

## **Individual Commissioner Position on the 2025–2026 Civil Grand Jury Report "*At Scale, At Risk: Upgrading Data and Oversight to Improve Homelessness Services*"**

- **FROM:** Joaquin Guerrero, Commissioner & Data Officer,
- Homelessness Oversight Commission
- **DATE:** July 28, 2026

### **PURPOSE AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This statement reflects my individual position as a Commissioner and does not represent an official response or collective action of the Homelessness Oversight Commission (HOC). I am submitting this memorandum for the public record and distribution to department leadership to:

1. Specify which findings and recommendations of the 2025–2026 Civil Grand Jury Report ("*At Scale, At Risk*", released June 23, 2026) I support;
2. Document how my prior conduct, Data Officer reports, and proposed framework motions directly align with the Jury's recommendations; and
3. Provide institutional context regarding Commission governance and parliamentary practice under San Francisco Charter Section 4.133.

Notably, key aspects of my work as Data Officer, including my formal data audit submitted on **May 15, 2026**, predated the Civil Grand Jury's report by over five weeks. The fact that the Grand Jury independently arrived at parallel conclusions underscores that the data gaps and oversight mechanisms identified in my reports represent urgent, documented operational priorities.

## **1. Recommendations Supported and Aligning Commission Record**

### **A. Data Analytics, Dashboards, and Public Transparency (Findings 1 and 2)**

- **Grand Jury Recommendations Supported:**
  - **R1.1:** HSH maintenance of an aggregated, anonymized business intelligence dashboard updated at least monthly, filterable by incident type, provider, housing type, and location.
  - **R1.3:** Incorporation of aggregated Critical Incident Report data in quarterly Director's Reports and public dashboards under the Sunshine Ordinance.
  - **R2.1:** Publication of public business intelligence dashboards aligned with HSH's Performance Measurement Plan by December 2026.
- **Aligning Data Officer Record (Predating Jury Findings):**
  - On **May 15, 2026**, prior to the Grand Jury's report, I formally submitted a data audit titled *360-Degree Data Audit: Parallel Trend Analysis of PIT Census and*

*HSH Operational Metrics* comparing 2024–2026 Point-in-Time (PIT) census data against internal HSH operational records.

- The audit revealed several critical operational discrepancies between snapshot census trends and real-time demand across the homeless response system:
  - **Unsheltered PIT vs. Shelter Waitlists:** While unsheltered PIT counts fell by 21.9 percent, the active adult shelter waitlist increased by 56.2 percent over the same period.
  - **Overall System Volume:** Total households served grew by 28.5 percent, demonstrating expanding service delivery despite headline census reductions.
  - **Prevention and Diversion Demand:** Active requests in the Problem-Solving queue expanded by 41.3 percent, signaling severe upstream pressure on diversion resources.
  - **PSH Utilization Disconnect:** Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) vacancy rates remained artificially elevated above operational targets despite expanding waitlists and high demand for permanent placements.
- To resolve these reporting discrepancies, I recommended that HSH adopt readable, standardized formats reconciling snapshot census data with real-time system metrics and % to goal quarterly reporting. This record directly supports the Jury's call in **R1.1** and **R2.1** for accessible, non-raw business intelligence.

## **B. Benchmarking, Automated Triggers, and Offline Units (Finding 2)**

- **Grand Jury Recommendations Supported:**
  - **R2.2:** Internal provider benchmarking by program and housing type to identify performance and safety outliers.
  - **R2.3:** Development of automated data-driven triggers (for example, elevated critical incidents or negative performance trendlines) to prompt targeted contract reviews.
- **Aligning Commission Record:**
  - In my Data Officer reporting and communications to the Commission, I provided example recommended motions for Commissioners to consider that would direct HSH to establish automated data-driven triggers. These proposed triggers specifically targeted offline permanent supportive housing (PSH) units to flag units withheld from occupancy beyond operational standards.
  - Providing these example framework motions directly aligns with the early warning system advocated in **R2.3**.

## **C. Restoring HOC Contract Review Role (Finding 3)**

- **Grand Jury Recommendations Supported:**
  - **R3.1:** Returning contract renewals and extensions to the Commission's consent calendar by December 2026.
  - **R3.2:** Jointly establishing monetary thresholds for contracts requiring Commission review and comment.

- **Aligning Commission Record:**
  - I note that the removal of renewals and extensions from Commission review in May 2025 occurred administratively without formal Commission deliberation or vote. Restoring these items to the consent calendar fulfills the Commission's oversight mandate under San Francisco Charter Section 4.133.
- **Policy Recommendation on Contract Extensions:**
  - I recommend that all contract renewals and extensions brought to this Commission include a clear, transparent justification for the request and an explicit accounting of what the funds will accomplish. For instance, if a provider experiences repeated critical incidents, any extension should detail targeted funding adjustments, such as increased security resources, demonstrating a direct, data-driven response to improve service quality and resident safety.

