Geographies and areas vulnerable to displacement.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)</p>	Medium
<p>4.2.10 Identify neighborhoods with a higher concentration of low-income, immigrant, and rent-burdened¹² families with children, such as Tenderloin, Mission, Chinatown, and/or SoMa, and allocate resources to increase permanently affordable housing that addresses their incomes and needs in those neighborhoods.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> 100% Affordable Housing</p>	Short
<p>4.2.11 Simplify language used in project notifications and hearing notices with the aim of clearly communicating a project's proposal or the topic of the hearing. Pursuant to the Language Access Ordinance, continue to provide translation services at commission hearings and for hearing agendas and minutes upon request. Aim to translate at least crucial portions of notifications, such as the project descriptions or hearing topics, into languages that comprise 5% or more of the total city population.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Neighborhood Notification, Notice of Public Hearing</p>	Ongoing, Medium
<i>Responsible Agencies:</i> Planning, MOHCD, SFMTA, RPD, DPW, DPH, PUC, ORCP, Port, Mayor/BOS	
<i>Funding Sources:</i> Departmental budget (Planning, HRC, MOHCD), Prop E/Hotel Tax Allocation (General Fund)	

4.3. Access to Economic Opportunity

Related Policies: 16, 37

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<p>4.3.1 Expand and target job training and financial readiness education programs to residents of Priority Equity Geographies prioritizing youth from American Indian, Black and other communities of color.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Workforce Development; Financial Capability Services</p>	Medium

Actions	Timeline
<p>4.3.2 Support developers of new permanently affordable housing developments in Priority Equity Geographies to include affordable community serving uses as part of their ground floor use programming by matching affordable housing developers with prospective small businesses and service providers known to the City seeking space. Help identify potential funding sources for tenant capital improvements, such as impact fees, Community Benefit Districts' grants and Small Business Program grants. Examples of community serving uses include, but are not limited to: grocery stores, healthcare clinics, or institutional community uses such as child-care facilities, community facilities, job training centers, and social services.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Community Facilities, Community Benefit Districts, Small Business Programs</p>	Medium
<p>4.3.3 Adopt commercial space guidelines that encourage the development of businesses owned by American Indian, Black and other people of color in permanently affordable housing buildings.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Neighborhood Retail Regulations; (NEW)</p>	Short
<p>4.3.4 Provide resources for tenant improvements for businesses owned by American Indian, Black, and other people of color in permanently affordable housing buildings.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Loans and Grants for Businesses; (NEW)</p>	Medium
<p>4.3.5 Expand capacity-building, job training, start-up, and business development resources for Black business owners in development and contracting construction trades in support of building housing.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Loans and Grants for Businesses; Technical Assistance for Businesses; Workforce Development; Developers of Color Fellowship (Dream Keeper Initiative/MOHCD)</p>	Medium
<p>4.3.6 Grow a range of business and career-building opportunities in Priority Equity Geographies through resources to support affordable Production, Distribution, and Repair (PDR) space, protections and incentives for PDR in the Planning Code, enforcement of PDR zoning, and industrial (or commercial) design guidelines.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Loans and Grants for Businesses; Technical Assistance for Businesses; Workforce Development; Land-Use Controls; Commercial Design Guidelines; (NEW)</p>	Medium
<p>4.3.7 Change regulations and definitions in current Planning code to improve flexibility on allowing home-based businesses and work from home in residential districts, for example, create an accessory entrepreneurial use that allows up to two employees.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Land-Use Controls, (NEW)</p>	Short
<p>4.3.8 Advocate for local or state legislation to make it mandatory for financial education to be integrated into all middle schools in San Francisco, similar to New Jersey's Law A1414, as a way to open access to economic opportunity, as the public school system primarily serves students of color in Priority Equity Geographies in San Francisco.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> City's Annual State and Federal Advocacy; (NEW)</p>	Medium
<p><i>Responsible Agencies:</i> MOHCD, OEWD, ORE, Planning, Mayor/BOS</p>	

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<i>Funding Sources:</i> Departmental budget (OEWD, MOHCD, Planning), Community Benefit District assessments, Dream Keeper Initiative	

4.4. Cultural Districts

Related Policies: 12, 13, 37, 42

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<p>4.4.1 Strengthen interagency coordination to ensure that Cultural District strategies related to the creation or improvement of cultural anchors and spaces are integrated into planning, funding, and construction and/or rehabilitation of public projects (e.g., parks and open spaces, street improvements, libraries, and transit facilities).</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Cultural Districts</p>	Short
<p>4.4.2 Update the Planning Code and Planning Department protocols where necessary to reflect strategies developed in Action 4.2.1, this includes updating Planning Department requirements to require project sponsors to engage with interested Cultural Districts to allow these communities to provide input upon initiation of a project application and to allow the project sponsor adequate time to address the input through dialogue or project revisions.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Cultural Districts; Processing and Permitting Procedures</p>	Short
<p>4.4.3 In Cultural Districts, reduce conditional use authorizations or other entitlement barriers for mixed-use buildings that can commit via deed restriction or other legal agreement to the inclusion of businesses, institutions, public realm improvements, public art, or services that support Cultural District needs and identify a minimum term based on consultation with Cultural District boards.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Cultural Districts; Conditional Use Authorizations; Land-Use Controls</p>	Short
<p>4.4.4 Ensure Cultural Districts and their CHHESS reports guide culturally supportive housing developments, affordable housing investments, and neighborhood investments in coordination with Program 5.2.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Cultural Districts; 100% Affordable Housing</p>	Medium
<p>4.4.5 Increase staff allocation within MOHCD, OEWD, DPW, ARTS, and Planning to create a more robust, sustained, and effective Cultural Districts program, provide more direct support for the development and implementation of their respective Cultural History Housing and Economic Sustainability Strategies (CHHESS).</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Cultural Districts; Cultural History Housing and Economic Sustainability Strategies</p>	Medium
<i>Responsible Agencies:</i> Planning, MOHCD, OEWD, ARTS, DPW	
<i>Funding Sources:</i> Departmental budget (Planning), Prop E/Hotel Tax Allocation	

4.5. Cultural Heritage and Expression

Related Policies: 13, 37, 41, 42

Actions	Timeline
<p>4.5.1 Improve consultation with local Native Ohlone representatives, including the Association of Ramaytush Ohlone representatives, and American Indian residents in policy development and project review regarding tribal and cultural resource identification, treatment, and management while compensating them for their knowledge and efforts. Improvements should include commissioning the development of community-led, culturally relevant guidelines for identifying and protecting tribal and cultural resources and identifying funding sources for cultural resource identification, treatment and management.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Association of Ramaytush Ohlone; Tribal Leaders</p>	Short
<p>4.5.2 Encourage uses in the ground floor of buildings that support housing, neighborhood activity and identity, especially in Cultural Districts, over inclusion of utility infrastructure, such as transformer vaults.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Cultural Districts</p>	Short
<p>4.5.3 Create objective Special Area Design Guidelines if requested by communities in Cultural Districts and Priority Equity Geographies where the design of public space and architecture could help reinforce cultural identities, in compliance with State requirements.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Cultural Districts; (NEW)</p>	Medium
<p>4.5.4 Study creation of a cultural resource mitigation fund that could be paid into by projects that impact cultural resources to support cultural resource protection and preservation throughout the city, prioritizing funding the development of cultural spaces as described in Action 5.2.5.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)</p>	Medium
<p>4.5.5 Designate historically and culturally significant buildings, landscapes, and districts for preservation using the Citywide Cultural Resource Survey, Planning Code Articles 10 and 11, and state and national historic resource registries to ensure appropriate treatment of historic properties that are important to the community, with a focus on those that are important to American Indian, Black, Japanese, Filipino, and other communities directly harmed by discriminatory government actions, and to unlock historic preservation incentives for more potential housing development sites.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Historic Preservation Review; Retained Elements Special Topic Design Guidelines; Citywide Cultural Resource Survey; Planning Code Articles 10 and 11</p>	Short
<p>4.5.6 Promote the use of the Retained Elements Special Topic Design Guidelines to development applicants to address sites where conserving parts of buildings sustains cultural identity and proposed housing serves the community.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Historic Preservation Review; Retained Elements Special Topic Design Guidelines</p>	Short
<p>4.5.7 Develop objective design standards for the treatment of historic buildings and districts to provide consistent and efficient regulatory review that facilitates housing development approvals and protects the City's cultural and architectural heritages.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Historic Preservation Review; Design Review; (NEW)</p>	Short

Actions	Timeline
<p>4.5.8 Promote historic preservation and cultural heritage incentives, such as tax credit programs and the State Historical Building Code, for use in residential rehabilitation projects through general outreach, interagency collaboration with MOHCD and OEWD, building trades collaboration, educational materials, community capacity building efforts, and the regulatory review process.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Historic Preservation Grants; State Historical Building Code; (NEW)</p>	Medium
<p>4.5.9 Revise Urban Design Guidelines to provide guidance on including signage, lighting, public art, historical interpretation, and educational opportunities in housing development projects in a manner that reflects neighborhood history and culture, prioritizing the acknowledgement and representation of American Indian history and culture, in coordination with State requirements.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Historic Preservation Review; Urban Design Guidelines</p>	Short
<p>4.5.10 Complete the Citywide Cultural Resources Survey, including the citywide historic context statement, with ongoing community engagement to identify important individual historic or cultural resources and districts, prioritizing engagement with American Indian, Black, Japanese, and Filipino communities, and other communities directly harmed by past discriminatory actions.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Historic Preservation Review; Citywide Cultural Resources Survey</p>	Medium
<p>4.5.11 Complete the Heritage Conservation Element of the General Plan to bring clarity and accountability to the City's role in sustaining both the tangible and intangible aspects of San Francisco's cultural heritage, prioritizing engagement with American Indian, Black, Japanese, and Filipino communities, and other communities directly harmed by past discriminatory actions during completion of the element.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Historic Preservation Review; Heritage Conservation Element</p>	Ongoing
<p>4.5.12 Consider the effects on housing in balance with the Planning Department's racial and social equity goals for any recommendation of approval, disapproval, or modification of landmark designations or historic district designations, or approval of substantive new review processes or requirements for historic resources.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Planning Landmark Designations; Historic District Designations; Historic Resource Review</p>	Short
<p><i>Responsible Agencies:</i> Planning, DPW, ARTS, MOHCD, OEWD</p>	
<p><i>Funding Sources:</i> General Fund</p>	

5. Redressing and Preventing Discrimination

The Redressing and Preventing Discrimination implementing program supports the Housing Element goal of repairing the harms of historic racial, ethnic, and social discrimination against American Indian, Black, and other people of color. Actions are organized along the principles of acknowledging and documenting harm, ending continuing harm, and tailoring redress to relate to the nature of the harm and respond to the expressed needs and desires of the victims of discrimination. The actions build primarily upon the work of the following local bodies and will require their continued coordination: Human Rights Commission, Office of Racial Equity, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development, the African American Reparations Advisory Committee, the Cultural Districts, the Community Equity Advisory Council, and the Planning Department.

5.1. Truth-telling and Acknowledging Past Harm

Related Policies: 10

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<p>5.1.1 Commission an American Indian community-led study to document the discriminatory practices and government actions against San Francisco's American Indian communities including the Indian Relocation Act of 1956 and the cumulative impacts of genocide, exploitation, and dispossession of resources in terms of wealth loss, disparate housing and health outcomes, and scale of displacement.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Association of Ramaytush Ohlone; Tribal Leaders; American Indian Cultural District; Office of Racial Equity</p>	Short
<p>5.1.2 Commission a community-led study by affected San Francisco communities, including American Indian, Black, and other communities of color, to document the history of redlining, racial covenants, and exclusionary zoning practices in San Francisco and their cumulative impacts, particularly on Black households, in terms wealth-loss, disparate housing and health outcomes, and scale of displacement.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> African American Reparations Advisory Committee; Cultural Districts; Office of Racial Equity</p>	Short
<p>5.1.3 Commission a community-led study by affected San Francisco communities, including American Indian, Black, and other communities of color, to document the history of urban renewal in San Francisco and its cumulative impacts, particularly on Black households, in terms wealth loss, disparate housing outcomes, and scale of displacement.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> African American Reparations Advisory Committee; Cultural Districts; Office of Racial Equity</p>	Short
<p>5.1.4 Commission a community-led study by affected San Francisco communities to document the history of racialized public housing and its replacement in San Francisco and its impacts, particularly on Black households, in terms of wealth loss, disparate housing and health outcomes, and scale of displacement.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> African American Reparations Advisory Committee; Cultural Districts; Office of Racial Equity</p>	Short

Actions	Timeline
<p>5.1.5 Commission a community-led study by affected San Francisco communities to document the history of predatory lending practices and other discriminatory real estate practices in San Francisco and its impacts in terms of wealth loss, disparate housing and health outcomes, and scale of displacement.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> African American Reparations Advisory Committee; Cultural Districts; Office of Racial Equity</p>	Short
<p>5.1.6 Report on the cumulative impacts to San Francisco's American Indian, Black, and other communities of color resulting from discriminatory practices and government actions as understood from the studies called for in Program 5.1 and Actions 5.1.1 through 5.1.5 to present a holistic view of the harms incurred and redress the harms comprehensively. Provide annual updates on new displacement trends and patterns and expand resources and programs to reverse negative trends.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)</p>	Long
<p>5.1.7. Incorporate findings from the studies called for in in Program 5.1 and Actions 5.1.1 through 5.1.5, including the resulting disparities and inequities, when applying the Planning Department's racial and social equity assessment tool⁶ to applicable projects.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)</p>	Short
<p>5.1.8 Incorporate relevant findings of the studies called for in Program 5.1 and Actions 5.1.1 through 5.1.5 in city decision documents for actions intended to redress past racial and social harm.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)</p>	Short
<i>Responsible Agencies:</i> Planning, HRC, ORE	
<i>Funding Sources:</i> Needs funding	

5.2. Cultural Investment and Restitution

Related Policies: 12

Actions	Timeline
<p>5.2.1 In recognition of the dispossession of American Indians of their ancestral lands, identify opportunities to give land back for traditional cultural and ceremonial uses and to invest in spaces for the American Indian community to participate in traditional cultural practices and convene community gatherings.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)</p>	Short

⁶ An analysis approach to assessing the potential racial and social equity impacts of a proposed action. This tool is part of San Francisco Planning's Racial and Social Equity Action Plan, which aims to pro-actively advance equity in the Department's internal and external work such as community planning, community engagement, policy/laws development, hiring, and process improvements. At the time of publication (December 2022), this tool is still being developed.

5.2.2 In recognition of the disproportionate loss of Black residents from San Francisco in recent decades resulting in part from a culmination of discriminatory government actions, identify opportunities to donate or dedicate land for use or development by Black-led, community-serving organizations. <i>Existing programs: (NEW)</i>	Short
5.2.3 Fund the development and implementation of community-led strategies in Cultural Districts to retain and grow culturally associated businesses and services that attract residents back to the area. <i>Existing programs: Cultural Districts</i>	Short
5.2.4 Recognize spaces of cultural importance identified by American Indian, Black, Japanese, Filipino, and other communities directly harmed by discriminatory government actions in community planning and regulatory review for development projects, consult them in decisions affecting those spaces, and direct resources towards their preservation and management. <i>Existing programs: Historic Preservation Review</i>	Short
5.2.5 Fund the development of cultural spaces that serve communities harmed as described under Program 5.2, using potential new funding sources such as the mitigation fund referenced under Action 4.5.4 or community facilities fees. <i>Existing programs: (NEW) Cultural Resource Mitigation Fund; Cultural Districts</i>	Medium
5.2.6 Prioritize businesses and non-profit organizations associated with American Indian, Black, Japanese, Filipino, and other communities directly harmed by discriminatory government actions for grant funding and technical assistance through the Legacy Business Program. <i>Existing programs: Legacy Business Program</i>	Short
<i>Responsible Agencies: Planning, MOHCD, OEWD, OSB, RED, Mayor/BOS</i>	
<i>Funding Sources: Departmental budget (Planning, OEWD, MOHCD), Prop E/Hotel Tax Allocation (General Fund)</i>	

5.3. Fair Housing Compliance and Enforcement

Related Policies: 6, 8

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
5.3.1 Evaluate and identify common cases of discrimination and violation of fair housing law and groups who continuously face such discrimination, including transgender and LGBTQ+, or people with disabilities, and implement solutions to strengthen enforcement of fair housing law in those cases. <i>Existing programs: Fair Housing Enforcement; Fair Housing Testing</i>	Medium
5.3.2 Amend the City's Fair Chance Ordinance to incorporate best practices to expand housing access for people with criminal records to privately owned units, Housing Choice Voucher units, and other federally funded units. ⁷	Short

⁷ Examples of similar programs can be found in affect in Oakland, CA and Seattle, WA in 2021.

