GONGÓRA FAMILY SAYS SFPD ENJOYS “100% IMPUNITY” IN SHOOTINGS

After meeting with District Attorney George Gascón, advocates for the family of a slain homeless man learned that a decision whether to charge two San Francisco police officers who shot him would come in six to eight weeks.

But recent figures published by an activist organization suggest that the cops might go scot free.

On February 28, Gascón met with friends and family of Luis Gongora Pat to update them on his office’s investigation of the fatal shoot-
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As of March 14th there are 1,090 people on the shelter waitlist in San Francisco.
This neighbourhood comes together to
Serve the community,
Long-time community,
Form bonds
Among themselves,
Feed the people,
North Oakland people
Free home-made
And donated food
On bowls & plates,
Free rides
To the hospital,
Free legal advice
Teaching the poor
About rights they
Never knew they had,
Useful when confronting
Cops, courts and landlords,
Free tips on
Getting the homeless
Housed at last,
Installing a bench
To sit on,
A hard plastic outhouse
For self-relief,
A cob oven
For cook-outs,
Planted collard greens
And fruit trees
For neighbours who
Joined the ancestors.
Survival is ensured,
Dignity is restored
Every Tuesday afternoon
At 61st and Adeline
Driver Plaza-----
This neighbourhood comes together to
Stop gentrification
From stealing
Food, community,
Human rights,
Black homes
And Aunti
From them.
Extended family member
Their Aunti Frances
With Berkeley
In her bloodstream,
She who holds
Her ‘hood in
Her affectionate arms,
She who walks
Liberation despite poverty
And ninety-day
Threats on paper.
Her revolutionary
Act of cooking
For the block,
Her perennial
Love Mission,
Black Panther vision
Won’t be evicted
If more neighbours
Stand behind her
And valiantly
Fight keeping her indoors.
The outside world
Has jaws agape
Hungry for bodies
Unhoused by evictions
Born, bred,
Oakland grown.
Aunti needs her triplex
Apartment, home of eight years.
Living and resting aren’t
All she needs it for.
Her kitchen especially, besides the plaza,
Is the centerpiece of her life,
Crucial in keeping
Her humanitariah vision
And folks fed and alive
In a city undergoing rapid change
At 61st & Adeline
Driver Plaza-----
No family could be
Strong without their auntie’s guidance.
W: Saint Valentine’s Day 2018
[ For ‘Aunti’ Frances Moore.]
OTHER HOMELESS PEOPLE KILLED BY POLICE

RANDAL PHILLIP DUNKLIN (JAN. 4, 2011)
Dunklin, who moves in a wheelchair and a mental health client, was denied services at Community Behavioral Health Care. Police were called after Dunklin started slashing tires. Police surround him, pepper-sprayed him, shot him with bean bags and then live rounds. Dunklin was charged with — and later acquitted of — stabbing an officer, felony assault and resisting arrest. The DA’s website found no information to determine whether the three officers acted criminally.

CHARLES BLAIR HILL (JULY 3, 2011)
Hill was killed by a BART police officer on a station platform. Showing signs of mental illness his time of death, he was shot in the abdomen and left thigh. A year and a half after Oscar Grant’s killing at the hands of BART police, Hill’s shooting generated public protest. Because no SFPD officers were involved, there was no internal affairs investigation. The DA deemed the BART cop’s actions to be lawful.

UNIDENTIFIED 42-YEAR-OLD DISABLED, BLACK MAN (AUG. 1, 2015)
He was walking down the street with crutches in his hand. Under the pretext of conducting a “wellness check,” SFPD officers pinned him down and pressed his face against the “piss-stained” ground, while twisting off his prosthetic leg. The incident involved 14 cops, but it is unknown if SFPD disciplined or the DA charged them.

JESSICA WILLIAMS (née JESSICA NELSON) (MAY 19, 2016)
She was 29 years old and four months pregnant at the time of her killing. She was sleeping in her car when police startled her, so she drove off. The officers followed her, and she crashed. They shot inside her vehicle, which is against SFPD policy, and she suffered from gunshot wounds to her chest, a graze to her forehead and superficial blunt trauma on the right side of her head. The DA declined to charge the cops.

