



Summary of Community Engagement Findings Strategic Planning 2025-2029

About the Report

This report summarizes insights from community engagement efforts by the Mayor's Office for Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), including forums, focus groups, and an online survey. Community engagement activities were carried out to bring community member voices into MOHCD's planning efforts and strategic investments in community services and programs. This report includes participant priorities, needs, challenges, and suggested solutions in affordable housing, self-sufficiency, and community development. Cross-cutting concerns that were raised across program and service areas are at the start, followed by participant housing preferences. Overall findings are then organized by service area on pages 4-10, and finally findings associated with MOHCD's work but relevant for other city agencies, are on pages 10-11. Community engagement aimed to understand the needs of different demographics and areas, with specific insights highlighted in orange font throughout.

Data Collection

Between September 2023 and January of 2024, the following data collection methods were conducted:

Method	Details
Neighborhood Forums	328 participants in 11 community forums across various neighborhoods throughout the city (Bayview, Chinatown, Excelsior, Mission, the Ocean View-Merced Heights-Ingleside neighborhoods (OMI), Richmond, South of Market (SOMA), Sunset, Tenderloin, Western Addition, and Visitacion Valley).
Focus Groups	28 focus groups with key constituent groups.
Survey	528 people participated in an online survey.

More information on participants, including a demographic breakdown of community forum and survey participants and a list of key constituent groups for focus groups can be found in Appendix I on page 12.

Cross-Cutting Community Needs and Concerns

Community engagement activities identified cross-cutting community needs and concerns across neighborhoods and specific community groups, and across MOHCD program or service areas. These include:

- ❖ **Communities desire tailored housing solutions; often linking ideal housing (types, amenities, size) to neighborhood quality of life concerns (like safety, green spaces, cultural centers, etc.).** Community members advocate for increased housing options that are responsive to the unique characteristics and needs of diverse communities, underscoring the takeaway that community members value not just increased quantity, but quality of housing.
- ❖ **Target populations would benefit from more culturally appropriate and responsive support** (that are respectful of and appropriate for different cultures), **and that offer prioritized or preferential access.** As

needs are not being experienced equally across all residents, certain residents (e.g., **seniors, disabled individuals, people of color, and LGBTQ+** residents) request that services and support are intentionally distributed to address their diverse needs. Suggestions include:

- Lottery preferences (for people of color, seniors, longtime residents [and their children]).
- Increased Downpayment Assistance Loan Program (DALP) and other home ownership services for Black residents, Indigenous residents, domestic violence survivors.
- Increased case management; particularly responsive to distinct needs of Transgender and non-English speaking residents.
- Rental subsidies for unique populations, including Bayview residents, families, teachers, nonprofit workers, and civil servants.
- Housing access for seniors and disabled residents as a right not just a preference.
- Eviction prevention, emergency rental assistance, and other legal services were named as a priority for Indigenous and Pacific Islander residents, Transgender and LGBTQ residents, and seniors to remain housed.
- Targeted employment opportunities for youth, seniors, immigrants, and people with disabilities.
- Education and legal services for undocumented and low wage workers to safeguard their workplace rights and defend against abuses.

❖ **Increasing access to programs and services through outreach, education, navigation, eligibility, and centralized or conveniently located services will increase their use, especially by target populations.**

Outreach. According to survey respondents, the biggest overall barrier to accessing or using existing programs and services is lack of awareness of the services that are available (reported most highly by **Middle Easter/West Asian/North African**, and **Pacific Islander** residents). This was also true for 72% of respondents from **Tenderloin**.

Access. Even if residents are aware of services, they are not able to easily apply. Residents state a lack of service navigators who can help them apply and the amount of paperwork needed to apply as issues. One **Asian** community member spoke about feeling discriminated against in the application process. Another **Latino** community member spoke about being scared to apply. Many residents, especially those with limited internet or computer access or know-how, or language barriers, have an interest in a central place or a go-to person in the community who can help them navigate and access services.

Eligibility was also a common issue. In fact, “I do not qualify for services” was the second-most selected reason among various underserved community members responding to the survey (**Asian, Black, Indigenous, Latinos**, and **Pacific Islander**) and the greatest barrier among survey respondents from **Bayview** (71%) and **Inner Richmond** (63%).