<i>Existing programs:</i> Fair Chance Ordinance	
5.3.3 Create and expand incentives for private landlords to use rental assistance programs (e.g., Housing Choice Vouchers) to rent their units to extremely and very low-income households. Incentives could include covering lease up fees, rent payment during the inspection period, providing tenant support for housing retention, and covering unit damage upon separation, as well as establishing a fund to support these incentives. <i>Existing programs:</i> Section 8 Housing Choice (Tenant) Vouchers; Tenant Counseling and Education; Supportive services; Rental Subsidies; Tenant-based Rental Subsidies; (NEW) Incentive Programs for Landlords/Section 8	Short
5.3.4 Address racial bias in home appraisals by strengthening local fair housing legislation for all stages of residential valuation and enhancing fair housing enforcement. <i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)	Medium
<i>Responsible Agencies:</i> HRC, SFHA, MOHCD, APD, HSH	
<i>Funding Sources:</i> General Fund, Department Budget	

5.4. Housing Programs to Redress Harm

Related Policies: 5, 11

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
5.4.1 Prioritize American Indian residents for housing opportunities to redress the historic dispossession of resources affecting these communities, such as by the Indian Relocation Act, and other government actions that broke the cohesion of this community. <i>Existing programs:</i> Lottery Preference Programs	Short
5.4.2 Establish pilot and permanent programs that offer homeownership opportunities targeted to Black households harmed through redlining or urban renewal or other forms of systemic racism related to housing, including Black individuals and their descendants who hold Certificates of Preference from the urban renewal period, as referenced in Actions 5.4.8 and 5.4.9. Building on the Dream Keeper initiative , such programs should include silent second loans or grants for down payment assistance, as well as other financial assistance to reduce income eligibility as a barrier to access homeownership opportunities. <i>Existing programs:</i> Homeownership Down Payment Assistance; Certificate of Preference; Dream Keeper Initiative; (NEW)	Medium
5.4.3 Upon completion of the pilot programs for Black communities cited in Action 5.4.2, evaluate and extend the programs to other communities directly harmed by discriminatory government actions. ⁸ <i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)	Long

⁸ Discriminatory programs include, but are not limited to, redlining, urban renewal, segregated public housing, and exclusionary zoning regulations, such as single-family zoning.

Actions	Timeline
<p>5.4.4 Target increased investment in the Down Payment Assistance Loan Program to American Indian, Black, Japanese, Filipino, and other communities directly harmed by redlining or urban renewal or by other discriminatory government actions.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Homeownership Down Payment Assistance</p>	Short
<p>5.4.5. Implement right to return legislation for residents of public housing including opportunities to those previously displaced.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Right-to-Return</p>	Medium
<p>5.4.6 Pursue expanding and modifying the shared equity homeownership and land trust models to address their effectiveness and scalability, including capacity and expertise of community-based organization to manage and support such projects, to serve communities harmed by past discrimination. Use the findings of the study referenced in Action 2.3.4 to inform expansion of these models.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Share equity housing; Land Trusts</p>	Medium
<p>5.4.7. Create and pilot programs to increase access to Affordable Rental and Homeownership units and other housing services as redress for American Indian, Black, Japanese, Filipino, and other communities directly harmed by past discriminatory government actions including redlining, urban renewal, the Indian Relocation Act, or WWII Japanese incarceration. Programs should be informed by the truth-telling processes described in Program 5.1.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Preference Programs; 100% Affordable Housing; Inclusionary Affordable Housing; Certificate of Preference; (NEW)</p>	Short
<p>5.4.8 Expand the Certificates of Preference program as required per recent State Law, Assembly Bill 1584 (Health and Safety Code, SEC 13 – 16), to qualify eligible descendants of those displaced by redevelopment projects for priority in renting or buying affordable housing. Conduct comprehensive outreach and engagement to identify the descendants of households who have been displaced. Expanding this program should rely on strategies that ensure such units meet the preferences and needs of eligible households as informed by Action 5.4.9.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Certificate of Preference</p>	Short
<p>5.4.9 Conduct a study to engage with Certificates of Preference holders and their descendants to identify their housing needs, preferences, and income levels and create a tracking system to better monitor who has obtained or declined affordable rental and homeownership opportunities and why.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Certificate of Preference; (NEW)</p>	Short
<p>5.4.10 Expand and fund community capacity to implement housing programs and investments for American Indian residents as one strategy to redress the historic dispossession of resources affecting these communities, such as the Indian Relocation Act, and other government actions that broke the cohesion of this community.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Community-Based Services; Organizational Capacity Building</p>	Short
<p><i>Responsible Agencies:</i> MOHCD, OCII, HRC, Planning, Mayor/BOS</p>	
<p><i>Funding Sources:</i> Housing Trust fund, General Fund, General Obligation Bonds, OCII funds</p>	

6. Serving Special Needs Groups

Various groups in San Francisco have special housing needs that need to be taken into account in housing policies and planning and have provided feedback during community outreach for the Housing Element update. These groups include families with children (especially lower income families), seniors, people with disabilities, people with chronic illness, including HIV/AIDS, transgender, and LGBTQ+ people. The programs and actions listed below address some of the specific needs of these groups including housing and building design, access to affordable housing, access to appropriately sized housing, and access to appropriate housing services.

6.1. Families With Children

Related Policies: 32, 33

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<p>6.1.1 Pursue multi-generational living for extended families and communal households that have space and amenities for children, working-age adults, seniors and persons with disabilities, when building permanently affordable housing or cooperative housing referenced in Action 1.6.1.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> 100% Affordable Housing</p>	Long
<p>6.1.2 Establish programs to assist extremely low and very low-income families with children to relocate from SROs and overcrowded living conditions to appropriate permanently affordable housing.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)</p>	Short
<p>6.1.3 Encourage family-friendly housing, which could include higher numbers of two- or three-bedroom units, units that are affordable to a wide range of low- to middle-income households, and child-friendly amenities such as playgrounds, on-site childcare, or designated childcare units.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)</p>	Medium
<p>6.1.4 Continue to require multi-bedroom unit mixes.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Unit Mix Requirements</p>	Ongoing
<i>Responsible Agencies:</i> Planning, MOHCD	
<i>Funding Sources:</i> Local: Housing Trust fund (General Fund), General Obligation Bonds, Revolving Loan Funds, Departmental budgets (Planning, MOHCD); Federal: CDBG, Housing Choice Voucher	

6.2. Transgender and LGBTQ+ People

Related Policies: 7, 8, 9

Actions	Timeline
<p>6.2.1 Study and identify programs that respond to the needs of transgender and LGBTQ+ groups, particularly those who are refugees, lack family connections, or previously incarcerated, to incorporate into permanently affordable housing investments that are concentrated in the neighborhoods where they have historically found community, such as the Castro for LGBTQ+ communities or the Tenderloin for transgender people of color, building upon research spearheaded by the Castro LGBTQ Cultural District.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> LGBTQ Cultural District, Compton's Transgender District</p>	Short
<p>6.2.2 Support and fund the implementation of San Francisco's "Ending Trans Homelessness Plan," as well as the ongoing housing placement for the transgender community, in recognition of the severe disparities in housing access and safety experienced by this group.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Ending Trans Homelessness Plan</p>	Medium
<p>6.2.3 Adopt Trauma-Informed Systems⁹ with robust training resources and increase cultural competency training specific to transgender and LGBTQ+ populations for all service providers and property managers in the City's affordable housing projects and Homeless Response System.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)</p>	Medium
<p>6.2.4 Expand short term medical recovery housing programs for unhoused transgender people, such as is offered by Maitri, so that transgender people can access medical care by meeting the public health system requirement for stable housing prior to undergoing gender-affirming surgeries.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Medical Recovery Housing</p>	Short
<p>6.2.5 Allocate resources to population-specific programs outside of the Homelessness Response System in acknowledgement that transgender and LGBTQ+ communities do not currently access the system because of safety and discrimination concerns.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)</p>	Short
<p><i>Responsible Agencies:</i> Planning, MOHCD, HSH, OTI, APD</p>	
<p><i>Funding Sources:</i> Prop E/Hotel Tax Allocation (General Fund), Flexible Housing Subsidy Pool, Departmental budget (OTI, MOHCD, HSH, DPH)</p>	

⁹ The TIS Initiative at the San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH) is an organizational change model to support organizations to respond to and reduce the impact of trauma.

6.3. Seniors and People with Disabilities and Chronic Illness

Related Policies: 6, 7, 32

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<p>6.3.1 Expand the Senior Operating Subsidy (SOS) program to allow extremely and very low-income seniors to be eligible for new senior Below Market Rate rental units.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Senior Operating Subsidy (SOS) program</p>	Short
<p>6.3.2 Increase permanently affordable senior housing along transit corridors to improve mobility of aging adults and seniors, particularly for extremely and very low-income households including through expansion of Senior Operating Subsidies as referenced in Action 6.3.1.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> 100% Affordable Housing; Senior Operating Subsidies</p>	Long
<p>6.3.3 Create or support financing programs that support aging in place, including improvements to accessibility through home modifications or building ADUs, and supported by technical assistance programs referenced in Action 8.2.2.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)</p>	Short
<p>6.3.4 Implement new strategies to support and prevent the loss of residential care facilities, using the recommendations of the Assisted Living Working Group of the Long-term Care Coordinating Council¹⁰, including business support services, as well as City-funded subsidies for affordable placement of low-income residents.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)</p>	Medium
<p>6.3.5 Support and explore expanding the Home Match Program to match seniors with people looking for housing that can provide home chore support in exchange for affordable rent.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Home Match</p>	Medium
<p>6.3.6 Strengthen interagency coordination to identify and implement strategies to address the housing needs of seniors and people with disabilities, informed by the Housing Needs Assessments referenced in Action 6.3.7.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)</p>	Short
<p>6.3.7 Conduct a Housing Needs Assessment¹¹ for seniors and people with disability every three years to inform strategies that meet their housing needs, as referenced in Policy 32.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Access Plan Review</p>	Ongoing
<p>6.3.8 Continue to provide housing affordable to HIV positive applicants on the Plus Housing List.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Plus Housing Program</p>	Ongoing

¹⁰ [Supporting Affordable Assisted Living in San Francisco, January 2019, Assisted Living Facility \(ALF\) Workgroup | San Francisco Human Services Agency \(sfhsa.org\)](#)

¹¹ These studies were required by Ordinance 266-20, passed by San Francisco Board of Supervisors in December 2020.

Actions	Timeline
<p>6.3.9 Explore a Disabled Operating Subsidy (DOS) program to allow extremely and very low-income people with disabilities better access to permanently affordable housing units.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: (NEW)</i></p>	Short
<p>6.3.10 Eliminate the requirement for a hearing for any Reasonable Accommodation requests making all requests administrative in nature, and clearly explain the review process for the public to seek a Reasonable Modification by January 31, 2024.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: (NEW)</i></p>	Short
<p><i>Responsible Agencies: Planning, MOHCD, DAS, HSA, MOD</i></p>	
<p><i>Funding Sources: Senior Operating Subsidy Program Fund, Departmental budget (DAAS, MOHCD), HOPWA</i></p>	

7. Expanding Housing Choices

San Francisco's diverse residents and households need a variety of housing to meet their needs, however, for decades zoning and other rules have limited the types of homes that can be built in most of the city. The result of these restrictions is that 10% or less of new housing in the last two decades has been built in the Well-resourced Neighborhoods of the City that cover more than half of residential land. Housing Element requirements to affirmatively further fair housing mean that the city must allow more housing in Well-resourced Neighborhood. In addition, the need to accommodate the RHNA housing targets across income levels also requires rezoning for over 36,282 homes in addition to current capacity. The Expanding Housing Choices program area includes various programs that will increase housing choices for residents around the city in a variety of housing types, including: rezoning to accommodate the RHNA and allow more homes in small and mid-rise multifamily buildings, support for ADUs in existing residential buildings, and actions to support additional housing near major transit nodes and jobs centers, such as new housing and conversions of office in Downtown.

7.1. Rezoning Program

Related Policies: 20

Actions	Timeline
<p>7.1.1 Create a rezoning program to meet the requirements of San Francisco's Regional Housing Needs Allocation across income levels and Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing laws, relying on a combination of strategies in Actions 7.3.2 and 7.2.1 above to accommodate the RHNA shortfall with a buffer (approximately 36,282 new units) primarily in Well-resourced Neighborhoods, in proximity to transit and commercial corridors. The rezoning program shall reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model and shall not add government constraints that reduce project financial feasibility as determined by an analysis prior to the rezoning enactment. Seek to implement a rezoning program that exceeds the identified RHNA shortfall plus 15% buffer (i.e., 36,282 units) to provide more capacity sooner and that would reduce the need and size of any subsequent rezoning triggered by Action 8.1.5. In addition, make any conforming amendments to relevant area plans in the city's General Plan based on final rezoning actions. Complete this effort by January 31, 2026.</p> <p>As described in the Sites Inventory Rezoning Program, the rezoning will meet the requirements of Government Code Section 65583.2(h)-(i), including sites identified to meet the very low and low-income RHNA unmet need will be zoned to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • permit owner-occupied and rental multifamily uses by-right for developments in which 20 percent or more of the units are affordable to lower-income households. By-right means local government review must not require a conditional use permit, planned unit development permit, or other discretionary review or approval that would constitute a "project" for purposes of CEQA; • accommodate a minimum of 16 units per site; and • require a minimum density of 20 units per acre. <p>At least 50 percent of the lower-income rezoning need must be accommodated on sites designated for residential use only or on sites zoned for mixed uses that accommodate all of the very low- and low-income housing need, if those sites allow 100 percent residential use and require residential use to occupy 50 percent of the total floor area of a mixed-use project.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Housing Element 2022 Update Sites Inventory and Analysis, (NEW)</p>	<p>Short</p>

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<p>7.1.2 Increase staff allocation within Planning to engage with communities living in Well-resourced Neighborhoods to inform existing residents how locating new housing and permanently affordable housing in every neighborhood can address historic inequity and injustice and expand housing opportunities for local residents and their families while strengthening neighborhood vitality. Use Sunset Forward Strategies as a reference for community engagement and development of housing strategies.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Sunset Forward; (NEW)</p> <p><i>Responsible Agencies:</i> Planning, Mayor/BOS</p> <p><i>Funding Sources:</i> Departmental budget (Planning)</p>	Short

7.2. Mid-rise and Small Multifamily Buildings

Related Policies: 20, 26, 29, 31, 34

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<p>7.2.1 Increase the opportunity to create more small multi-family buildings (4 to 20 units) by replacing lot-based unit maximum zoning controls with form-based zoning in Well-resourced Neighborhoods near transit.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> ConnectSF Transit Strategy; Land-use Controls</p>	Short
<p>7.2.2 In Priority Equity Geographies and Cultural Districts where community-led strategies have defined and codified community benefits required for project approvals, establish/implement ministerial approval processes for mid-rise and small multi-family buildings. Examples include designating commercial space as a Community Benefit Use, as defined in Action 9.4.5, or offering reduced rent for community-serving purposes via a development agreement or deed-restrictions.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)</p>	Short
<p>7.2.3 In areas outside of Priority Equity Geographies, unless areas opt-in through community-led processes, allow a minimum of four units on all residential lots and a minimum of six on corner lots, expanding on the State duplex/lot split program (SB 9) and pair with rental and/or down payment assistance that supports opportunities for low- and moderate-income tenants and owners.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> SB 9, (NEW)</p>	Short
<p>7.2.4 Revise and codify SB 9 program implementation with Department of Building Inspection to ensure that both flag-shaped lots and utility easements for lot splits are accepted.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> SB 9, (NEW)</p>	Short