SOURCE: PEOPLE’S POLICE OBSERVATORY, A PROJECT OF THE JUSTICE4LUIS COALITION
This June voters will be asked to vote on an initiative put forward by the Police Officers Association (POA) that would arm every police officer with Tasers, a lethal weapon that has long been controversial in San Francisco. The Police Commission, a body meant to enforce police accountability, approved the implementation of Tasers in SFPD in November but has undergone an extensive community process to decide when Tasers can or cannot be used. The ballot initiative would set that policy for them.

The day after Mayor Lee endorsed the POA initiative, the Police Commission announced a meeting to vote on their own Taser policy, a vote that is happening as this paper goes to press. There is proposed language in front of the Commission that was written by SFPD as well as language proposed by different community organizations. The SFPD language is far more restrictive than the POA’s version, but still includes language that allows for dangerous use of Tasers.

Whether or not the Police Commission passes a policy on March 14, the ballot initiative will take precedence if passed in June. This means that the more permissive Taser policy could be put into effect regardless of the Commission’s process. SFPD Police Chief Bill Scott has come out publicly in opposition to the POA’s ballot measure saying that it would undermine the police reform process that was created with the Police Commission.

The ACLU has come out against both the ballot initiative and the SFPD language. They say they would support a policy that restricted Taser use for situations in which suspects were resisting “violently”, rather than “actively” as the current SFPD language would allow. They also noted several other places in which the policy is vague to the point of being unenforceable, or where the policy could threaten the lives of those targeted. Under this proposal SFPD could justify the use of a Taser, a lethal weapon, on anyone being verbally aggressive.

Community groups like the Coalition on Homelessness have been fighting to prevent SFPD from adopting Tasers since 2004, citing their use on mentally ill people, the risks they pose to elderly or physically disabled people, their tendency to be used against people of color, and their failure to prevent police-involved deaths. Reuters statistics from 2017 showed that 1,005 people have been killed by police Tasers since 2000, and that 90 percent of the victims were unarmed.

“For years San Francisco has debated whether or not to allow police to be equipped with these lethal weapons, which will be used mainly against homeless people and against people of color” said Jennifer Friedenbach of the Coalition on Homelessness. “This initiative that is being put on the ballot by the POA seeks to bypass the massive community effort and implement Tasers dangerously and irresponsibly. The ballot measure is irresponsible and allows lethal weapons to be used on someone doing something as non-threatening as holding a pole.”

Unfortunately the SFPD policy that may be supported at the Police Commission meeting has serious drawbacks as well, with language allowing the use of Tasers when there is no immediate threat of physical injury to an officer or another and failing to include a requirement that de-escalation be tried first. The policy would also allow for the use of the stun gun mode, which is an inhumane pain compliance tool that was removed from proposed policy last year at the behest of the community. Critically absent as well is prohibition against using the weapon on high risk populations, like children and pregnant people, as well as a requirement for all cops armed with Tasers to carry defibrillators to revive people.
NO JUSTICE, NO DEAL: TIME FOR A BETTER CONTRACT WITH THE POLICE UNION

FATHER RICHARD SMITH

SF cops are among the highest-paid in the country — but we aren’t getting our money’s worth, and the POA is a major obstacle to reform.

Two years after the city formally committed itself to police reform, we have almost bupkis to show for it. The reason? The San Francisco Police Officers’ Association, the single, greatest obstacle to police reform in the city.

Right now, San Francisco is negotiating a new contract with the POA. Such negotiations usually happen behind closed doors, with the community left out in the cold. But not this time. A campaign led by attorneys, physicians, educators, clergy, youth, nonprofits, and activists is firing out a clear message: No justice, no deal! The new contract must respect our values and foster necessary police reform.

Why? Because the recent level of corruption within SFPD has simply caused too much pain and anger. Too many lives have been cut short, too many families destroyed, too many moms and dads left in tears.

The stories are wrenching: Alex Nieto, gunned down in a hail of 59 police bullets; Amilcar Perez Lopez, shot in the back six times by police; Mario Woods, executed as if by a police firing squad; Luis Gongora Pat, a homeless man, one of the city’s most vulnerable, killed within 30 seconds after the squad car pulled up; Jessica Williams, a young pregnant mother, shot while trying to dislodge her crashed vehicle from beneath a truck.

In not one of these instances has a rogue officer even been brought to trial.