Availability. Residents would like to see more services overall in their communities, and there is a specific need for these services to be trauma-informed, with providers who understand trauma (**Domestic Violence, Newly Arrived**), culturally competent (**Latino, Native**), and linguistically responsive, with providers who are able to communicate effectively in various languages (**Latino, Arab**). It is also important for these services to respond to the unique needs of each population (e.g., **seniors, persons with disabilities, Transgender**).

Participants named several solutions to improve access and connection to services:

- Make translation services available for all programs, and specifically city navigation, case management, DAHLIA counseling, labor rights, training programs, and Workforce Link, San Francisco’s job-matching database.
- Employ and train individuals that are part of the community to act as interpreters and translators.
- Fund community outreach leaders (e.g., Promotoras).

- Provide service specialists or representatives who come out to the community regularly to provide information about available services and help with applications.
 - Facilitate coordination among CBOs and other community stakeholders.
- ❖ **Community engagement findings highlight how broader challenges and root causes of San Francisco’s affordable housing crisis are closely connected to and contribute to the cycle of the city’s growing economic divide.** Developing and preserving affordable housing and focused eviction prevention efforts must be combined with efforts that support an overall positive quality of life—sustainable and quality working conditions and opportunities, affordable access to healthcare and childcare, community-centered services and supports, and retaining long-term residents and thriving local businesses.

Housing Preferences

When asked about the most important housing features, community members shared the following:

- **Cost** is cited as the most important to survey respondents and their families (86%), followed closely by **location** (74%). Other features including size, proximity to transit, and parking respectively, are a top priority for less than a third of respondents. As stated in the cross-cutting findings, feedback on housing preferences varies, with some population-specific priorities coming up and seen as nearly as important as developing more accessible and affordable housing.
- The presence of larger **families** and cultural norms favoring inter- or multigenerational living emphasizes the need for **spacious accommodations with more bedrooms/bathrooms and square footage**.
- In addition to **natural light, safe, green spaces and parks and walkable communities**, focus group and community forum participants widely want **modern, convenient, and amenities with buildings or units**, including washers and dryers, gyms or recreational spaces, community and/or wired, coworking rooms and spaces.

Specific housing features were named by sub populations, such as:

- Participants identified **seniors** as a population with a potential group to prioritize, stating a need for seniors to “age in place”. Features include working elevators or ground-level units in new developments, adaptable spaces to accommodate hospital beds, rail and other assistive supports as needed, and potentially shared housing models to support seniors’ income levels and needs.
- **LGBTQ** populations express similar needs, for different reasons. **Transgender** focus group members cited the need for elevators and rails or other assistive supports for those recovering from gender-affirming surgery. Additional suggestions include well-designed and privacy-focused shared housing models for affordability, and LGBTQ-safe housing (in general, and for those over 24).
- **Formerly incarcerated** residents and others in compulsory shared housing systems (e.g., homeless shelters), express similar interests in privacy, safety and cleanliness, comprehensive, local services that support mental health needs or therapy requirements, and positive community to support their well-being.
- **Proximity, or closeness, to transit** is named a high priority for **Pacific Islander** survey respondents (67%) and **Asian** respondents (41%) compared to other racial/ethnic groups respondents, for whom only about 20-29% identify proximity to transit as a priority. **Genderqueer/non-binary** survey respondents rate proximity to transit as more important compared to other respondents. **LGBTQ** and **Transgender** focus group members name it as important if they experience emergency housing placement and to access services in-person. One **Transgender** focus group participant stressed the necessity of transit for LGBT-centered housing and healthcare support, especially for transgender, gender non-conforming individuals after gender-affirming surgery.
- **Proximity to work** was named as somewhat of a consideration for community engagement participants’ housing preferences. Feedback named employees’ inability to afford to live in San Francisco as a rising concern, interest in decreased commute times for more time with family, and “accommodating the mobility

needs that come with working in sectors requiring a car.” This was identified as a priority more highly among **Asian** (35%) and **Pacific Islander** (33%) survey respondents.

Affordable Housing Creation

More permanent and *truly* affordable housing is a top priority for a majority of community engagement participants. 71% of **Black** survey respondents, and 64% of **Asian** respondents, followed closely by **Latino** respondents (58%) named more affordable housing as important to them and their family to get or stay in housing in San Francisco, compared to 53% of all survey respondents.