Actions	Timeline
<p>7.2.5 Permit uses and eliminate regulatory limitations, such as conditional use authorizations, that discourage innovative, smaller housing types where licensing is not required, such as co-housing¹² with amenities that support seniors and those with disabilities</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Land-Use Controls; (NEW)</p>	Medium
<p>7.2.6 Modify the definition of “dwelling unit” to comply with Health and Safety Code 17021.5. Evaluate and amend the definition of “family” to ensure that it provides zoning code occupancy standards specific to unrelated adults and complies with fair housing law. Permit group housing broadly throughout the city, particularly in zones allowing single-family uses, increase group housing density permitted in these districts, and remove Conditional Use Authorizations or other entitlement barriers to group housing. Changes should focus on special needs groups, including those with disabilities, by ensuring that intermediate care facilities or congregate living health facilities, with six or fewer residents are treated no differently than other by-right single-family housing uses as required in Health and Safety Code sections 1267.8, 1566.3, and 1568.08.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Land Use Controls, (NEW)</p>	Short
<p>7.2.7 Support process and code changes in Priority Equity Geographies that seek to define specific needs or limits around co-housing types, as informed by Policy 18. Conduct an affordability analysis to determine financial feasibility.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Land Use Controls; (NEW)</p>	Short
<p>7.2.8 Create a co-housing informational program that provides ideas and recommendations on types, financing structures, precedents, and technical guidance to support their creation in Cultural Districts and Priority Equity Geographies to meet community needs.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Cultural Districts; (NEW)</p>	Short
<p>7.2.9 Revise HOME-SF program and entitlement process to apply to more sites and be easier to use by: eliminating Commission hearings for program-compliant project applications; eliminating environmental criteria (i.e., historic resource, shadow, and wind); expanding applicability to RH1 and RH2 zoned areas; and, broadening the modifications to be more aligned with the State Density Bonus program. Proposed projects should not demolish existing rent-controlled units and must meet tenant protection, relocation, and replacement standards as recognized in Housing Crisis Act of 2019.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Home-SF</p>	Short
<p><i>Responsible Agencies:</i> Planning, MOHCD, Mayor/BOS, HSA</p>	
<p><i>Funding Sources:</i> Departmental budget (Planning, DBI), Prop E/Hotel Tax Allocation (General Fund)</p>	

¹² Co-housing, group housing, or co-living rooms are a type of housing that may have limited cooking facilities and do not contain a full kitchen in each room. Co-housing may include (but is not limited to) communes, fraternities and sororities, or Residential Hotels.

7.3. Housing Near Job Centers and Transit

Related Policies: 20, 24 26, 35

Actions	Timeline
<p>7.3.1 Explore height increases and density limit removal at major transit nodes along Rapid bus and rail corridors, in addition to areas referenced in Policy 20, along with planning for needed infrastructure improvements and achieving maximum permanently affordable housing units.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> ConnectSF Transit Strategy</p>	Medium
<p>7.3.2 Increase the opportunity for mid-rise multi-family buildings in Well-resourced Neighborhoods through changes to height limits, removal of density controls, and other zoning changes along SFMTA's Muni Forward Rapid Network¹³ and other transit routes such as California Street, Union Street, Lombard Street, Geary Blvd, Judah Street, Noriega Street, Ocean Ave, Taraval Street, Sloat Blvd, 19th Ave, Park Presidio Blvd, West Portal Ave, Junipero Serra Blvd, Church Street, Divisadero Street, 17th and Market/Castro, and Van Ness Ave. In areas that overlap with Priority Equity Geographies, such as the Japantown Cultural District, any potential zoning changes should be developed through community-led processes per Policies 18 and 29.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> ConnectSF Transit Strategy; SFMTA's Muni Forward Rapid Network</p>	Medium
<p>7.3.3 Study removing the planning code requirement on large development sites south of Harrison Street in the Central SoMa Special Use District that limits residential uses in proportion to office ones on sites larger than 40,000 square feet that entail new construction or an addition of 100,000 square feet or more.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Land Use Controls</p>	Short
<p>7.3.4 Study feasibility challenges and support proposals for adaptive re-use of vacant and under-utilized commercial office buildings to potentially increase housing and affordable housing opportunities, especially if building types work well for groups that would benefit from their proximity to transit, services, or institutions, such as seniors, teachers, or students.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Land Use Controls</p>	Short
<p>7.3.5 Pursue partnerships that commit large institutional employers that are not subject to job-housing linkage fees (such as hospitals and educational institutions) to conduct an analysis of the housing demand of their employees and to meet that demand within institutional master plans or equivalent documents.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Institutional Master Plans, (NEW)</p>	Medium
<p>7.3.6 Pursue partnerships with educational institutions to identify the housing needs of students, monitor implementation of planned student housing in institutional master plans, and promote strategies to address the unmet housing needs of students.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Institutional Master Plans, (NEW)</p>	Medium
<p><i>Responsible Agencies:</i> Planning, Mayor/BOS</p>	

¹³ These transit routes account for the majority of Muni's ridership. Before the pandemic, Rapid Network routes were scheduled to operate every 10 minutes or better all day on weekdays.

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<i>Funding Sources:</i> Departmental budget (SFMTA, Planning, OEWD, SFCTA)	

7.4. Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)

Related Policies: 31

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
7.4.1 Prioritize City permitting staff resources for the review of ADUs that do not displace tenants. <i>Existing programs:</i> Accessory Dwelling Units	Short
7.4.2 Continue to strengthen the interagency coordination (e.g. Roundtable Review) for permit processing of ADUs and implement an integrated online permitting system and permitting governance structure to support permit streamlining and government transparency. <i>Existing programs:</i> Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs); Processing and Permitting Procedures	Ongoing
7.4.3 Create an affordable ADU program that provides financial support for professional services and construction of units that serve low-income households. <i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)	Short
7.4.4 Encourage Junior ADUs (JADUs) as an effective and low-cost way of adding habitable space within existing single-family homes, as JADUs also expand opportunities for multi-generational living. <i>Existing programs:</i> Accessory Dwelling Units	Short
7.4.5 Revise ADU rent control provisions under local program to start ten years after issuance of Certificate of Occupancy to support homeowners adding units in existing single- and two-family housing. <i>Existing programs:</i> Accessory Dwelling Units	Short
7.4.6 Once adopted, submit the ADU ordinance to HCD and revise the ordinance based on HCD's review as needed. <i>Existing programs:</i> Accessory Dwelling Units	Short
<i>Responsible Agencies:</i> Planning, DBI, MOHCD	
<i>Funding Sources:</i> Departmental budget (Planning)	

8. Reducing Constraints on Housing Development, Maintenance, and Improvement

The Constraint reduction program addresses the challenges in achieving housing approvals and production for shelters, supportive, and housing affordable to low-, moderate-, and above moderate-income households identified in the Analysis of Governmental and Non-Governmental Constraints. This program recognizes that regulatory code and permitting processes direct housing to respond to City priorities, and that the overall system can be simplified and more accessible, that community-led strategies support systematic approaches rather than project-by-project decision-making, and that the cumulative effect of complex entitlement and post-entitlement permitting is making the process uncertain and even more expensive. Key agencies that can advance legislative and programmatic efforts include: the Planning Department, the Department of Building Inspection, Public Works, the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development, and the Office of Workforce and Economic Development.

8.1. Cost and Fees

Related Policies: 26, 27, 30

Actions	Timeline
<p>8.1.1 Reduce building code or jurisdictional conflicts to enable cost-efficient construction types and materials such as cross laminated timber,¹⁴ cassette,¹⁵ or modular¹⁶ construction, especially where local jobs are supported.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Building Code</p>	Medium
<p>8.1.2 Expand the construction workforce through training programs in partnership with non-City apprenticeship programs and expand the Local Hire program to allow more projects to participate.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> CityBuild Training; Local Hire; Workforce Development</p>	Medium
<p>8.1.3 Modify requirement to collect impact fees upon issuance of a Certificate of Final Completion and Occupancy instead of issuance of building permit, in order to support small and mid-size multifamily housing projects.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Impact Fees</p>	Short

14 Laminated timber: An engineered wood building material that can be used in walls, roofs, or ceilings, typically uses sustainable materials, and could lower construction cost through decreased lead times.

15 Cassette: A type of prefabricated housing where components or types of building parts but not full building units are manufactured in a factory setting, then assembled on site

16 A type of prefabricated housing where full units or substantial parts of a building are manufactured, shipped to a construction site, and then assembled into a full building. This evolving housing production method can reduce construction costs and increase durability.

Actions	Timeline
<p>8.1.4 Assess modification of Article 12C of the San Francisco Health Code Non-Potable Water Ordinance as it relates to housing projects, with specific consideration of increasing square footage requirement for housing projects from “at or over 100,000 square feet,” to “at or over 2500,000 gross square feet”</p> <p><i>Existing programs: San Francisco Health Code Non-Potable Water Ordinance</i></p>	Short
<p>8.1.5. If the City issues building permits¹⁷ for fewer than 29,049 new units¹⁸ by January 31, 2027, then the City shall enact and implement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • additional rezoning outside of Priority Equity Geographies and areas vulnerable to displacement, and • additional constraints reductions for housing projects, including existing projects in the development pipeline. <p>This additional rezoning and additional constraints reductions shall accommodate 115% of the shortfall, minus any capacity created by the rezoning(s) in Action 7.1.1 in excess of 36,282 units.¹⁹</p> <p>The scope of this additional rezoning and additional constraint reduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • shall account for sites’ likelihood of development during the RHNA planning period, and affirmatively incorporate the results of an analytical model and the cumulative constraints analysis described in Action 8.1.8 to increase supply choice and affordability and accommodate the RHNA in the planning period. • shall not impose any new governmental constraints not already in effect on January 31, 2027 to the development of housing unless that constraint is offset by the repeal or mitigation of another constraint. • shall consider progress and implement strategies toward meeting the RHNA goals by income group and AFFH objectives, including strategies considered under 8.1.10. • shall consider community engagement, in alignment with Program area 4.2 in areas that may be disproportionately impacted with displacement risk beyond Priority Equity Geographies. <p>The City shall complete this effort, if needed, by July 31, 2028. The City will implement this program in consultation with HCD, including HCD approval.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Planning Code, Land Use Controls, Processing and Permitting Procedures</i></p>	Long
<p>8.1.6. In alignment with the provisions and purpose of the Housing Crisis Act of 2019 (Government Code 66300 et seq.), any City-adopted rezoning or development controls shall not impose any new governmental constraints to the development of housing unless those increased constraints are offset by the removal or reduction of other constraints. A “new governmental constraint” is a city-imposed requirement, including but not limited to process, fees, or design, that increases the cost of development not in effect on January 31, 2023, not including mitigation measures adopted in compliance with CEQA or a requirement adopted to specifically protect against a threat to health or safety.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Planning Code, Land Use Controls, Processing and Permitting Procedures</i></p>	Short

17 "Issues building permits" in this action refers to issuance of building permit to construct a building, which is subsequent to any planning entitlements.

18 This number is 50% of the existing capacity for housing in the Sites Inventory, which is 50% of 58,813 units (see Appendix B, Fig. 3).

19 This number is the RHNA shortfall (plus 15%) identified in the Sites Inventory that is the minimum target required for rezoning per Action 7.1.1

Actions	Timeline
<p>8.1.7. Explore increasing General Fund support for non-regulatory and non-permit review activities of the Planning Department to support the implementing actions of this plan, including community engagement, Cultural Districts strategies, funding strategies for affordable housing, and community plans for services and infrastructure needed for additional housing, Housing Sustainability Districts, rezoning, and overall revisions to the Planning Code.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Planning Code, Land Use Planning and Controls, Processing and Permitting Procedures</p>	Short
<p>8.1.8. Conduct a pro-forma-based study of cumulative governmental constraints on housing development in relation to the socio-economic needs to the city. The study shall quantify the net number of economically feasible housing units that could be built in the City under the regulatory status quo and conduct a sensitivity analysis to determine the amount of constraint reduction necessary to ensure that the majority of typical code-compliant housing projects are economically feasible, including quantification of the hypothetical increase in the net number of economically feasible units that would be realized under a range of constraint-removal scenarios. The study shall consider the effects of economic cycles, considering feasibility under both current economic conditions as well as feasibility under average prevailing conditions over the preceding decade, and sensitivity analysis to variations in construction costs and market rents and sales prices. It should also consider the cost of housing in relation to the population needs. The study shall be updated triennially in tandem with the required Controller's study of the Inclusionary Program required by Planning Code Section 415.10, with the first such study completed in tandem with the first Controller's study completed on or after January 31, 2025, but in no case later than January 31, 2027.</p> <p>The results of the cumulative constraints study shall also inform Action 8.1.5 with the goal of ensuring the economic feasibility of achieving the city's RHNA targets during the planning period.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Planning Code, Land Use Controls, Processing and Permitting Procedures</p>	Medium
<p>8.1.9. Create a Monitoring Program to track progress against Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing goals and metrics and evaluate the effectiveness of AFFH programs, including but not limited to displacement and place-based strategies that address community preservation and revitalization. The evaluation should also seek to harmonize the multiple goals of housing supply, choice, affordability, and conservation. Evaluate reductions to project approval timelines through constraints reduction programs; and monitor housing production from a variety of sources, including pipeline projects, the rezoning described in Program 7.1.1, SB 9, and ADUs. This team shall provide a mid-term evaluation of progress against these metrics and make adjustments to improve performance through additional programs, increased constraints reduction, and additional rezoning, as necessary. This Monitoring Program will be led by the Interagency Housing Element Implementation committee in consultation with community organizations described in Action 4.1.4</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)</p>	Short, Ongoing

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<p>8.1.10 By January 2026, the Interagency Housing Element Implementation committee (see Action 4.1.4) will assess if the City has approved the appropriate housing units by income level to meet the RHNA goals. If the City is behind the pro rata affordable housing production goals the Interagency Housing Element Implementation committee should trigger:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase of additional City funding for affordable housing and pursuit of additional State funding • Increase the land banking strategy to accommodate 50 percent more affordable housing units than the capacity of the sites acquired from 2022 through 2025 <p>The City will implement these actions in consultation with HCD.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)</p>	Medium
<i>Responsible Agencies:</i> DBI, OEWD, Planning, Controller	
<i>Funding Sources:</i> Departmental budget (DBI, Planning, OEWD), Impact fees	

8.2. Small Multifamily Financing and Support

Related Policies: 30

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<p>8.2.1 Create low-interest construction loan programs for eligible lower-income homeowners to expand their existing homes with additional units or demolish and replace their homes with more units up to the allowable maximum density.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)</p>	Medium
<p>8.2.2 Create and sustainably fund financing, technical assistance, outreach, and educational programs, such as the Housing Development Incentive Program for Homeowners, for eligible homeowners interested in updating their property from single- to multi-family housing, particularly assisting low-income property owners, households of color, seniors, and people with disabilities. Such programs should ensure accessible accommodations for aging adults and people with disabilities.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Housing Development Incentive Program for Homeowners; (NEW)</p>	Medium
<p>8.2.3 Explore new fees on housing applications that propose large new or large expansions to single-family homes where no new units are added to create a funding for affordable housing including programs as described in Action 8.2.2</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)</p>	Medium
<i>Responsible Agencies:</i> MOHCD, Planning, Mayor/BOS	
<i>Funding Sources:</i> Departmental budget (Planning, MOHCD), permit fees	