Then there are the exchanges of racist and homophobic text messages among officers, and documented incidents of officers stealing from low-income people and dealing drugs — abuses both stupefying and intolerable.

Sadly, with this bomb cyclone of scandals whirling about, the POA leadership, instead of pressing for reform, has adamantly opposed many of our values in this City of St. Francis. Rather than focus on the needs of its members for decent wages, benefits, and working conditions — the prime focus of any responsible union — POA leadership has been propagating a law-and-order agenda à la Donald Trump.

Examples:

• Instead of using established procedures for resolving disputes as intended, the POA has used them to block, delay or weaken reforms outlined by both the Department of Justice and the Blue Ribbon Panel — most recently, the city’s new use-of-force policies that prioritize the sanctity of life.

• The POA is currently promoting a deeply flawed ballot initiative to override the chief, the Police Commission, and elected officials in overseeing the use of Tasers, weapons that are potentially lethal.

• At a time when immigrant families are under attack, POA leadership continues to undermine our City’s sanctuary ordinance.

• When Colin Kaepernick courageously protested police brutality by taking a knee, POA leadership arrogantly called him “foolish” and “naive” and called on the 49ers to “denounce” his gesture.

SFPD is one of the highest paid police forces in the country and, curiously, 30% of the POA president’s lucrative salary is paid by the city. Given the recent slew of scandals, isn’t it time to ask if we’re getting our money’s worth?

City officials simply cannot check their values at the door when entering these negotiations. They cannot overlook the abuses within SFPD and the leadership of the union claiming to represent it. The new POA contract must respect our values and foster rather than impede reform. The clear message from a broad and diverse segment of the community could not be more timely: No justice, no deal!

Check out the #NoJusticeNoDeal Campaign on Facebook and Twitter
The New SROs

SROs, or single room occupancy hotels, have long formed the backbone of San Francisco housing. SROs traditionally serve low-income individuals and are often owned privately, but operated by nonprofits or leased by the city. According to the Department of Building Inspection, there are 405 privately owned SROs in San Francisco with around 13,950 residential rooms available for rental.

As the housing crisis in San Francisco shows no signs of abating, the concept of SROs is expanding. New startups are emerging to bring the SRO model to young professionals, offering dorm-style living to the “middle-class backbone of San Francisco.” One of these startups, Starcity, was recently featured in the New York Times. Starcity’s customers—who make between $40,000 and $90,000—pay upwards of $4,200 for what is essentially a luxury SRO: a private room with shared bathrooms and common areas.

Starcity already has three properties in San Francisco with 36 units and nine more in development, along with $89 million in venture capital funding. The New York Times described the CEO and co-founders, John Dishotsky, showing a reporter one of these prospective properties. Wearing “muddy leather boots, black jeans and a hard hat,” he examines the property at 56 Mason Street. The reporter writes, “it will soon be 71 Starcity units.”

56 Mason Street was formerly known as Bristol Hotel, an (admittedly non-luxury) SRO with a questionable past. According to the Residential Hotel Unit Conversion and Demolition Ordinance of 1979, SRO owners must declare which rooms are residential and which are for tourists, permanently. Residential rooms underwritten by city departments like the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing offer hotel owners rates of $650-800 per month for a room. Tourists often pay upwards of $600 a night for a room.

Per the conversion ordinance, owners who covert rooms must offer former residents replacement rooms at the same monthly rate they had been paying. As a result, owners are incentivized to leave rooms empty or force their residents out of the building to do unending repairs, as was the case with the Bristol Hotel. According to the most recent estimate by the Department of Building Inspection, 14 percent of the 13,950 residential rooms available for rental are empty.

In a rebuttal to Eikenazi’s reporting, Randy Shaw of the Tenderloin Housing Clinic countered that “virtually every owner of a currently vacant SRO I know wants to lease it out for city homeless programs.” In fact, he cited that he worked with Thakor to lease the Bristol Hotel to San Francisco for step-up housing for formerly homeless single adults once it had finished its renovations. Since the Bristol has all private baths and only 71 units, the city decided that nonprofit leasing would be too expensive.

Regardless, the Bristol Hotel clearly had more lucrative ventures in mind when they ejected their tenants in 2012 and began looking for other opportunities. After the city rejected their plan to work with the Tenderloin Housing Clinic, they began conversations with Starcity to convert the former SRO into the startup’s more euphemistic (and expensive) “dorm living for professionals.”

