



October 14, 2025

Commission Streamlining Task Force
c/o City Administrator's Office
City and County of San Francisco
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Homelessness Policy Area: Support for Option 3 — converting the Homeless Oversight Commission into an advisory body with expanded scope

Dear Chair Harrington and Members of the Task Force,

Homelessness in the Bay Area is the result of several overlapping regional problems, including housing costs, addiction, mental health, law enforcement, and resource challenges. These problems, all regional in scale, uniquely converge in San Francisco. From this convergence San Francisco has an outsized role to play in addressing this regional crisis. Success requires a whole-systems approach bringing all available resources to bear.

San Francisco's current constellation of boards and commissions on homelessness makes this whole-systems approach impossible. We believe Option 3 offers a structural reform that better positions the city to align resources, sharpen oversight, drive outcomes, and improve accountability.

The current system of five homelessness-related boards and commissions diffuses accountability and is ineffective. Over time, San Francisco has layered multiple bodies — oversight commissions, coordinating boards, grievance panels, monitoring committees, etc. — each with partial authority, overlapping charge, and limited capacity. The result is a splintered governance structure that undermines accountability and which is ineffective at rooting out waste, fraud, and abuse. By converting the Commission into a robust advisory body with greater jurisdiction, the city can centralize oversight and advice under a single entity with clarity of purpose, reduce redundancy and confusion among overlapping committees, and focus accountability in the mayor's office where it belongs.

The current system's numerous oversight boards for distinct funding streams is incongruous with the development of comprehensive strategies. Our City, Our Home, for example, advises on the 45% of HSH funding that comes from Proposition C, while the Homelessness Coordinating Board provides oversight on the 10% of HSH spending from the Continuum of Care program. A strengthened and consolidated advisory body can span multiple funding sources and program areas (e.g. shelter, services, housing, behavioral health) rather than being constrained to one pot; evaluate tradeoffs and synergies across programs (for instance, how

much to invest in prevention vs. shelter vs. long-term housing); and guide allocation decisions in light of an overarching strategic framework rather than incremental, isolated programmatic tweaks. The city should seek to develop holistic strategies involving all resources rather than deepening programmatic silos.

The proliferation of narrowly focused bodies undermines the goal of treating homelessness as a unified system challenge rather than a series of disjointed tasks. Option 3 allows realignment — making oversight and advice fungible across program categories, so the city can better orchestrate its full portfolio of interventions. Additionally, when a single advisory body is charged with absorbing functions from other related bodies, the public can clearly see how resources fit together, where gaps remain, and which policy tradeoffs are being made.

For these reasons we encourage the Commission to recommend Option 3. Thank you for considering our views.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Adrian Covert".

Adrian Covert
Senior Vice President, Public Policy
Bay Area Council

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Chris Wright".

Chris Wright
Senior Vice President
AdvanceSF