8.3. Objective Design Standards & Findings

Related Policies: 26, 27, 28, 41

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<p>8.3.1 Develop Objective Design Standards that do not act as a constraint on new development and eliminate subjective design review of housing projects while ensuring that new development in existing neighborhoods support livability, building durability, access to light and outdoor space, and creative expression.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: (NEW)</i></p>	Short
<p>8.3.2 Codify commonly applied but unadopted policies, on such topics as roof decks or flats, as design standards to increase certainty in decision-making at Planning Commission.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Land Use Controls</i></p>	Short
<p>8.3.3 Evaluate open space and exposure standards to reduce the number of projects seeking exceptions on typical lot conditions, for instance by removing the inner court five-foot setback at each level requirement under Planning Code Section 140 and amend Section 135(g)(2) to allow inner courts to serve as usable open space even if the height of adjoining walls is somewhat larger than the width of the inner court to allow more efficient construction techniques and reduce the cost of housing construction.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Land Use Controls</i></p>	Medium
<p>8.3.4 Establish objective design standards as part of Better Streets requirements for on- and offsite improvements that replace existing subjective ones.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: (NEW)</i></p>	Medium
<p>8.3.5 Revise public right-of-way (ROW) policy, rules, and procedures across city agencies to facilitate the use of the below grade public ROW for utility infrastructure that would currently be required to be installed on private property to maximize the construction of housing units and expedite post-entitlement approvals as described in Post-Entitlement Permitting and Pipeline Support Program under 8.9.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Land Use Controls</i></p>	Short
<p>8.3.6 Eliminate or remove application of design guidelines including through imposition of project-specific conditions of approval that subjectively restrict the massing of housing for projects that comply with applicable objective standards in accordance with the State's Housing Accountability Act.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Design Review</i></p>	Short

Actions	Timeline
<p>8.3.7 Create and adopt a new objective design standard to require the use of natural and durable materials for front façade and windows, for example stucco, stone, concrete, wood, and metal to replace existing discretionary design guidelines, except in Special Area Design Guidelines or adopted or listed Historic Districts, that require detailed front façade compatibility with surrounding neighborhood architectural patterns, for example window proportions, roof shape, or type of entry.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: (NEW)</i></p>	Short
<p>8.3.8 Create, complete, adopt, and apply the Ground Floor Residential Objective Design Standards to housing projects to require porches, stoops, and open space under specific conditions without compromising accessibility to invite social engagement and belonging.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: (NEW)</i></p>	Medium
<p>8.3.9 Eliminate the use of “neighborhood character” and/or “neighborhood compatibility” terminology in case report findings towards approvals.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Design Review</i></p>	Short
<p>8.3.10 Given health and safety requirements in the Building Code and rear yard requirements in the Planning Code, eliminate the use of “light” and “air” terminology in case report findings to support discretionary requests.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Design Review</i></p>	Short
<p>8.3.11 Remove terminology of “neighborhood character” and “neighborhood compatibility” in the Urban Design Element. Replace such concepts with policies that promote objectivity and certainty and that avoid severe changes to building scale and architectural expressions that dehumanize the experience of the built environment, while supporting the need for physical evolution of neighborhoods in accommodating new housing. Explore implications with Proposition M²⁰</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Urban Design Element</i></p>	Short
<i>Responsible Agencies: Planning, Mayor/BOS</i>	
<i>Funding Sources: Departmental budget (Planning)</i>	

8.4. Process and Permit Procedures

Related Policies: 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29

²⁰ Proposition M was adopted by the voters on November 4, 1986. It requires that the City shall find that proposed alterations and demolitions are consistent with eight priority policies set forth in Section 101.1 of the Planning Code. This includes a policy stating that existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods.

Actions	Timeline
<p>8.4.1 Incentivize housing project applications outside of Priority Equity Geographies that maximize density and height under existing zoning and regulatory programs as that will result in the production of more permanently affordable housing units, as informed by the racial and social equity impact analysis referenced in Actions 4.1.7 and 4.1.8.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> SB 35; State Density Bonus; Local Density Bonuses</p>	Short
<p>8.4.2 Establish local non-discretionary ministerial approval for housing applications in Well-resourced Neighborhoods outside of areas vulnerable to displacement that net two or more housing units, do not demolish existing rent-controlled units, and meet tenant protection, relocation, and replacement standards as recognized in the Housing Crisis Act of 2019, by Board of Supervisors or voter approval of a City Charter amendment. Planning staff will use the Rent Board's Housing Inventory data and seek input from tenants organizations.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)</p>	Medium
<p>8.4.3 Adopt one or more Housing Sustainability Districts in Well-resourced Neighborhoods outside of areas vulnerable to displacement that include tenant protections, relocation, and replacement standards as recognized in Housing Crisis Act of 2019, by January 31, 2026.</p> <p>Unless implementation of Action 8.4.2 has already occurred in the same geography and renders Housing Sustainability Districts (HSD) unnecessary, Housing Sustainability District(s) shall encompass at least 15% of the total land area of the city up to the maximum allowed by state law and shall not include parcels where residential uses are not permitted or are critical sites for City infrastructure, such as parks or utilities.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Housing Sustainability Districts</p>	Medium
<p>8.4.4 Establish a non-discretionary ministerial pathway for project applications that provide 20% affordable housing on site through mechanisms described in Actions 8.4.2 and 8.4.3, for RHNA Cycle 6 lower-income sites identified in the Housing Element Update 2022 Sites Inventory that have been reused from Cycles 4 and 5 by January 31, 2024, as required by per California Government Code §65583.2 (c).</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)</p>	Short
<p>8.4.5 Eliminate Commission hearings on any code-complying project in the Well Resourced Neighborhoods subject to the Housing Accountability Act by July 31, 2023 until January 31, 2027.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)</p>	Short
<p>8.4.6 In Priority Equity Geographies where community-led strategies have defined and codified community benefits, affordable housing goals, environmental justice measures, design standards and/or any other community-determined outcomes required for project approvals, streamline approval processes including reducing notification requirements, consolidating appeal hearings, and providing non-discretionary ministerial pathways, to facilitate certainty in the development process and comprehensively address all community concerns.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)</p>	Short

Actions	Timeline
<p>8.4.7 Revise current hearing procedures for Planning Code Sections 147 and 295 Height Restrictions on Structures Shadowing Property Under the Jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission to codify that the City complies with the maximum number of allowed hearings for projects as required by the project approvals requirements under Housing Crisis Act of 2019 hearing requirements i.e., Government Code section 65905.5 and ensure project approvals meet hearing requirements.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Planning Code</i></p>	Short
<p>8.4.8. Remove Conditional Use Authorizations or other regulatory barriers for lot mergers and lots or proposed densities that exceed conditional use thresholds on housing applications that net two or more housing units, do not demolish existing rent-controlled units, and meet tenant protection, relocation, and replacement standards as recognized in Housing Crisis Act of 2019 to facilitate larger and more efficient housing projects by January 31, 2025.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Planning Code</i></p>	Short
<p>8.4.9 Remove Conditional Use Authorization requirement for demolition of single-family or multi-unit buildings that (1) are not tenant occupied and without history of tenant evictions, recent buyouts, no-fault, Ellis, or OMI Evictions; (2) net two or more housing units in the case of projects that construct less than 4 units or that net an increase of at least 50% in the number of existing units for projects that construct 4 or more units, (3) do not demolish existing rent-controlled units, and (4) meet tenant protection, relocation, and replacement standards as recognized in Housing Crisis Act of 2019 by January 31, 2025. Continue to apply Conditional Use requirements to demolition of tenant occupied buildings. Review “protected unit” standards in the Housing Crisis Act, and strengthen definitions for local use as necessary, to ensure that properties with a history of no-fault evictions, such as Ellis Act or Owner-Move-Ins, continue to require heightened scrutiny or prohibition of demolition. Planning staff will use the Rent Board’s Housing Inventory data and seek input from tenants organizations.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Planning Code</i></p>	Short
<p>8.4.10 Remove Conditional Use Authorizations where required to achieve greater height for a housing project or replace height and bulk districts that require Conditional Use Authorizations to exceed the base height with one that allows the current maximum height by January 31, 2025.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Planning Code</i></p>	Short
<p>8.4.11 Reduce the minimum lot size to 1,200 square feet and minimum lot width to 20 feet for proposed projects that net at least one housing unit.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Land Use Controls</i></p>	Short
<p>8.4.12 Study changes to existing objective Planning Code standards on wind speeds in downtown (c-3) districts under Section 148 to prevent creation by new buildings taller than 85’ of hazard level wind speeds (26 mph) in identified pedestrian areas and to remove the existing comfort standard (7-11 mph); publish a clear document describing the methodology and procedures for wind analysis using these standards; study adopting Planning Code standard measures (e.g., building design objective standards) for certain locations that reduce hazard level wind speeds to reduce individual project-level technical analysis and expedite housing application approvals; and commit to addressing wind impacts collectively through the results of the study in action 9.2.12.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Planning Code</i></p>	Short

Actions	Timeline
<p>8.4.13 Analyze interaction between different planning department teams and identify and implement where internal application review processes could be reformed and simplified, for example, standardizing and codifying technical studies and best practices to shorten the time to get to a stable project description.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: N/A</i></p>	Medium
<p>8.4.14 Designate a lead permitting agency or assigned project manager for priority projects or projects delivering over 20% affordable housing to facilitate interagency alignment from application start to certificate of occupancy and final certification.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: N/A</i></p>	Short
<p>8.4.15 Lower the requirement for a major encroachment permit to a minor encroachment permit for housing projects to lay utility lines through public land to meet streetlight requirements for SFPUC.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Land Use Controls</i></p>	Medium
<p>8.4.16 Continue to implement the Mayoral Executive Directives to accelerate creating new housing and expand City department's compliance with the directives (Mayor Breed's Executive Directive 18-01 and Mayor Lee's Executive Directive 17-02).</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Mayor Executive Directives</i></p>	Medium
<p>8.4.17 Amend the Planning Code to prohibit Discretionary Review requests for code compliant projects adding at least one net unit, except for projects affecting buildings with units that are tenant occupied, are located in Priority Equity Geographies, or meet the definition of protected units under the Housing Crisis Act of 2019. Remove neighborhood notification requirements for projects outside of Priority Equity Geographies that are code complying, net at least one housing unit, and only expand the rear or side of an existing building and for all non-discretionary ministerial projects.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: N/A</i></p>	Short
<p>8.4.18 Prioritize Department staffing and resources to review Discretionary Review applications that are filed within Priority Equity Geographies in a timely manner and reallocate the Planning Department's staff resources from other Discretionary Review applications to support low-income homeowners with technical assistance as identified under Action 8.2.2, using the Department's Racial and Social Equity Assessment tool. Consider Commission action to limit Discretionary Review heard by Commission for projects that do not affect the size or number of dwelling units on a parcel, for example, changes to decks or other similar exterior modifications.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: (NEW)</i></p>	Medium
<p>8.4.19 Whenever Planning Code amendments or revisions are proposed, advocate for ensure and promote simpler or an overall reduction of rules that affect housing approvals to reduce the specific or institutional knowledge needed by City staff, applicants, and members of the public to increase accessibility.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Planning Code</i></p>	Medium, Ongoing
<p>8.4.20 Create best-practices applicant checklist of priority pre- and post-entitlement documents for all departments and agencies that participate in post-entitlement review and permitting.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: (NEW)</i></p>	Short

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<p>8.4.21 Led by American Indian, Black, other communities of color, and Cultural Districts, explore options to support community engagement as part of ministerial review to simplify and shorten the approval process for housing projects citywide. All considered options must not add subjective constraints to the housing approval process and must reduce project approval timelines.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Planning Code</p>	Short
<p><i>Responsible Agencies:</i> Planning, OEWD, MOHCD, DBI, SFPUC, PG&E, SF Port, SFFD, SFMTA, OCII, SFFD, MOD, Board of Supervisors</p>	
<p><i>Funding Sources:</i> SB 2 Planning Grants, Departmental budgets (Planning, DBI)</p>	

8.5. Compliance with State Programs and Law

Related Policies: 28

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<p>8.5.1 Ensure that local adopted rules and procedures that implement future state housing law support and conform with the State's legislative intent.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Planning Code</p>	Short
<p>8.5.2 Remove Commission hearings for program-compliant State Density Bonus projects that do not require additional entitlements in consultation with California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Planning Code</p>	Short
<p>8.5.3 Request that HCD and the State legislature clarify and consolidate permit milestone and timeframe definitions that stem from past legislation to ensure data accuracy and compliance in the required Annual Progress Report.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Planning Code</p>	Short
<p>8.5.4 Advocate for HCD to provide more immediate and standardized implementation support for State housing legislation so that it is directly operational for general planning staff, reducing the need for highly specialized experts, to reduce constraints on staffing.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Planning Code</p>	Short
<p>8.5.5 Establish and document two critical markers of site and building permit applications progress, "complete application" and "approved application" in permit application processes, to ensure accurate data collection and continued compliance with the Permit Streamlining Act.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Planning Code</p>	Short

Actions	Timeline
<p>8.5.6 Evaluate the local CEQA review process to identify what goes beyond the CEQA statute and state guidelines in San Francisco-specific initial study checklist topics (e.g., wind and shadow) and requirements pertaining to notification, posting, public hearings, and appeals. Amend Chapter 31 of the Administrative Code to modify or eliminate the identified requirements while continuing to satisfy CEQA. Update department standard operating procedures, guidelines, and bulletins to reflect the amended code and evaluation. Evaluate replacing CEQA wind analysis with expanded and modified Planning Code 148 objective requirements as described in Action 8.4.12 to new buildings taller than 85' throughout the city.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Planning Code</i></p>	Medium
<p>8.5.7 Issue comprehensive plan check comments concurrently with design review comments after submittal of a complete application within the timeframes required by the Permit Streamlining Act and/or Housing Accountability Act for housing applications; complete legislative and/or procedural changes to enable the CEQA and code review process to begin earlier in the application process to expedite permit processing.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Planning Code</i></p>	Short
<p>8.5.8 Examine and change necessary legislation to allow project applications that only require building permits to not meet the definition of a “project” under CEQA (locally and/or at state level).</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Planning Code</i></p>	Medium
<p>8.5.9 Develop a streamlined process for implementing use of the Housing Element Environmental impact Report for future housing projects and future planning code amendments related to housing consistent with the Housing Element 2022.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Planning Code</i></p>	Medium
<p>8.5.10 Revise data collection process and establish data dashboards on application process, approvals, and unit delivery to provide more accurate, up to date, and transparent information to the State, advocates, and communities and reduce staff time on reporting. Review current requirements and eliminate any out-of-date or redundant housing reporting requirements.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Planning Code</i></p>	Medium
<p>8.5.11 Study and address post-entitlement permit processes for projects subject to California State Highway System permits.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: (NEW)</i></p>	Medium
<p>8.5.12 Comply with all state laws including but not limited to SB 35 Streamlined Ministerial Approval Process (Gov. Code, § 65913.4), Housing Crisis Act (Gov. Code, § 66300), Housing Accountability Act (Gov. Code, § 65589.5), Permit Streamlining Act (Gov. Code, §§ 65941.1 and 65943), and CEQA timelines., This will include strengthening data collection, clarifying definitions, revising processes, and other actions to comply with all state housing laws.</p> <p>Include an analysis of proposed housing projects for potential applicability of the Housing Accountability Act in staff reports and commission resolutions.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Planning Code, Processing and Permitting Procedures</i></p>	Short, Ongoing
<p><i>Responsible Agencies: Mayor/BOS; Planning; PUC; DBI</i></p>	

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<i>Funding Sources:</i> Departmental budget (Planning)	

8.6. Support for Affordable Housing and Shelters

Related Policies: 8, 26, 27, 30

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<p>8.6.1 Expand the Impact Fee exemption to a broader range of permanently affordable housing projects including those with units affordable up to 120 percent of Area Median Income or projects that rely on philanthropic capital.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Planning Code</p>	Short
<p>8.6.2 Utilize and comply with the state-wide streamlining opportunities to expedite and increase the production of Permanent Supportive Housing. Continue the nondiscretionary approval of Supportive Housing projects in accordance AB 2162 and of all shelters, including Low Barrier Navigation Centers, in accordance with AB 101.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Plan Review, AB 101, AB 2162</p>	Short
<p>8.6.3 Make shelters, transitional housing, or crisis interventions (such as Safe Sleeping Sites) principally permitted in all zoning districts, regardless of the declaration of a shelter crisis.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Planning Code</p>	Short
<p>8.6.4 Remove requirement for General Plan referrals for shelters, 100% affordable housing, permanent supportive housing, and development agreement projects.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Planning Code</p>	Medium
<p>8.6.5. Remove Planning Code Section 429 Public Art requirements for 100% affordable housing projects.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Planning Code</p>	Medium
<p>8.6.6 Create an administrative process for 100% affordable rehabilitation projects to add accessory dwelling units.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Plan Review</p>	Medium
<p>8.6.7 Strengthen the interagency coordination to streamline the requirements for the associated approvals for publicly funded affordable housing by creating a public inventory of all such approvals, establishing a baseline process and expected duration for each approval, and ensuring clear project management; examples of associated approvals include the PG&E requirements to accommodate Public Utilities Commission (PUC) low-cost electric service, or the multi-agency review of disability access to reduce per-unit construction costs.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Plan Review</p>	Short