- Whether by **building new units or converting existing buildings**, participants look to the city to do more to create affordable housing options, including: using vacant spaces, converting office buildings and motels, buying (instead of leasing) properties, and expanding programs and processes that help prevent resident displacement, increase housing stability, offer building alternatives, increase coordination, and remove barriers to new builds (e.g. the Small Sites Program (SSP), the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) approval process, more coordination with HSH and DPH, and urging the Planning Commission to move faster on applications). Neighborhoods with recent new units (**Bayview, Embarcadero, Mission, Tenderloin, Visitacion Valley**) see these as positive, but still often see a need for more affordable housing.
- The need for **moderate or middle-income and mixed-income properties** was also named by a number of participants.
- As named above, participants also requested **affordable housing dedicated to specific populations** such as **seniors, veterans, families, transitional age youth (TAY)**, SFUSD teachers and other civil servants, **people with disabilities, people with mental illness**, and people with a history of being unhoused.

Affordable Housing Maintenance

Current residents of affordable housing units named buildings in **disrepair, run-down, and poorly maintained**. In addition to funding for repairs to electrical and HVAC systems and to replace lead paint, residents also named a need for updated laundry, outdoor spaces, children’s play areas, and gyms.

- Specific mentions of **SRO hotels** describe them as **inadequate housing solutions** by community members, with a lack of privacy, kitchen and bathroom space, and overcrowding as concerns. SRO residents could likely benefit from targeted support for appropriate and more permanent housing solutions, with one focus group participant describing SROs as considered “a form of stable housing, but some of our clients feel like that type of unit is not stable...SROs can be claustrophobic... [people need] dignified housing.”

High maintenance costs and a lack of affordable and high-quality contractors are a significant barrier for low-income homeowners. Plumbers, electricians, painters, and handy people are often too expensive for Below Market Rate (BMR) owners to hire. One survey respondent recommended providing a list of vetted service people.

Rental Subsidies

Rent across San Francisco is too high for many residents, importantly, for *both* low- and middle-income communities. Despite a brief respite, with programs and policies that were available during the pandemic now over, residents are once again struggling to afford housing in San Francisco.

- **Rental subsidies, while seen as an important service, are not enough and a short-term form of support** when long-term, permanent affordable housing options are critically needed. Additionally, participants named barriers to using subsidies, noting landlord discrimination or direct refusals to accept subsidies and vouchers. One survey respondent also added the need for more subsidies, suggesting “group discounts” or subsidies for city services like electricity, water, and parking for affordable housing residents. **Indigenous** survey respondents (85%) and focus group participants named rental subsidies as a priority, citing those for large families as especially important, followed closely **Black** (83%) and **Pacific Islander** (83%) respondents,

compared to 68% of overall respondents. By neighborhood, 89% of **Tenderloin** and 79% of **Bayview** survey respondents rated rental subsidies as important.

- **Community members think affordable housing criteria (50% and higher of the Area Median Income (AMI)) is too high.** Many community forum, focus group, and survey participants emphasized that the maximum should be 30% of net income.
- **Incentives to support landlords' ability to offer affordable rent was suggested as an untapped tool to increase affordability.** Several survey respondents described both positive incentives (e.g., mortgages subsidies or lower property taxes) and disincentives such as vacancy taxes or taxes for house sharing (e.g., for companies like Airbnb, Sonder).

Emergency Rental Assistance & Eviction Prevention Services

Community engagement participants shared that **emergency rental assistance** is an incredibly important service, but it needs improvement, noting that the application process and timing is difficult for people in crisis. Across survey respondents, emergency rental assistance was the second highest rated (66% said it was important, after rental subsidies, 68%). Looking at responses by race, a large percentage of **Indigenous**, **Pacific Islander**, and **Black** survey respondents said it was important (83-85%).

Tenants who are vulnerable to eviction, including those who cite frequent abuse or harassment such as residents of rent-controlled apartments, **Transgender** and **Queer** residents, and **residents with disabilities**, **benefit greatly from counseling and other legal services.** About two thirds of survey **respondents of color** rated eviction prevention legal services (such as mediation and representation) as important compared to less than half of white survey respondents (47%). Yet, in general, residents feel these services need improvement, calling for clearer tenant protections and greater coordination between the city and providers.