## **D. Exercising HOC's Full Statutory Authority (Finding 4)**

- **Grand Jury Recommendations Supported:**
  - **R4.1:** City Attorney development of onboarding and training materials explaining the Commission's full Charter authority under SF Charter Section 4.133 (including powers derived under Sections 4.102 through 4.104), including performance audit powers.
  - **R4.2:** Collaboration between HSH and HOC to revise Executive Director reports to incorporate Commissioner and Data Officer data requests.
  - **R4.3:** Commission initiation of a performance audit specifically evaluating overdoses, reversals, and mortality at PSH sites.
- **Aligning Commission Record:**
  - **Budget and Fiscal Oversight:** On **February 13, 2026**, I moved to amend the proposed FY2026–27 and FY2027–28 HSH budget to require General Fund cost savings identification to offset proposed cuts and mandate a racial and gender equity impact analysis. The motion received no second, and I recorded the sole dissenting vote against budget approval.
  - **Executive Director Selection Authority:** Following the official reopening of our meeting session to address the leadership transition, I moved to exercise our statutory authority under **SF Charter Section 4.133** regarding executive leadership selection. Specifically, I introduced motions proposing the formation of a Commission hiring committee or engaging a third-party executive search recruiter. Neither motion received a second.
  - **Proactive Effort to Encourage Buy-In:** Furthermore, in my formal Data Officer report analyzing the Point-in-Time count and operational data, I explicitly included suggested example motions for my fellow Commissioners to consider taking up. Because my prior oversight motions had died without any publicly stated rationale, I structured these suggestions as flexible, collaborative options to invite open discussion and encourage buy-in from my colleagues. Despite this approach, no corresponding motions were taken up or brought to a vote.

## **E. Independent Shelter and Housing Monitoring (Finding 5)**

- **Grand Jury Recommendations Supported:**
  - **R5.1 and R5.2:** Controller's Office reviews detailing the resources necessary for HSH to conduct complaint investigations, monitoring, and unannounced site visits following the sunset of external advisory and monitoring bodies.
- **Aligning Record on Oversight Restructuring:**
  - Although the Commission took no collective action to agendize this discussion in time, I did not support the decision to sunset all independent advisory and monitoring bodies, nor did I believe that the Homelessness Oversight Commission could functionally absorb these responsibilities at its current operational capacity.
  - To preserve dedicated oversight while streamlining administrative functions, my recommendation was to consolidate the Shelter Monitoring Committee (SMC) and the Shelter Grievance Advisory Committee (SGAC) into a single unified monitoring entity, while retaining the Local Homeless Coordinating Board (LHCB) and Our City Our Home (OCOH) Oversight Committee as distinct, independent bodies.
- **Policy Position on Independent Third-Party Oversight:**
  - In addition to R5.1 and R5.2, I recommend that the Board of Supervisors evaluate establishing an independent monitoring body external to HSH to conduct unannounced inspections and process resident complaints. Internalizing complaint investigations and facility inspections within the department creates an inherent conflict of interest; external, third-party oversight is necessary to ensure objective, neutral protection for unhoused residents.

## 2. Statement on Commission Governance and Parliamentary Practice

In **Finding 4**, the Civil Grand Jury concluded that the Commission has not fully exercised its statutory authority since its inception. From an institutional perspective, it is important to clarify the structural and parliamentary factors that shape this public record.

Under standard parliamentary procedure, commission action requires both a formal motion and a second to bring any measure to a vote or public floor discussion. On multiple occasions, individual oversight proposals, including fiscal budget amendments, expanded data reporting formats, recommended framework motions in Data Officer reports, and open-session motions regarding the Executive Director selection process, did not receive a second and were therefore not brought to a vote.

This parliamentary record demonstrates that the perceived underutilization of Charter authority highlighted by the Grand Jury reflects internal governance procedures rather than a lack of proactive oversight proposals brought forward for consideration. Establishing clear public frameworks for evaluating policy, budget, and contract oversight will ensure the Commission fully realizes its intended Charter mandate under SF Charter Section 4.133.

### 3. Summary Table: Cross-Reference of Record to Civil Grand Jury Report

| Civil Grand Jury Recommendation                                | Commissioner Joaquin Guerrero Record                                                                                                        | Core Objective                                                                                                                                                             |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>R1.1, R1.3, R2.1</b> ( <i>Dashboards and Transparency</i> ) | Data Audit Memo ( <i>submitted May 15, 2026; predating Jury report</i> )                                                                    | Reconcile PIT drops (-21.9%) with queue spikes (shelter waitlist +56.2%, households served +28.5%, problem-solving +41.3%, PSH vacancies) via real-time public dashboards. |
| <b>R2.3</b> ( <i>Automated Data Triggers</i> )                 | Example Motions in Data Officer Report on Offline PSH Units                                                                                 | Provide framework motions for Commissioners to establish automated flags for vacant units, operational delays, and safety outliers.                                        |
| <b>R3.1, R3.2</b> ( <i>Contract Review Role</i> )              | Policy position on transparent contract extensions                                                                                          | Require clear justification and targeted funding adjustments for contract extensions.                                                                                      |
| <b>R4.1, R4.2, R4.3</b> ( <i>Statutory Charter Authority</i> ) | Reopened Session Motions on ED Selection ( <i>SF Charter Section 4.133; died for lack of second</i> ) & Data Officer Report Example Motions | Exercise delegated Charter authority on executive leadership selection and offer collaborative example motions in Data Officer reports to foster colleague buy-in.         |

|                                                             |                                                                     |                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>R4.3</b> ( <i>Statutory Audit and Budget Authority</i> ) | Budget Amendment Motion and Dissenting Vote ( <i>Feb 13, 2026</i> ) | Exercise delegated Charter authority over fiscal allocations, impact analyses, and operational performance.                                                                         |
| <b>R5.1, R5.2</b> ( <i>Shelter and Housing Monitoring</i> ) | Policy Position on Independent Oversight and Advisory Bodies        | Opposed blanket sunseting of independent bodies; recommended merging SMC and SGAC while retaining LHCB and OCOH, and advocate for an external, neutral third-party inspection body. |