Actions	Timeline
<p>8.6.8 Identify common disputes and establish processes to resolve them in specific time periods. Resolve common disputes between the SFPUC and PG&E, especially on affordable housing project applications, which result in unnecessary equipment, delays, and costly upgrades.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Plan Review</i></p>	Medium
<p>8.6.9 Assess the effectiveness of recently issued administrative bulletins on code and standards interpretations intended to establish clear expectations and reduce review and inspection time from the Mayor's Office of Disability for 100% affordable housing projects. Revise these bulletins regularly to address any ongoing challenges with accessibility reviews.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Plan Review</i></p>	Short
<p>8.6.10 Streamline plan checks, response to revisions, and field inspection process to support and reduce review time from Mayor's Office of Disability by 20% for 100% affordable housing projects.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: (NEW)</i></p>	Short
<p>8.6.11 Advocate for AB 101, State legislation that requires Low-Barrier Navigation Centers by right, to cover other crisis interventions that house people that are not considered emergency shelter, for example safe sleeping sites.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: (NEW)</i></p>	Medium
<p>8.6.12 Determine and codify procedures that recognize that housing applications for shelter, temporary housing, or crisis interventions (such as Safe Sleeping Sites) do not meet the standard of a "project" under CEQA, to ensure compliance with AB 101.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: (NEW)</i></p>	Short
<p>8.6.13 Work with design professionals to produce replicable building details (such as bathroom layouts) that are code compliant and meet accessibility standards on publicly subsidized 100% affordable housing projects. This will reduce plan review time, field corrections, and cost, while maintaining high-quality standards.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: (NEW)</i></p>	Medium
<p>8.6.14 Expand use of third-party consulting peer review of construction documents on publicly subsidized 100% affordable housing projects, in addition to continuing to maintain staff experts on affordable housing project review and assigning them to affordable housing projects.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: (NEW)</i></p>	Medium
<p>8.6.15 Implement innovations in project financing, including options for payment and performance bonds, retention, and other contract terms, expedited payments to contractors on publicly subsidized 100% affordable housing projects.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: (NEW)</i></p>	Medium

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<p>8.6.16 Expand nonprofit project management capacity, especially focused on areas of the city that have not seen much affordable housing development and where there are few or no community-based affordable housing developers.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: (NEW)</i></p>	Medium
<p>8.6.17 Support new systems of property management and asset management for efficiencies and low cost per unit for expanded portfolios that include mid and smaller size buildings.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: (NEW)</i></p>	Medium
<p>8.6.18 Ensure compliance with SB 1087 requirements, including immediately delivering the adopted housing element to water and sewer service providers, that sewer and water providers have policies and procedures that grant priority for service allocations to proposed developments that include housing units affordable to lower-income households.</p> <p><i>Existing Program: Existing compliance and priority for affordable housing</i></p>	Short
<i>Responsible Agencies: Planning, MOHCD, DBI, SFPUC, PG&E, Mayor, and Board of Supervisors</i>	
<i>Funding Sources: Departmental budget (Planning, MOD), Needs new additional funding</i>	

8.7. Facilitating Large Projects

Related Policies: 24, 27

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<p>8.7.1 Enable public-private partnership solutions to front-end the necessary funding for on- and off-site infrastructure investments to expedite housing for large master plans and development agreements with major up front infrastructure needs, such as Treasure Island, Candlestick Point, Mission Bay, Hunters Point Shipyard, Parkmerced, and Schlage Lock/Bayland North. Solutions could include Infrastructure Finance Districts, Tax Increment Financing, or other methods to provide direct City investment, allocation of public financing, or issuance of other public debt.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Infrastructure Finance Districts</i></p>	Medium
<p>8.7.2 Advocate for regional, State, and federal funds through the existing infrastructure bank or other paths to help finance the infrastructure needs of large urban infill and redevelopment projects.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Infrastructure Bank</i></p>	Medium
<p>8.7.3 Continue to strengthen coordination of interagency permitting review and approval processes for implementation of approved large master-planned or development agreement projects to accelerate construction timelines of infrastructure improvements.</p> <p><i>Existing programs: Plan Review</i></p>	Short
<i>Responsible Agencies: DBI, OEWD, Planning</i>	

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<i>Funding Sources:</i> Enhanced Infrastructure Financing Districts, Departmental budget (Planning, DBI), California Infrastructure and Economic Development Bank	

8.8. Policy and Practice Review

Related Policies: 28

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
8.8.1 Participate and perform data and process analysis as directed by mandatory Policy and Practice Review HCD scope and timeline. <i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)	Short
8.8.2 Revise local process, procedures, and other relevant requirements to implement priority recommendations of HCD's finalized Policy and Practice Review. <i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)	Short
8.8.3 Amend Housing Element, as needed, to include final actions required by outcomes of mandatory Policy and Practice Review HCD effort. <i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)	Short
<i>Responsible Agencies:</i> Planning	
<i>Funding Sources:</i> Departmental budget (Planning)	

8.9. Post-Entitlement Permitting and Pipeline Support

Related Policies: 24, 27, 28

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
8.9.1 Create workflow and organizational charts to clarify how City agencies review and permit housing; link interdepartmental process and combine pre- and post-entitlement project review and monitoring teams, when feasible, to optimize workflow. <i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)	Short

Actions	Timeline
<p>8.9.2 Coordinate pre- and post-entitlement review Actions across City agencies to reduce entitlement process time. This includes actions 8.1.14 to support priority projects; 8.4.15 to lower permit requirements for streetlights; 8.4.20 to create applicant checklist for pre- and post- entitlement documents; 8.6.7 to streamline publicly funded affordable housing projects; 8.6.8 to resolve common disputes between the SFPUC and PG&E; 8.6.9 to assess the effectiveness of recently issued administrative bulletins to reduce review and inspection times from the Mayor's Office of Disability for 100% affordable housing projects; 8.6.13 to produce replicable building details that meet accessibility standards on publicly subsidized 100% affordable housing projects; 8.6.14 to expand use of third-party consulting peer review of construction documents on publicly subsidized 100% affordable housing projects; and 8.6.15 to innovate financing on publicly subsidized 100% affordable housing projects.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Land Use Controls, Plan Review, (NEW)</p>	Short
<p><i>Responsible Agencies:</i> OEWD, DBI, DPW, SFPUC, MOD, PG&E, Planning</p>	
<p><i>Funding Sources:</i> Departmental budget (Planning)</p>	

9. Healthy, Connected, and Resilient Housing and Neighborhoods

The Healthy, Connected, and Resilient Housing and Neighborhoods implementing program supports the Housing Element goal of promoting neighborhoods that are well-connected, healthy, and rich with community culture. Actions are organized along the principles of fostering safe, sustainable and accessible neighborhoods that reflect San Francisco’s diversity. San Francisco is actively involved in planning for and implementing transportation infrastructure. ConnectSF is a multi-agency collaboration process to build an effective, equitable, and sustainable transportation system. The city is advancing ConnectSF through the San Francisco Transportation Plan update and the Transportation Element of the General Plan update. The Transportation Plan is the countywide, long-range transportation policy and investment blueprint for the next 30 years and is consistent with Plan Bay Area 2050, the long-range transportation plan for the nine-county Bay Area. The Plan includes investment scenarios based on expected revenues and potential new revenues. The Transportation Element defines the goals and policies for how people and goods circulate through San Francisco. The Transportation Element must identify potential funding sources for capital, operations, and maintenance of planned additions to the network for projects that San Francisco leads, additions that would be triggered by policies in the element, and the existing network. City agencies are guided by ConnectSF as they develop their operating and capital budgets. The actions build primarily upon the work of the following local bodies and will require their continued coordination: SFMTA, OEWD, MOHCD, DPW, and the Planning Department.

9.1. Housing Rehabilitation for Health and Safety

Related Policies: 39, 42

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<p>9.1.1 Create and expand programs to improve indoor air quality for existing housing, prioritizing resources in Priority Equity Geographies that overlap with Environmental Justice Communities, such as applying the standards in Article 38 of SF Health Code to such housing.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Environmental Justice Framework; Climate Action Plan; Article 38 of SF Health Code, (NEW)</p>	Short
<p>9.1.2 Create electric conversion policies and programs for existing housing that decrease the use of gas appliances in homes to support respiratory health, prioritizing Priority Equity Geographies that overlap with Environmental Justice Communities.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Environmental Justice Framework; Climate Action Plan; Safety & Resilience Element; (NEW)</p>	Short

Actions	Timeline
<p>9.1.3 Support and streamline permits for heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC), energy and weatherization retrofits and upgrades, prioritizing Priority Equity Geographies that overlap with Environmental Justice Communities.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Energy Efficiency Upgrade Programs; Energy Upgrade California; Renewable Energy Requirements; Solar, Electric, and Water Heating Incentives; Processing and Permitting Procedures</p>	Short
<p>9.1.4 Expand funding for repair and rehabilitation programs to remove mold, lead, and other health hazards through programs such as Fix Lead SF and CalHome recognizing the need to protect tenants throughout the remediation process and not pass along costs afterwards, prioritizing Priority Equity Geographies that overlap with Environmental Justice Communities.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> CalHome Rehab Program; Healthy Homes Lead Hazard Remediation; Environmental Justice Framework; Fix Lead SF</p>	Medium
<p>9.1.5 Continue to connect residents and housing developments with technical support and financing programs for earthquake safety retrofits such as the Mandatory Soft Story Retrofit Program.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Mandatory Soft Story Retrofit Program, Safety & Resilience Element; Hazards and Climate Resilience Plan</p>	Ongoing
<p>9.1.6 Create programs to provide rehabilitation assistance to qualified homeowners to maintain exterior cladding, roofs, and essential building utilities in housing in Environmental Justice Communities.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> CalHome Rehab Program (MOHCD); Environmental Justice Framework; (NEW)</p>	Medium
<p>9.1.7 Establish priority building permit and entitlement Planning Department review processes for multi-family residential development projects that rehabilitate or adaptively reuse existing buildings to support sustainable building practices, per Policy 34, while preserving cultural resources.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Ministerial Approval; Processing and Permitting Procedures; Historic Preservation Review; Safety & Resilience Element</p>	Short
<p><i>Responsible Agencies:</i> Planning, DOE, DBI, OCRP, DPH, Mayor/BOS</p>	
<p><i>Funding Sources:</i> Departmental budget (DPH, DOE, MOHCD, Planning), Bay Area Air Quality Management District grants (Clean Air Centers, EV charging, Climate tech finance, etc.)</p>	

9.2. Resilient and Healthy Neighborhoods and New Housing

Related Policies: 37, 40

Actions	Timeline
<p>9.2.1 Ensure and reinforce that all community planning efforts meet the City's Climate Action Plan to prepare existing neighborhoods and future housing projects for sea level rise and flooding impacts, especially in Priority Equity Geographies that overlap with Environmental Justice Communities.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Community Plans; Community Strategies; Climate Action Plan; Environmental Justice Framework; Safety & Resilience Element; Waterfront Resilience Program; Islais Creek Southeast Mobility and Adaptation Strategy</p>	Short
<p>9.2.2 Provide neighborhood and infrastructure planning to mitigate flood risks during extreme weather events or due to climate crisis impacts, prioritizing resources for Priority Equity Geographies that overlap with Environmental Justice Communities.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Development Agreements; Community Plans; Community Strategies; Climate Action Plan; Environmental Justice Framework; Safety & Resilience Element; Waterfront Resilience Program; Islais Creek Southeast Mobility and Adaptation Strategy</p>	Medium
<p>9.2.3 Enhance high-pressure fire protection for the Westside of San Francisco by implementing and constructing Phase 1 of the Westside Potable Emergency Firefighting Water System (PEFWS) and continue to work with the community and obtain funding to implement and construct Phase 2 of the PEFWS.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Phase 1 of the Westside Potable Emergency Firefighting Water System; Safety & Resilience Element</p>	Medium
<p>9.2.4 Identify strategies to reduce the impact of polluting sources, such as freeways, in planning efforts in Priority Equity Geographies that overlap with Environmental Justice Communities so that impacted residents may provide input on solutions that support health of sensitive populations, such as seniors, children, and those with disabilities. Examples of strategies include vegetative buffers and location of childcare and other sensitive uses away from busy roadways, among others.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Article 38 of SF Health Code; Environmental Justice Framework; Safety & Resilience Element</p>	Short
<p>9.2.5 Strengthen building standards to ensure that new housing developments limit sound intrusion from exterior and interior sources.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Building Codes</p>	Short
<p>9.2.6 Explore whether certification or building codes effectively incentivize the use of low volatile organic compounds (VOC) materials in new construction to reduce exposure.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Building Codes; Processing and Permitting Procedures; Environmental Justice Framework</p>	Short

Actions	Timeline
<p>9.2.7 Maximize the installation of site-appropriate, native trees and vegetation at grade and on roofs in new residential development, especially in neighborhoods with less tree canopy coverage as per the SF Better Streets Plan, the SF Green Landscaping Ordinance, and the SF Better Roofs Ordinance.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Better Streets Plan; Green Landscaping Ordinance; Better Roofs Ordinance; Environmental Justice Framework; Safety & Resilience Element</p>	Short
<p>9.2.8 Update Planning Code requirements, such as the SF Green Landscaping Ordinance, to reduce paved surfaces and underground enclosed space in rear and side yards to specifically retain deep soil for trees and more sustainable vegetation.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> SF Green Landscaping Ordinance; Land Use Controls</p>	Short
<p>9.2.9 Study and document the impact of open space and housing on people's health, especially for children, for the Planning Commission's use in evaluating open space and rear yard variances in housing applications.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Development Agreements; Open Space Requirements; Environmental Justice Framework</p>	Long
<p>9.2.10 Enforce compliance with existing requirements in the SF Stormwater Management Ordinance to incorporate on-site stormwater management and flood resilience</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> SF Stormwater Management Ordinance; Safety & Resilience Element</p>	Ongoing
<p>9.2.11 With passage of more opportunities for non-discretionary ministerial approvals in Policy 25, redirect Planning Department staff time as available towards long-range environmental efforts, like those that reduce the city's regional and global contributions to the climate crisis instead of the discretionary permit and environmental review of such housing projects with minimal environmental impacts.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)</p>	Medium
<p>9.2.12 Study ways for the city to plan, fund, and mitigate environmental conditions (e.g., wind) that impact many sites, may not be pragmatically solvable on a site-by-site basis, and could deter or delay projects that include affordable housing units, especially in Priority Equity Geographies.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Hazards and Climate Resilience Plan</p>	Medium
<p>9.2.13 Identify the public health needs of neighborhoods, especially in Priority Equity Geographies that overlap with Environmental Justice Communities, in community planning processes or when planning for large-scale development projects by engaging community-based organizations; public health needs include addressing air, soil, groundwater contamination, and noise pollution.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Environmental Justice Framework</p>	Medium
<p>9.2.14 Organize housing and neighborhood business and service areas to prioritize proximity in neighborhood planning or development agreement projects that propose land use changes.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Development Agreements; Community Plans; Community Strategies</p>	Medium
<p><i>Responsible Agencies:</i> Planning, DBI, SFPUC, DPW, DPH, RPD, Mayor/BOS</p>	