Anti-Displacement

Long-time residents advocate for increased MOHCD efforts to support them remaining housed in the city. Long-time, low- and middle-income residents feel they can't afford to stay in SF and are actively being displaced by new developments and higher-income residents. Though there are housing lottery preferences intended to help certain San Francisco residents and workers access affordable housing, the lottery system doesn't appear to be working – residents that have applied have been waiting for many years to be placed.

Many residents fear being displaced by increasing rents as well as abusive landlords. It is important for MOHCD to continue to invest in and improve rental assistance and tenant protection programs. As discussed above, rents across the city are too high for residents (low- and middle-income), even those with subsidies. Many residents fear being displaced by “outsiders” that are moving into the community and driving up rents. Residents want MOHCD to do more to prevent their displacement (namely, **Black** and **Latino**). Landlord abuse further worsens the issue of high rents. Residents recounted stories of landlords who harass them or fail to keep up with maintenance. While MOHCD offers eviction prevention legal services as well as tenant and landlord assistance programs, these programs were rated as needing improvement by most community forum participants. Residents that can hang on, complain of friends or family who have been displaced (especial their children who will no longer be able to live in San Francisco).

Opportunities for Homeownership

An emerging priority is to **increase ownership opportunities for specific populations or residents that face greater barriers to homeownership.** **Domestic violence survivors, veterans, teachers, first time homebuyers, Native** or **Indigenous** residents, and **Black** residents are named as potential beneficiaries, alongside the need for alternative or amended criteria or actions related to more flexible credit requirements, lower property taxes, rent-to-own

agreements, opportunities to use Veterans Affairs loans, and experts or workshops that offer support with the process.

- **Homeowners Association (HOA) fees for BMR properties are too high.** One survey respondent noted that fees are often equal to market rates and given annual increases, are an additional barrier for homeownership for many working-class residents.
- **Several survey respondents and community forum participants questioned who benefits from the Downpayment Assistance Loan Program (DALP),** wanting more clarity and an oversight committee to help ensure that intended populations and residents are benefiting. Over 30% of **Black, Indigenous, and Middle Eastern/West Asian/North African** survey respondents selected “down payment help” as needed for them or their family to get or stay in housing in San Francisco. **Pacific Islander** focus group participants indicate that home ownership, building family wealth and equity, and the ability to pass on equity to their family is something that is deeply desired and not a current reality.

Access to Housing Programs and Services

As mentioned in the cross-cutting findings, making it easier for everyone and reducing unnecessary obstacles are key to improving access to renting and owning homes.

- **Many participants, including target populations, feel the lottery system for affordable housing placements is not effective, painstakingly slow, and not transparent.** Participants report affordable housing placement processes have too many burdens and are too slow, with residents describing having to apply numerous times, waiting anywhere from five to over 30 years, and never hearing anything back about the status of their application.
- Participants describe **difficult requirements** like credit history, rental history, proof of work for three years, and a minimum monthly salary of \$3000 as an incredible barrier for many residents.
 - A participant in the **Mission** focus group highlighted the lack of credit among immigrants, making housing difficult.
 - Participants in the **Asociacion Mayab** focus group, which serves the Yucatec Maya community, stated that these barriers prevent community members from finding housing.
 - A participant in the **domestic violence providers’** focus group supported more flexible credit requirements due to residents' crises that potentially result in financial and credit issues.
- Additional challenges with the application process include **a lack of assistance for multiple languages, the overall amount of paperwork, and high fees.** In general, residents request more counseling and language services to support applying for rental housing and the lottery.
 - 95% of community forum participants **across neighborhoods** rated “Rental housing support (e.g., housing education, application assistance)” as “Important.”
 - Participants in the **Arab** community focus group observed and noted patterns of Arabic speaking persons and families that were selected in the lottery, but who, due to the lack of language assistance from property management, did not end up receiving the housing.
- **Strict rules and regulations such as income or asset limits** contribute to residents feeling stuck when they try to get better jobs or make more money. **Bayview** community forum participants specifically talked about how some individuals are scared to take jobs that pay more because they might lose help with their housing. This makes it harder for them to get ahead and, potentially, maintain a stable place to live.
- For marginalized or vulnerable populations, **access may not be enough to overcome challenges in finding safe, sustainable accommodations.** **LGBTQ** and **Transgender** focus group participants, for example, describe facing frequent harassment by neighbors, landlords, or property managers and seek faster processes to transfer to other affordable housing units without those same administrative obstacles (e.g., before the lottery is opened more broadly).