I interviewed John Dishotsky for this article, and he said that the New York Times reporter had misrepresented Starcity’s progress at the Bristol Hotel property. Starcity is just in talks with Thakor, and upon finding out that Thakor is embroiled in a lawsuit, has slowed down any discussions on taking over the property. They even asked the Times reporter to correct the article.

Dishotsky made sure to reiterate to me that Starcity typically avoids taking over SROs at all cost, precisely because it can create an economic incentive for previous owners to be bad actors. This is especially true for vacant SROs. He said that the vast majority of Starcity properties are vacant commercial buildings that have never been used for housing.

As he pointed out, though, one of their three operational Starcity properties is a former SRO. He explained that they only took it over because it was in complete disrepair. There were only four individuals living in the building, and Starcity is allowing them to stay in their (refurbished) rooms at the same rate they were paying before: $400 a month, or one-fourth the base rent of the property’s new tenants.

I pushed him on the Bristol Hotel property. Clearly if he took the New York Times reporter to the property, talked were not as premature as he let on. He admitted that the Bristol Hotel is not entirely off the table. While Starcity doesn’t want to support the
It is an election conundrum. The city clearly showed no interest in master-leasing the Bristol Hotel, and whether the owner was a bad actor or not, the fact remains that the rooms lie vacant. All we’re left with is a question: Is filling a room a zero-sum game? [27x74]

Two ballot measures are rushing to the June ballot this year that aim to recuperate taxes from businesses and put them to work for poor people. Both are new gross receipts taxes, or taxes on the revenue receipts taken in by businesses in San Francisco. Measure C, introduced by Norman Yee and Jane Kim, is a 3 percent tax meant to fund pay increases for child care workers. Measure D, introduced by Asha Safai, is a 17 percent tax meant to generate $60 million for shelter and housing for homeless people (potentially 400 units), $15 million for SRO acquisition and $26 million to create “middle income” housing (which could house a family of four making somewhere around $92,000 per year).

But the two measures are embroiled in controversy because they pit our low-income communities against each other. These are competing pieces of legislation, because the housing measure contains what policy wonks call a “poison pill,” meaning if both pass, the one with the higher voting margin is implemented and the other is killed.

But you may ask, why must the voters pick between these two seemingly necessary pieces of legislation? One need not look farther than the upcoming mayoral race. We have competing mayoral candidates on either side of these bills. Jane Kim is running for mayor and has made children and families a top priority in their campaign positions. On the other side is London Breed, who is making homelessness a major issue in their prospective campaign.

While mayoral races have funding limits, ballot measures are not tied down by those same limitations. Mayoral candidates may put their own faces, money and names behind any ballot measure they endorse. At the same time, they can court voters for their own perspective campaigns and galvanizing voters.

All that being said, at least $60 million are on the line, with $35 million that could potentially go to housing of single homeless adults. But what about child care? The bill pushed by Jane Kim could potentially open up valuable child care support for lower income and homeless families. While not directly housing them, this bill could create opportunities for working families to send their children to daycare by opening up more slots within the system and affording child care workers higher wage.

It is an election conundrum.
Name: Shane Springer
Date: 26 February 2018
Place: Dore Street between Bryant and Brannan
Time without a home: About 33 years
Age: 47

How long have you been homeless?
I left home when I was 14, so 33 years I guess. But I've had like short periods of time when I had apartments. Mostly it's been on the streets, or hotels, you know, cars or things like that.

What does home mean?
Home, I guess, to me, would probably be where I grew up at. But it really doesn't have any meaning because we're moved around so much that there really isn't any home. When I was younger, when I look back in my childhood, I guess it would be an idea of... Stability? We really don't have a home out here because we're being pushed around so much. You don't have enough time to really setup a home.

Is shelter important?
(Shelter) It's one of the three basic needs, food, shelter, and ah... what's the other one? I can't remember the other one. But if you don't have shelter, you'll perish.

What's happening here?
Homelessness is being pushed under the rug. It's being overlooked. We're not bad people just because we don't have a place to live. In San Francisco the prices, what it costs to live here, is just astronomical. It costs more for a hotel room than it costs for an apartment. It's crazy. It's a crazy situation out here.