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<p><i>Funding Sources:</i> Bay Area Air Quality Management District grants (Clean Air Centers, EV charging, Climate tech finance, etc.), Departmental budgets (Planning, DBI, DOE, DPH, DPW, SFPUC), Advancing California Finance Authority, and other regional, state, and federal grants</p>	

9.3. Transportation and Other Infrastructure

Related Policies: 17, 37, 38

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
<p>9.3.1 Apply equity metrics identified under Action 4.1.1 in identifying necessary infrastructure improvements for Priority Equity Geographies and to guide all City investment decisions, including but not limited to: Capital Planning, General Plan Elements, Interagency Plan Implementation Committee, or Citizen Advisory Council review, in coordination with Actions 9.3.5 to 9.3.7.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Capital and Operational Planning (city-level and agency-level); General Plan Elements; Vision Zero; Interagency Plan Implementation Committee; Community or Citizen Advisory Councils</p>	Ongoing
<p>9.3.2 Prioritize investments in Priority Equity Geographies that overlap with Environmental Justice Communities related to improving transit service, pedestrian safety, schools, child development centers, parks, streetscape, and other neighborhood amenities, in coordination with the investments referenced under Action 9.3.7.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Capital and Operational Planning (city-level and agency-level); General Plan Elements; Interagency Plan Implementation Committee; Community or Citizen Advisory Councils</p>	Ongoing
<p>9.3.3 Strengthen interagency coordination, review, and compliance processes to ensure that transit, walking, and biking infrastructure and safety improvements are integrated into planning, funding, and construction and/or rehabilitation of public projects (e.g., parks and open spaces, libraries, and transit facilities) in addition to private development projects, consistent with the City's Vision Zero policy.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Interagency Transportation Advisory Staff Committee, Interagency Street Design Advisory Team, ConnectSF, Planning Transportation Review under CEQA, Vision Zero</p>	Ongoing
<p>9.3.4 Continue to adhere to guidelines in the Better Streets Plan when new housing creates improvements to sidewalks, streets, and other public spaces.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Better Streets Plan review through Interagency Transportation Advisory Staff Committee and Interagency Street Design Advisory Team</p>	Ongoing

Actions	Timeline
<p>9.3.5 Strengthen interagency coordination for transportation, evaluating and prioritizing the existing and future needs of Priority Equity Geographies that overlap with Environmental Justice Communities, and Well-resourced Neighborhoods targeted for increased housing capacity, and plan for staffing and funding needed for these investments (e.g., general obligation bonds, federal grants). This includes delivering a capital program that provides extensive transit priority on a network transit routes that would make it possible for service to reliably operate every five minutes or better,²¹ and consistent with the city's ConnectSF vision and its Transit Strategy.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> ConnectSF and its Transit Strategy and Streets and Freeways Strategy; SFCTA San Francisco Transportation Plan (SFTP); Transportation Element; MTC Plan Bay Area 2050</p>	Ongoing
<p>9.3.6 Repair, maintain, and optimize the existing transit system, particularly through SFMTA's 5-year Capital Improvement Program's (CIP) Transit Optimization and Expansion Projects (e.g., transit only lanes, transit signal priority, boarding islands, etc. on transit streets) in Priority Equity Geographies that overlap with Environmental Justice Communities and Well-resourced Neighborhoods targeted for increased housing capacity.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> SFMTA 5-year Capital Improvement Program; SFMTA Muni Forward; SFMTA Muni Service Equity Strategy; ConnectSF Transit Strategy</p>	Ongoing (Medium for 5-year CIP)
<p>9.3.7 Expand and improve local and regional transit service as identified in ConnectSF Transit Strategy, prioritizing essential workers, low-income households, and transit-dependent people, and in Priority Equity Geographies that overlap with Environmental Justice communities.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> ConnectSF Transit Strategy; SFMTA Muni Service Equity Strategy; SFCTA SFTP</p>	Ongoing
<p>9.3.8. Adopt requirements that encourage trips using priority modes²² in new housing and reduce transportation impacts from new housing. Such requirements for some new housing may include additional transportation demand management measures and driveway and loading operations plans; protecting pedestrian, cycling, and transit-oriented street frontages from driveways; and reducing vehicular parking.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Planning Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program and related Planning Code TDM provisions; Planning Code Transportation Sustainability Fee; Planning Transportation Review under CEQA; Development Agreements</p>	Short
<p><i>Responsible Agencies:</i> SFMTA or Planning, SFCTA, DPW, OEWD, Mayor/BOS, Police, Fire, Regional Transit and Transportation Agencies, RPD, SFPUC, LIB, Port</p>	
<p><i>Funding Sources:</i> Departmental budget (SFMTA, SFCTA, Planning, DPW) and Operating Budgets, MTC Transit Core Capacity Challenge Grants, MTC Priority Development Area (PDA) Grants, Cap and Trade funding, Gas Tax funding, Regional Measure 3 funding, and other local, regional, state, and federal sources</p>	

21 A conceptual network of transit corridors, where a substantial investment in on-street improvements would markedly increase the routes' speed and reliability. These improvements include transit lanes, traffic signal adjustments, queue jumps, turn restrictions, boarding bulbs/islands, turn restrictions/requirements, and other treatments, and can be installed relatively quickly. Corridors on the five-minute network potentially include routes in the Rapid Network, other routes where demand warrants frequent service, and routes where growth in transit demand is anticipated.

22 Priority modes include walking, bicycling, transit, and vanpooling.

9.4. Community Services

Related Policies: 26, 33, 37

Actions	Timeline
<p>9.4.1 Collaborate with the San Francisco Unified School District to evaluate the feasibility of providing a priority in the school assignment process for lower income families to be assigned at higher quality schools.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> School Assignment Priority</p>	Medium
<p>9.4.2 Remove Conditional Use Authorizations outside of Priority Equity Geographies and areas vulnerable to displacement where required to remove an existing use and construct housing, and instead apply neighborhood notification procedures for proposed demolition of identified community-service uses, such as theaters, grocery stores, and laundromats, by January 31, 2027 and support their economic survival through a replacement provision or participation in a Community Benefit Use program²³ as described in Action 9.4.5.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Community Benefit Use; Conditional Use Authorizations; Land Use Controls; Neighborhood Retail Regulations; Processing and Permitting Procedures; Environmental Justice Framework; (NEW)</p>	Medium
<p>9.4.3 Develop or adopt certification programs for community-serving businesses, such as grocery stores, child development centers, healthcare clinics, and laundromats, starting in Priority Equity Geographies so that there is a way to resource or plan for them via other actions.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Land-Use Controls; Processing and Permitting Procedures; (NEW)</p>	Medium
<p>9.4.4 Incentivize new housing to commit via deed restrictions or other legal agreement to below market rate commercial leases for community-based organizations serving the neighborhood community for a minimum of ten years by providing fee waivers, especially in Cultural Districts.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Fee Exemptions; (NEW)</p>	Medium
<p>9.4.5 Study the creation of a Community Benefit Use program, referenced in Actions 7.2.2 and 9.4.8, that allows new housing developments to have a highly flexible ground floor use entitlement and tenants to be eligible for rent subsidy in exchange for community participation in tenant selection or for businesses that obtain certifications as described in Action 9.4.3.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> (NEW)</p>	Short

²³ Geographically specific programs established through community-led process to identify a menu of uses that meet community needs to be incorporated into certain future project approvals, thereby reducing the time and community resources required to shape projects that meet their needs on individual project approval basis. Programs may be supported through the Office of Small Business or other community services resources.

Actions	Timeline
<p>9.4.6 Create and implement a long-range community facilities plan, and update every 5-10 years, for public facilities including parks, recreation centers, schools, child development centers, libraries, to accommodate a thirty-year projected population growth, informed by equity metrics in a manner that secures equitable access in Priority Equity Geographies, Environmental Justice Communities, and Well-resourced Neighborhoods that are targeted for increased housing capacity, building on processes such as the Community Facilities Framework, and in collaboration with Interagency Plan Implementation Committee.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Community Facilities Framework; Interagency Plan Implementation Committee; (NEW)</p>	Medium
<p>9.4.7 Develop a comprehensive and regularly updated map of daily needs, amenities, and community facilities, to inform the work of the interagency coordination under Action 9.3.3 as well as community-based organizations in planning for services, resources, open space, and businesses to be near each other and supportive to communities.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Community Facilities Framework; (NEW)</p>	Medium
<p>9.4.8 Expand and allow community serving uses, such as retail, restaurants, and personal services within areas that are primarily residential especially on corner parcels, especially uses under the Community Benefit Use program defined under Action 9.4.5.</p> <p><i>Existing programs:</i> Land-Use Controls; Community Benefit Districts; Neighborhood Retail Regulations; (NEW)</p>	Short
<p><i>Responsible Agencies:</i> Planning, SFUSD, MOHCD, OEWD, SFMTA, SFRPD, LIB, DPW, DYCF, HSA</p>	
<p><i>Funding Sources:</i> SFUSD, Departmental budgets (OEWD, Planning, DPW, MOHCD)</p>	

Quantified Objectives

	<i>Extremely Low and Very Low Income</i>	<i>Low Income</i>	<i>Moderate Income</i>	<i>Above Moderate Income</i>	<i>Total</i>
RHNA Target	20,867	12,014	13,717	35,471	82,069
New Construction					
Development Agreements	1,762	4,650	1,610	16,578	24,600
Private Mixed Income Pipeline		1,644	541	13,185	15,370
ADUs			1,800	200	2,000
100% Affordable Pipeline	1,234	1,234	120	18	2,606
100% Affordable Anticipated	1,080	1,080			2,160
Acquisitions for Affordability					
Supportive Housing Acquisitions- Pipeline and Planned	750				750
Small Sites Program Acquisitions- Planned	395	789	148	148	1480
Total Housing Units	5,221	9,397	4,219	30,129	48,966

Household Served by MOHCD Tenant and Homebuyer Assistance (8 year estimated total)

Rental assistance	14,528	3,584	904	0	19,016
Tenants' Right to Counsel	10,128	1,504	632	488	12,752
Other Tenant Counseling/Mediation	7,584	2,512	800	496	11,392
Homeownership Counseling	7,200	3,016	6,608	4,448	21,264
Homeownership Loans	0	0	24	376	400
Households Placed in Affordable Units Via DAHLIA	1,728	760	1,088	432	4,000

SF Housing Authority Estimate of Housing Choice Voucher Capacity (Ongoing- based on 2021)

Housing Choice Vouchers	13,132
-------------------------	--------

	<i>Extremely Low and Very Low Income</i>	<i>Low Income</i>	<i>Moderate Income</i>	<i>Above Moderate Income</i>	<i>Total</i>
Shelter, Transitional Housing, and Supportive Housing (Ongoing- numbers as of 2022)					
Shelter and Transitional Housing Beds/Units	2,872				
Supportive Housing for Formerly Homeless	13,451				

Key Constraints Reduction Actions

The following actions are summarized here from the programs listed above as key for reducing constraints on housing development, maintenance, and improvement. The table includes dates by which these key actions should be completed and sunset dates where applicable.

Actions	Completion Date
1.1.1 By March 2023, convene City leadership, staff, policymakers, affordable housing advocates, and industry experts to collaborate on an Affordable Housing Implementation and Funding Strategy that provides specific recommendations and responsible parties to achieve and sustain the substantial public funding from local, state, and federal sources, that would join with public-private partnerships, needed to achieve the RHNA targets of over 46,000 units affordable at low- and moderate-incomes. Assign appropriate City staff to include a budget proposal for Fiscal Year 2023-2024 and complete this effort by January 31, 2024.	January 31, 2024
2.1.4 Increase funding to expand the services of community-based organizations and providers for financial counseling services listed under Action 1.7.5, as well as tenant and eviction prevention services listed under Program 2, to better serve vulnerable populations, populations in areas vulnerable to displacement, and Cultural Districts Tenant and eviction protection services include legal services, code enforcement outreach, tenant counseling, mediation, and housing-related financial assistance; expansion of such services should be informed by community priorities referenced under Action 4.1.3. Complete by completion of Rezoning Program or no later than January 31, 2026.	January 31, 2026
7.1.1 Create a rezoning program to meet the requirements of San Francisco's Regional Housing Needs Allocation across income levels and Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing laws, relying on a combination of strategies in Actions 7.3.2 and 7.2.1 above to accommodate the RHNA shortfall with a buffer (approximately 36,282 new units) primarily in Well-resourced Neighborhoods , in proximity to transit and commercial corridors. The rezoning program shall reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model and shall not add government constraints that reduce project financial feasibility as determined by an analysis prior to the rezoning enactment. Seek to implement a rezoning program that exceeds the identified RHNA shortfall plus 15% buffer (i.e., 36,282 units) to provide more capacity sooner and that would reduce the need and size of any subsequent rezoning triggered by Action 8.1.5. In addition, make any conforming amendments to relevant area plans in the city's General Plan based on final rezoning actions. Complete this effort by January 31, 2026. As described in the Sites Inventory Rezoning Program, the rezoning will meet the requirements of Government Code Section 65583.2(h)-(i), including sites identified to meet the very low and low-income RHNA unmet need will be zoned to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • permit owner-occupied and rental multifamily uses by-right for developments in which 20 percent or more of the units are affordable to lower-income households. By-right means local government review must not require a conditional use permit, planned unit development permit, or other discretionary review or approval that would constitute a "project" for purposes of CEQA; • accommodate a minimum of 16 units per site; and • require a minimum density of 20 units per acre. At least 50 percent of the lower-income rezoning need must be accommodated on sites designated for residential use only or on sites zoned for mixed uses that accommodate all of the very low- and low-income housing need, if those sites allow 100 percent residential use and require residential use to occupy 50 percent of the total floor area of a mixed-use project.	January 31, 2026

8.1.5 If the City issues building permits²⁴ for fewer than 29,049 new units²⁵ by January 31, 2027, then the City shall enact and implement:

- additional rezoning outside of Priority Equity Geographies and areas vulnerable to displacement, and
- additional constraints reductions for housing projects, including existing projects in the development pipeline.

This additional rezoning and additional constraints reductions shall accommodate 115% of the shortfall, minus any capacity created by the rezoning(s) in Action 7.1.1 in excess of 36,282 units.²⁶

The scope of this additional rezoning and additional constraint reduction:

- shall account for sites' likelihood of development during the RHNA planning period, and affirmatively incorporate the results of an analytical model and the cumulative constraints analysis described in Action 8.1.8 to increase supply choice and affordability and accommodate the RHNA in the planning period.
- shall not impose any new governmental constraints not already in effect on January 31, 2027 to the development of housing unless that constraint is offset by the repeal or mitigation of another constraint.
- shall consider progress and implement strategies toward meeting the RHNA goals by income group and AFFH objectives, including strategies considered under 8.1.10.
- shall consider community engagement, in alignment with Program area 4.2 in areas that may be disproportionately impacted with displacement risk beyond Priority Equity Geographies.

July 31, 2028

The City shall complete this effort, if needed, by July 31, 2028. The City will implement this program in consultation with HCD, including HCD approval.

8.1.6. In alignment with the provisions and purpose of the Housing Crisis Act of 2019 (Government Code 66300 et seq.), any City-adopted rezoning or development controls shall not impose any new governmental constraints to the development of housing unless those increased constraints are offset by the removal or reduction of other constraints. A "new governmental constraint" is a city-imposed requirement, including but not limited to process, fees, or design, that increases the cost of development not in effect on January 31, 2023, not including mitigation measures adopted in compliance with CEQA or a requirement adopted to specifically protect against a threat to health or safety.

July 1, 2024
& Ongoing

24 "Issues building permits" in this action refers to issuance of building permit to construct a building, which is subsequent to any planning entitlements.

25 This number is 50% of the existing capacity for housing in the Sites Inventory, which is 50% of 58,813 units (see Appendix B, Fig. 3).