- **Onsite services to support residents to keep their housing and ultimately transition to more permanent housing is a priority to residents of subsidized housing.** Participants name a need to hire, train, and maintain quality staff; case management, mental health, and addiction recovery services; employment and training services, and better coordination with community services and providers. SRO residents would also benefit from support applying for affordable housing.

Employment Opportunities

The need for more employment opportunities was a recurring theme across survey, community forum and focus group participants, with 35% of survey respondents experiencing challenges getting or keeping a job. Among those respondents experiencing challenges, the supports most respondents indicated would be helpful are: job skills training (39%); help with job searching (38%); and resume and application support (36%). As named above in the cross-cutting findings, community forum and focus group participants encourage **tailoring services to specific populations**, including:

- **Young people** and people with little to no work experience; **seniors** and **people with disabilities**; **immigrants** and **undocumented workers**.
- **Transgender** focus group participants and survey respondents **named job centers and job readiness services** as an important service in getting, keeping, or advancing in a job.
- **Asian, Black, Middle Eastern/West Asian/North African**, and **Pacific Islander** residents reported experiencing greater challenges getting or keeping a job (48-54%) compared to White residents (21%).

Jobs that pay a livable wage and have opportunities for growth are a priority across participant groups. Community engagement participants **see consistent follow-through on job referrals and placement** as important for achieving stable and sustainable housing.

Skill Development and Training Resources

Workforce development findings suggest education and training continue to be a priority area of focus.

- **Currently employed survey respondents** indicated supports that would help them keep their jobs or advance in their career: paid job training rises to the top (40%). Mentorship/coaching, and flexible training schedule (e.g. evenings, weekends, and online) were also identified as valuable supports by 36% of respondents currently employed. About one third also selected information about available training or educational opportunities (32%) and trainings provided by an employer (31%).
- Community members specified **paid training opportunities and affordable (low-cost or free) education** as much-needed resources. Programs like CCSF's CityBuild Academy (a pre-apprenticeship construction program) and UCSF's custodian career advancement training program are cited as successful examples.
- More **vocational skills training**, trainings targeted towards **TAY, women, and BIPOC** residents, and **job-specific training** in areas like healthcare, computer, and language skills are named as important needs.

Financial Literacy

Financial literacy was not mentioned in focus groups as often as other services (e.g., job placement and training), but it still rated highly in the community forums' prioritization activity and with more than half of survey respondents (61%). Participants mentioned the need for overall improvement in the financial services offered, as well as support to become and remain self-employment.

Digital Literacy

Improvement of digital services and training for digital literacy are mentioned as specific barriers to community members obtaining services. Community forum and focus group participants mention that this can be particularly

challenging for **seniors** who do not have the requisite skills to use online platforms to access services (e.g., DAHLIA or Workforce Link). As mentioned above, **non-English speaking** community members highlight the need for better translation of digital services.

Civil Legal Services

Legal supports for immigrants, tenants, and workers were a frequently mentioned need among community engagement participants. Legal services for eviction prevention were often cited as a need for residents **across neighborhoods** and among **Transgender** and **Queer** residents. As highlighted in the cross-cutting findings, targeted legal support is needed to protect **vulnerable workers** (undocumented and low wage workers) from employer mistreatment. 94% of community forum participants **across neighborhoods** rated Legal Services (e.g., benefits advocacy, consumer protection, family law, workers' rights) as important. Legal services (including for protections to stop businesses from using unfair, deceptive, or fraudulent practices) were identified by **non-English speaking survey respondents**¹ as the most important service or support offered by MOHCD. On a positive note, Open Door Legal (a MOHCD grantee) is providing much needed services to community members.

Community-Based Services

Overall, community engagement participants shared a deep need for increased access to housing and employment services, as named in the cross-cutting findings. Additionally, participants spoke of the importance of providing more support in key areas, specifically childcare and healthcare, that are linked to the ability of community members to secure housing and employment long term.

CBOs are key to the fabric of a community; however, they are strapped for capacity and aren't always as up-to-date or informed of programs and services to support residents. Residents appreciate the concrete supports (e.g., food, vaccines, and other necessities) offered by CBOs. CBOs are also valued as residents' go-to place for information on benefits and services available to them. However, CBOs have insufficient funding to meet service demand, have reduced or lost staff due to low wages and high cost of living in the area, and largely do not have the ability in-house to support the multiple languages in a community. CBOs are also sometimes limited in understanding what services are available to residents, eligibility requirements, and how to apply successfully.

