



CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER

Ben Rosenfield
Controller

Todd Rydstrom
Deputy Controller

August 15, 2016

Mr. John Arntz
Department of Elections
City Hall, Room 48
Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

RE: Proposition Q – Ordinance prohibiting the placement of tent encampments on public sidewalks

Dear Mr. Arntz,

Should the proposed ordinance be approved by the voters, in my opinion, it would have a minimal to significant impact on the cost of government, depending on the practices used to implement the policies required in the ordinance.


The proposed ordinance would prohibit tent encampments, or any structure with a top or roof that can fit a person sitting or lying down, on public sidewalks. There are approximately 3,500 unsheltered homeless in San Francisco, though the number of individuals who may be impacted by the proposed ordinance is unknown.

The City would be required to offer housing or shelter, though the proposed ordinance does not specify the number of days of housing that must be offered. The City would also be required to offer homeless services, defined as a program (Homeward Bound) that pays for transportation to reunite individuals with family or friends outside of San Francisco.

The proposed ordinance requires the City to provide written notice 24 hours in advance to individuals and also to post the notices in the area of the encampment. The affected individuals' personal property, with certain exceptions, would be stored by the City for at least 90 days.

The cost to implement the policies required in the ordinance would vary significantly depending on the practices used to implement them. Costs would be likely be minimal to the extent that the City did not seek to enforce the prohibition on encampments, or to prioritize individuals in noticed encampments for existing shelter beds, housing options, or other services over other individuals currently provided those services or on waiting lists for them. Costs would likely be significant to the extent that the City instead increased services for individuals impacted by the ordinance without reprioritizing those receiving these services.

Sincerely,


Ben Rosenfield
Controller