26 This number is the RHNA shortfall (plus 15%) identified in the Sites Inventory that is the minimum target required for rezoning per Action 7.1.1

8.1.8. Conduct a pro-forma-based study of cumulative governmental constraints on housing development in relation to the socio-economic needs to the city. The study shall quantify the net number of economically feasible housing units that could be built in the City under the regulatory status quo and conduct a sensitivity analysis to determine the amount of constraint reduction necessary to ensure that the majority of typical code-compliant housing projects are economically feasible, including quantification of the hypothetical increase in the net number of economically feasible units that would be realized under a range of constraint-removal scenarios. The study shall consider the effects of economic cycles, considering feasibility under both current economic conditions as well as feasibility under average prevailing conditions over the preceding decade, and sensitivity analysis to variations in construction costs and market rents and sales prices. It should also consider the cost of housing in relation to the population needs. The study shall be updated triennially in tandem with the required Controller's study of the Inclusionary Program required by Planning Code Section 415.10, with the first such study completed in tandem with the first Controller's study completed on or after January 31, 2025, but in no case later than January 31, 2027. The results of the cumulative constraints study shall also inform Action 8.1.5 with the goal of ensuring the economic feasibility of achieving the city's RHNA targets during the planning period.

January 31, 2026

8.4.3 Adopt one or more Housing Sustainability Districts in [Well-resourced Neighborhoods](#) outside of areas vulnerable to displacement that include tenant protections, relocation, and replacement standards as recognized in [Housing Crisis Act of 2019](#), by January 31, 2026. Unless implementation of Action 8.4.2 has already occurred in the same geography and renders Housing Sustainability Districts (HSD) unnecessary, Housing Sustainability District(s) shall encompass at least 15% of the total land area of the city up to the maximum allowed by state law and shall not include parcels where residential uses are not permitted or are critical sites for City infrastructure, such as parks or utilities.

January 31, 2026

8.4.4 Establish a non-discretionary ministerial pathway for project applications that provide 20% affordable housing on site through mechanisms described in Actions 8.4.2 and 8.4.3, for RHNA Cycle 6 lower-income sites identified in the Housing Element Update 2022 Sites Inventory that have been reused from Cycles 4 and 5 by January 31, 2024, as required by per California Government Code §65583.2 (c).

January 31, 2024

8.4.5 Eliminate Commission hearings on any code-complying project in the Well-resourced Neighborhoods subject to the Housing Accountability Act by July 31, 2023, until January 31, 2027.

January 31, 2024 to sunset January 31, 2027

8.4.8. Remove Conditional Use Authorizations or other regulatory barriers for lot mergers and lots or proposed densities that exceed conditional use thresholds on housing applications that net two or more housing units, do not demolish existing rent-controlled units, and meet tenant protection, relocation, and replacement standards as recognized in Housing Crisis Act of 2019 to facilitate larger and more efficient housing projects by January 31, 2025.

January 31, 2025

8.4.9 Remove Conditional Use Authorization requirement for demolition of single-family or multi-unit buildings that (1) are not tenant occupied and without history of tenant evictions, recent buyouts, no-fault, Ellis, or OMI Evictions; (2) net two or more housing units in the case of projects that construct less than 4 units or that net an increase of at least 50% in the number of existing units for projects that construct 4 or more units, (3) do not demolish existing rent-controlled units, and (4) meet tenant protection, relocation, and replacement standards as recognized in [Housing Crisis Act of 2019](#) by January 31, 2025. Continue to apply Conditional Use requirements to demolition of tenant occupied buildings. Review "protected unit" standards in the Housing Crisis Act, and strengthen definitions for local use as necessary, to ensure that properties with a history of no-fault evictions, such as Ellis Act or Owner-Move-Ins, continue to require heightened scrutiny or

January 31, 2025

prohibition of demolition. Planning staff will use the Rent Board's Housing Inventory data and seek input from tenants organizations.

8.4.10 Remove Conditional Use Authorizations where required to achieve greater height for a housing project or replace height and bulk districts that require Conditional Use Authorizations to exceed the base height with one that allows the current maximum height by January 31, 2025.

January 31, 2025

8.8.2 Revise local process, procedures, and other relevant requirements to implement priority recommendations of HCD's finalized Policy and Practice Review.

July 1, 2024

8.8.3 Amend Housing Element, as needed, to include final actions required by outcomes of mandatory Policy and Practice Review HCD effort.

July 1, 2024

9.4.2 Remove Conditional Use Authorizations outside of Priority Equity Geographies and areas vulnerable to displacement where required to remove an existing use and construct housing, and instead apply neighborhood notification procedures for proposed demolition of identified community-service uses, such as theaters, grocery stores, and laundromats, by January 31, 2027 and support their economic survival through a replacement provision or participation in a Community Benefit Use program²⁷ as described in Action 9.4.5.

January 31, 2025

²⁷ Geographically specific programs established through community-led process to identify a menu of uses that meet community needs to be incorporated into certain future project approvals, thereby reducing the time and community resources required to shape projects that meet their needs on individual project approval basis. Programs may be supported through the Office of Small Business or other community services resources.

Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Actions

Implementing Program Area	AFFH Contributing Factors	AFFH Program Action	AFFH Category
1. Affordable Housing Resources and Equitable Access	Impediments to mobility due to high housing costs	<p>1.1.1. By March 2023, convene City leadership, staff, policymakers, affordable housing advocates, and industry experts to collaborate on an Affordable Housing Implementation and Funding Strategy that provides specific recommendations and responsible parties to achieve and sustain the substantial public funding from local, state, and federal sources, that would join with public-private partnerships, needed to achieve the RHNA targets of over 46,000 units affordable at low- and moderate-incomes. Assign appropriate City staff to include a budget proposal for Fiscal Year 2023-2024 and complete this effort by January 31, 2024.</p> <p>Metric: Expand affordable housing funding by a minimum of 30%.</p>	<p>New Housing Choices and Affordability in Areas of Opportunity</p> <p>Housing Mobility Strategies</p>
	Impediments to mobility due to high housing costs	<p>1.2.1 Build between 25% and 50% of the City's new permanently affordable housing within Well-resourced Neighborhoods over the next two RHNA cycles, implementing the zoning strategies of Policy 20.</p> <p>Metric: 25%-50% of permanently affordable housing on newly acquired sites in Well-Resourced Neighborhoods by 2031.</p>	<p>New Housing Choices and Affordability in Areas of Opportunity</p> <p>Housing Mobility Strategies</p>
	Exclusionary Land use and zoning laws	<p>1.2.2 Strategically acquire sites and identify targeted funding for land acquisition and banking for affordable housing throughout the city. This will include lots for consolidation that can accommodate permanently affordable housing of at least 50 to 100 units or more through publicly funded purchases, in balance with investment in affordable housing preservation and production and in strategic coordination with sites owned by religious, nonprofit, and public property owners. Prioritize sites of interest identified in coordination with American Indian, Black, and other communities of color. Consider sites that accommodate fewer than 50 units as additional affordable housing funding, financing, and operating approaches are secured.</p> <p>Metric: Acquire and fund sites for minimum of 2,160 units over the 8-year plan, with 25-50% in Well-Resourced Neighborhoods.</p>	<p>New Housing Choices and Affordability in Areas of Opportunity</p> <p>Place-based Strategies to Encourage Community Conservation and Revitalization</p> <p>Housing Mobility Strategies</p>

<i>Implementing Program Area</i>	<i>AFFH Contributing Factors</i>	<i>AFFH Program Action</i>	<i>AFFH Category</i>
	Impediments to mobility due to high housing costs	<p>1.5.3 Increase housing that is affordable to extremely low and very low-income households in Well-resourced Neighborhoods, as well as in Priority Equity Geographies and Cultural Districts, through City-funded permanently affordable housing projects.</p> <p>Metric: Apply 25-50% distribution of affordable units in Well-resourced Neighborhoods to the total ELI and VLI units produced, including 30% of units in affordable housing for formerly homeless.</p>	Protecting Existing Residents from Displacement
	Lack of affordable and accessible housing in a range of unit sizes	<p>1.5.4 Reduce severe cost burdens and increase stability for extremely low- and very low-income renters through ongoing rental assistance for qualifying vulnerable households, including people harmed by past government discrimination, seniors, people with disabilities, transgender people, and families with children, particularly those living in SROs.</p> <p>Metrics: Expand Senior Operating Subsidy (SOS) by 40 units per year or 320 new units over the 8-year plan to reach a total of 363 households served. Expand the Local Operating Subsidy Program (LOSP) by 163 units per year or 1,304 new units over the 8-year plan to reach a total of 2,863 households served.</p>	Protecting Existing Residents from Displacement
	Admissions and occupancy policies and procedures, including preferences in publicly supported housing	<p>1.7.8 Evaluate increasing neighborhood preference allocation for Below Market Rate units in Priority Equity Geographies to better serve American Indian, Black, and other communities of color, if possible, per the Federal Fair Housing regulations, as informed by Policy 5 and related actions.</p> <p>Metric: Complete evaluation by 2026 and implement changes if found appropriate by 2027.</p>	Housing Mobility Strategies
	Admissions and occupancy policies and procedures, including preferences in publicly supported housing	<p>1.7.9 Create or expand programs to provide housing counseling, financial literacy education, and housing readiness to low-income American Indian, Black and other people of color households who seek housing choices in Well-resourced Neighborhoods by 2024, and provide incentives and counseling to landlords in Well-resourced Neighborhoods to offer units to low-income households. Consider similar incentives referenced in Action 8.4.16.</p> <p>Metric: Target relevant programs for 30% increase in Black and American Indian people served by 2024.</p>	Housing Mobility Strategies

<i>Implementing Program Area</i>	<i>AFFH Contributing Factors</i>	<i>AFFH Program Action</i>	<i>AFFH Category</i>
2. Stabilizing Tenants and Rental Housing	Displacement of Residents due to Economic pressures	<p>2.1.1 Fund the Tenant Right-to-Counsel program to match the need for eviction defense.</p> <p>Metric: Increase the number of households served annually from 1,300 per year to 1,600 per year to serve all tenants in need of full-scope representation. Report on households in need of eviction defense and households served with full-scope representation every year to track improvement over the 8-year plan and adjust the goal accordingly.</p>	Protecting Existing Residents from Displacement
	Displacement of Residents due to Economic pressures	<p>2.1.4 Increase funding to expand the services of community-based organizations and providers for financial counseling services listed under Action 1.7.5, as well as tenant and eviction prevention services listed under Program 2, to better serve vulnerable populations, populations in areas vulnerable to displacement, and Cultural Districts. Tenant and eviction protection services include legal services, code enforcement outreach, tenant counseling, mediation, and housing-related financial assistance; expansion of such services should be informed by community priorities referenced under Action 4.1.3. Complete by completion of Rezoning Program or no later than January 31, 2026.</p> <p>Metrics: Expand counseling services from 1,500 households served every year to 2,000, prioritizing this expansion for American Indian and Black households by the end of 2025. Expand investments in other forms of outreach and engagement, such as Know-Your-Rights workshops and tenant organizing and advocacy services, by 20% over the 2022 baseline by the end of 2025. Expand alternative dispute resolution and other legal services from 700 households served every year to 840 by the end of 2025.</p>	Protecting Existing Residents from Displacement
	Displacement of Residents due to Economic pressures	<p>2.3.1 Prioritize and expand funding for the purchase of buildings, including those with chronically high residential vacancy, underutilized tourist hotels, and SRO residential hotels, for acquisition and rehabilitation programs that serve extremely low to moderate-income households, including unhoused populations.</p> <p>Metric: 15% increase in the distribution of ELI and moderate-income households in Small Sites Program acquired buildings by 2027.</p>	Protecting Existing Residents from Displacement

<i>Implementing Program Area</i>	<i>AFFH Contributing Factors</i>	<i>AFFH Program Action</i>	<i>AFFH Category</i>
	Displacement of Residents due to Economic pressures	<p>2.3.3 Increase non-profit capacity-building investments, particularly for American Indian, Black, and other community organizations of color, to purchase and operate existing tenant-occupied buildings as permanent affordable housing in Well-resourced Neighborhoods, particularly for populations at risk and in areas vulnerable to displacement, to expand implementation of the Community Opportunity to Purchase Act (COPA).</p> <p>Metric: At least 25% of annual Small Sites Program acquisitions in Well-resourced Neighborhoods by 2027.</p>	<p>New Housing Choices and Affordability in Areas of Opportunity</p> <p>Protecting Existing Residents from Displacement</p>
3. Preventing and Eliminating Homelessness	Admissions and occupancy policies and procedures, including preferences in publicly supported housing	<p>3.1.1 Identify and implement strategies by Spring 2023 to increase and accelerate placement in Permanent Supportive Housing through the Coordinated Entry System for racial and social groups who are overrepresented in the unhoused population, such as extremely and very-low income American Indian, Black, and Latino(a,e) people, transgender people, or people with prior involvement in the criminal justice system.</p> <p>Metric: Proportion of people placed in Permanent Supportive Housing through Coordinated Entry from racial and social groups overrepresented in the homeless population should be equal to or greater than their representation in the homeless population by the end of the 8-year plan.</p>	Protecting Existing Residents from Displacement
	Displacement of Residents due to Economic pressures	<p>3.4.3 Prioritize tenant-based rental assistance with social services for people who are: (1) unhoused, (2) at risk of homelessness or displacement, or (3) ready to exit Permanent Supportive Housing for more independent living.</p> <p>Metrics: Increase the number of households served annually by tenant-based shallow subsidies from 1,350 per year to 1,550 per year by 2025. Increase the number of households served annually by the locally funded emergency rental assistance program from 1,800 per year to 2,000 per year by 2025. Continue to use non-LOSP resources, such as Continuum of Care, MHSA, and SFHA S8 contracts, to support permanent supportive housing. By 2025 establish tracking of percentage of rent assistance going to unhoused, at-risk of homelessness, and ready to exit Permanent Supportive Housing to inform program priorities.</p>	Protecting Existing Residents from Displacement

<i>Implementing Program Area</i>	<i>AFFH Contributing Factors</i>	<i>AFFH Program Action</i>	<i>AFFH Category</i>
4. Centering Equity Communities and Cultural Heritage	Lack of public investment in specific neighborhoods, including services and amenities	<p>4.2.1 Develop and implement community outreach and engagement strategies that center racial and social equity and cultural competency to be used by Planning Department staff as well as developers or community groups.</p> <p>4.2.2 Increase resources and funding to partner with community-based organizations primarily serving and representing American Indian, Black, and other people of color, and other disadvantaged communities, to ensure inclusive outreach and engagement and meaningful participation in housing and planning processes through focus groups, surveys, and other outreach events.</p> <p>Metric: Create community engagement strategies by end of 2023, identify culturally competent planners by end of 2024, and secure funding of \$750,000 per year for CBOs for community engagement by 2023.</p>	Place-based Strategies to Encourage Community Conservation and Revitalization
	Displacement of Residents due to Economic pressures	<p>4.2.4 Implement the upcoming housing strategies recommended by the African American Reparations Advisory.</p> <p>Metric: Identify key priorities by end of 2023 and then update Housing Element Implementing Programs accordingly upon completion of plans.</p>	<p>Place-based Strategies to Encourage Community Conservation and Revitalization</p> <p>Fostering and maintaining compliance with civil rights and fair housing laws</p>
	Impediments to mobility due to high housing costs	<p>4.3.1 Expand and target job training and financial readiness education programs to residents of Priority Equity Geographies prioritizing youth from American Indian, Black, and other communities of color.</p> <p>Metric: 10% increase in participation by youth from American Indian, Black, and other communities of color in job training and financial readiness by 2026.</p>	Place-based Strategies to Encourage Community Conservation and Revitalization