Investments in and capacity building for community-based organizations (especially those that are embedded in and reflect the people in the community) surfaced as a priority across focus groups, survey respondents, and the **Bayview, Chinatown, Excelsior, Mission, SOMA, Sunset, Tenderloin, and Visitacion Valley** community forums. Priority is emphasized for these community-embedded, long-term CBOs versus "outsider" nonprofits that may have less familiarity and credibility with longstanding residents. Below are examples of supports that would benefit CBOs:

- **More, longer-term, and accessible funding** for general operations (especially staff salaries that attract/retain staff) and capital improvements, not just services. Some respondents also noted the importance of streamlining the funding process. RFPs require a lot of time to complete, which discourages some CBOs from applying – especially those with limited bandwidth. Delays in funding can also jeopardize CBO operations.
- Investing in **collaboration and convening** between city agencies and CBOs, and among CBOs. This helps CBOs know what services others provide and can improve service coordination, which was emphasized as significant in the cross-cutting needs and concerns.

¹ This data does not include responses from the English-speaking respondents because the corresponding question (3b. How important are these services to you and your family? Other legal services - e.g., benefits advocacy, consumer protection, family law, workers' rights) was not included in the English version of the survey.

Public Spaces

Clean, safe, accessible public/community spaces (e.g., parks/recreational/green, community centers, cultural spaces) **are often named a priority across community forums and focus groups.** Some neighborhoods highlighted these spaces as assets in their community (**Visitacion Valley, Western Addition, Sunset/Parkside**), though some spaces could benefit from better maintenance or upgrades. Other neighborhoods expressed an important need for parks/community/cultural spaces (**Excelsior, Mission, OMI, SOMA, Tenderloin, Visitacion Valley**) and others expressed the need for spaces/streets that are safe and clean (i.e. from trash, vandalism, open drug use/dealing, homeless encampments) (**Mission, SOMA, Tenderloin, Visitacion Valley**), which was also a cross-cutting finding.

Community centers are particularly critical because they serve as hubs where residents get information about services and access resources. Community centers also provide spaces for groups with shared racial/ethnic identities to convene, build community, and access services tailored to their community. Communities that spoke about the need for a hub or center in their community (or upgrades to an existing center) included the **Excelsior** and **Visitacion Valley** community forums and focus groups for the **African Diaspora** and **Russian speakers**.

Local Businesses & Commercial Corridors

Supporting small, local businesses that serve and reflect the existing community is a priority to residents who feel displaced. In many neighborhoods, retail and business spaces have not rebounded from the pandemic. Residents of color (**Latino, Indigenous, Black, Asian**), however, want these spaces to be filled with small, local businesses that serve their needs and reflect their community—in particular, small businesses owned by people of color or that are community-serving, long-established businesses.

- Community forum members shared examples of **technical assistance** that could support small businesses e.g., expert/specialized assistance to start or maintain a business or to learn innovative business practices, or resources to make business upgrades. One community forum participant suggested expanding Business Accelerator programs such as those supported by DreamKeeper.

Across community forums, **the importance of supporting thriving commercial areas frequently surfaced.** Residents from several neighborhoods discussed the ongoing impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on businesses (**Chinatown, Excelsior, Mission, OMI, Portola, SOMA, Sunset, Tenderloin**). Many retail and office spaces remain shuttered, and many others continue to barely hang on. Residents are especially eager to support small, local businesses, and retail services for basic needs such as groceries (**Tenderloin**) and pharmacies (**Excelsior**). Some residents also encourage investment in business that contribute to a lively nightlife. In one neighborhood, **Chinatown**, the limited number of businesses that stay open after 5pm, shows the lack of foot traffic named in the cross-cutting findings on safety, and is described as reflecting the fear entrenched in this community due to the rise in Asian hate crimes.

Community Engagement in Planning Efforts

Communities name the importance of their engagement in planning and would appreciate opportunities and resources for increased community engagement. Some community members cited community meetings and involvement as an asset (e.g., 11th district collective in **OMI** is named as giving the community voice). Other community members (in the **Bayview** and **Tenderloin**) shared a concern about the level of their community's engagement and the need for more community forums or neighborhood gatherings. Ideas for how to increase community engagement included: incentives (free food, a raffle), inviting city leaders or "supervisors" to attend, and training/resourcing for local community leaders. Participants in the **Latino Parity and Equity Coalition (LPEC)** focus group had promising ideas to share on this topic (see quotes below).