<i>Implementing Program Area</i>	<i>AFFH Contributing Factors</i>	<i>AFFH Program Action</i>	<i>AFFH Category</i>
	Lack of public investment in specific neighborhoods, including services and amenities	<p>4.3.2 Support developers of new permanently affordable housing developments in Priority Equity Geographies to include affordable community serving uses as part of their ground floor use programming by matching affordable housing developers with prospective small businesses and service providers known to the City seeking space. Help identify potential funding sources for tenant capital improvements, such as impact fees, Community Benefit Districts' grants and Small Business Program grants. Examples of community serving uses include, but are not limited to: grocery stores, healthcare clinics, or institutional community uses such as child-care facilities, community facilities, job training centers, and social services.</p> <p>Metric: Include community serving uses in 60% of permanently affordable housing starting in 2024. Establish dedicated funding source for tenant improvements in these spaces by 2026.</p>	Place-based Strategies to Encourage Community Conservation and Revitalization
5. Redressing and Preventing Discrimination	Admissions and occupancy policies and procedures, including preferences in publicly supported housing	<p>5.3.1 Evaluate and identify common cases of discrimination and violation of fair housing law and groups who continuously face such discrimination, including transgender and LGBTQ+, or people with disabilities, and implement solutions to strengthen enforcement of fair housing law in those cases.</p> <p>Metric: Conduct survey led by community-based organizations serving transgender, LGBTQ+ and people with disabilities by December 2024, develop solutions by December 2025, and implement solutions throughout the rest of the 8-year plan.</p>	Fostering and maintaining compliance with civil rights and fair housing laws

<i>Implementing Program Area</i>	<i>AFFH Contributing Factors</i>	<i>AFFH Program Action</i>	<i>AFFH Category</i>
	Admissions and occupancy policies and procedures, including preferences in publicly supported housing	<p>5.4.2 Establish pilot and permanent programs that offer homeownership opportunities targeted to Black households harmed through redlining or urban renewal or other forms of systemic racism related to housing, including Black individuals and their descendants who hold Certificates of Preference from the urban renewal period, as referenced in Actions 5.4.8 and 5.4.9. Building on the Dream Keeper initiative, such programs should include silent second loans or grants for down payment assistance, as well as other financial assistance to reduce income eligibility as a barrier to access homeownership opportunities.</p> <p>Metric: Extend and expand budget allocation for Dream Keeper Initiative through 2031, including the Dream Keeper Downpayment Assistance Loan Program to serve at least 200 households, the Senior Home Repair Program to serve at least 120 households, and in Dream Keeper homebuyer education for up to 3,000 people over the 8-year plan. Increase participation of Black households in financial literacy education and housing readiness by 30% by 2025.</p>	<p>Place-based Strategies to Encourage Community Conservation and Revitalization</p> <p>Fostering and maintaining compliance with civil rights and fair housing laws</p> <p>Protecting Existing Residents from Displacement</p>
	Lack of public investment in specific neighborhoods, including services and amenities	<p>5.4.7. Create and pilot programs to increase access to Affordable Rental and Homeownership units and other housing services as redress for American Indian, Black, Japanese, Filipino, and other communities directly harmed by past discriminatory government actions including redlining, urban renewal, the Indian Relocation Act, or WWII Japanese incarceration. Programs should be informed by the truth-telling processes described in Program 5.1.</p> <p>Metric: Increase affordable rental and homeownership placement of underserved populations from groups harmed by past government discrimination by 33% over the 8-year plan.</p>	<p>Place-based Strategies to Encourage Community Conservation and Revitalization</p> <p>Fostering and maintaining compliance with civil rights and fair housing laws</p> <p>Protecting Existing Residents from Displacement</p>

<i>Implementing Program Area</i>	<i>AFFH Contributing Factors</i>	<i>AFFH Program Action</i>	<i>AFFH Category</i>
	Admissions and occupancy policies and procedures, including preferences in publicly supported housing	<p>5.4.8 Expand the Certificates of Preference program as required per recent State Law, Assembly Bill 1584 (Health and Safety Code, SEC 13 – 16), to qualify eligible descendants of those displaced by redevelopment projects for priority in renting or buying affordable housing. Conduct comprehensive outreach and engagement to identify the descendants of households who have been displaced. Expanding this program should rely on strategies that ensure such units meet the preferences and needs of eligible households as informed by Action 5.4.9.</p> <p>Metric: Finalize research of displaced households and develop a comprehensive outreach and engagement plan for descendants of displaced households by 2024. Implement the outreach and engagement plan for descendants of displaced households in 2025 and throughout the end of the 8-year plan.</p>	Fostering and maintaining compliance with civil rights and fair housing laws Protecting Existing Residents from Displacement
	Admissions and occupancy policies and procedures, including preferences in publicly supported housing	<p>5.4.10 Expand and fund community capacity to implement housing programs and investments for American Indian residents as one strategy to redress the historic dispossession of resources affecting these communities, such as the Indian Relocation Act, and other government actions that broke the cohesion of this community.</p> <p>Metric: Invest in affordable housing development and acquisition capacity for American Indian-specific community serving organizations by 2025, with a goal to make the first acquisition serving American Indian tenants in 2026.</p>	Fostering and maintaining compliance with civil rights and fair housing laws Protecting Existing Residents from Displacement
6. Serving Special Needs Groups	Lack of affordable and accessible housing in a range of unit sizes	<p>6.1.4 Continue to require multi-bedroom unit mixes.</p> <p>Metric: Start tracking units by number of bedrooms in new housing developments by January 2024.</p>	Protecting Existing Residents from Displacement
	Admissions and occupancy policies and procedures, including preferences in publicly supported housing	<p>6.2.2 Support and fund the implementation of San Francisco's "Ending Trans Homelessness Plan," as well as the ongoing housing placement for the transgender community, in recognition of the severe disparities in housing access and safety experienced by this group.</p> <p>Metric: Reach functional zero transgender homelessness by 2027.</p>	Protecting Existing Residents from Displacement

<i>Implementing Program Area</i>	<i>AFFH Contributing Factors</i>	<i>AFFH Program Action</i>	<i>AFFH Category</i>
	Lack of affordable and accessible housing in a range of unit sizes	<p>6.3.1 Expand the Senior Operating Subsidy (SOS) program to allow extremely and very low-income seniors to be eligible for new senior Below Market Rate rental units.</p> <p>Metric: Increase number of senior households served eightfold over the 8-year plan.</p>	Protecting Existing Residents from Displacement
	Lack of affordable and accessible housing in a range of unit sizes	<p>6.3.2 Increase permanently affordable senior housing along transit corridors to improve mobility of aging adults and seniors, particularly for extremely and very low-income households including through expansion of Senior Operating Subsidies as referenced in Action 6.3.1.</p> <p>Metric: Increase the number of permanent affordable housing units for seniors by 20% in Well-resourced Neighborhoods near transit corridors over the 8-year plan.</p>	New Housing Choices and Affordability in Areas of Opportunity

7. Expanding Housing Choices	<p>Exclusionary Land use and zoning laws</p> <p>Community opposition</p>	<p>7.1.1 Create a rezoning program to meet the requirements of San Francisco's Regional Housing Needs Allocation across income levels and Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing laws, relying on a combination of strategies in Actions 7.3.2 and 7.2.1 above to accommodate the RHNA shortfall with a buffer (approximately 36,282 new units) primarily in Well-resourced Neighborhoods, in proximity to transit and commercial corridors. The rezoning program shall reasonably account for sites' likelihood of development during the planning period using an analytical model and shall not add government constraints that reduce project financial feasibility as determined by an analysis prior to the rezoning enactment. Seek to implement a rezoning program that exceeds the identified RHNA shortfall plus 15% buffer (i.e., 36,282 units) to provide more capacity sooner and that would reduce the need and size of any subsequent rezoning triggered by Action 8.1.5. In addition, make any conforming amendments to relevant area plans in the city's General Plan based on final rezoning actions. Complete this effort by January 31, 2026.</p> <p>As described in the Sites Inventory Rezoning Program, the rezoning will meet the requirements of Government Code Section 65583.2(h)-(i), including sites identified to meet the very low and low-income RHNA unmet need will be zoned to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • permit owner-occupied and rental multifamily uses by-right for developments in which 20 percent or more of the units are affordable to lower-income households. By-right means local government review must not require a conditional use permit, planned unit development permit, or other discretionary review or approval that would constitute a "project" for purposes of CEQA; • accommodate a minimum of 16 units per site; and • require a minimum density of 20 units per acre. <p>At least 50 percent of the lower-income rezoning need must be accommodated on sites designated for residential use only or on sites zoned for mixed uses that accommodate all of the very low- and low-income housing need, if those sites allow 100 percent residential use and require residential use to occupy 50 percent of the total floor area of a mixed-use project.</p> <p>7.1.2 Increase staff allocation within Planning to engage with communities living in Well-resourced Neighborhoods to inform existing residents how locating new housing and permanently affordable</p>	New Housing Choices and Affordability in Areas of Opportunity
-------------------------------------	--	---	---

<i>Implementing Program Area</i>	<i>AFFH Contributing Factors</i>	<i>AFFH Program Action</i>	<i>AFFH Category</i>
		<p>housing in every neighborhood can address historic inequity and injustice and expand housing opportunities for local residents and their families while strengthening neighborhood vitality.</p> <p>Metric: Complete rezoning program and launch a program to provide community education on affordable housing planning and development by January 31, 2026.</p>	
8. Reducing Constraints on Housing Development, Maintenance, and Improvement	Exclusionary Land use and zoning laws	<p>8.4.2 Establish local non-discretionary ministerial approval for housing applications in Well-resourced Neighborhoods outside of areas vulnerable to displacement that net two or more housing units, do not demolish existing rent-controlled units, and meet tenant protection, relocation, and replacement standards as recognized in the Housing Crisis Act of 2019, by Board of Supervisors or voter approval of a City Charter amendment Planning staff will use the Rent Board's Housing Inventory data and seek input from tenants organizations.</p> <p>Metric: Make zoning changes and establish processes by January 31, 2026. Apply to at-minimum the approximately 36,282 units resulting from the rezoning program in Program 7.1.</p>	New Housing Choices and Affordability in Areas of Opportunity
	Community opposition	<p>8.4.3 Adopt one or more Housing Sustainability Districts in Well-resourced Neighborhoods outside of areas vulnerable to displacement that include tenant protections, relocation, and replacement standards as recognized in Housing Crisis Act of 2019, by January 31, 2026.</p> <p>Unless implementation of Action 8.4.2 has already occurred in the same geography and renders Housing Sustainability Districts (HSD) unnecessary, Housing Sustainability District(s) shall encompass at least 15% of the total land area of the city up to the maximum allowed by state law and shall not include parcels where residential uses are not permitted or are critical sites for City infrastructure, such as parks or utilities.</p> <p>Metric: Make zoning changes to cover at least 15% of the city by January 31, 2026.</p>	New Housing Choices and Affordability in Areas of Opportunity

<i>Implementing Program Area</i>	<i>AFFH Contributing Factors</i>	<i>AFFH Program Action</i>	<i>AFFH Category</i>
	Exclusionary Land use and zoning laws	<p>8.4.4 Establish a non-discretionary ministerial pathway for project applications that provide 20% affordable housing on site through mechanisms described in Actions 8.4.2 and 8.4.3, for RHNA Cycle 6 lower-income sites identified in the Housing Element Update 2022 Sites Inventory that have been reused from Cycles 4 and 5 by January 31, 2024, as required by per California Government Code §65583.2 (c).</p> <p>Metric: Make zoning changes by January 31, 2024. Apply to the 331 reused sites with no pending projects.</p>	New Housing Choices and Affordability in Areas of Opportunity
	Exclusionary Land use and zoning laws	<p>8.6.3 Make shelters, transitional housing, or crisis interventions (such as Safe Sleeping Sites) principally permitted in all zoning districts, regardless of the declaration of a shelter crisis.</p> <p>Metric: Make zoning changes by 2024.</p>	New Housing Choices and Affordability in Areas of Opportunity

9. Healthy, Connected, and Resilient Housing and Neighborhoods

Lack of public investment in specific neighborhoods, including services and amenities

9.3.2 Prioritize investments in Priority Equity Geographies that overlap with Environmental Justice Communities related to improving transit service, pedestrian safety, schools, child development centers, parks, streetscape, and other neighborhood amenities, in coordination with the investments referenced under Action 9.3.7.

Place-based Strategies to Encourage Community Conservation and Revitalization

Metrics: See below for all quantifiable investments; the goal is to complete all the improvements below by the end of the 8-year plan.

Bayview-Hunters Point

Community facilities & services: New commercial kitchen and food retail space and new education and learning space at Hunter's View.

Parks & open space: India Basin's new open space and improvements. New park in Hunter's View. New playground at Alice Griffith.

Chinatown

Health services: Secure funding for the renovation and expansion of the Chinatown Public Health Center.

Japantown

Parks & open space: Japantown Peace Plaza renovation.

Portola

Health services: Secure funding for the renovation and expansion of the Silver Avenue Family Health Center Renovation.

Potrero

Community facilities & services: New childcare center.

Parks & open space: Two new open spaces, community room, and teen room.

Urban design: New streetscape of at least one street.

SOMA

Parks & open space: Gene Friend Recreation Center renovation, including a new basketball court, playground and the replacement of a facility with a new gym and expanded program space.

Tenderloin

Health services: New Crisis Stabilization Unit for people in immediate crisis with behavioral issues.

Treasure Island

Community facilities & services (construction commencement and/or completion): Historic chapel renovation that can serve as a community center, new library kiosk, and new childcare facility.

<i>Implementing Program Area</i>	<i>AFFH Contributing Factors</i>	<i>AFFH Program Action</i>	<i>AFFH Category</i>
		<p><i>Health services:</i> New Behavioral Health Center with 172 replacement residential step-down beds and around 70 new ones.</p> <p><i>Parks & open space:</i> Seven new parks and one new promenade.</p> <p><i>Schools (commencement):</i> Renovation and construction of new K-5 elementary school.</p> <p><u>Sunnydale</u></p> <p><i>Community facilities & services:</i> A new community center with two new early childhood education centers and a neighborhood space. Seven new micro-retail spaces prioritized for residents.</p> <p><i>Health services:</i> New wellness center.</p> <p><i>Parks & open space:</i> New Herz Playground Recreation Center, including a new playground and a new recreation center with a gym and program spaces. A second new garden and recreation space.</p> <p><i>Urban design:</i> New Sunnydale Ave. streetscape.</p> <p><u>The Western Addition</u></p> <p><i>Parks & open space:</i> Buchanan Street Mall renovation, including a new playground.</p>	
	Lack of public investment in specific neighborhoods, including services and amenities	<p>9.3.6 Repair, maintain, and optimize the existing transit system, particularly through SFMTA's 5-year Capital Improvement Program's (CIP) Transit Optimization and Expansion Projects (e.g., transit only lanes, transit signal priority, boarding islands, etc. on transit streets) in Priority Equity Geographies that overlap with Environmental Justice Communities and Well-resourced Neighborhoods targeted for increased housing capacity.</p> <p>Metrics: Transit improvements remain within 10% of CIP Transit Optimization and Expansion Projects schedule for Priority Equity Geography and Environmental Justice Communities located projects. Investments in Treasure Island: New ferry service to and from SF, new ferry plaza, new on-island shuttle service, new AC Transit service to and from East Bay, new bikeshare program and bike lanes, new streets, new freeway on- and off-ramps.</p>	Place-based Strategies to Encourage Community Conservation and Revitalization

<i>Implementing Program Area</i>	<i>AFFH Contributing Factors</i>	<i>AFFH Program Action</i>	<i>AFFH Category</i>
	Lack of public investment in specific neighborhoods, including services and amenities	<p>9.4.6 Create and implement a long-range community facilities plan, and update every 5-10 years, for public facilities including parks, recreation centers, schools, child development centers, libraries, to accommodate a thirty-year projected population growth, informed by equity metrics in a manner that secures equitable access in Priority Equity Geographies, Environmental Justice Communities, and Well-resourced Neighborhoods that are targeted for increased housing capacity, building on processes such as the Community Facilities Framework, and in collaboration with Interagency Plan Implementation Committee.</p> <p>Metric: Complete community facilities plan by 2026; include an analysis of estimated investment required to implement it. The plan should prioritize the Tenderloin, Western Addition, Chinatown, Bayview-Hunters Point, Visitation Valley, Sunnydale and Excelsior, as these were identified as R/ECAPs and TCAC Areas of High Segregation and Poverty concentration; the plan should include strategies to prevent displacement from these investments. The plan should also include facilities identified as top priority in the Sunset Forward community plan, which include affordable health services and child development centers, community spaces, and multiuse spaces. Secure initial funding through the General Fund, bonds, and state and federal grants by 2028.</p>	Place-based Strategies to Encourage Community Conservation and Revitalization