Community Building

Participants in the **LPEC, API Council, African Diaspora, and Native** focus groups shared a few perspectives about the importance of community-building for community cohesion and community planning. In particular, the **African Diaspora** and **Native** groups shared the desire to build community strength and cohesion by establishing their own Cultural Districts so that they have a place where they can see themselves and build greater agency. In addition to in-language support services and community features like cultural and community centers, playgrounds, a community computer room for school and business, and pools, the African Diaspora focus group specified their needs and interests in support for locally-based community building so their needs are more prominent to the city.

Non-MOHCD Program Areas

Safety

San Francisco stakeholders desire a thriving and inclusive community but grapple with persistent safety concerns. These concerns vary across demographics, with safety being a major factor for retaining residents and important for families with children and those sharing spaces (e.g., those in shared Single Room Occupancies (SROs) or in homeless shelters). Participants describe less foot traffic due to COVID, business closures, and perceptions of increased drug activity and encampments blocking sidewalks as major safety concerns. Residents of permanent supportive housing advocate for increased unarmed, nighttime street patrols. Broadly, community forum participants described “community safety” as an important for securing appropriate and ideal housing and a cornerstone of community development and resilience.

Homelessness

San Francisco faces rising rental prices, barriers to homeownership, and increased homelessness, making housing development a top priority. **Concerns about homelessness span community feedback on affordable housing, self-sufficiency, and community development.** Stakeholders call for preventive action, addressing current residents being displaced, and housing options that meet residents' needs and dignity—naming concerns about shelter and SRO adequacy and safety. Overall, stakeholders largely request greater coordination between systems and agencies to provide services for those who are currently unhoused or facing homelessness.

Personal experiences of homelessness vary across populations, and there are requests for tailored solutions for **families** and vulnerable groups like **seniors, domestic violence survivors, LGBTQ+ individuals, formerly incarcerated individuals, and those in sober living**; requesting diverse responses to diverse needs. Participants name the importance of emergency, transitional, and permanent housing, and targeted support to move to more stable housing. As one participant put it, there is a need for “a housing ladder for people to exit HSH.” Mental health support is also named as crucial, and sustained community and mental health support services as important to address eviction prevention and repeated cycles of homelessness.

Importantly, many community engagement participants highlight the community impact of San Francisco’s growing homeless crisis. Participants frequently highlight ongoing issues with homelessness: encampments, a perceived uptick in crime and drug use, and related quality of life issues, as affecting community well-being and safety. Participants suggest more permanent housing solutions to improve quality of life for both housed and unhoused residents.

Transportation

Public transit and parking options are crucial for community engagement participants, despite not being listed as MOHCD’s responsibility. One San Francisco stakeholder shared “the vital role that affordability, quality, and

convenient access to parking and public transit play in shaping housing priorities for our family and the broader community.”

Public transit is important across San Franciscans’ life stages, from accessing work to family needs and “aging in place”. Improved, affordable, and reliable transit services, including free options for low-income individuals are seen as an important need. Strong public transit is considered an asset (in neighborhoods like **Excelsior** and along Mission St), and in other areas (e.g., “the outskirts of San Francisco” or in the **Richmond District**) lack of strong public transit is considered a barrier to positive quality of life. Public transit is seen as a resource for individuals and communities—important for reducing car dependency and for access to attractions and community-building.

Similarly, increased parking is described as a need across the city, and necessary for growing **senior populations, people with disabilities, veterans, and families**. Residents see parking as important for all new housing developments and as an important amenity for their ideal housing preferences.

Appendix: Community Engagement Participant Data

Focus Groups

28 focus groups were conducted throughout the city, largely with key stakeholder groups, to ensure a wide range of voices and perspectives were represented. Where possible, specific data connecting findings to group-level demographics are noted throughout this summary.

Please Note: Comprehensive demographic breakdowns for focus group participants were not available at the time of this reporting but are expected to be included in the broader MOHCD Consolidated Plan.

Key Constituent Groups
Age Disability Friendly
African Caribbean and African Diaspora Community
American Indian/Native American Community
Anti-displacement CBO Providers
Arab Community
Cambodia Community
Council of Community Housing Organizations (CCHO)
Domestic Violence Service Providers
Housing Counseling Agencies
HUD Co-ops
Human Services Provider Network
Immigrants/Undocumented and Newly Arrived Shelter Families
Lao and Thai Community
LGBQ Organizations
Mayan Community
Pacific Islander Community (including Samoan)
Pan-Asian (API Council)
Pan-Latino (LPEC)
Re-entry Community (RLC)
Russian
Supportive Housing Providers Network
Tenderloin Spanish Speaking Community
Transgender Community
Veterans
Vietnamese Community

Community Forums

Community Forum data provides a composite snapshot of the voices represented. Registration for these activities was encouraged, but not required and as such, demographic data—presented in aggregate below—is not linked directly to specific remarks or findings. It does, however, signify the diverse communities actively involved in this process.

11 community forums were conducted across various neighborhoods throughout the city (Bayview, Chinatown, Excelsior, Mission, the OMI (Ocean View-Merced Heights-Ingleside) neighborhoods, Richmond, South of Market (SOMA), Sunset, Tenderloin, Western Addition, and Visitacion Valley). Some neighborhoods offered multiple forums or rooms, offering translators to accommodate stakeholders for whom English is not their primary language.

A demographic breakdown of voices and communities represented in the community forums, and who volunteered their respective demographic details, are specified below:

Gender Identity	Percentage
Female	61%
Male	23%
Genderqueer/gender non-binary	3%
Transwoman	1
Transman	0

Sexual Orientation	Percentage
Straight/heterosexual	64%
LGBTQ	14%
Not listed	2%

Race/Ethnicity	Percentage
Asian	42%
Latino	17%
Black	15%
White	9%
Pacific Islander and Indigenous	1% each
Multi-racial/ethnic	5%

Language	Percentage
English	50%
Asian languages (Cantonese, Filipino, Mandarin, Vietnamese)	27%
Spanish	9%

Survey

The following tables show survey participant demographic information.

Gender Identity	Number of respondents	Percentage
Female	338	64.0%
Male	128	24.2%
Genderqueer/Gender Non-binary	15	2.8%
Trans Female	1	0.2%
Trans Male	2	0.4%
Other	4	0.8%
No response	40	7.6%

Sexual Orientation	Number of respondents	Percentage
Bisexual	35	6.6%
Gay/Lesbian/Same Gender Loving	54	10.2%

Questioning/Unsure	5	0.9%
Straight/Heterosexual	323	61.2%
Other	28	5.3%
No response	83	15.7%

Race/Ethnicity *(Select all that apply)	Number of respondents	Percentage
Asian	149	28.2%
Black	66	12.5%
Indigenous	20	3.8%
Latino	97	18.4%
Middle Eastern/West Asian or North African	13	2.5%
Pacific Islander	6	1.1%
White	194	36.7%

San Francisco Neighborhood	Number of respondents	Percentage
No answer	103	19.5%
Bayview Hunters Point	14	2.7%
Bernal Heights	6	1.1%
Castro/Upper Market	17	3.2%
Chinatown	7	1.3%
Excelsior	40	7.6%
Financial District	4	0.8%
Glen Park	7	1.3%
Golden Gate Park	2	0.4%
Haight Ashbury	10	1.9%
Hayes Valley	4	0.8%
Inner Richmond	8	1.5%
Inner Sunset	8	1.5%
Japantown	4	0.8%
Lakeshore	2	0.4%
Lone Mountain/USF	1	0.2%
Marina	2	0.4%
McLaren Park	2	0.4%
Mission	43	8.1%
Mission Bay	6	1.1%
Nob Hill	5	0.9%
Noe Valley	7	1.3%
North Beach	8	1.5%
Oceanview/Merced/Ingleside	12	2.3%
Outer Mission	5	0.9%

Outer Richmond	27	5.1%
Pacific Heights	6	1.1%
Portola	7	1.3%
Potrero Hill	7	1.3%
Presidio	1	0.2%
Presidio Heights	1	0.2%
Russian Hill	6	1.1%
South of Market	32	6.1%
Sunset/Parkside	26	4.9%
Tenderloin	29	5.5%
Treasure Island	12	2.3%
Twin Peaks	5	0.9%
Visitacion Valley	11	2.1%
West of Twin Peaks	8	1.5%
Western Addition	23	4.4%